

**Freedom of Speech or Effective Managing Social Media:
Ofcom in UK as Case Study**

By

Fang-Chi, Jao

Submitted to the Faculty of
Department of International Affairs in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts in International Affairs

Wenzao Ursuline University of Languages
2022

WENZAO URSULINE UNIVERSITY OF LANGAUGES
DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

This senior paper was presented

by

Fang-Chi Jao
饒芳綺

It was defended on

November 20, 2021

and approved by

Reviewer 1: Daniel Lin, Associate Professor, Department of International Affairs

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Reviewer 2: Yuan-Ming Chiao, Assistant Professor, Department of International Affairs

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Adviser: Mark Lai, Associate Professor, Department of International Affairs

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Copyright © by Fang-Chi Jao 饒芳綺
2022

Freedom of Speech or Effective Managing Social Media: Ofcom in UK as Case Study

Fang-Chi Jao

Wenzao Ursuline University of Languages, 2022

Abstract

In the circumstances of massive and fragmented information and algorithms, the users on social media lack of comprehensive understanding and the ability of judging accuracy on an issue; what's more, information is over extreme and singular, so social media has become a hotbed of disinformation transmission and social polarization. As a result, each country starts to consider managing social media important, and discuss the regulations and implements, in which it will involve the problem of freedom of speech, government responsibility and corporate social responsibility.

This research aimed to explore effective way in managing social media by collecting and analyzing the data from Ofcom in UK and the studies from International Conference on Social Media as a methodology of content analysis. This paper found that there were three main points of effective managing social media as the followings: managing based on local politics and culture, setting up the responsibility system including the users and social media companies operating for a profit. In the end, this paper suggested that management was the last means, and all we need to do is to improve civil society and our ability of judgement, try to accept different opinions, and take responsibility on ourselves.

Key words: social media, media regulation, media management, freedom of speech

摘要

數位革命之下，網路服務功能與技術規格大幅提升，Web2.0 之網路功能特性奠定社群媒體發展穩定的基礎觀念與技術。社群媒體為不同於傳統傳播媒體型態的網路產業，同時具備「快速傳播」、「雙向性」、「非專業性」的新型態互動，不僅為個人分享平台，更是現今許多政治人物、新聞媒體與大眾交流的重要媒介。由於對使用者要求門檻低，且方便快捷的特性，社群媒體很快地成為全世界人口聚集的平台。然而，使用者在大量、碎片化的資訊下，缺乏對於事件全面性的了解、判斷資訊正確性的能力，演算法使得資訊接收過度極端與單一，社群媒體成為假訊息流竄、分化社會的溫床。因此，各國開始重視管理社群媒體的議題，並研討相關政策的制定與執行方式，其中將牽涉言論自由、政府職責與企業社會責任之問題。

本文將以內容分析之研究方法，蒐集英國通訊管理局(Ofcom)之研究作為第一資料庫，並納入社交媒體與社會國際會議之學術研究為參考，其資料來自各地社交媒體研究者對於當前發展的觀察與未來趨勢之分析，藉由以上資料庫探討更符合現今各國社群媒體的管理方式。經過研究分析後，我們認為社群媒體的管理，政府應考慮當地政治制度與文化背景；在使用者享有言論自由的權利之下，也應該承擔其相對責任；企業平台之責任則分為是否營利，若受使用者之使用而有營利，該平台業者也應分擔相關責任。法律，只是最後的手段，我們認為其最根本之道即為提升使用者的判斷力、思考力，並接受多元的資料考證事實，以促進良性溝通達成社會共識，使自由言論在負責任的制度之下，於社群媒體平台上達到真正的自由。

關鍵詞：社群媒體、媒體管制、媒體管理、言論自由

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION.....	8
Background.....	8
Motivation.....	10
Research Purpose	10
Research Questions.....	11
Contribution	11
Limits.....	11
Delimits.....	11
Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	13
The freedom of speech on social media.....	13
The stand of regulating in social media	14
Debate: Freedom of Speech versus Regulation	15
Freedom of speech: Individualism and Collectivism.....	15
Controversy of Social Media	17
Summary	18
Chapter 3 METHODOLOGY	20
Source of Data.....	20
Data collection	21
Chapter 4 DATA ANALYSIS.....	23
Types.....	23

Extremely regulated country: China	23
Relatively relaxed regulatory country: United States, Germany and France.....	25
Germany and France	26
The management of Ofcom	28
Implication	32
Chapter 5 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION.....	34
Bibliography	36
Appendix A	40
Appendix B	47

LIST OF TABLES

Table1. The brief introduction of the database	22
--	----

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

Background

From the perspective of the Internet development, the Digital Revolution, so called the third industrialization, has great impact on our daily lives and brings a novel form for human beings in living. In 2007, O'Reilly¹ put forward the concept of the Web 2.0, which described that the new commercial model based on Web 2.0 would have the following characters: seen the Internet as a platform, attaching great importance to data, using collective intelligence, enriching the users' feelings and so on. The advanced Internet promotes the development of social media, making it a diversified platform for people to communicate, obtain information, and even trade in people's lives. In other words, the Internet service offered by Web 2.0 is an ideological and technological basis of forming social media.² According to the digital news report from Reuters Institute in 2016, it pointed out that most people aged under 45, gaining news from Internet was more important than television news; especially aged for 18–24s, they preferred use social media for news to TV, with Facebook being the primary source.³

As Chaswick (2011)⁴ mentioned that the way people gaining news were

¹ Tim O'Reilly, "What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software", *MPRA Paper* No. 4578, November 2007, pp17-19

² Andreas M. Kaplan; Michael Haenlein, "Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 53 (2010), pp59-68

³ Nic Newman, Richard Fletcher, David A. L. Levy and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. "Reuters Institute digital news report 2016", *the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism at Oxford University* (2016), p8-11

⁴ Andrew Chadwick. "The Political Information Cycle in a Hybrid News System: The British Prime Minister and the 'Bulgate' Affair." *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 16, no. 1 (January 2011), p 3–29.

converting from a traditional “news cycle” determined by journalists and professional attributions to a more complicated “information cycle” that mingled with uncertain information to some degree. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)⁵ as well as proposed that from the observation of the phenomenon in global social media, there were three main traits on user- created content, including “public”, “creation”, and “non-professional”. That meant the content on social media could spread out in public through the Internet, and there were a lot of personal ideas from non-professionals or organizations. What’s more, not only Web 2.0 effected the related information technology and commercial model issues, but also extended to the field of social science research. Beer pointed out that in addition to the content level is different from the past, the innovation of Internet technology also brings some “by-products”⁶. This refers to the results obtained by re-analyzing the user's data through algorithms, which can infer the user's behavior pattern, the so-called social media data aggregators.

