

Social Media and TV: A Preliminary Review of Interaction

Jafar Khoshrouzadeh^{1*} H.Md.Salleh^{2*}

1.J. Khoshrouzadeh, PhD candidate in Mass Communication Department of Communication Faculty of Modern Languages & Communication Universiti Putra Malaysia Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

2.H. Md. Salleh, PhD., Prof. Senior Lecturer Department of Communication Faculty of Modern Languages & Communication Universiti Putra Malaysia

Abstract

This paper review the role of social media and social networks sites in promoting social TV as a new emerging platform for people who tend to socialize around TV shows and programmes . Social media which are used in connection with television, have made TV watching experience much more interactive and social than before. Thanks to social media and social networks, television has gradually become a driving force for social interaction among the viewers. On social TV platform, people use social media networks to be more interactive in their online communications including sharing, posting comments, putting like and dislikes under TV related posts, or tagging and recommending certain TV shows to their friends and families via social media platform. All these facilities, innovations and activities can be taken into consideration as a new emerging television viewing habit. In this article researchers evaluated different opportunities and possibilities that social media offer to TV content creators and broadcasters as well as TV users and viewers. The findings of paper indicate that social media facilitate television viewer to socialize and interact around TV content in deferent conditions.

Keywords: Interaction, social media, social TV, television

1. Introduction

Over the past couple of years, there has been an increased interest in interactive television as a shared, synchronous experience. In spite of the argumentative dichotomy between interactive TV and social TV, Cesar (2009) argued that television has been a social medium since its invention, and has been considered a social link among people. People chat and discuss television programmes, recommend shows and send SMS messages when there is something of interest on (Cesar, 2009).

Frequently enhanced by innovation interactive TV culminated in the phenomenon called social TV has provided practitioners, academicians, researchers and developers with the current and interesting findings on the phenomenon referred to as social interactive television, which was created based on ‘Immersive Shared Experiences and Perspectives’, as well as evaluation methods that focus on social experiences around television. From the evolutionary perspectives of social TV, social media outlets like Facebook and Twitter can be regarded as earlier means of interaction on social TV (Rafaeli, 2008; Henson, 2010; Williams, et al 2009; Metcalf et al 2008). Moreover, Audio-visual communication has given way to primarily text-based online conversation in this area. Nowadays thank to social media platform, people interact online by posting status updates, writing on their friends’ walls and participating in web chats and forums around TV related contents before during and after watching.

Moreover, findings from a study conducted by Williams, et al (2009) which investigated the use of television as a device that supports social interactions between groups, argued that television could be used to support significant new forms of social communication and interaction between groups in different households. The study also introduced the idea of framing experiences, within which social communication can take place. In addition, interpreting the findings of the research has helped define the focus of proposed technical work required to deliver a range of new applications and social media designed to help support social interactions (Williams, et al 2009; Holbling, 2008).

Moreover, new TV paradigms, such as interactive TV and social TV have been developed to provide social and interactive features simultaneously with TV viewing experience (Chorianopoulos, 2007; Cesar, et al 2011; Metcalf, et al 2008). Hu et al (2014) agreed that interactive TV combines interaction on two screen media, including on-demand delivery of TV programmes as well as some value-added services, as Shamma, Shaw, Shafton & Liu (2007) admitted that social TV provides a platform where instant messaging can be synchronously done while watching television and video content, showing how this can enhance the chat experience. Meanwhile, Rothbaum, Weisz & Snyder (1982), in union with Shamma, et al (2007), looked at how watching television online while chatting can create a social experience and at the same time influence distraction and entertainment. The main objective of this article is to study the role of social media and social networks in promotion social TV as a new emerging phenomenon in other word researchers during this study are going find proper response some questions such as: how and in what extend social media influences TV viewing habit? What proportion of people discuss TV shows before, during and after viewing via social networks? What is the patterns of TV viewer’s participation on social networks before, during and after a TV show? How much

does social media affect TV viewing choices? And how showing social media icons on TV motivates people to participate in Social TV and finally how and to what extent social media promote traditional and social TV to be more interactive. For doing so, this article will organize in five parts in the first and second parts of article, social media and social TV will be reviewed separately. Then, referring to some facts and figures and through reporting some previous researches findings in this area, features and facilities of social media for social TV and traditional TV will be analyzed.

2. Social Media: An Overview

The emergence of social media in the Internet era has been a turning point to the discipline, history, practice and application of communication and social interaction. Social media can be defined as, “a group of Internet applications that builds on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and allows the creation and exchange of user-generated content” (Stassen, 2010, p. 5). Social media allows people to feel like they are a part of a community, even if they live thousands of miles apart from one another (Dalton, 2011). Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) defined social media as a technological space where online users create their own content and engage with their acquaintances, with similar users as well as with the virtual world as a whole. Furthermore, social media are defined as, “web-based services that allow individuals to construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system” (Boyd & Ellison, 2007, p.211). In that definition, the scholars highlighted three key functional roles of social media, namely:

1. Social media allow users to construct a public or personal profile;
2. Social media allow users to articulate a list of online friends; and
3. Social media allow users to surf through the profiles of their friends and others online.

The growing penetration of social media has prompted the desire for a commercial use of such social networking sites as Facebook and Twitter by, for example, advertisers (Burst Media, 2013). According findings of a study by Nielsen Company (2013), nearly 90% of advertisers use social media free tools, such as Facebook and Twitter, and 75% of them use paid social media advertising, such as paid ads on Facebook or sponsored blogs. Today, social networking on social media has become a global phenomenon (Nielsen Smartphone Analytics, July 2012). Thus, arguably social media have revolutionized the role of media in not only consumer’s life but also producers and manufactures’ lives by obliterating the fourth wall between media providers and media users and facilitating genuine dialogue (Logan, 2014).

