

THE CO-VIEWING 2.0: DETACHING FROM HISTORY AND APPLYING IN THE NEW MEDIA AGE

Fernanda Pires de Sá

Open University of Catalonia, Barcelona, Spain

Abstract: Since the advent of digital media and the 2.0 environments, the way we watch television and consume audiovisual media has changed. The audience can now be also called users, users who generate content and therefore share experiences online and offline. This has an impact on how the user understands TV content.

For instance, the proliferation of user-generated content has made a strong impact on the different spheres of society, as people are able to access online information from anywhere (computers, mobile phones, tablets) and also share, create, contribute or view together new and mass media content. In other words, it has generated a new way of co-viewing. This concept of co-viewing comes after an experiment made with Sesame Street in 1970 whereby it was shown that when children watch television together with adults, their capacity of learning increases.

Hence why I found it necessary, in this study, to develop a brief history review of co-viewing. After having examined the concept we also try to apply generate a new definition of co-viewing, what we call co-viewing 2.0. It is done to attach the concept in the actual environment. This intent also includes the use of this concept not just in the scope of children but in general as co-viewing and discussing media content with others

can be an enhancing experience in terms of acquiring knowledge at any age.

Keywords: Co-viewing; TV, Collective Intelligence; User-generated content; new media; Social Network Sites

I. INTRODUCTION

The information and communication technologies (ICT) together with how we have been applying it have changed the way we watch television and the way we access information. The top-down model of mass media communication now co-exists with a new model of bottom-to-top whereby information is distributed from many-to-many. This coexistence is changing the way people watch television.

Watching television has always been a sharing experience whereby we co-view with friends, family, and neighbours. Nonetheless, this sharing experience was not the same. In its beginning, TV had a high cost and not every household had this appliance and therefore family and friends were together in a living room to watch television.

Over the years, the technological development and the cost reduction made the device to become popular

and almost universal, occupying other parts inside the houses. Gradually, it took places not just in the living room but also in intimate spaces and rooms, as well as the kitchen, which allowed each family member attend his/her favourite show independent of others.

The idea of having the family in the living room sitting together watching television is not common or not the same, since, as it was mention before, people started to have TV sets in different areas of the house. Now, with different devices as tablets, smartphones, computers and also social media websites the possibility to watch and engaged with TV content goes further than a common living room (Nielsen, 2014).

No longer do we wait for the prime time or to follow the programming schedule of TV channels. Everything is available to almost everybody at anytime because of the ways to access programming has changed. We can access the TV shows on any of the previous commented devices and through streams, web platforms or via files on the web (Bredl et. al, 2014). Therefore all these new screens or so-called second screen (Finger & de Souza, 2012) and ways of watching television and video can be even thought more a solo way of viewing or perhaps it is rising a new way of social TV viewing

Due to social network websites the audience is now users that can use it for sharing images, videos, links, have groups of discussions of topics of interest create and maintain personal network and also use other platforms as a way of communication (Jensen, & Sørensen, 2014) since most of this websites have Application Programming Interface (API), what allows access and sharing of other applications content – e.g. Facebook can share a Tweet, a You Tube Video and so on (Bredl et. all, 2014).

Also, social network websites as well as the second screens can be considered backchannels (Finger & de Souza, 2012), as we can watch television in one main screen (TV), and get in formation about that or talk with peers in other screens, such as computers, smartphones, tablets and so fourth. Whereby both second screens and social media support this type of backchannel communications by the vast allowance of large-scale interaction, which is collectively resourceful as it is making peer-to-peer communications and audience participation more evident, as they are able to create information and share it with each other, which was not possible before (Sutton, Palen & Shklovski, 2008). Hence, it can also be considered a new way of co-viewing, since people geographically detached can be attached by the experience of viewing and sharing the TV Shows.

The term co-viewing is commonly used in studies of children learning with TV. In 1969 the famous TV Show Sesame Street was aired, which was/is dedicated to children. Its contents have always been created with a learning purpose whereby it was also created to keep adults watching the show with their children. The idea of having a parent or an adult who was co-viewing with the kid was shown in experiments to increase the learning experience of children in comparison with children that watch it alone (Ball, 1970).