As a result, this research will explore the importance of regulation in social media and take Ofcom (Office of Communications) as an example to focus on how it responds and offers solutions to issues about regulation in social media by studying cases.

⁵ Graham Vickery, Sacha Wunsch-Vincent and OECD, “Participative Web and User-Created Content: Web 2.0 Wikis and Social Networking”, *Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)*, (2007)

⁶ David Beer, “Using Social Media Data Aggregators to Do Social Research”, *Sociological Research Online* 17, no. 3, Aug 2012, pp 91–102

Motivation

The new social network constructed by technology, in a democratic country without any regulation norms, is prone to create an open information environment that challenges individual security and privacy, and even under the benefit of it, it will even affect the political, economic and cultural aspects of other countries. The social network constructed by social media is novel, transnational, and global. Therefore, it is necessary to intervene in management.

Research Purpose

This study aims at taking the Ofcom in UK as a model to discuss how an organization regulate in social networking services, since the social media has been popular and become one part of our daily life. According to the United Kingdom development, there is the world's oldest and largest national broadcasting organization, as well as a system of public ownership of the world's media. Hence, the British media regulatory system has developed mature and stable, and it is worthy of our in-depth study of the reasons for its unshakable standing. Furthermore, the study is also to raise the public's awareness of the usage and information on social media, because any actions we do on the platform can be tracked and manipulated by people with bad intentions, and even influence our thoughts in a silent way.

Research Questions

This research will perform as a case study on Ofcom, to explore the importance of regulator and how this organization to formulate relevant regulations to maintain the network environment and to respond to the controversy issues.

Question1: Who should regulate the platform of social media?

Question2: Does regulating in social media intervene in freedom of speech?

Question3: Does it help the development of society by regulating the social media?

Contribution

This research enables to help the readers have quick understanding about the function and operation of Ofcom. Besides, with cases study compared with other solutions from other organizations on controversy issues, the findings of the study may help the readers rethink the necessary and importance of regulating in social media, and raise the awareness of use in social media.

Limits

Management in social media is a novel and controversial issue, and most regulations are at the stage of negotiation among government, enterprises and the public. Therefore, there are a few cases of regulatory practice, and we cannot regard it as the most successful method just because Ofcom implements a more systematic specification. The other limit of the paper is that most of information are in English, but English is not the author's mother language. So, it might have some misunderstandings to some degree.

Delimits

Ofcom is an official agency of the national government, so that there is no

suspicion of private confidential information. What's more, the British media has developed early, and there is a stable and systematic database as a reference to research. In terms of language barrier, the data from Ofcom is mostly presented in quite perspicuous descriptions with diagrams at times, so that it is able to reduce the rate of misunderstanding content.

Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

In a democratic system, freedom of speech is the cornerstone of the operation of society. However, on the basis of Philip Napoli's interpretation of freedom of speech in the First Amendment to American Constitutional History⁷, he pointed out that the two interpretations of freedom of speech are individualism and collectivism. As a result, whether the government intervenes in the media has always been a controversial issue: some people think that such a mechanism is democratic defense; others think that speech censorship is a means of persecuting democracy. Therefore, this chapter will give the readers the related discussions of the previous scholars, and be divided into two categories to discuss which are: the freedom of speech on social media and the stand of regulating in social media.

The freedom of speech on social media

Freedom of speech is regarded as one of the important factors of the democratic system. The well-known British scholar John Milton emphasized in the book, *Areopagitica*, that all kinds of ideas can only obtain truth by freely competing in the open market⁸. Consequently, government intervention in the development of media is seen as a restriction on free speech and persecuted the democratic system⁹. In 1974, the United States Supreme Court Justice, Potter Stewart, proposed the concept of the fourth estate theory¹⁰, indicating that the media in contemporary society not only has the function of spreading news, but also exists in society as a watchdog¹¹. This concept shows that the media has occupied an important position and great influence in society

⁷ Philip Napoli, "Foundations of communications policy: principles and process in the regulation of electronic media", *Hampton Press* (2011)

⁸ John Milton, "Areopagitica; a speech of Mr. John Milton for the liberty of vnlicens'd printing, to the Parliament of England.", *London*, printed in the year, (1644)

⁹ Milton Friedman; Rose D. Friedman, "Capitalism and Freedom", Chicago: *University of Chicago Press* (1962).

¹⁰ Potter Stewart, "Or of the Press", *Hastings Law Journal*, Vol 26, pp 631-37 (1975).

¹¹ Warren Francke, "The evolving Watchdog: The Media's Role in Government Ethics," *The Annals of the American Accademy of Political and Social Science* 537, no.1(1995). pp 109-21

at that time, and later this concept has also evolved into one of the primary theories of the theoretical basis of media development. Since the media is given the responsibility of supervising the government, it should be an independent role, and there should be no government intervention absolutely.

Thanks to technology, the development of media has changed from traditional newspapers and magazines, television, and radio to social media with Internet as a medium, including Facebook, Twitter, or YouTube, which are often used in modern society. According to Clay Shirky¹² emphasized that social media can promote the public sphere as discussed by J. Habermas¹³, just like the traditional media before. In other words, the new platform constructed by social media conforms to the conditions of the public sphere in Habermas's theory, that is, outside of political power, citizens have the space to discuss public affairs and participate in politics freely. In addition, due to the Internet without borders and time restrictions, the decentralized form allows information to be exchanged in a fast and diversified way on social media, replacing the top-down information dissemination in the past.

The stand of regulating in social media

With the changes in the ways of information dissemination, the old norms and systems cannot effectively guarantee the correctness of the information. Due to the sharing mechanism of social media, information is continuously and quickly transmitted in a fragmented mode. In addition, the algorithm of the Internet creates ideological separation, so that people in the stratosphere cannot access information related to different opinions. Under the circumstances of incomplete and extreme information, people cannot maintain an objective and fair attitude towards an event.

¹² Clay Shirky, "The Political Power of Social Media: Technology, the Public Sphere, and Political Change", *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 90, No. 1, Council on Foreign Relations, pp. 28-41

¹³ Jürgen Habermas, Translated by Thomas Burger, "The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society", *The MIT Press* (August 28, 1991)

Therefore, it is difficult to reach a consensus on the discussion of the event, which hinders social progress. There are also many cases around the world that influence local politics or policies due to social media factors. For example, Brexit and the US presidential election in 2016¹⁴.

Debate: Freedom of Speech versus Regulation

Regarding to social media management, there are two main controversial issues discussed. First, effective management must involve the government to formulate normative measures to make it legitimate. Therefore, whether this action challenges the people's right to freedom of speech is often discussed in democratic countries. Furthermore, the second issue needing more discussion is about the role of social media. Is social media regarded as a public operation or a private company? What law based on do we ask for social media to take responsibility? In this paragraph, we will give a deeper description in each issue.