Expressing somewhat different views from the findings of Nielsen Company (2013) Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy and Silvestre (2011) opined that not quite a large population of (business and other) executives appreciated the benefits of using social media to boost businesses and other social endeavor. However, the scholars agreed with Logan (2014) and Boyd and Ellison (2007) that, social media employ mobile and web-based technologies to create virtual, or online social sphere. The Kietzmann, et al. (2011) further outline that,

Social media employ mobile and web-based technologies to create highly interactive platforms via which individuals and communities share, co-create, discuss and modify user-generated content. Given the tremendous exposure of social media in the popular press..., it would seem that we are in the midst of an altogether new communication landscape. (p.241)

The scholars designed a framework that identifies seven key functional roles of social media. Their functional roles framework for social media is more comprehensive than the one presented by Boyd and Ellison (2007). The functional roles of the social media are as follows:

1. Identity
2. Conversations
3. Sharing
4. Presence
5. Relationships
6. Reputation, and
7. Groups (Kietzmann, et al. 2011)

Furthermore, according to Brake and Saflo (2011), the term social media refers to the collective activities, practices, and behaviors of communities of Internet users that share information, knowledge, and opinions online. Web-based applications serve as the primary vehicles for social media (Brake & Saflo, 2011; Kietzmann, et al. 2011; Boyd & Ellison, 2007; Lagon, 2014), enabling quick and easy transmission of content such as text, photos, video, and audio (Brake & Saflo, 2011). According to the scholars, the concept of social media combines two traditional terms to create a relatively new experience: ‘Social,’ of course, refers to a person’s ability to interact with and influence others. ‘Media’ traditionally refers to newspapers, magazines, television and similar venues that accommodate the delivery of news and information. Together, social media is a powerful and pervasive notion (Brake & Saflo, 2011; Boyd & Ellison, 2007; Kietzmann, et al. 2011) that can be a boon (or potential barrier) to a small business. In fact, it has now become imperative to learn to live with the

idea that it is virtually impossible to hide from friends, employees, customers and others who are motivated to talk about you (Brake & Saflo, 2011).

Social media also has been described as a technological space where online users create their own content and engage with their acquaintances, with similar users as well as with the virtual world as a whole (Haenlein, 2010). According to the scholars, user-generated content (USG) can be seen as the sum of all ways in which people use social media. Furthermore, Bahnisch and Bruns (2009) numbered four key enablers of social media similar to those highlighted in creative collaboration studies. These are:

1. Low threshold to participation
2. Highly granular participation (gradual socialisation to community)
3. Assumption of user equipotentiality (equal potential to become valued), and
4. shared content ownership

Burton (2011) identified social media as a comprehensive term used when discussing all tools that people, especially businesses, use to create an integrated online presence. The scholar then highlighted the relationships between social media and businesses, saying that those tools give businesses the ability to create and publish many different kinds of information on the Internet for the benefit of both their customers and their employees. According to the scholar, the social media platform is one of the fastest-growing fields in small business marketing and collaboration.

The relationship between social media and social networking sites is described crucial and that social networking sites are an intrinsic part of the definition for social media. Collectively, online applications that allow multiple users to exchange knowledge, personal information and skills are known as Web 2.0, or the second phase of the Internet that embraces online gatherings of people or resources (Burton, 2011). Social networking sites, as a segment of the Web 2.0 concept, allow users to meet friends, express ideas, and develop interests in a variety of online applications (Burton, 2011; Kietzmann, et al. 2011; Boyd & Ellison, 2007; Logan, 2014).

It is widely believed that social media is changing the way people send and receive information. Social media are characterized by a high level of interactivity (Stassen, 2010). Moreover, news consumers are using social media in order to engage with news in ways that challenges traditional media organizations (Kerrigan & Graham, 2010). The interactivity and level of engagement available in social media transcend anything offered by mainstream media (Stassen, 2010).

Social Tv: A New Emerging Phenomena

Media research has shown that people enjoy watching television as a part of socializing in groups. However, many constraints in daily life limit the opportunities for doing so. The Social TV project builds on the increasing integration of television and computer technology to support sociable, computer-mediated group viewing experiences Ducheneaut et al (2008). Social TV has been given various definitions and descriptions by scholars. Some scholars viewed it from the social aspect of users' engagement with one another. In this perspective, users usually use the 'second screen' on their mobile or hand-held communication devices such as smartphones, mobile phones, laptops, iPads, tablets and even personal computers (PCs) via social networking sites (SNSs), to exchange live comments about a TV or video content. Other scholars defined it from the aspect of user-broadcaster interaction, which usually does not involve exchange of comments via SNSs but rather such communication channels like telephone, fax, email, website live chats, etc. Nathan, et al (2008) described social TV as the medium that supports communication and social interactions – remote or co-located – in a TV-watching content, or related to a TV experience, and technology that supports these communications and interactions. According to Bjur (2012), social TV is sets of technological solutions that accurately melt together television and social media on the single platform of the television. While Gross, et al (2008) described social TV as a system that has a huge potential for making the group-viewing experience of TV spectators more enjoyable by providing novel means for advanced social interaction among spectators. Furthermore, the concept of social TV, according to Oehlberg, et al (2006: p.251) can be defined as "the increasing integration of television and computer technology to support sociable, computer mediated group viewing experiences."

Some other scholars explain the social TV landscape. Metcalf, et al (2008) opined that apart from synchronous communication mechanisms, social TV provides an unremarkable awareness system based on ambient devices. The final goal of these approaches, according to the scholars, is to provide enriched communication between separate parties, when watching television content. In addition, having a social TV helps people feel like others were around, pulls them in to the TV viewing experience, and encourages new TV behaviours. Williams, et al (2009) highlighted that television shows are now prompting online social interactions between viewers by requesting viewers, as part of the first broadcasters, to engage in simultaneous discussions about the shows. Coppens, et al (2008) regarded social TV from the non-sociable interactive perspectives. There is distinctive contrast between the two genres of interactive TV – one is social while the other is not. It is therefore, clear that interpersonal relationships on social interaction TV are different from those of non-social

interactive TV due to differences in the manner of TV programme consumption and accompanying user behaviours (Putnam, 2000; Nathan, et al 2008)

Alvear (2012) suggested that social TV is about bringing sociality back into TV. The scholar argued that television has always been a social medium. Alvear (2012) however, reasoned that personal video devices and multiple TVs in the home have made it less social, somehow in unison with Gerbner, et al. (1986), Signorielli, et al. (1995), Newhagen and Reeves (1992) and Hoynes (1994). Today, social networking sites are making it easy for consumers to get sociality with TV again (Alvear, 2012).

