In this article out of Denmark our author intends to show that social networking sites encourage and sometimes even require a certain amount of ‘participatory surveillance’ – he points out that in many cases, there are clear warnings from social context as well as from the networking sites themselves, however, users are more than willing to post information and media regarding themselves than ever before. He outlines what the immediate as well as future effects are on a younger, digital generation – asks “Why?’, and intends to show that while there are traditional concerns raised by these surveillance practices, the users often do not seem to mind just how open and public they have made their lifestyle. The modality of Twitter for instance is akin to posting a personal diary of your life online for everyone to see and while there is a small possibility that this information could be used to seek out and harm a user, what happens more frequently is the user publishing personal information for communication, play, work, and everything in between. The online community does not seem overly concerned with the privacy risks – at least in comparison to their enthusiasm to embrace new digital means to communicate with old friends and meet new ones.

This article makes great assumptions about social networking web sites and online communities, but it is done without actually identifying which social network sites were chosen and which patterns of surveillance take place most frequently at each. The author cites these social networking sites as a single homogenous phenomenon and thus it seems as if he has relied on the most basic probability sampling techniques available. I find it interesting that he has made a conscious decision not to identify which networking sites feature which options in play. It was obviously a decision made at the outset of writing this research and so this decision probably played a major role in the methods he used to sample various online networking sites.

He may have been using a systematic stratification sampling method – that is to say that the author looked at a wide variety of community social web sites, then he chose which would best represent his argument about surveillance & social networking. Now that I say it out loud it sounds more like he is making a judgment sample because he has identified which social networking sites best suit his argument and then put them altogether into one larger homogenous group to be studied as a single entity. In any case there is a clear resolution that this research is not being carried out on any particular single web site, because he does not mention one single name of any particular social networking web site from start to finish in the entirety of the article.