Freedom of speech: Individualism and Collectivism

This paragraph will discuss based on the different views on freedom of speech proposed by scholar Philip Napoli in 2001¹⁵. He pointed out that there are two interpretations of freedom of speech, namely individualism and collectivism. The former emphasizes the main construction of individual rights and protects individual freedom, rationality and autonomy. Collectivism tends to balance between communitarianism and right, emphasizing community, democracy and public affairs.

In this paragraph, we will take previous U.S. President Donald Trump's account suspended by Twitter permanently as an example. On the evening of January 8th local time, Twitter will permanently suspend the personal account of US President Trump

¹⁴ Brandon Boatwrighta , Joseph P Mazerb , and Sarah Beachc, "The 2016 U.S. Presidential Election and Transition Events: A Social Media Volume and Sentiment Analysis", *Southern Communication Journal*, (20 Jan 2019)

¹⁵ Ibid. 7

for fear of more incitement to violence. From the perspective of individualism, expressing opinions through Trump's personal account is his basic right as a citizen even though the words are inappropriate. Due to his expression is from personal account instead of official presidential Twitter account. However, social media is based on avoiding more violent incidents, safeguarding the collective interests of society, and taking actions after evaluating the impact on society. The founder and CEO of Twitter, Jack Dorsey, said that it was a dangerous but right thing to permanently disable Trump's account, and he was not at all proud of it.

This article believes that from the perspective of individualism, shutting down Trump's account is equivalent to depriving the basic right of freedom of speech, and neither the government nor the enterprise can do it arbitrarily. Hence, many U.S. White House officials and congressmen have expressed their opinions on it.¹⁶ It can be seen that more emphasis has been placed on discussing the legitimacy and legitimacy of the platform's actions. In other words, the focus is not whether to manage the speech on the platform, but who should take the responsibility. British Conservative MP Nicky Morgan said that Twitter's permanent ban on Trump is a dangerous thing. In addition to proving that social media is not only the publisher of the news, it also proves to be inconsistent with their long-standing claim that they only have platform functions. German government spokesman Steffen Seibert said that freedom of speech is a fundamental right with a core significance¹⁷. Therefore, the restriction on this basic right must be based on the legal framework, not by the management of a social platform. In this case, apart from showing that society is struggling with freedom of speech between individualism and collectivism, it is also suffering from the dilemma

¹⁶ See database G (Appendix B)

¹⁷ Reuters, "Germany has reservations about Trump Twitter ban, Merkel spokesman says", Jun. 11, 2021, accessed May 30, 2021
<https://www.reuters.com/article/usa-trump-germany-twitter-idUSL8N2JM4ES>

of regulatory. In addition, the actions of social media also show that it has a huge control over political communication and is leading the coordination of information dissemination and political mobilization. United States Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Ben Carson, once expressed his opinion to Trump's Twitter ban event that today's technology giants and social media platforms try to be like traditional media organizations, but they are not as responsible as other media¹⁸. So, we will mention the responsibilities and rights of social media in the next part.

Controversy of Social Media

Social media uses algorithms to make messages not spread equally, but to make a purposeful choice to appear or disappear, intensify political prejudice, and use it as a business model to earn huge advertising revenue through a large amount of social traffic. Therefore, we should re-examine the role and responsibilities of social media.

Social media has always claimed that they are only network intermediaries and only provide platform services. As for the content on the platform, it is generated through self-publishing and sharing by users, which is the so-called user-generated content (UGC)¹⁹. The platform is only responsible for the message carrier and cannot control the content in advance. What's happening today is not what they claim to be. Under this circumstance, how we should regulate social media has become the most important issue today. First of all, we have to clarify the situation of social media in the dissemination of content.

For example, a boss rents noodles from a store vendor to the landlord, but in fact he sails under false colors. Under this circumstance, should the landlord be responsible? Another scenario is that the vendor sails under false colors, and the landlord knows as

¹⁸ Ben & Candy Carson, *Twitter* (Jan. 9, 2021), accessed May 10, 2021
<https://mobile.twitter.com/realbencarson/status/1347735180245684224>

¹⁹ Marcelo Luis Barbosa dos Santos, "The "so-called" UGC: an updated definition of user-generated content in the age of social media", *Online Information Review - Emerald*, ISSN 1468-452, (2021)

well as, in this case, should the landlord be responsible?

It is also one of the important judgments that the responsibility of social media belongs to its knowledge or ignorance. If social media knows and allows their speech to be disseminated on the platform, social media should take the relative responsibility.

Summary

According to cultural hierarchy theory, artifact level drives system level changes, and social media is subject to technological innovation and promotion. Therefore, we believe that the social media system should also keep pace with the times. Based on the above-mentioned literature review, freedom of speech is an important basic right of the people in most modern countries, as a result, the key point is that how to manage social media with effectiveness and legitimacy.

Nowadays, many countries have formulated relevant laws and regulations on social media. The author believes that the meaning of freedom speech is that people can collide and exchange different ideas freely and equally, and then construct a consensus. The social platform through the Internet is a new medium that spreads quickly, widely, and diversified. As the concepts put forward by other scholars, such as Tewksbury and Rittenberg (2012)²⁰, emphasized that the rise of social media does not represent a complete break with the past mass media environment, but the use of new media and new media is increasingly supplementing or replacing older and more mature media usage. The formulation of relevant laws and regulations does not represent the deprivation of freedom speech, but can promote consensus on public affairs and achieve more efficient discussions in a regulated and rational environment.

Google Executive Chairman Eric Schmidt once wrote in the Foreign Affairs

²⁰ David Tewksbury and Jason Rittenberg, "News on the Internet: Information and Citizenship in the 21st Century", *Oxford University Press* (March 23, 2012)

quarterly that social media is indeed beneficial to the people, because the website is a one-to-many relationship, and social media is a many-to-many relationship. So, the power of each individual has increased, and the power in the world is more dispersed²¹. Consequently, appropriate control interventions are needed so that users should take on relative responsibilities while using their rights of freedom of speech. In addition, this article believes that the influence and power on today's social platforms are enough to affect a country's politics or economy, and can even restrict one's speech. Since then, the individualism of free speech has challenged the basic values of social democracy. As a result, proper state intervention, built under a balanced basic situation, it can get true freedom instead²².

²¹ Eric Schmidt and Jared Cohen, "The Digital Disruption Connectivity and the Diffusion of Power", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol 89, no. 6 (2010), pp 75–85.

²² James Curran; Jean Seaton, "Power Without Responsibility: Press, Broadcasting and the Internet in Britain (8th ed.)", *Routledge* (2018)

Chapter 3 METHODOLOGY

This paper mainly focuses on the issue of social media regulation and management. The goal of this article is to collect and analyze the database to understand what contemporary British nationals do on the Internet, their attitudes towards Internet use, based on their experience of using the Internet and what services the Internet platform provides to users. The source of the author's database is mainly divided into two categories: Social Media and Society International Conference, and the other is a British government agency, Ofcom.