Studies have indicated that social TV multitasking with other media while watching a television programme has become the norm for many viewers, particularly among young adults, with engagement with social media increasingly becoming the number one other activity. One of the more common occurrences of social TV is the use of Twitter hashtags (#) for a growing number of television, sports and news shows (Montpetit, Klym & Blain, 2010). According to the scholars, many of these shows have staff with the specific job of monitoring and reporting social media posts.

Social TV also provides an unprecedented opportunity for viewers to share their opinions and learn the views of others. This process introduces all participants to new voices, content and characters that they might enjoy (Network Executive's Social TV Survival Guide, 2013). As viewers become more engaged and share more about what they are thinking, TV producers can tailor content to viewers' likes and avoid their dislikes, creating a more worthwhile experience. While, advertisers can provide more content that is relevant and offers through more targeted media choices, a winning formula for reaching consumers who spend four to six hours daily consuming TV content (Network Executive's Social TV Survival Guide, 2013).

Social Media and Social Tv: An Interactive Equation

Television has traditionally been an important facilitator for social interaction and a popular source of conversation (Wohn & Na, 2009). Scholars have referred to television as a 'cultural forum' where people discuss a broad variety of topics (Newcomb, 1994) or an 'electronic hearth' that brought people together (Tichi, 1991). However, the convergence between TV and social media has produced a much more online social TV experience (Oehlberg, et al. 2006; Cesar and Greets, 2011a). Media research has shown that people enjoy watching television as a part of socialising in groups. However, many constraints in daily life limit the opportunities for doing so. The social TV project builds on the increasing integration of television and computer technology to support sociable, computer-mediated group viewing experiences (Ducheneaut et al. 2008).

Earlier research on social television viewing looked at two elements - television content as a conversation trigger and television as a medium that physically connects two or more people into a confined space (Morrison & Krugman, 2001). Social network sites (SNSs), however, allow television viewers to, once again, enjoy the communal experience of group viewing without being physically together (Morrison & Krugman, 2001). This study looks at a new practice of television viewing that combines these two elements: viewers are sharing their viewing experiences real time through computer-mediated communication, which creates a pseudo-communal viewing experience even though they are not collocated (Wohn & Na, 2009). The researchers went ahead to discuss that examining messages on Twitter, a popular social network site applies a uses and gratifications framework to explore what types of messages people share with others while they are watching television and how those messages correspond to the context of the programme they are watching. The researchers proposed that the AEIO (Attention, Emotion, Information, and Opinion) model is an analytical model for mapping type and flow of content on social media message streams (Wohn & Na, 2009).

In another case preliminary results of a study conducted by Hill and Benton (2012) show that displaying hashtags in one's tweets correlates with increase in TV programme viewers' Twitter activity overall, as well as increases their engagement with the programme during commercial breaks. The findings also show two main effects. First, displaying a tweet during a programme will increase its retweet rate. In controlling for the popularity of the tweeter, the content of the tweet will also affect its expected number of retweets. Second, displaying hashtags during a programme seems to increase the number of programme-related tweets, in this case by a relatively high proportion, 18.8% (Hill & Benton, 2012).

Furthermore, it has been documented that people who use smartphones and tablets while watching TV are often checking e-mail or Facebook, and show-specific applications, mainly serve the most devoted (Greer & Douglas, 2011). Similarly, Chung and Nah (2009) conducted a study which focused on the number of followers of local TV Twitter sites, market size and features offered on the sites as they relate to strategic goals, strategic targets, and tactical approaches (Eastman et al., 2006).

Greer & Douglas (2011) also documented how television stations explored the use of Twitter for promotion and branding. According to the scholars, applying newer strategies to older media is often complicated as audiences find different ways to receive information. Social media were adopted by stations that sought to stay relevant in a changing media environment. Examining the use of new media technologies by traditional media provides important information for broadcasters who seek new ways to attract and maintain

audiences (Greer & Douglas, (2011). Similarly, EMarketer (2012) reported that from June 2011 to June 2012, social media commentary about television and television shows increased by 17.0%. However, social TV is still not a mainstream activity. Nevertheless, the number of social media users who followed TV shows on social network sites grew from 10.4% to 15.3% in one year. The volume of conversation within this minority and the ability for those conversations to influence audiences that is what is significant to marketers and brands (EMarketer, 2012).

Twitter is a Web-based social network system first made available for public use in August 2006. Referred to as a 'status update service,' Twitter enables people to post tweets, which are brief statements about what they are doing, and to read the postings of others (Fox, Zickuhr, & Smith, (2009); Stassen, (2010). Hermida (2010) has highlighted the significance of Twitter as a micro-blogging tool. Micro-blogging can be defined as, "a new media technology that enables and extends our ability to communicate, sharing some similarities with broadcast" (Hermida, 2010, p. 298). Because of this similarity, it enjoys substantial popularity among television journalists. According to the scholar, people use Twitter for four main reasons: "daily chatter, conversations, sharing information and reporting news" (Hermida, 2010, p. 299). Twitter is increasingly becoming popular among social TV users, bloggers and journalists because micro-blogging systems like Twitter allow a large number of users to communicate with each other in short bursts of information (Ebbini 2010).

A study conducted by Social Guide and Nielsen confirmed that there is a strong correlation between the volume of Twitter conversations and TV ratings (Wieland, 2013). In addition to advertising expenditure and previous-year ratings, Twitter was identified as a proxy for viewership in relation to ratings increases. This relationship has largely been driven by the rise in consumers consuming media across second screen devices (Nielsen, 2013). Furthermore, a recent TV Guide study demonstrated that 17.0% of people began watching a show because of a social media comment, while 31.0% of them said that they continued to watch a TV programme because of the social interactions they were having with others during the show and the volume of social interactions is constantly increasing (Wieland, 2013).