Nevertheless, I consider necessary to make a brief revision of the concept of co-viewing since its origins until the present days, in order to be able to apply it in the ICT field, as more and more it is part of our daily life. I also intend to propose a new definition for co-viewing blending with the previous ones and also adapting it to the current situation.

II. CO-VIEWING 1.0

The term co-viewing has emerged during a period of the media, which was centered on a top down model whereby the audience could not produce content just watch what were produced. Therefore I call it co-viewing 1.0, thus making an intertextuality similar to what O'Reilly has called Web 1.0 since the Web at this stage was basically a top-down model and users could just read without doing any creation or contribution (O'Reilly, 2005).

The term has developed since the beginning of Sesame Street. In 1970, Ball et al developed the first Report about Sesame Street on the Children's Television Workshop. The results have led to the conclusion that children who watched Sesame Street together with their mothers, while discussing the show, increase their capacity of learning (Ball, 1970).

Later the Children's Television Workshop was founded and a lot of research in this field was developed, being more than 30 years of research. Researchers within and outside of the Children's Television Workshop (CTW- currently named Sesame Workshop) studied, among other issue, the roles that parents and others in the household can play in enhancing the viewing experiences of preschoolers (Takenuchi & Stevens, 2011). They discovered that parents co-viewing with their children make the latter learn more about the program that they are engaging with.

Co-viewing is a term well known in the studies of psychology, normally, as it was mentioned above, used to refer when a child engages with TV together with a parent or a person who is taking care of him/her. Many co-viewing studies are more commonly focused on

television and its capacity to enhance a kid's learning, since until some years ago TV was one of the main media that the population used as entertainment and also to acquire information or a way for the parents to engage with children and teenagers (Austin et. al, 1990; Dorr& Doubleday, 1989; Rice et, 1990; Paavonen et al., 2009; Padilla et al., 2012; Warren, 2003; among others.). Although other studies were focused on learning but also parental or adult control on children's television viewing as the study of Valkenburg et al. (1999).

Most of the studies that were developed about co-viewing were done within the context of family viewing. Valkenburg et al. have developed a research where they did a very extant literature review about co-viewing and other types of parental control of a kid's viewing. In this study they have defined co-viewing as the "occasions when adults and children watch television together, sharing the viewing experience, but not engaging in any discussions about the program."(Valkenburg et al., 1999: 54)

However, other studies were developed with the aim of understanding how viewing was configured inside the households, since, later on, TV started to spread around all the rooms of the house. McDonald (1986) had defined co-viewing as a peer phenomenon in one of his studies, whereby he had examined the viewing configurations and factors predicting television viewing and his results have suggested that peer co-viewing was the most common pattern.

Another study tried to understand how the social context could affect this condition of co-viewing and also the structure of families and how it changes during the adolescence and the youth (Sang, Schmitz & Tasche, 1992, 1993). Another tried to understand how this co-

viewing is affected by partners with different backgrounds because of the period of television literacy (Hendriks Vettehen et al., 2012).

Haefner and Wartella (1987) have studied the effects of sibling co-viewing while watching television, which characterizes another type of co-viewing, whereby they found that co-viewing with older siblings can influence the way the children evaluate the characters of a plot, and it is normally happening through comments and laughter.

Takenuchi and Stevens (2011) in their study say that any medium has its social side. Therefore television is a social medium, since it can generate forms of social engagement that are clearly visible in the medium itself because they happen in the room and normally they tend to be ephemeral.

This social characteristic of television can be seen in one of the books of James Lull (1990), whereby he creates a theoretical perspective to analyze a family's viewing rituals. He brings back the idea of Marshal McLuhan of media being extensions of man. However, he adapts it in another direction - while for McLuhan the media is the actual extensions of humans' senses because of their technological capabilities, Lull is focused on acts of viewing. In this acts of viewing he interprets television's views as extensions of audience member's basic behavioral and mental orientations. Therefore he developed a theoretical perspective to analyze those extensions of viewing on three levels: the culture, the home and the person. Within these three levels, Lull considers not only how the audience uses the TV to respond to their individual interests and family, but also considers the ways in which television interacts with everyday practices and broader social and cultural values- this means that the social uses of television interact on the one hand with

patterns of interaction within the family circle, and on the other hand with wider societal norms.