Source of Data

The International Conference on Social Media and Society gathers together outstanding social media researchers from all over the world. The discussion of the topic of the conference is mainly for researchers from various countries to share new discoveries about how social media affects society or discuss the interaction between media and different fields. Since the launch in 2010, the data has shown that there are many cross-disciplinary research results from communication, education, journalism, information science, management, political science, psychology and sociology. Therefore, the characteristics of the data from here are authentic, immediate and reliable. With the academic research and insights of experts from various countries, it can show what role social media plays today and how it affects the public.

Another database, Ofcom, is a government agency. In addition to providing communications services such as broadcasting, telecommunications and postal services, it is mainly the regulator of communications services in the UK. The reasons for choosing the United Kingdom as the main country are as follows: First, European development has paid more attention to human rights earlier, so the control is more rigorous than United States, where the Mercantilism prevails, but not as strict as China

government's control. In Europe, the United Kingdom has the world's oldest and largest national broadcasting organization, the BBC, which is also a model of the world's media public ownership. Second, Ofcom levies a TV license fee of 147 Euros from the British people every year. Since the funding comes from the people, it is subject to the supervision of the whole people. If the content is too nasty or too commercial, it will be reported, so the neutrality of its organization can be maintained. Third, the documents are all in English. Compared with other non-native language materials, it can reduce the errors and understanding of language translation for the author.

As a result, both of the above-mentioned data sources are reliable, which can help the researcher analyze the current situation from an objective and diverse perspectives. In addition, it also refers to the arguments of other scholars and the current state of regulations in various countries, and then deduces which management norms or models are the better options.

Data collection

This paper will collect the data regarding the regulations in social media as a content analysis methodology. The data collected includes research and academic data of social media professionals from all over the world, as well as surveys and studies of Internet users by related institutions. In this paper, we will analyze these data from the perspective of regulating the management network and use them as an empirical reference to answer the main research questions of this paper: Who should regulate the platform of social media?

In the process of data collection, the researcher organized two main data sources into a database, one is from the International Conference on Social Media & Society and the other is from the research report of the Ofcom organization. The amount of data from the both source is almost equal. Ofcom's research reports can be further

subdivided into Online Nation, Adult’s Media Literacy Tracker and Adults’ Media Lives. The reason for collecting these reports is to have a complete and in-depth understanding of the experience and feelings of Internet users in the UK. It not only has research reports on the country as a whole, but also focuses on reference to the adult Internet user population with mature independent thinking and judgment capabilities. For the brief introduction of the database, please refer to Table 1, and for details, please refer to Appendix A and B.

Table1. The brief introduction of the database

Main Source	Type of information	Database Number	Total
the International Conference on Social Media & Society	2020 Conference Publications	A-01-10	10
Ofcom	Online Nation	B-22-24	17
	Adult’s Media Literacy Tracker	C-25-31	
	Adults’ Media Lives	D-32-38	
GOV.UK	Online Harms White Paper	E-01-03	3
	Cyber Aware	F-04-14	11
Twitter	Opinions of White House Officials and Members of Congress on Twitter’s Blocking of Trump’s Account.	G	1

Chapter 4 DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter will describe the data searching based on the database. In the chapter, it will describe comparative case studies in the type of regulation, and divided into extremely regulated country, relaxed regulatory country, and UK.

Types

Extremely regulated country: China

Many non-democratic countries have strict control over social media, and strict network supervision can facilitate the management and control of the government and help optimize the network environment.

In 1994, since the State Council promulgated “Regulations of the People’s Republic of China for Security Protection of Computer Information Systems”, China has formulated a number of laws and regulations²³, such as Measures for Administration of internet Domain Names, Measures for Administration of Licensing for Operating Telecommunications Services, Provisions on Administration of Internet Audio-visual Program Services, and so on. China also asks for the ISP (Internet Service Provider) to take responsibility in regulating. According to the Methods for the Administration of Internet-Based Information Service²⁴, ISPs should not only be charge for the content they provide to Internet users, but also cooperate with the government to control harmful and illegal content on the Internet. For example, when inquiring by relevant state departments in accordance with the law, Internet information service providers need to provide and keep backup records of Internet access service providers. Based on the same regulation, the Chinese government has proposed a licensing system for commercial Internet information services and a record

²³ Yong Hu, “China's Regulation of the Internet”, *Journalism Research* No. 103 (2010) pp 261-87

²⁴ Song Yan, ed., “Methods for the Administration of Internet-Based Information Service”, *the State Council of the People's Republic of China* (2000)

system for non-commercial Internet information services. In short, related Internet services such as news information, electronic bulletins, network operations and so on, all need requirement for permission from the relevant central authorities' departments.

From the above mentioned, it can be seen that China's regulatory framework is composed of specific regulations, relevant government departments, technology filtering systems, and Internet service providers. The Chinese government has formulated special regulations and a license application system, the main purpose of which is to control Internet services, content, and expression behavior. Moreover, in order to implement these regulations thoroughly, relevant government departments have spent a lot of manpower and material resources to build a complete basic equipment system. They have established a network police, filtering and red firewall system, and network blocking includes a series of technical controls such as IP blocking, keyword filtering, content filtering, and DSN server transmission. In addition to the supervision of the central government, companies that provide Internet services are required to help the government regime. With clear laws and regulations and a comprehensive governance method of cooperation between the central government and enterprises, China's Internet services have obtained an efficient and complete control framework. Under the way of China government facing the Web 2.0 featuring the concept of “decentralization²⁵”, they attempt to gain control through the means of “re-centralization”, which makes the allocation of network resources more reasonable and the responsibility of each individual clear.

However, the strict supervision of social media in non-democratic countries has also brought negative effects. Excessive control has led to the disappearance of many speeches that weaken the opposition, and discussions on the Internet have

²⁵ Ibid. 14, p272-75

formed a phenomenon in which the public prefers information to shape a good image of the government and patriotism. In other words, restricting speech that conflicts with national interests cannot achieve multiple exchanges, as the aforementioned scholar Habermas (1989) put forward the idea of promoting public interest. Furthermore, take China as a reference, if a cross-company wants to set up a website in China's Net domain, it has to apply a license or a record to China government. Due to the complicated steps, it may decrease the wiliness of the company to do that in China. Therefore, social media may become another potential tool for the continuation of government regime, the development of social media is also demarcated.

Relatively relaxed regulatory country: United States, Germany and France

The most frequently mentioned law in the United States in recent years is the Communications Decency Act 230²⁶ (CDA 230) passed in 1996.

No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider.