With the proliferation of social media applications and Smartphone technology, social interaction around television programming can now be shared amongst millions of viewers simultaneously. It is estimated that on average, 10 million public online comments are made each day worldwide related to television content (Talbot, 2011). For instance, studies have shown that an estimated 40% of Twitter traffic during the "PRIME TIME" show period is about television, (Wired Magazine 2013). According Keller (2013) in the near future, a show's tweetability may be just as crucial as the sheer size of its audience. However, the role social media really play in driving people's viewing behaviour is a matter of debate.

Social networking which is also part of social media (Kietzmann, et al. 2011; Logan, 2014; Boyd and Ellison, 2007) provides opportunities to expand the nature of existing applications and user activities in cyberspace. Considering the idea of 'social TV', along with these opportunities, to combine activities such as social networking and TV or entertainment Ali-Hasan (2008) argued that whether offering a shared entertainment experience or common ground to elicit conversation, TV watching is already a social activity. The convergence of television and social media is an exciting prospect for researchers and one that is also of interest to users. Ali-Hasan (2008) presented the findings of a study examining social scenarios for TV, which indicated that even those users who were not actively engaged in creating social media were actively using social software to consume content on a daily basis. Regardless of their level of engagement in social software, the participants reacted to most social TV scenarios with overwhelming enthusiasm. The scholar also highlighted the idea of a TV-themed online community. Through this community, users could share their TV viewing history and favourite programmes with family, friends and others, meet new people who watch the same programmes as they do, post reviews of programmes they have watched and discuss their favourite programmes with other people.

From another point of view, the importance of social media in the second screen phenomenon cannot be overemphasized. Social media has become one of the media most commonly used coupled with TV. According to the scholars, this can be attributed to rise in adoption of second screen devices such as tablets and mobile phones, as well as the portability of laptop and computers. Corroborating, Wieland (2013) documented that Forrester Research reported that 48% of United States adults claimed to use a laptop while watching TV to chat, browse, or research what they were watching, while 85% of tablet owners said they used their tablets while watching TV (Wieland, 2013). Google further estimates that 52% of smartphone users use their device while watching television. As more people engage with social media, the volume of online conversations about television content while shows and commercials are airing within those platforms will increase (Wieland, 2013).

Lochrie and Coulton (2011) investigated the role of social media as the facilitator of second screen for TV, through the analysis of tweets for weekend primetime UK TV show the X-Factor. The results highlighted the rich source of information that can be extracted in real-time and its enormous potential for broadcasters and producers both in terms of reinvigorating live TV viewing and creating new forms of audience interaction. In the research, Lochrie and Coulton (2011) presented a study into how the social networking service Twitter was

increasingly being used as a channel for real-time inter-audience interaction for TV and implications for the role of mobile as the 'second screen'. The findings of the study highlighted that mobile phones are already becoming the second screen for TV but not through broadcaster provision of personalised services, or service providers enabling them to act as a new form of remote, but rather by audiences themselves, creating their own forums for inter-audience interaction.

Furthermore, the data clearly illustrated the high levels of interaction, which was already developing in the use of Twitter as an inter-audience forum around TV, and how the narrative of the show was played out through this interaction. Therefore, producers and broadcaster should consider how best to weigh the importance of such interaction in relation to their whole audience. The findings also showed that different level of audience interaction depends on the type of show in question (Lochrie & Coulton, 2011).

It has been stressed that social media has become established as a 'second-screen' for a select group of viewers. Social marketing, for example, seems effective in generating conversation around new season premieres, particularly with certain genres of programming (PR Newswire US, 2014). However, many people will claim that this emerging social TV trend is fundamentally changing the way people watch and interact around TV content (Cesar & Geerts, 2011a).

Moreover, an example of social media use in social TV is Google TV, which includes Twitter integration but does not show tweets related to what the user is watching. Otherwise, Google TV provides the expected Twitter functions (via an Android application) including viewing and posting status updates and interacting with tweets (reply, retweet, view URLs and search Twitter functions using typed text or hashtags).

However, in contrast, although Facebook is not a content provider, it is possible that it will be a big player in social TV in the near future (Auerbach, 2012) by combining large amounts of video content and a very large social network. The Facebook Connect API already makes it easy for any web site to integrate the social media capabilities of Facebook.

The findings of an experiment conducted by Hamaguchi (2012) on the viewing behaviour of users in about Teleda as a large-scale social TV system and the future shape of TV media in the social media era suggested that user satisfaction is likely to be increased the current trends in the change and development of media environments and related technologies were considered. The findings also revealed that the trend towards social media in TV has become irreversible. The study recommended that there should be a concerted effort from the TV media to break through into the emerging arena to ensure sustainability of the TV system.

Furthermore, findings of an experiment on the potential linkage of social TV with external social network sites (SNSs) by Ogawa and Yonekura (2013), indicated that 22% of the respondents used the function to link with outside SNSs. A total 1,371 programmes reviews were posted on outside SNSs and 62% of them were on twitter, followed by 28% on Facebook and 10% on Mixi.

3. Social Media and Social TV: Facts And Figures

To better understanding of social media and social TV interaction referring to some numbers and statistics can be beneficial. A study by Eriksson Consumer Lab (2011) found that 62% of TV users used social media while watching TV, which increased by 18% since 2011. Furthermore, 62% of people use social networking sites and forums while watching TV on a weekly basis and this number is growing. Of these people, 40% will be discussing what they are currently watching on TV over social networks (Eriksson Consumer Lab, 2011). The study also revealed that women were more likely to use social forums while watching TV. That is indicated by 69% of women who engaged in this behaviour, compared to 62% of men. However, of those respondents, the men were more likely to discuss the things they were currently watching. This may be linked to the desire to discuss live sports as they happen (Eriksson Consumer Lab, 2011).

Another study conducted by Nielsen and Yahoo (2011) indicated that 86% of mobile Internet users in US watched TV with their mobile devices. Of that set, 40% said they were using the devices for social networking, 33% of them said they were using applications and more than half of them were texting friends and family. On the wired web with PCs and laptops, 60% of Nielsen panelists reported they simultaneously watched TV and browsed the Internet.

