

Political Science

G. R. Boynton's New Media and Politics

University of Iowa

10-1-2010

Continuous Streams with Episodic Communication

Lauren Groeper, *University of Iowa*

Emilie Lee, *University of Iowa*

Hassanein Ahmed, *University of Iowa*

Alec Siglin, *University of Iowa*

Anthony Sudarmawan, *University of Iowa*

Andrea Bunting, *University of Iowa*

Bryan Hill, *University of Iowa*

Jeremy McDaniel, *University of Iowa*

Hillary Block, *University of Iowa*

Kaitlin Davies, *University of Iowa*

Andrew Ewing, *University of Iowa*

David Clayton, *University of Iowa*

Miranda Nielson, *University of Iowa*

Copyright ©2010 Lauren Groeper, Emilie Lee, Hassanein Ahmed, Alec Siglin, Anthony Sudarmawan, Andrea Bunting, Bryan Hil , Jeremy McDaniel, Hillary Block, Kaitlin Davies, Andrew Ewing, David Clayton, Miranda Nielson

This paper is posted at Iowa Research Online.

http://ir.uiowa.edu/polisci_nmp/133

Continuous Streams with Episodic Communication

Authors: Lauren Groeper, Emily Lee, Anthony Sudarmawan, Andrea Bunting, Bryan Hill, Jeremy McDaniel, Hillary Block, Kaitlin Davies, Andrew Ewing, David Clayton, Ahmed Hassanein, Miranda Nielson

Question: What are the continuous streams within which we find episodic communication?

1. Abstract- Each group researched a different topic and the topics included Obama, Afghanistan, Karzai, Afghanistan-Corruption, and Obama-Afghanistan. We are looking to compare volume, overlap, and communication practices.
2. Concrete- Each group used Archivist to research different topics and to specifically find the total number of tweets, the usage of hashtags, the usage of URLs, and the usage of retweets. The group that researched Afghanistan also searched to find the total number of tweets which included Karzai. Then, each group compared their total numbers for each topic in order to find episodic communication.

Procedure:

The groups that researched Afghanistan, Karzai, Afghanistan-Corruption, and Obama-Afghanistan used Archivist and searched their topic from 9/22/10 at 11:30 am to 9/24/10 at 10:30 am. These groups then searched for communication practices ([\) in Microsoft Excel. The group that researched Obama used Desktop Archivist and searched from 9/22/10 at 4:04 pm to 9/24/10 at 9:52 pm.](http://)

Overlap and Volume:

After two days of archiving tweets on our topics, the results show that episodic content is a relatively low percentage of the larger ongoing cases. Of the tweets regarding President Obama, only 15 of his 106,834 (less than one one-thousandth of a percent) referenced Karzai as well, while only 926 (less than one percent) mentioned the much broader topic of Afghanistan. Karzai and Afghanistan had a larger correlation (0.81% of Afghanistan tweets referred to Karzai as well), though the crossover of the episodic content (Karzai) was still less than one percent of the total for the ongoing affair.

	Obama	Afghanistan	Karzai	Afghanistan Corruption	Total Tweets
Obama	-	926 (0.87%)	15 (0.0001%)	-	106,834 (100%)
Afghanistan	381 (7.95%)	-	39 (0.81%)	6 (0.13%)	4791 (100%)
Karzai	39 (4.95%)	96 (12.18%)	-	0 (0.00%)	788 (100%)
Corruption Afghanistan	8 (3.33%)	240 (100.00%)	1 (0.42%)	-	240 (100%)
Obama Afghanistan	-	-	6 (0.38%)	8 (0.51%)	1566 (100%)

Communication Practices:

	Karzai	Corruption/Afghanistan	Afghanistan	Obama/Afghanistan	Obama
Size	788	240	4792	1566	106834
#	168 (21.3%)	65 (27%)	1139 (23.8%)	367 (23%)	25994 (24.3%)
RT@	109 (13.8%)	56 (23%)	1186 (24.7%)	405 (26%)	27904 (26.1%)
Http://	621 (78%)	214 (89.29%)	3473 (72.5%)	1272 (81%)	65673 (61.47%)

The greatest portion of tweets included URLs, with the minimum percentage being 61.47%. This most likely means that people were including news articles in their messages to back up the information that they were sending, or were tweeting from the newspaper's online content.

Retweets and hashtags were nearly even in terms of how many tweets included them. For Karzai and Corruption/Afghanistan, hashtags were slightly more common, but for Afghanistan, Obama/Afghanistan and Obama, the reverse was true. In general, both retweets and hashtags were far less common than URLs for all topics researched.

Conclusion:

Here is a summary of results of the research.

Obama-Afghanistan

Hashtag (#)	RT	URL	Total
367 (23%)	405 (26%)	1272 (81%)	1566

Karzai

Hashtag (#)	RT	URL	Total
367 (23%)	405 (26%.)	1272 (81%).	1566

Corruption-Afghanistan

Hashtag (#)	RT	URL	Total
367 (23%)	405 (26%.)	1272 (81%).	1566

Afghanistan

Hashtag (#)	RT	URL	Total
367 (23%)	405 (26%.)	1272 (81%).	1566

Obama

Hashtag (#)	RT	URL	Total
367 (23%)	405 (26%.)	1272 (81%).	1566