The content is to protect users from being held legally responsible for uploading content, and the social platform does not have to be responsible for it. Therefore, this law is regarded as the law that best demonstrates freedom of speech in social media. From legislation to present, CDA 230 has a positive impact on the development of social media. Because of its freedom, convenience and transmission speed, the use of social media is no longer limited to the United States when the government allows its development to operate with the market mechanism.

²⁶ Electronic Frontier Foundation, "Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act", accessed June 21, 2021
<https://www.eff.org/issues/cda230>

In the past, laws and regulations enacted in the United States mainly focused on protecting children and filtering pornographic violence. However, freedom of speech, which democracy is proud of, is rapidly spread on social platforms through algorithms, with a singular, specific transmission form, leading to individuals only receiving likeminded information sources, and it is likely that society will become more fragmented and more polarized. We can see the cases in the U.S. in the past years. People expressed their political standpoints with extreme and harmful words under the right of freedom of speech, which made social media become a political tool to manipulate users. Furthermore, the laws and regulations that originally meant to prevent criminal cases cannot form a binding force on today's society. For instance, there are problems that may lead to the division of the real society, such as racial discrimination, crime, terrorism, and the proliferation of fake news.

Polarization of opinions and echo chamber²⁷, reducing the heterogeneity of opinions on the platform, and based on the scholar Sunstein (2001)²⁸, the phenomena will be a risk to the functioning of democracy, since the society will have less consensus and the public will be lack of tolerance on the opposing opinions. As a consequence, with regard to CDA 230, both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party of the United States agreed that this regulation should be amended to maintain social stability in the United States.

Germany and France

Nowadays, some countries such as Germany and France have formulated relevant regulations and penalties for social media companies, requiring them to fulfill

²⁷ Matteo Cinelli, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Alessandro Galeazzi, Walter Quattrociocchi, Michele Starnini, "The echo chamber effect on social media", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 118 (2021), pp1-8

²⁸ Thomas S. Ulen, "Democracy and the Internet: Cass R. Sunstein, Republic.Com. Princeton, Nj. Princeton University Press", *Journal of Law, Technology and Policy*, No. 2, 2001

their social responsibilities.

In Germany, at the meeting on June 30, 2017, the Bundestag passed a bill that has a major impact on social media-the “Network Enforcement Act, or NetzDG law” (hereinafter referred to as the “NetzDG law”)²⁹. The “NetzDG law” stipulates that large-scale social networking sites with more than 2 million German registrations, such as Facebook and Twitter, must remove “obviously” hatred that violates German criminal law within 24 hours of receiving notification from users. For fake news or “less obvious” and “controversial” hate speech, social media companies have 7 days to decide whether to remove the post. Supporters of the NetzDG law believe that this law can urge social media companies to more actively deal with speech on the platform, and can reduce the error rate of messages or extreme hate speech. Proponents of the NetzDG law believe that the law can encourage social media companies to more actively deal with speech on the platform, and can reduce the error rate of messages or extreme hate speech. However, the adoption and implementation of the NetzDG law has caused many controversies. First, if it is fake news, it can be found out through verification, but if it is hate speech, it is difficult to determine the boundary of the degree. Second, the transfer of powers determined by law from the government to private enterprises. In addition to positions that private companies do not want to own, there are also doubts about the impropriety of the review process. The German Federal Minister of Economic Affairs, Brigitte Zypries, also stated that there is no legal liability for violations of the law and should not be privatized.

France hopes to emulate Germany's NetzDG Law³⁰, Therefore, the French National Assembly passed the anti-hate speech legislation proposal on July 9, 2019.

²⁹ Federal Ministry of Justice and Consumer Protection, “Legislative package to combat hate and hate speech has entered into force.” accessed May 19, 2020

³⁰ Légifrance, “Avis relatif à la proposition de loi visant à lutter contre la haine sur internet”, *The Official Journal of the French Republic*, July, 2019, accessed May 15, 2020

The content of the proposal is that online platform operators should be responsible for managing online hate speech. The legislation requires large online platform companies and search engines, such as Facebook and YouTube, to set up user reporting channels, and delete based on race, religion, Gender, sexual orientation or disability incites hatred or discriminatory insulting speech.

Regarding the competent authority, under the supervision of the French High Audiovisual Commission (CSA) and the French Radio and Television Administration, network platform operators must submit hate speech handling reports and related data to them. At the same time, platform operators should strengthen cooperation with the French judicial system, remove the anonymity of illegal users, and provide relevant evidence to facilitate judicial prosecution.

As far as the current situation is concerned, it will take time to prove whether Germany's and France's current practices can be effectively managed, but from the perspective of the both countries' positions in the EU system, the related law has a great impact on European social media companies. Germany and France are important leader countries in the EU system. If the normative precedents of the two countries are successful and effective, many countries will follow suit. What's more, through EU institutional legislation, the network environment of the entire EU system can be improved and optimized.

The management of Ofcom

Ofcom is a semi-official independent organization in the United Kingdom, whose main responsibility is to be charge of the intermediary communication and television industry³¹. Its purpose is to protect the rights and interests of consumers and ensure that public interests are not infringed. What's more, it has the power to issue licenses and

³¹ B-24

revoke licenses. Since the modern regulatory model is diversified, Ofcom is a hybrid method of regulatory agency, including the coordination and management of command and control, self-discipline, and joint supervision³². It has law enforcement, review and supervision responsibilities, and takes non-strong intervention measures. Ofcom also has a committee organization, provides a grievance mechanism, and reviews content with doubts. The method is mostly based on analysis of the content, and includes contextual understanding, and judges from the standpoint of citizens' interests. In addition, this organization provides a transparent and open annual report, including users' experience and usage trends on the Internet.

After studying this article, it is concluded that the operation mode of this organization is between the public sector and private enterprises, and is mainly composed of a board of directors, a senior management team, and a committee. Because this organization is not monitored and managed by government officials, but there is a board of directors within Ofcom. The board of directors has a central governance function, and its purpose is mainly to provide Ofcom strategic guidance, and is fully responsible for financial and operational matters.³³ The decentralization of power under the chairman of the board is the senior management team (SMT), which leads the team within Ofcom and forms the core of the policy and management committee. Furthermore, according to the content of Ofcom's organization and external supervision, the committee is divided into personnel committee, risk and audit committee, communication consumer group, etc., to conduct internal and external supervision and control. Most of the committee members are experts and private individuals with rich experience in this field. Supervise executives internally and give advice, and expand

³² E-01

³³ B-23

research, provide advice and encourage the government, EU, industry, etc., externally.

In addition to the legality and legitimacy of the organization's existence, the records of meetings held by internal organization operations will also be made public on the Internet for public reference. This organization has a sound organizational system and resources, and its influence extends to problems in a certain area of the United Kingdom. Relatively speaking, the opinions, needs and special circumstances of various countries need to be included in the opinions of Ofcom, so its office is expanded to Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England. Since most of the internal member organizations come from local elites, in addition to introducing policies tailored to local conditions, it can also improve the credibility of research reports and the feasibility of policy recommendations.

