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Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the role of curatorial activities by the general web public with a focus on the concept of selective exposure in online political discussions. A heated controversy about Japan’s state secrecy law using a social curatorial application, Togetter, was used as a case for this study. Descriptive content analysis was applied as a method to examine whether selective exposure to like-minded opinions or cross-ideological exposure to dissimilar opinions functioned in this case. The major finding was that Twitter’s tendency of selective exposure was enhanced by curatorial activities using Togetter. The concept of context collapse and technological affordances were likely to contribute this tendency. The study also suggests curators played a significant role to encourage selective exposure in political discussions.
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1. Introduction

Political discussions on social media have attracted scholarly attentions as well as more general attention due to the recent emergence of political and social movements using social media around the world. The most representative case was the so-called “Arab Spring” that emerged in Tunisia and Egypt in 2011 (Tufekci & Wilson, 2012). Authoritarian nations sometimes shut down the connection to social media or to all Internet services to prevent those movements (Youmans & York, 2012). A more recent case was seen in Turkey where the government shut down some social media (Avni, 2014). Although Japan has not experienced such severe turbulence, the popularity of Twitter continues to grow, specifically after the East Japan Disaster (Jung & Moro, 2012; Kaigo, 2012). Moreover, what is discussed on Twitter became more serious, topics such as social and political issues, and sometimes this media has been used to lead the general public to gather for collective demonstrations (Tabuchi, 2012).

Despite the fact that the Internet and social media can allow people to interact with each other beyond space and time, it is too optimistic to take it for granted that it is a platform where people can exchange different political opinions and contribute to democratic society (Hindman, 2008; Sunstein, 2006). The problem of selective exposure has been discussed for long time and the emergence of the new media has revitalized the issue (Garrett, 2009; Stroud, 2007). The concept of selective exposure refers to individuals’ preference for exposing themselves “to arguments supporting their position over those supporting other positions” (Garrett, 2009, p. 678). The concern is that the structure of the Internet may lead users to expose themselves to opinions that are consistent with their opinions (Sunstein, 2006). Twitter also casts doubt on the optimistic view of the Internet as a platform for democracy through interaction between those
with different opinions. Prior research suggests that its technological features and affordances may rather lead users to expose themselves to like-minded opinions (Conover et al., 2011; Himelboim, McCreery, & Smith, 2013; Himelboim, Smith, & Shneiderman, 2013; Yardi & boyd, 2010).

Social curation is another emerging trend on the Internet. It is defined as a manual process of categorizing, organizing, and collecting of online contents by the general web public (Duh et al., 2012; Hall & Zarro, 2012; Zhong, Shah, Sundaravadivelan, & Sastry, 2013). Togetter is one of the social curation sites used by Japanese language tweeters. It functions as an add-on application for Twitter. People can select multiple tweets from Twitter, bundle them as a list, and publish the list on the Togetter site. As more serious topics have been discussed in the Japanese Twitter sphere, more Togetter lists seem to have been created to collect and organize these discourses (Duh et al., 2012).

The aim of this study is to investigate the role of curatorial activities by the general web public with a focus on selective exposure in online political discussions. The heated controversy about Japan’s state secrecy law, which passed the Japanese National Diet in December 2013, is used as a case of political discussions on Twitter. The significance of this study is that it will shed light on one of the important concepts in communication studies at the intersection of two recent frameworks, social curation and social media. Moreover, it can also contribute to research on political discussions in the Japanese social media context, which has been rarely studied.

Descriptive content analysis is applied as a method to investigate whether selective exposure to like-minded opinions or cross-ideological exposure to dissimilar opinions functions in this case of political discussions about the secrecy law. It is analyzed how curatorial activities using Togeter as well as technological affordances of Twitter affect online political discourse.
The major finding of this study is that Twitter’s tendency of selective exposure was enhanced by curatorial activities using Together. The concept of context collapse and technological affordances were likely to contribute this tendency. It was also suggested curators played a role to encourage selective exposure in political discussion.