The television for decades was the main medium in the media diet until the different kind of devices started to be inside the market as video games and computers. However, a lot of games had their origin in previous classical media as cinema and television and vice-versa.

Other important point about this Triad discussed by Lull is that society has changed its structure with the booming of ICT, which consequently changed the person, the family and the culture. Creating a new way of consuming television at the level of dynamics of choice, at the level of models of usage, conditions and visions styles (Fanchi, 2001).

III. CO-VIEWING 2.0

The term co-viewing 2.0 is a remix, since the new characteristics of the term that are described below are an outcome of the 2.0 environment that has emerged and developed since the Web and new media have allowed the user's participation and creation.

New media have brought back what Toffler has called 'prosumer' - a person who consumes what him/herself produces (1980). Before the Industrial Revolution we used to produce what we consume and the market was almost based on exchange. However, with the First Industrial Revolution those 2 roles have gotten separated and we've become most of the time just consumers, consequently in the era of broadcast we were indeed mere consumers as technology was expensive and just few people could afford to learn about it. So our act of co-viewing was just based on a model of top-down technologies and it was only possible through a physical presence, this process of

learning was mediated just via TV or by the cinema. Since it was done in a short period, it was not possible to be spread out of a room – as Takenuchi and Stevens say - it was/is ephemeral (2011).

Recently, we are able to share experiences and knowledge with others – with our peers. The process of watching television and co-viewing were further facilitated by the increasing popularity of computer-mediated communication technologies, in particular with the usage of the so-called social media or social network websites which were, most probably, the missing stimulus for a shift in viewing habits as the audience has now the possibility to use the emerging digital backchannels – which facilitates the communication between viewers of TV broadcasting (Doughty et al., 2011).

Those so-called backchannels or second screens can remit a way of learning collectively. When it concerns learning and the production of knowledge, it is important to talk about Lévy, who understands that every activity, every act of communication, and every human relationship involves learning. Therefore his idea of '*Collective Intelligence*' is really interesting, an intelligence that is distributed everywhere and created by all humans and renewed all the time, since nobody knows everything, it should be done together, (Levy, 1997). His ideas, together with McLuhan (technologies as human's extensions -1969) are making sense more than ever before, because we are now using new technologies as tablets, smartphone, computers, the Web as a whole to exchange and also create knowledge together.

The idea of collective intelligence can be linked with a new way of co-viewing or as claimed by Steven and Penuel (2010) – a joint media engagement (JME). They said that it refers to spontaneous and designed

experiences of people using media together. JME can happen anywhere at any time whenever there are multiple people interacting together with media. Modes of JME include viewing, playing, searching, reading, contributing, and creating, with either digital or traditional media. JME can support learning by providing resources for making sense and making meaning in a particular situation, as well as for future situations" (Takenuchi & Stevens, 2011:9).

Having in mind this definition, as it suggest different ways of sharing viewing experiences in the era of multiple screens, we can also look at some studies that were done in this field recently.

Haridakis and Hanson (2009) have developed a study about co-viewing on You Tube and the results of their study have suggested that co-viewing is a means of sharing content with others; which re-affirms the ideas previously mentioned by Lull (1980) about the social uses of television. Nevertheless, in this study the You Tube is a way of enhancing the during-viewing interaction and post-viewing social activities. Since on You Tube it is possible to watch and share content. Moreover, those social interactions and co-viewing on YouTube are "[...] a way of sharing online activities with family and friends with whom they have existing social ties."(Haridakis & Hanson, 2009:330). Consequently those ideas of social ties are directly linked one more time with the ideas of Lévy and also with what Bruns has called 'produsage' – a term that "[...] highlights that within communities, which engage in the collaborative creation and extension of information and knowledge [...] within a wider context of new emerging concepts for describing the social, technological, and economic environment of user-led content creation..." (Bruns, 2008, : 2). Or what is more commonly called 'User- Generated Content' – when

regular people voluntarily contribute with data creation, information and media creation on the Web (Krumm et al., 2008).

Other studies were done related to second screen or backchannels (Doughty et al, 2011; *ibid*, 2012; Finger & de Souza, 2012; Canatta, 2014) and recently the social media co-viewing was investigated in the study of Cohen and Lancaster (2014), that did an exploratory study of co-viewing that suggested that social media co-viewing is able to provide social connection between viewers who watch television in physical solitude

Nonetheless, previous studies were not just focused on the web, Information and Communication Technologies or Social Networks, some previous studies, with the booming of the digital TV, were about social TV – systems used to support the construction of virtual communities on TV, similar to the Web (Mantzari et.al, 2008).