Although the United Kingdom has the supervision of Ofcom's regulatory agency, the effectiveness of network management is still relatively weak compared to other traditional media. Therefore, in recent years, the UK Home Office has published the Online Harms Whitepaper³⁴, which mainly proposes suggestions on the governance views of the Internet generation and future legislative goals. Subsequently, the British government announced in February 2020 that the Office of Communications (Ofcom) will act as the independent supervisory authority for online content, proposed a draft cybersecurity law, and responsibilities for online service providers to deal with cyber-hazardous content to create a safe, secure, and friendly use environment. The British government sets different statutory obligations according to different Internet service types and functions. The difference is search service and user-to-user service. On the one hand, the former has a relatively low control density and belongs to the Category 2A service in its specification. Service providers are required to register with Ofcom,

³⁴ E-32

submit transparency reports, and pay administrative fees when their global revenue reaches the specified standards. In addition, they also need to undertake the obligations of illegal content risk assessment and handling of illegal and harmful children's and children's content. On the other hand, user-to-user services refer to Internet services that provide user-generated content (UGC) produced by users of the service, or provide users of the service to upload or share UGC, and provide access to other users of the service. Social media such as Facebook and YouTube. "User-to-user services" are divided into "Category 1 services" with higher control density and "Category 2A" with lower control density based on the number of users and the risk of content dissemination³⁵. Category 1 should also take the following statutory obligations. First, it must deal with harmful adult content and avoid the negative impact caused by related content; second, relevant measures shall be formulated to protect content of democratic importance; the last one, service providers shall take relevant measures, and develop a quick appeal procedure to facilitate the handling of related appeals and protect the freedom of the press. The latter's responsibilities belonging to Category 2B are the same as in Category 2A above. Service providers must minimize the existence of illegal content in their services and remove confirmed or potentially illegal content to effectively reduce their presentation and dissemination effects. At the same time, if the content posted by the user is removed, which constitutes a serious violation of freedom of speech or privacy, the user can directly appeal to Ofcom.

In response to this proposal, Ofcom explained that the British government is not responsible for censoring all content on the Internet, but the purpose of this proposal is to hope that online platforms should have appropriate systems and procedures to protect

³⁵ E-02

users³⁶. As a regulatory agency, Ofcom only takes action when these platforms fail to meet the requirements and will focus on dealing with the most serious injuries, including illegal content and harmful content that endangers children.

Implication

Regulatory network in China seems to be ordinary, strict and unfree, but there is a stable network environment. However, in this case, the restrictions of freedom and the easy to turn the media into a political tool. In the United State, regulation is relatively free, but it also brings problems. Excessive emphasis on individual liberalism sometimes causes problems that conflict with national interests. Then, the other EU countries focus on collectivism, sacrificing personal interests to achieve the interests of citizens. Even if the United Kingdom has Ofcom's strict supervision system, it is still a democratic country with a high degree of press freedom. In international comparisons, the press freedom index is higher than that of the United States, Germany and France. Ofcom's business model combines government, private and user management, with a triangular partnership, mutual responsibility and supervision of each other, this relationship is a stable management model. Ofcom also pointed out that since we have many choices of media expression in contemporary times, it is the most important point to improve the media literacy of social citizens through media supervision, educational institutions, and personal life and family.³⁷

In the past, laws and regulations tended to allow the media to be more self-disciplined. Today, the UK has drafted more stringent laws and regulations that target

³⁶ E-03

³⁷ F-14

Internet regulations, which has changed from a loose and passive form to a proactive one. However, there is still room for the normative measures. Therefore, this article believes that as long as the purpose is confirmed, the measures adopted can be handled flexibly. Furthermore, this specification also requires that the industry must provide an appeal agency and provide a channel for users to respond. However, this article believes that it is not appropriate to directly grant social media control rights, because this may result in a monopoly of social media information, but instead grants technology giants greater power, and it is not a long-term solution. Between extreme and loose legal norms, the hybrid mechanism adopted by the United Kingdom gives enterprise platforms and participants flexible space and freedom of expression of the press.

Chapter 5 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Social media has become an important part of contemporary people's lives. Daily life such as news, exchanges, and sharing are all gathered on the platform. It can also be seen from many cases that the influence of social media extends from the personal level to the national level, including political, economic, and cultural exchanges, such as the Arab Spring in 2011 to the Brexit and U.S. presidential elections in 2016. Nowadays, it is hard to deny that social media has become the most powerful weapon in information warfare.

Therefore, this article uses Ofcom's management model as a reference, and suggests that countries should adopt flexible measures that suit their national conditions when regulating social media. Totalitarian countries often violate the freedom of the media and people's freedom of speech due to improper political interference. However, the operation of commercial media in democratic countries may also reduce the diversity of speech and suppress weak voices. Whether it is strict control or deregulation, if a country can comprehensively learn from the other's advantages and appropriately control freedom of speech in order to achieve the greatest public interest, this will promote the overall development of the world society.

This article believes that responsibility attribution is not intended to punish or completely eliminate harmful effects. On the contrary, it is to establish a healthy and balanced system and promote social media to become a good channel for expressing democracy, rather than a political tool for persecuting democracy. Like many others scholars³⁸ emphasized that the rise of social media represents a complete break with the past mass media environment, but the use and supplement of new media

³⁸ David Tewksbury and Jason Rittenberg, "News on the Internet: Information and Citizenship in the 21st Century", *Oxford University Press*, (2012), Hermida, Alfred, Frederick J. Fletcher, Darryl Korell and Donna Logan. "SHARE, LIKE, RECOMMEND." *Journalism Studies Vol.13* (2012): 815 - 824.

(Sometimes it's just a replacement). It can make the old media use more mature and increase the channels for people to express their opinions. Social media does benefit for people, because websites or traditional media have a one-to-many relationship, while social media is a many-to-many relationship. When everyone has the opportunity to express, the relative right possessed is increased, and the power in the world is therefore more dispersed. Moreover, we currently do not have a power or organization that transcends the country to balance the power and influence of multinational companies. In other words, the world is being dominated by multinational corporations in global operations. Therefore, the conclusion of this article suggests that by the efforts of various countries to ensure that the government, media companies and netizens have legal and equal rights and responsibilities through appropriate management, so that the democratic system and freedom of speech will be balanced in contemporary society.

Bibliography

Beer, David, “Using Social Media Data Aggregators to Do Social Research”, *Sociological Research Online* 17, no. 3, Aug 2012, pp 91–102

Boatwrighta, Brandon, Joseph P Mazerb, and Sarah Beachc, “The 2016 U.S. Presidential Election and Transition Events: A Social Media Volume and Sentiment Analysis”, *Southern Communication Journal*, Vol 84, (20 Jan 2019), pp 196-209

Carson, Ben & Candy, *Twitter* (Jan. 9, 2021), accessed May 10, 2021

<https://mobile.twitter.com/realbencarson/status/1347735180245684224>

Chadwick, Andrew. “The Political Information Cycle in a Hybrid News System: The British Prime Minister and the ‘Bullygate’ Affair.” *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 16, no. 1 (January 2011), p 3–29.