Moreover, according to the results of a recent industry survey from Informa Telecoms & Media (2012) on the 'Future of TV', over 20% of respondents felt that social networking sites like Facebook were preferred to build an audience for paid digital content, compared with only 16% for network operators. However, despite the minimal investment in TV by Facebook, compared with other SNSs platforms like Apple or Netflix to date, the growth of tablets and the new trend for simultaneous multiscreen consumption means that Facebook is could improve the social TV phenomenon (Informa Telecoms & Media, Business Wire, 2012) as corroborated by Informa Telecoms & Media (2012).

As mentioned earlier twitter has emerged as a key driver of social TV interaction. Study findings indicated that in June 2012, one thirds of active Twitter users tweeted about TV-related content, which is an increase of 27% from the beginning of the year (Nielsen Net View, July 2012). Facebook, Twitter, Blogger,

Pinterest, WordPress, LinkedIn, Tumblr, Wikia, Reddit and MySpace are some social media outlets. In a related development, findings of a study by Berelowitz (2012) indicated that among respondents to a Hollywood Reporter survey of social network users ages 13 to 49, 79% always or sometimes visited Facebook while watching TV and 83% surfed other parts of the Web.

A study by Nielsen Net View (2012) indicate that, the influence of social media on purchase intent is strong across all regions, but strongest among online consumers in the Asia-Pacific, Latin America and Middle East / Africa markets. Thirty per cent of online consumers in the Middle East / Africa region and 29% in Asia-Pacific use social media on a daily basis to learn more about brands/products/services, with one-thirds of respondents in both regions connecting on a weekly basis.

The assumption that the type of social networking experiences that have proven very popular globally on PC platforms (sites and applications such as Orkut, Cyworld, MySpace, Mixi, QQ and Facebook, etc. will prove popular on a television platform has also been outlined (Ducheneaut, et.al 2008). However, according to Martin (2013) Twitter and Facebook both claim to be broadcasters' ideal partners. Yet as they compete for \$211 billion in global TV advertisements expenditure, it would be interesting to know how far their interests would match those of the television industry.

Furthermore, Keller (2013) stated that consumer interaction with social media in relation to their television viewing is relatively modest compared to other forms of communication and lags behind other online media, TV promotions and, especially, offline communication. More specifically, only 12% of respondents used social media one or more times per day for content related to TV (Fay, 2013). According to the scholar, a greater number, 37% of the respondents, used social media at least once a week to engage with TV, suggesting a growth potential for social media as an influence on TV viewing if these infrequent users become more frequent overtime.

Recent numbers from Ericsson ConsumerLab indicate that over 60% of TV viewers engage in social media activities while watching TV (on a weekly basis) (Ericsson, 2012). According to the researcher, those statistics had increased from only 40% in 2011, indicating a rapidly growing trend. It is however, interesting to note that over 40% of those viewers actually used social media to talk about what they were watching, while watching it (Ericsson, 2012). Is using social media while watching TV further changing the way we consume TV content?

Based on Nielsen's (2012) Social Media Report highlights, the rise of social TV is evolving how consumers use social media, while also transforming TV-watching into a more immediate and shared experience. Viewers talking about shows with each other on Twitter or Facebook while they watch can encompass social network activities that TV networks and creators engage in to promote their shows. According to a Markets Report (2014) from late 2013, the total social TV market worth was expected to grow to more than \$256 billion by 2017 (Kohn, 2014). Indeed, large businesses have been built around measuring what people are tweeting about TV shows while they watch. According to Kohn (2014), Facebook has also joined the market, and stake the claim that Twitter is not the only social TV game in use. Twitter is generally considered the most prominent social media platform for social TV because of its near real-time nature. Facebook, with the highest number of social media subscribers, is also a major player in this interactive environment (Montpetit, et al. 2010).

One factor that distinguishes Twitter from other popular social network systems is the age of its users. The scholar pointed out that traditionally, younger populations tend to drive the growth of an innovation. Studies also found that Media organisations are using Twitter to connect with their audiences. According findings by PR Newswire (2014) about half of social media activity while users are watching TV relates to the TV programming.

4. Features and Facilities of Social Media for Social TV

The first scholarly work to link real-time TV posts to real-time TV engagement response (Hill & Benton, 2012) analysed features of the social media strategy of an American reality singing show. The work showed that when messages were posted on the TV screen during the show, they were much more likely to be discussed by viewers than messages created by the same online social media users during the show that were not posted on the screen, indicating that this strategy works (Hill and Benton, 2012). The contribution by the scholars is a set of results, which showed the relationship between prompting viewers during a TV show with social media posts on screen and increased and prolonged engagement during the show.

Furthermore, studies have indicated that in recent years, social networking and social interactions have challenged old conceptions in the television landscape. According to Cesar and Greets (2011), Web applications that offer video content, networked television sets and set-top boxes, and online TV widgets are - or, will be - radically transforming how people watch and interact around television content. Cesar and Geerts (2011) provide a structured framework for better understanding of the emerging field, social TV. Social TV system is described as a platform where social networking and mass media seamlessly integrate, leveraging social interactions between viewers separated in time and or space. The scholars identified four key aspects that define social TV:

1. Content selection and sharing
2. Direct communication
3. Community building, and
4. Status updates

Such categorisation is helpful not only for classifying current solutions, but for paving further innovations. In the future, users should expect convergent environments where TV, the Web and social networks fluidly interoperate in, for instance, domestic video conferencing that nurtures closed relationships and novel social-aware TV formats (Cesar & Greets, 2011; Nielsen, 2013; Hill & Benton, 2012).

The Internet itself has changed media consumption, but social media that operate on the Internet are having a profound effect all their own (Ebbini, 2010). Social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter have become ‘virtual pacemakers,’ setting the tone of people’s lives, which are increasingly being lived online (McDonnell, 2011). In other hand traditional news organisations, such as local television news stations, are also joining the social media as a way to reach larger audiences. Journalists are pursuing these new, larger audiences by blogging and posting updates and stories on Twitter and Facebook (Stassen, 2010). In this phenomenon, widget has been used by websites such as CNN and BBC to combine live streaming of video content with Facebook updates from others watching the same content (or from only your friends). Facebook has also unveiled a live video streaming channel, Facebook Live, which does the same thing effectively (Cesar, 2010). There is clearly more activity in integrating social media with TV, at least in terms of viewing or sending status updates for Twitter and or Facebook. However, there is less activity in retrieving social media messages about the TV programme being watched (Cesar, 2010).