Oehlberg et al (2006) have developed a research in order to develop a system for co-viewing (based on an experiment), since more and more the pressures of our daily lives' routine make joint television viewing difficult to happen. They have envisioned a prototype of a Social TV, which would have audio-video equipment and also allow for geographically – distributed viewers to communicate with each other using an open audio channel. They've believed that the social TV would facilitate distributed, sociable television viewing. Lee et al. (2010) have developed an experiment with an interactive narrative based on a controller where people could make decisions that would impact an entire group's experience of viewing. They were based on the assumption that interactive viewing was imagined to be a cross between passively watching television on the sofa and continuously

interacting with a game and also by the idea that television viewing often happens in a group setting. They did this experiment with students from a university – therefore, placing the idea that co-viewing can be applied to any age.

However, the traditional social TV interactive television settings used to consider the remote control as the main entry point in a co-view or interact, which most of the time imposes a number of restrictions on how people can in fact socialize (Cesar & Chorianopoulos, 2008).

Just a remote control is not enough within the context that we are living, of course, the remote control still being part of our lives. Nonetheless, the way we can use it can be different, since media are converging and we are living in a hybrid media ecology (Jenkins & Deuze, 2008) – media tend to adopt or simulate the narratives and grammar from other media (Scolari & Carlón, 2009). Since, we have different devices with multi-functionalities - a smartphone is also a TV, a radio, a computer, a book as well as a tablet or a computer and vice-versa.

According to Henry Jenkins (2006), this refers to the 'media convergence', which is more than a simple technological shift. Convergence alerts the relationship between existing technologies, industries, markets, genres, and audiences. These changes, as was mentioned before, put the audience in democratized position – the usage of media to share information and learn more about the world from a wider perspective (Jenkins & Deuze, 2008). This wider perspective is that the Web and the mobile applications for instant messaging such as, Whatsapp, Viber, and so on, made the possibility to break space, time and boundaries. Consequently these have shaped the new way of co-viewing, in an era that the generation grew and is

growing educated within an environment that everything can be made in a paradoxical way, together but far, alone but in company with each other. We can have peers on Facebook, on Twitter, on Whatsapp groups, on Google Plus, on Torrent applications; sometimes we know them, and sometimes we don't.

However, in most of the previous media channels mentioned, we can have a space, whereby we can share our interests, i.e. Facebook groups. Many of those groups are created with the intention to share

common goals or interests, television shows are one of the reasons that people gather together, as peers to talk about the plot, learn more and enhance their experience. Consequently, it is inevitable not to revise McDonald, who, in 1986, could define Co-viewing as a peer-to-peer phenomenon. Proving as the Lavoisier conservation of mass law, that "nothing is created, nothing is lost, and everything is transformed."

Year	Reference	Definition
1970	(Ball, 1970)	Origin of Co-viewing - It was when children who watched Sesame Street with their mothers and also talked about the show learned more than other children that watched alone.
1985	(Hopkin & Mullis, 1985)	Co-viewing is when parents and their children have some qualitative interaction while there are watching Television. Since it is an activity that is mutually pleasurable. Though, the co-viewing or Joint Television viewing requires from the parents a few planning or input.
1986	(McDonald, 1986)	Co-viewing is considered a peer phenomenon.
1987	(Haefner & Wartella 1987)	Co-viewing normally happens between relatives.
1990	(DeFelix, Johnson, & Schick 1990)	Co-viewing is a shared act of television co-viewing contexts between adult and child. The adults are mediators and important facilitators of the child's learning.
1992	(Sang, Schmitz, & Tasche, 1992)	Co-viewing happens within the family and it is generally presumed that parents watch television together with their child
1999	(Valkenburg et al. 1999).	Co-viewing normally occurs in occasions when adults and children watch television together, sharing the viewing experience. However, they not engage in any discussions about the program.
2009	(Haridakis & Hanson 2009)	Co-viewing is a way of sharing content with others.
2010	(Lee, Heeter, & LaRose, 2010)	Co-viewing is when the act of Television viewing occurs often in a group setting.
2010	(Stevens, Penuel, (2010 In Takenuchi, Stevens, 2011: 9)	"Joint Media Engagement refers to spontaneous and designed experiences of people using media together. JME can happen anywhere at any time when there are multiple people interacting together with media. Modes of JME include viewing, playing, searching, reading, contributing, and creating, with either digital or traditional media. JME can support learning by providing resources for making sense and making meaning in a particular situation, as well as for future situations"
2011	(Doughty, Rowland, & Lawson 2011)	Co-viewing is considered a shared viewing experience. That was facilitated by the rise in popularity of computer mediated communication technologies. Mainly the social media and backchannels.
2012	(Padilla-Walker et al. 2012)	Co-viewing are situations where parents watch television or play video games with their kids
2012	(Doughty, Rowland, & Lawson, 2012)	The co-viewing activity is a second screen whereby the TV broadcast content is discussed. Within the discussion subjects about the actors, the participants and narratives are discussed, commented on or spoken to. Normally by social networks with connected viewers that are using a range of social network platforms or/and technologies
2012	(Finger, de Souza, 2012)	Co-viewing is to watch television together with other people, even though their presence is merely virtual.