Cinelli, Matteo, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Alessandro Galeazzi, Walter Quattrociocchi, Michele Starnini, “The echo chamber effect on social media”, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 118 (2021), pp1-8

Curran, James; Jean Seaton, “Power Without Responsibility: Press, Broadcasting and the Internet in Britain (8th ed.)”, *Routledge* (2018)

Electronic Frontier Foundation, “Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act”, accessed June 21, 2021

<https://www EFF.org/issues/cda230>

Federal Ministry of Justice and Consumer Protection, “Legislative package to combat hate and hate speech has entered into force.”, accessed May 19, 2020

Francke, Warren, “The evolving Watchdog: The Media’s Role in Government Ethics,” *The Annals of the American Accademy of Political and Social Science* 537,

no.1(1995), pp 109-21

Habermas, Jürgen, Translated by Thomas Burger, “The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society”, *The MIT Press* (August 28, 1991)

Hu, Yong, “China's Regulation of the Internet”, *Journalism Research* No. 103 (2010), pp 261-87

John Milton,” Areopagitica; a speech of Mr. John Milton for the liberty of vnlicens'd printing, to the Parlament of England.”, London, printed in the yeare, (1644)

Kaplan, Andreas M.; Michael Haenlein, “Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media”, *Business Horizons*, Vol. 53 (2010), pp59-68

Légifrance, “Avis relatif à la proposition de loi visant à lutter contre la haine sur internet”, *The Official Journal of the French Republic*, July, 2019, accessed May 15, 2020

Napoli, Philip, “Foundations of communications policy: principles and process in the regulation of electronic media”, *Hampton Press* (2011)

Newman, Nic, Richard Fletcher, David A. L. Levy and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. “Reuters Institute digital news report 2016”, *the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism at Oxford University* (2016), p8-11

O'Reilly, Tim, “What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software”, *MPRA Paper* No. 4578, November 2007, pp17-19

Reuters, “Germany has reservations about Trump Twitter ban, Merkel spokesman says”, Jun. 11, 2021, accessed May 30, 2021

<https://www.reuters.com/article/usa-trump-germany-twitter-idUSL8N2JM4ES>

Santos, Marcelo Luis Barbosa dos, “The “so-called” UGC: an updated definition of user-generated content in the age of social media”, *Online Information Review - Emerald*, ISSN 1468-452, (2021)

Schmidt, Eric and Jared Cohen, “The Digital Disruption Connectivity and the Diffusion of Power”, *Foreign Affairs* Vol.89, no. 6 (2010), pp 75–85.

Shirky, Clay, “The Political Power of Social Media: Technology, the Public Sphere, and Political Change”, *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 90, No. 1, Council on Foreign Relations, pp 28-41

Stewart, Potter, “Or of the Press”, *Hastings Law Journal*, Vol 26, pp 631-37 (1975)

Tewksbury, David and Jason Rittenberg, “News on the Internet: Information and Citizenship in the 21st Century”, *Oxford University Press* (March 23, 2012)

Tewksbury, David and Jason Rittenberg, “News on the Internet: Information and Citizenship in the 21st Century”, *Oxford University Press*, (2012), Hermida, Alfred, Frederick J. Fletcher, Darryl Korell and Donna Logan. “SHARE, LIKE, RECOMMEND.” *Journalism Studies* Vol.13 (2012): 815 - 824.

Vickery, Graham, Sacha Wunsch-Vincent and OECD, “Participative Web and User-Created Content: Web 2.0 Wikis and Social Networking”, *Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)*, (2007)

Ulen, Thomas S., “Democracy and the Internet: Cass R. Sunstein, Republic.Com. Princeton, Nj. Princeton University Press”, *Journal of Law, Technology and Policy*, No. 2, 2001

Yan, Song, ed., “Methods for the Administration of Internet-Based Information

Service”, *the State Council of the People's Republic of China* (2000)

Appendix A

Table of the Database Established for Data Analysis on Regulation in social media

Source: The International Conference on Social Media & Society

A. 2020 Conference Publications (22 July, 2020)

Main source: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/proceedings/10.1145/3400806>

Ref. No.	Title	Author	Item URL
A-01	Analyzing Hate Speech with Incel-Hunters' Critiques	Yisi Sang, Jeffrey Stanton	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400808
A-02	Analyzing Public Discourse on Social Media With A Geographical Context: A Case Study of 2017 Tax Bill	Jaehee Park, Ming-Hsiang Tsou	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400809
A-03	Building Trustworthiness in Computer-Mediated Introduction: A Facet-Oriented Framework	Angela Borchert, Nicolás Emilio Díaz Ferreyra, Maritta Heisel	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400812
A-04	Characterizing Online Vandalism: A Rational Choice Perspective	Kaylea Champion	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400813
A-05	Characterizing the Evolution of Communities on Reddit	Humphrey Mensah, Lu Xiao, Sucheta Soundarajan	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400814

A-06	Comparative Discourse Analysis Using Topic Models: Contrasting Perspectives on China from Reddit	Zachary Kimo Stine, Nitin Agarwal	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400816
A-07	Exploring Political Ad Libraries for Online Advertising Transparency: Lessons from Germany and the 2019 European Elections	Juan Carlos Medina Serrano, Orestis Papakyriakopoulos, Simon Hegelich	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400820
A-08	Fair Game: The Effects of Target Identity, Attack Topic and Role-Relevance in the Judgement of Online Aggression	Kimberley R. Allison, Kay Bussey, Naomi Sweller	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400821
A-09	How do Digital Divides Determine Social Media Users' Aspirations to Influence Others?	Sanna Malinen, Aki Koivula, Ilkka Koiranen	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400823
A-10	Understanding Perceptions and Attitudes toward Genetically Modified Organisms on Twitter	Inyoung Jun, Yunpeng Zhao, Xing He, Rania Gollakner, Christa Court, Olga Munoz, Jiang Bian, Ilaria Capua, Mattia Prospero	https://doi.org/10.1145/3400806.3400839

Source: Ofcom

B. Online Nation (2021-2019)

Main source : <https://reurl.cc/Q6p6kb>

Ref. No.	Title	Publisher	Published Date	Item URL
B-21	Online Nation 2021 report	Ofcom	9 June 2021	https://reurl.cc/YjljaL
B-23	Online Nation 2020 Summary report	Ofcom	24 June 2020	https://reurl.cc/GbkbWx
B-24	Online Nation 2019 report	Ofcom	30 May 2019	https://reurl.cc/73235N