It has been asserted that news programmes, awards shows and other real-time programmes have continued to create more of a two-way conversation with viewers by utilising social media tools like Facebook and Twitter (Torrez-Riley, 2012). Online social activities, or tools like asking questions, providing commentary and voting on content, allow users to participate in the actual creation and presentation of television programmes. Those tools not only create an interaction between viewer and television programme, they also expand viewers’ interpersonal relationships by opening social circles wider to include an online community that spans worldwide (Torrez-Riley, 2012).

Social TV also provides an unprecedented opportunity for viewers to share their opinions and learn the views of others. This process introduces all participants to new voices, content and characters that they might enjoy (Network Executive’s Social TV Survival Guide, 2013). As viewers become more engaged and share more about what they are thinking, TV producers can tailor content to viewers’ likes and avoid their dislikes, creating a more worthwhile experience. For their part, advertisers can provide content that is more relevant and offers through more targeted media choices, a winning formula for reaching consumers who spend four to six hours daily consuming TV content (Network Executive’s Social TV Survival Guide, 2013).

In addition, with the diffusion of the Internet and social network sites such as Facebook and Twitter, which are used in concert with television, the TV experience has become much more interactive and it is now impossible not to acknowledge that television has also become a driving force for social interaction. On social TV platform, people use the Internet to be more interactive in their online communications; posting comments, links and pictures on the sites of things they follow, even news organisations. In addition, the parallel diffusion of Internet videos and user-generated content, fostered by YouTube in particular, has provided society with a different approach to media and television in particular (Summa, 2012).

Summa (2011) highlights the active audience aspect of social TV using social media interactions with Internet services. The researcher opined that programme consumers have also become producers. That outlines the phenomenon popularly referred to as user-generated media/content (Logan, 2014). It has been acknowledged that different technological improvements have changed the definition of television. Special attention is given to how Facebook and Twitter influenced some of the fundamental properties of TV, such as liveliness, character-centric storylines and flow as well as what the YouTube phenomena means for television. Studies have forecast about the increasingly social future of television (Summa, 2011).

Cesar and Greets (2011a) explained that now TV viewers utilising social media while watching TV, synchronizing up with other viewers and creating their own social TV experiences. Content providers are incorporating it into their programming and TV manufacturers into their TV sets. There is further a growing number of applications on everything, from computers to smartphones, labelling themselves as dedicated social TV applications that can facilitate TV viewers’ need to socialise with each other around TV content (Cesar & Greets, 2011a).

Interference Between Social Media And Traditional Television

Scholars have documented that nowadays, viewers can watch their favourite TV shows on the computer monitor (Ciacu & Tanase, 2012). According to the scholars, the link between the traditional TV and social TV is the Internet. More than the Internet itself, however, the social media have an important role in changing the

behaviour of traditional TV viewers, directing them more and more to online environment and to selective consumption of content, they stressed. As far as interferences between 'old media' and 'new media' (involving socialising networks) are, relatively major migrations of online viewers of classical televisions towards the online environment can be noticed (Ciacu & Tanase, 2012).

During a user study the scholars have chosen five relevant television channels from Romania (Pro TV, Antena 3, Realitatea TV, TVR1 and Discovery Romania) and have analysed their evolution according to the following indicators: TV rating, website traffic and the number of fans on Facebook. In this context, Ciacu and Tanase (2012) proposed to identify the interferences between traditional televisions and social media. According to the findings of the study, the fluctuations concerning the rating of TV channels but this is not relevant in the context of the rating figures from the first six months of 2011. Nevertheless, we can see an increase of the websites traffic submitted to the study. In another work Clark F. Greer & Douglas. A (2011) documented how traditional television stations explore the use of Twitter for promotion and branding. Applying newer strategies to older media is often complicated as audiences find different ways to receive information. Social media were adopted by stations that sought to stay relevant in a changing media environment. Examining the use of new media technologies by traditional media provides important information for broadcasters who seek new ways to attract and maintain audiences.

Traditional retail and online brands seek new ways to build a platform to enable customers to connect with one another and encourage consumer engagement. The purpose of the M.Sharpe's work has conducted to understand how social media is transforming consumer engagement and redefining commercial marketing strategies using video on the Web, mobile devices, and traditional TV. THEY develop and validate a conceptual model of how experiential *personal engagement* and *social-interactive engagement* influence active and passive behaviour in the emerging form of television that supports and integrates social interaction. The paper describes how personal engagement with the content and social-interactive engagement (resulting from the perceived sense of community, intrinsic enjoyment, and participation experience) differentially influence both active and passive behaviour and results illustrate the different effect of gender and level of interaction provided (social features) by the social TV Web site.