IV. EVOLUTION OF CO-VIEWING

Following the same logic, co-viewing concept that has emerged in a 1.0 environment is now being transformed together with the environment 2.0. Thus, above a simple table was presented with some definitions; just few are indeed presented, as the literature of co-viewing is really vast due to the period of time of its existence.

It is important to mention that in its beginning some authors used to write it altogether - Coviewing. In our table we opted to write the term as it is being more used recently - Co-viewing, although both types are correct.

V. DETACHING FROM HISTORY ATTACHING IN THE NEW MEDIA AGE

Once doing this brief review of the concept of co-viewing, and observing the changes in the media ecology. I can conclude this article with a definition proposal for the new media age. The co-viewing 2.0 is an act of sharing and learning together. To learn, in this case, it is not mandatory to be children for this to happen, because the capacity of learning together with another person can happen at any age as we can see in previous mentioned book of Levy (1997). Co-viewing 2.0 is a way that people in any age can engage together with any kind of media. It means to share this experience of watching with peers that are geographically or at least virtually together, though never alone. It can happen by having conversations, chatting, viewing, playing, creating and sharing new and different content related to a main text e.g. a movie, a soap opera, a TV series, a video game etc...

Consequently learning in a collaborative condition, this can be also applied within families' context as well as in others. Although, Is good to bear in mind that co-viewing 1.0 still existing as well as gaps of accessibility to technologies.

Despite the previous mentioned gaps, still a lot to be done to understand the co-viewing 2.0, since the media ecology is changing constantly and more and more people are using new media technologies, and also the TV content is becoming a transmedia storytelling content. It means that stories and TV shows are becoming part of a process where the elements get dispersed across different platforms and ideally each platform (medium) makes its own contribution to create an entertainment experience where we unfold each part of the story in a different medium (Jenkins, 2007). It can also be understood as a centrifugal process, as mentioned by Scolari(2011), whereby an initial narrative text (mother-ship) explodes as a big bang and new text starts to be generated to reach user-generated content. Thus, different from a classical and linear narrative, it generates a textual galaxy. This textual galaxy can be well planed by the creators of the initial narrative text or can appear without planning whereby the audience (users) expands these texts accordingly to their own ways and own experiences.

Therefore, my next step will be to study in depth the co-viewing within a transmedia perspective. Since, the experience to watch together some audio-visual content can be a simple act or a transmedia experience. Whereby this act of co-viewing can happens because people can engage together and discuss about contents within any available media, via any type of text.