Source: Ofcom

C. Adult's Media Literacy Tracker (2021-2015)

Main source : <https://reurl.cc/gzvzgQ>

Ref. No.	Title	Publisher	Published Date	Item URL
C-25	Adults' Media Use and Attitudes report 2021	Ofcom	28 April 2021	https://reurl.cc/bn6Eoy
C-26	Adults' Media Use and Attitudes report 2020	Ofcom	24 June 2020	https://reurl.cc/52gpxn
C-27	Adults: Media use and attitudes report 2019	Ofcom	30 May 2019	https://reurl.cc/EZKRdm
C-28	Adults: Media use and attitudes report 2018	Ofcom	25 April 2018	https://reurl.cc/q1DNly
C-29	Adults: Media use and attitudes report 2017	Ofcom	June 2017	https://reurl.cc/43gpA2
C-30	Adults: Media use and attitudes report 2016	Ofcom	April 2016	https://reurl.cc/q1DNyN
C-31	Adults: Media use and attitudes report 2015	Ofcom	May 2015	https://reurl.cc/pxDZDd

Source: Ofcom

D. Adults' Media Lives (2021-2015)

Main source: <https://reurl.cc/zWyrdN>

Ref. No.	Title	Publisher	Published Date	Item URL
D-32	Adults' Media Lives 16: 2020/21	Ofcom	April 2021	https://reurl.cc/15LZ1Q
D-33	Adults' Media Lives 15: 2020	Ofcom	June 2020	https://reurl.cc/n5VZal
D-34	Adults' Media Lives 2019	Ofcom	23rd May 2019	https://reurl.cc/AR1yE3
D-35	Adults' Media Lives 2018: A qualitative study Wave 13 Summary Report	Ofcom	25 April 2018	https://reurl.cc/jgdldn
D-36	Adults' Media Lives 2016: A qualitative study Wave 12 Summary Report*	Ofcom	14 June 2017	https://reurl.cc/GbkerA
D-37	Media Lives 2015: A Qualitative Study Wave 11 Summary Report	Ofcom	26 February 2016	https://reurl.cc/gzvZ87
D-38	Media Lives: Wave 10 (2014) and Ten Year retrospective Summary Report	Ofcom	29 April 2015	https://reurl.cc/52gMo6

* Note: Ofcom have named this report after the year of publication. Previously, they named the report after the year of fieldwork.

Source: GOV.UK

E. Online Harms White Paper (2021-2019)

F. Cyber security guidance for business (May 12, 2021)

Main source: <https://www.gov.uk/>

Ref. No.	Title	Publisher	Published Date	Item URL
E-01	Online Harms White Paper: Full Government Response to the consultation	GOV.UK	April 8, 2019	https://reurl.cc/43vbZR
E-02	The Government Report on Transparency Reporting in relation to Online Harms	GOV.UK	April 8, 2019	https://reurl.cc/Zjqlpg
E-03	Online Harms White Paper - Initial consultation response	GOV.UK	February 12, 2020	https://reurl.cc/AR1yE3
F-04	Cyber Aware	GOV.UK	Accessed July 20, 2021	https://www.cyberaware.gov.uk/
F-05	The Small Business Guide	GOV.UK	November 15, 2018	https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/collection/small-business-guide

F-06	The Board Toolkit	GOV.UK	March 21, 2019	https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/collection/board-toolkit
F-07	The 10 Steps to Cyber Security	GOV.UK	May 11, 2021	https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/collection/10-steps
F-08	Cyber security guidance for non-executive directors	GOV.UK	December 10, 2014	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cyber-security-balancing-risk-and-reward-with-confidence
F-09	Protecting against ransomware	GOV.UK	February 13, 2020	https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/ransomware
F-10	National Cyber Security Centre	GOV.UK	Accessed July 25, 2021	https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/guidance
F-11	Draft Online Safety Bill	GOV.UK	May 2021	https://reurl.cc/1o787X
F-12	Memorandum of authorized rights	GOV.UK	May 12, 2021	https://reurl.cc/ARL9IQ
F-13	Online Safety Bill Explanatory Notes	GOV.UK	May 12, 2021	https://reurl.cc/MkL2m4
F-14	Impact Assessment (IA)	GOV.UK	April 26, 2021	https://reurl.cc/V5Q2OZ

Appendix B

G. Opinions of White House Officials and Members of Congress on Twitter's Blocking of Trump's Account. (Accseed in Jan. 9- Jan.10)

Main source: Twitter

Position	Name	Content	Item URL
U.S. Secretary of State	Mike Pompeo	Silencing speech is dangerous. It's un-American. Sadly, this isn't a new tactic of the Left. They've worked to silence opposing voices for years. We cannot let them silence 75M Americans. This isn't the CCP.	https://reurl.cc/43vY62
Senator of South Carolina	Lindsey Graham	Twitter may ban me for this but I willingly accept that fate: Your decision to permanently ban President Trump is a serious mistake. The Ayatollah can tweet, but Trump can't. Says a lot about the people who run Twitter.	https://reurl.cc/MkLWM3
Senator of Florida	Marco Rubio	Even those who oppose Trump should see the danger of having a small & unelected group with the power to silence & erase anyone. And their actions will only stoke new grievances that will end up fueling the very thing they claim to be trying to prevent.	https://reurl.cc/RbER29
Minister of Housing and Urban Development	Ben Carson	Silencing a significant number of voters and erasing history is no way to unite us; it only further divides. Big tech & social media platforms want to act like media orgs but don't want to be held accountable with the rest of media. Speech should be free whether you agree or not.	https://reurl.cc/L7LVr9

Representative of Texas	Ted Cruz	Big Tech's PURGE, censorship & abuse of power is absurd & profoundly dangerous. If you agree w/ Tech's current biases (Iran, good; Trump, bad), ask yourself, what happens when you disagree? Why should a handful of Silicon Valley billionaires have a monopoly on political speech?	https://reurl.cc/aN8EEQ
Colorado Federal House of Representatives	Lauren Boebert	By banning the duly elected President of the United States, Big Tech has declared they are more powerful than the will of the American people. Unelected tech oligarchs should not have such massive power over global discourse while enjoying little to no oversight/accountability.	https://reurl.cc/73LYlk
Representative of Texas	Beth Van Duyne	Twitter purges conservatives. Google suspends Parler. Where was Big Tech over the summer when liberal voices were inciting violence in our streets? To be clear: This isn't about violence. This is about Big Tech trying to control what we think, what we share, how we communicate.	https://reurl.cc/NZLOE5
Congressman of North Carolina	Madison Cawthorn	When you tear out the tongues of those who speak against you, you are not proving them liars. Instead you are proclaiming, on the altar of oppression, that you are crippled by fear of what they might say.	https://reurl.cc/gzpNjR