5. Conclusion

As reported in this paper in recent years social networking and social interactions have challenged old conceptions in the television landscape. The fact that social TV integrates social networking sites like Facebook, Twitter, google plus, Instagram and other social networks media into the TV environment, will allows remote viewers to interact with each other via the TV set. In this atmosphere interactive social TV services have implemented social media applications for TV viewers to read and respond to tweets and other messages from social networking sites while watching TV. In other word, social TV will enable sociable interaction between and among users regardless of physical barriers that may have been between them and also creates the opportunity for asking viewers to perform complex interactions such as responding to tweets on a TV screen breaks the lean-back nature of TV viewing as argued by Ali-Hasan (2008). Moreover, the fact remains clear that social TV is increasingly becoming trendy among users. Social TV also provides the landscape for sociable networking of a peer-to-peer group with whom TV programme watching would like to be shared who may be somewhere else than in the same place at the same time. This feature provides people with a new kind of watching and social experience (Oksman, 2009; Oehlbrg, et al 2006). Social and interactive TVs could recreate a virtual social arena for online interaction and sociality among viewers, the possibility of creating a network of TV programme viewers simultaneously though they may be geographically dispersed is progressively making social TV more trendy and fun among users. And last but not least, all this trends and innovation can be take in consideration as a new emerging paradigm in television related studies that social media and social networks are the main effective drivers of this so called new paradigm.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aniseh Ebbini, "An exploration of social media use in local television news stations: An evaluation and development of a successful new media strategy", A paper submitted in partial fulfilment for the requirements of the Degree of Master of Arts in Journalism, University of Arkansas Bachelor of Arts in Journalism, (2010).
- [2] Bahnisch, M., & Bruns, A., "Social media: Tools for user-generated content: Social drivers behind growing consumer participation in user-led content generation", Smart Services CRC, Vol. 1, (March 2009).
- [3] Bjur, Jakob (2012) 'Social Television Ecology – The Misfits and New Viewing Practices', in Alberto Abruzzese, Nello Barile, Julian Gebhardt, Jane Vincent and Leopoldina Fortunati (eds) *New Television Ecosystem*, pp. 175–92. Participation in Broadband Society Series. New York: Peter Lang.
- [4] Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B., "Social network sites: definition, history, and scholarship," *Engineering Management Review, IEEE*, Vol. 38, No. 3, (2010): pp. 16-31.

- [5] Burst Media, “Online insights: Expanding the conversation: Leveraging social media for brand interaction,” (2013). Retrieved April 4, 2013 from http://www.burstmedia.com/pdf/burst_media_online_insights_2013_04.pdf
- [6] Ciacu, Nicoleta & Tanase, TaseŃte, “Television in the social media era, *Communication & Marketing*, Vol. 3, No. 4, (March 2012), p. 95. The network executive’s social TV survival guide, (January, 2013), Retrieved January 1, 2013 from <http://www.gleanster.com/whitepaper/the-network-executive-s-social-tv-survival-guide>
- [7] Clark F. Greer & Douglas A., “Using Twitter for promotion and branding: A content analysis of local television”, *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, Vol. 55, No. 2, (May 2011): pp. 198-214.
- [8] Collin, P., Richardson, I., & Third, A., “The benefits of social networking services”, *Cooperative Research Centre for Young People, Technology and Wellbeing* (2011), Retrieved November 12, 2012 from <http://www.fya.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/The-Benefits-of-Social-Networking-Services.pdf>
- [9] Coppens, T., Vanparijs, F., & Handekyn, K. (2005). *AmigoTV: A social TV experience through triple-play convergence*. Alcatel Technology white paper.
- [10] D. Yvette Wohn & Eun–Kyung Na., “Tweeting about TV: Sharing television viewing experiences via social media message streams”, *Journal of First Monday*, Vol. 16, No. 3, (2011). Retrieved July 15, 2010 from <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3368/2779/html>
- [11] D.S. Chung, & S. Nah, “The effects of interactive news presentation on perceived user satisfaction of online community newspapers”, *Journal of Computer - Mediated Communication*, Vol. 14, No. 4, (April 1998): pp. 855-874.
- [12] David Brake & Lon Saflo, *Write in the social media bible: Tactics, tools and strategies for business success*. Cengage Learning, (2011).
- [13] Ed Keller, “Is social TV ready for primetime?” *Insight Blog*, (29 June, 2013).
- [14] Enrique Martin, E.V.P., “Futurescape’s social TV report is great, it allows us to understand how TV is today and how it will be in the near future”, in *Social TV* (5th edition), (2013), Retrieved January 13, 2014 from www.futurescape.t
- [15] GCF, “Facebook 101: What is Facebook?” (2014). Retrieved November 27, 2014 from <http://www.gcflernfree.org/facebook101/2>
- [16] Giacomo Summa & A.P. Lambert, “Social TV: The future of television in the Internet age”, *Academic Publishing*, (2012).
- [17] Greer, Clarke F., & Douglas A. Ferguson, “Using Twitter for promotion and branding: A content analysis of local television, *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, Vol. 55, No. 2, (2011): pp. 198–214, doi: 10.1080/08838151.2011.57082.
- [18] Gross, T., Fetter, M. & Paul-Stueve, T. (2008). Toward advanced social TV in a cooperative media space. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 42(2), 155-173. Also available at www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10447310701821491 Accessed on 11 November 2014.
- [19] Hermida A., “Twittering the news: The emergence of ambient journalism”, *Journalism Practice*, Vol. 4, (2010), p. 297-308.
- [20] Informa Telecoms & Media, *Business Wire*, Facebook key to the future of social TV, (March 29, 2012), Database: Regional Business.
- [21] Jason, K., Where is social TV growing fastest? Maybe not where you think, (January 27, 2014), Retrieved December 21, 2014 from <http://blogs.cisco.com/cle/where-is-social-tv-growing-fastest-maybe-not-where-you-think/html>
- [22] Jessica Torrez-Riley, *The social TV phenomenon: New technologies look to enhance television’s role as an enabler of social interaction*, *Elon University*.
- [23] Jose Alvear, “Guide to streaming multimedia”, *Wiley*, (April 1998), Retrieved December 25, 1998 from <http://www.tvover.net/CategoryView,category,IPTV%2BReports.aspx>
- [24] Kang Yong Lee, “Social TV service: A case study”, *IEEE, International Conference on Consumer Electronics (ICCE) Las Vegas*, 9-12 January 2011, (2011), pp. 287 – 288.
- [25] Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M., “Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media”, *Business Horizons*, Vol. 53, No. 1, (2010): pp. 59-68, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003>
- [26] Karen R. Sollins, “Challenges to privacy in social networking mashups: Social TV as a case study”, (2011).
- [27] Keller Fay Group, “Talking social TV: Understanding the effects of social media and television viewing”, *The Council for Research Excellence*, (2013).
- [28] Kellyn Jane Wieland, *Social TV and the second screen*, B.A. advance report presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Texas, Austin in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts, (May 2013).
- [29] Kietzmann, J. H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I. P., & Silvestre, B. S., “Social media? Get serious!