REFERENCES

- [1] E.W. Austin, D.F. Roberts, C.I. Nass, "Influences of Family Communication on Children's Television-interpretation Processes", *Communication Research*, vol. 17, no.4, pp. 545-64, 1990.
- [2] K. Bredl, C. Ketzer, J. Hünninger, J. Fleicher "Twitter and Social TV: Microblogging as a New Approach to Audience Research" in G. Patriarcho, H. Bilandzic, J. L. Jensen, *Audience Research Methodologies: Between Innovation and Consolidation*, Ed. New York, U.S.: Routledge, 2014.
- [3] S. Ball, "The First Year of Sesame Street: An Evaluation. Final Report", Educational Testing Service, New Jersey, U. S. Tech. Rep. vol.3 III, pp. 1-439, Oct. 1970.
- [4] A. Bruns, *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and beyond: From production to produsage*, Vol. 45, Ed. New York, U.S.: Peter Lang, 2008.
- [5] F. Canatta, "Tv e segunda tela: uma análise do horário nobre no Twitter.", M. thesis, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, 2014.
- [6] P. Cesar, K. Chorianopoulos, "Interactivity and user participation in the television lifecycle: creating, sharing, and controlling content" in *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on Designing interactive user experiences for TV and video*, 2008, pp. 125-128, ACM.
- [7] L. J. Claxton, K. C. Ponto, "Understanding the properties of interactive televised characters", *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 57-62, 2013.
- [8] E. L. Cohen, A. L. Lancaster, "Individual Differences in In-Person and Social Media Television Coviewing: The Role of Emotional Contagion, Need to Belong, and Coviewing Orientation", *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, vol. 17, no. 8, pp. 512-518, 2014.
- [9] S. M. Coyne, L. M. Padilla-Walker, L. Stockdale, R. D. Day, "Game on... girls: associations between co-playing video games and adolescent behavioral and family outcomes" *Journal of Adolescent Health*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp.160-165, 2011.
- [10] J. W., DeFelix, R. Johnson, J. A. Schick, "Socio-and psycholinguistic considerations in interactive video instruction for limited English proficient students", *Computers in the Schools*, vol. 7, no.1-2, pp.173-190, 1990.
- [11] M. Doughty, D. Rowland, S. Lawson, "Co-viewing live TV with digital backchannel streams", in *Proceedings of the 9th international interactive conference on Interactive television*, Jun. 2011, pp. 141-144, ACM.
- [12] M. Doughty, D. Rowland, S. Lawson, "Who is on your sofa?: TV audience communities and second screening social networks" in *Proceedings of the 10th European conference on Interactive tv and video*, Jul. 2012, pp. 79-86, ACM.
- [13] A. Dorr, P. Kovaric, C. Doubleday, "Parent-child coviewing of television", *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 35-5, 1989.
- [14] M. Fanchi, *La famiglia in televisione, la famiglia con la televisione: le nuove forme del consumo televisivo in familia*, Vol. 183, Ed. Roma, Italy: RAI ERI, 2001.
- [15] C. Finger, F. C. de Souza, "Uma nova forma de ver TV no sofá ou em qualquer lugar", *Revista FAMECOS-Mídia, Cultura e Tecnologia*, vol. 19, no.2, pp.373-389, 2012.
- [16] M. J. Haefner, E. A. Wartella, "Effects of sibling coviewing on children's interpretations of television programs", *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 153-168, 1987.
- [17] P. Haridakis, G. Hanson, "Social interaction and co-viewing with YouTube: Blending mass communication reception and social connection", *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp.317-335, 2009.
- [18] P., Hendriks Vettehen, R. P. König, H. Westerik, H. Beentjes, "Explaining television choices: The influence of parents and partners", *Poetics*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 565-585, 2012.
- [19] H. Jenkins, M. Deuze, "Convergence Culture", *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 5-12, 2008.
- [20] H. Jenkins, (2007). "Transmedia Storytelling 101". Confessions of an Aca-Fan; the Official Weblog of Henry Jenkins. Available: http://henryjenkins.org/2007/03/transmedia_storytelling_101.html
- [21] H. Jenkins, *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. Ed. New York, U.S.: New York University Press, 2006.
- [22] J. L. Jensen, A.S. Sørensen, "Analyzing Online Social Networks from a User Perspective: A Quantitative-Qualitative Framework", in G. Patriarcho, H. Bilandzic, J. L. Jensen, (2014). *Audience Research Methodologies: Between Innovation and Consolidation*, Ed. New York, U.S.: Routledge, 2014.
- [23] N. M. Hopkins, A. K. Mullis, "Family Perceptions of television viewing habits", *Family Relations*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 177-181, Apr. 1985