Below, prior literature is reviewed with a focus on selective exposure and social curation. Next, based on the review, research questions are introduced with defining key variables and terms. In methods section, the details of content analysis are introduced as well as definition of codes for the analysis. Results section shows the results from the content analysis, which is followed by discussion section where major findings are discussed.
2. Literature Review

The subject of this research is political discussions that originally emerged as tweets on Twitter and were curated in an add-on application of Twitter, Togetter, in Japanese context. The purpose of the research is to investigate how curatorial activities by Japanese web public function in the discussions with a theoretical focus on selective exposure. The controversy about the secrecy law is taken as a most recent and relevant case of online political discussions. Prior research is reviewed in four sections below with an emphasis on sociotechnical perspectives. First, the literature on Twitter is reviewed to understand a fundamental environment where political discussions occur. Second, the concept of selective exposure in communication studies is reviewed with a focus on recent research specifically investigating the concept in the context of Twitter. Third, the preceding research on social curation is reviewed, and key features and affordances of Togetter are reviewed in that frame. Last, the controversy about the enactment of Japan’s new secrecy law is reviewed with its political background as a case for this research.

Twitter

Although Twitter has a relatively short history since its launch in 2006, scholars have studied it attentively as one of the major social media services. It has unique technological features and affordances that consequently influence communication via the media. However, it is not only those technological factors but also social factors that can influence the uses of Twitter from the perspective of social informatics (Kling, 2000). In this Japanese case, the 2011 East Japan Disaster and socio-political situations after that incident seem to contribute to the uses
of Twitter. A detailed literature review follows in three sections. First, a basic definition and current statistics of Twitter are summarized. Second, its key concepts, significant features and affordances are reviewed. Last, the recent research focusing on its uses in Japanese context follows.

**Definition and statistics.** Twitter launched its service in 2006. It is defined as an online microblogging service which is situated at the intersection of blog and social network sites (boyd, Golder, & Lotan, 2010). The basic function is that users (tweeters) post short textual messages called ‘tweets’ online via mobile phones, smart phones, or web clients. Since Twitter was originally designed to share tweets via Short Message System (SMS), each tweet is limited to 140 characters (boyd et al., 2010). This limitation of short, text-based messages can enhance its flexibility in an online environment, so that tweeters can post their tweets via various devices as well as many third-party applications with various additional functions (boyd et al., 2010).

The fundamental feature of Twitter is a stream of tweets called ‘timeline’ displayed in reverse chronological order. Users register their account names that are displayed as the syntax of @ followed by an account name. As a social network site, the system applies a direct friendship model, ‘following’ and ‘followed.’ Tweets of a user and those he/she follows are updated in a personal timeline simultaneously as they are posted. Moreover, since Twitter implements a non-reciprocal friendship model, a tweeter does not need to follow those who follow him/her; a tweeter cannot read the tweets of those who follow unless he/she follow them back (Marwick & boyd, 2010). However, tweets are open for the web public to read as default, unless tweeters set their accounts as private. Thus, people can read any tweeter’s tweet by searching via keywords or account names unless they set their accounts as private.
Twitter is the sixth largest social network in the world as of 2014 (Bennett, 2014). International users constitutes 77% of the users (Delo, 2013). Twitter has 288 million monthly active users, and 500 million tweets are posted every day (Twitter, 2015). Twitter was the fastest growing social platform in 2013, however it’s user growth decelerates recently (Frier, 2015; Tom, 2013).

**Key concepts, features and affordances.** There are several key concepts and technological features that have been studied to understand their influence on Twitter use. ‘Context collapse’ and ‘imagined audience’ are significant concepts to understand users’ perception and activities on Twitter. The concept of context collapse refers to the situation that multiple people with whom a user communicates in different social contexts come into a single context (Marwick & boyd, 2010). It stems from the direct relationship of following and being followed on Twitter that users cannot divide their friends into multiple contexts. Moreover, as tweets are fundamentally viewable by anyone who can browse the service, it is impossible to account for users’ potential audiences (Marwick & boyd, 2010). The system of stream-based updates also makes it difficult for tweeters to imagine to what extent their tweets are viewed by the followers. Therefore, tweeters have to navigate their multiple faces to different layers of an imagined audience using strategic tactics (Marwick & boyd, 2010).