- Understanding the functional building blocks of social media”, *Business Horizons*, Vol. 54 No. 3, (2011): pp. 241-251.
- [30] Kirk Hazlett, “Social TV: How marketers can reach and engage audiences by connecting television to the Web”, *Social Media, and Mobile*, (2012).
- [31] Kirk Hazlett, *Social TV: How marketers can reach and engage audiences by connecting television to the Web*, *Social Media, and Mobile*, (2012).
- [32] Logan, K., “Why isn’t everyone doing it? A comparison of antecedents to following brands on Twitter and Facebook”, *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, Vol. 14, No. 2, (2014): pp. 60-72.
- [33] M. Montpetit, N. Klym, & E. Blain, *The future of mobile TV: When mobile TV meets the Internet and social networking*, presented at “Mobile TV: Customizing content and experience”, (2010): pp. 305-326.
- [34] M. Morrison and D. Krugman 2001. “A look at mass and computer mediated technologies: Understanding the roles of television and computers in the home,” *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, volume 45, number 1, pp. 135–161.http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4501_9
- [35] Mark Lochrie & Paul Coulton, “Mobile phones as second screen for TV: Enabling inter- audience interaction”, (2011).
- [36] McClard, A. & Anderson, K., “Focus on Facebook: Who are we anyway?” *Anthropology News*, Vol. 49, No. 3, (2008): pp. 10-12. Retrieved November 27, 2014 from <http://www.aaanet.org/issues/anthronews/upload/49-3-McClard-and-Anderson-In-Focus.pdf>
- [37] Narichika Hamaguchi, “Investigating trends in social TV services based on user participating experiments”, (2012).
- [38] Nathan, M., Harrison, C., Yarosh, S., Terveen, L., Stead, L., & Amento, B. (2008). *CollaboraTV: making television viewing social again*. In *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on Designing interactive user experiences for TV and video* (pp. 85-94). ACM. ISBN: 978-1-60558-100-2, DOI: 10.1145/1453805.1453824. Also obtainable at <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1453824> Visited on 9 November 2014.
- [39] Nicholas. N., *Social television, creative collaboration and television production: The case of the BBC’s ‘The virtual revolution’: Value chain and business models in changing media markets, Part IV*”, Berlin Heidelberg, (Spring 2013): pp. 603-618.
- [40] Nicolas Ducheneaut, Robert J. Moore, Lora Oehlberg, James D. Thornton & Eric Nickell, “Social TV: Designing for distributed, sociable television viewing,” *Intl. Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, Vol. 24, No. 2, (December 2008): pp. 136–154.
- [41] Nielsen Company, “The paid social media advertising report 2013: Industryupdate and best practices”, (2013). Retrieved January 25, 2013 from <http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/reports/2013/the-paid-social-media-advertising-report-2013.html>
- [42] Nielsen Company, “The social media report: Nielsen smartphone analytics”, (2012). Retrieved July 15, 2012 from <http://www.marketingcharts.com/online/mobile-is-driving-growth-in-social-media-consumption-25185/html>
- [43] Noor F. Ali-Hasan, “Exploring social media scenarios for the television”, (2008).
- [44] Ogawa, Koji & Ritsu Yonekura “Social TV system for public broadcasting service – Analysis of user behavior in large-scale field trial of “Teleda”, *Keio Communication Review*, Vol. 67, No. 35, (2013).
- [45] Pablo Cesar & David Greets, “Understanding social TV: A survey”, CWI: Centrum Wiskunde & Informatica, 2CUO, IBBT/K.U.Leuven (nd.).
- [46] Pablo Cesar and David Greets, “Understanding social TV: A survey”, CWI: Centrum Wiskunde & Informatica, 2CUO, IBBT/K.U.Leuven, (nd.).
- [47] PR Newswire, *Half of social media activity while watching TV relates to TV*, Percouncil for research excellence study, New York, US. (March, 2014). Retrieved May 3, 2014 from www.researchexcellence.com
- [48] Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster, New York, USA. ACM: 978-1-60558-100-2/10. Also available at <http://www.weibnc.com/wp-content/uploads/brkpdfs/Bowling-AloneThe-Collapse-and-Revival-of-American-Community-by-Robert-D-Putnam-North-Dakota-South-Dakota-And-Minnesota-High-Levels-Of-Social-Capital.pdf> Accessed on 10 November 2014.
- [49] Research and Markets, “Social TV and the emergence of interactive TV”, *Business Wire (English)*, (January 18, 2011), R
- [50] Shawnra Hill & Adrian Benton, *Analysing the Impact of Social TV Strategies on Viewer Engagement*. (2012).
- [51] Shiguo Lian Auerbach, “TV: Enhancing social TV through social media mining”, (2012).
- [52] Stassen, W., “Your news in 140 characters: Exploring the role of social media in journalism”, *Global Media Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 1, (2010): pp. 1-16.
- [53] Suzan, B & Alena, S., “Interactive or reactive? Marketing with Twitter”, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*,

- Vol. 28, No. 7, (2011): pp. 491 – 499.
- [54] Talbot, D., A social media decoder, (2011), Retrieved January 1, 2011 from http://static.bluefinlabs.com/website/bluefin_mit-tech-review.pdf
- [55] Thomas V. Pollet, Roberts, S.G.B., & Dunbar, R.I.M., “Use of social network sites and instant messaging does not lead to increased offline social network size, or to emotionally closer relationships with offline network members”, *Cyber Psychology Behaviour, and Social Network*, Vol. 14, (2011): pp. 253–258, Retrieved November 23, 2012 from <http://www.mdpi.com/1660-601/8/9/3528/htm#sthash.srmWC4MQ.dpuf>
- [56] Thomas V. Pollet, Sam G.B. Roberts, & Robin I.M. Dunbar, *Cyber Psychology, Behaviour, and Social Networking* Vol. 14, No. 4, (April 2011): pp. 53-258.
- [57] Virgil L. Burton, “Social media: Overview encyclopaedia of small business, Ed. III, Vol. 2, 4th ed., Detroit: Gale, pp. 1180-1182, (2011).