- [24] M. S. Lee, C. Heeter, R. LaRose, "A modern Cinderella story: a comparison of viewer responses to interactive vs linear narrative in solitary and co-viewing settings." *New Media & Society*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 779-795, 2010.
- [25] J. Krumm, N. Davies, C. Narayanaswami, "User-generated content", *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, 7(4), pp. 10-11, 2008.
- [26] P. Lévy, *A inteligência colectiva para uma antropologia do ciberespaço*, Ed. Lisboa, Portugal: Instituto Piaget, 1997.
- [27] E. Mantzari, G. Lekakos, A. Vrechopoulos, "Social TV: introducing virtual socialization in the TV experience", in *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on Designing interactive user experiences for TV and video*, Oct. 2008, pp. 81-84. ACM.
- [28] D. G. McDonald, "Generational aspects of television coviewing", *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, vol. 30 no. 1, pp. 75-85, 1986
- [29] M. McLuhan, *O meio é a Mensagem: Os Meios de Comunicação como Extensões do Homem*, São Paulo, Brazil: Cultrix, 1969.
- [30] Nielsen (2014). An Era Of Growth: The Cross-Platform Report Available: <http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/reports/2014/an-era-of-growth-the-cross-platform-report.html>
- [31] L. Oehlberg, N. Ducheneaut, J. D. Thornton, R. J. Moore, E. Nickell, "Social TV: Designing for distributed, sociable television viewing", in *Proc. EuroITV*, May 2006, pp. 25-26.
- [32] O'Reilly, T. (2005) What is the Web 2.0. Available: <http://oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html>
- [33] E. J. Paavonen, M. Roine, A. R. Lahikainen, "Do parental co-viewing and discussions mitigate TV-induced fears in young children? ", *Child: Care, Health and Development*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 773-780, 2009.
- [34] L. M. Padilla-Walker, S. M. Coyne, A. M. Fraser, W. J. Dyer, J. B. Yorgason, "Parents and adolescents growing up in the digital age: Latent growth curve analysis of proactive media monitoring." *Journal of adolescence*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 1153-1165, 2012.
- [35] M. L. Rice, A. C. Huston, R. Truglio, J. Wright, "Words from Sesame Street: learning vocabulary while viewing." *Developmental Psychology*, vol. 26, pp. 421-428, 1990.
- [36] F. Sang, B. Schmitz, K. Tasche, "Individuation and television coviewing in the family: Developmental trends in the viewing behavior of adolescents", *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, vol. 36 no. 4, pp. 427-441, 1992.
- [37] F. Sang, B. Schmitz, K. Tasche, "Developmental trends in television coviewing of parent-child dyads", *Journal of youth and adolescence*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 531-542, 1993.
- [38] R. Stevens, W. R. Penuel, "Studying and fostering learning through joint media engagement." in Principal Investigators Meeting of the National Science Foundation's Science of Learning Centers, October 2010, in. Takenuchi, R. Stevens, "The new co-viewing: designing for learning through joint media engagement", *Joan Ganz Cooney Center at Sesame Workshop*, vol. 1, pp. 1-75, 2011.
- [39] C. Scolari, in M. C. Mungliogli, "A construção de mundos possíveis se tornou um processo coletivo. MATRIZes, vol.4, no.2, pp.127, 2011.
- [40] C. Scolari, M. Carlón, *El fin de los medios masivos: el comienzo de un debate*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: La Crujía Ediciones, 2009
- [41] J. Sutton, L. Palen, I. Shklovski, "Backchannels on the front lines: Emergent uses of social media in the 2007 southern California wildfires", in *Proceedings of the 5th International ISCRAM Conference*, May 2007, pp. 624-632.
- [42] J. Lull, *Inside Family Viewing - Ethnographic Research on Television's Audience*, Ed. London, U.K.: Routledge, 1990.
- [43] L. Takenuchi, R. Stevens, "The new co-viewing: designing for learning through joint media engagement", *Joan Ganz Cooney Center at Sesame Workshop*, vol. 1, pp. 1-75, 2011.
- [44] A. Toffler, *La tercera ola*, Ed. Barcelona, Spain: Plaza & Janés, 1980.
- [45] P. M. Valkenburg, M. Krcmar, A. L. Peeters, N. M. Marseille, "Developing a scale to assess three styles of television mediation: "Instructive mediation," "restrictive mediation," and "social coviewing"" *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 52-66, 1999.