Technological affordances refer to elements or properties of design implemented in social media, with which users perceive certain functions (Baym & boyd, 2012). In social network sites there are typical features of affordances, such as profiles, friends list, public commenting tools, and stream-based updates (boyd, 2011). The feature of an affordance is significant because it determines how it is possibly used (Litt, 2012). Moreover, what is perceived to be possible to do is more significant than what really is possible to do with the feature of an affordance (Brock,
In Twitter, some key features of social network sites such as profiles, friends lists, and public-commenting tools are limited compared to other services (boyd et al., 2010).

The key features of affordances on Twitter are: a stream-based timeline, a limitation of 140 characters, mentioning, hashtags (#), retweeting, a favorite folder, personal lists of interested accounts, trending topics, and URL links. Mentioning is that tweeters can directly refer or mention a certain user using the syntax of @ followed by the user’s account name. With hashtags, tweeters add the syntax of # before a specific keyword so that tweets can be searched via that keyword. Retweeting refers to reposting a tweet which appears on a tweeter’s timeline to his/her followers’ timeline. Tweeters can archive interesting tweets in an online ‘favorite’ folder and also archive tweets of interesting accounts in a ‘list’ folder to see their tweets separately from other following accounts’ tweets. ‘Trending’ topics or hashtags appear on Twitter window, which tweeters can sort by their geographical location. URL links to other online pages can also be included in a tweet. Some features were not initially in the application but emerged from users’ practices and implemented as conventions in Twitter, such as mentioning, hashtags, and retweeting (boyd et al., 2010).

The uses of Twitter are affected by these technological affordances as well as social factors. For instance, Brock (2012) examines the features of 140 characters limitation, hashtags, and trending topics in the case of the “Black Twitter” phenomenon. It is argued that unique use of the affordances shapes external perception of the phenomenon. Hashtags can induce performative discourse of Black culture, namely, signifyin.’ Moreover, the feature of trending topics picks up and shows signifyin’ hashtags, so that the discourse of Black culture appears more prominent even for users in outside of the culture.
boyd et al. (2010) focus on the activities of retweeting. Tweeters can forward a specific tweet that they pick up from their timelines or search with hashtags or keywords to their followers. That retweeted tweet appears in followers’ timelines with the indication of retweeting and who retweeted it. The scholars examine extensive perceptions that reveal how tweeters believe retweeting is supposed to work. Moreover, those different perceptions affect their different objectives to use the function, different strategies to use, and different contents that they add to retweeted tweets. They argue that retweeting functions as information diffusion as well as a means of engaging in a diffused conversation.

**Twitter in Japanese context.** Japan has the fourth largest Internet population in the world, with an Internet penetration rate of 82.8% (ComScore, 2013; Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communication, 2014). Almost 60% of the population use the Internet via mobile devices (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communication, 2014). The penetration rate for smartphones is 62.6% (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communication, 2014).

Regarding Twitter, Japan has the third largest population of users following the United States and Brazil, and Japanese is the second most used language following English as of 2012 (Semiocast, 2012). Since Twitter has almost the same population as Facebook in social network sites in Japan (ComScore, 2013), the country is sometimes called a “Twitter nation” (Akimoto, 2011).

The East Japan Disaster in 2011 is considered as a key incident that caused a near-instant popularity of Twitter (Jung & Moro, 2012; Kaigo, 2012), and much research has been done focusing its uses in relation to the disaster. There are some significant factors that affected its popularity. Many Japanese people had to rely on Internet access to seek essential information due to the widespread power outages and jammed phone lines (Peary, Shaw, & Takeuchi, 2012).
The people also looked for alternative media to gain information about the nuclear leak from Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Plant that was caused by the earthquake and tsunami (Jung & Moro, 2012), because the Japanese government withheld information fearing mass panic (Willacy, 2012).

Although Twitter had been mainly regarded as a tool for interpersonal communication or distributing entertaining content until the disaster (NEC Biglobe, 2011; Shigyo, 2011; Yoshitsugu, 2011), it has come to be used as a platform for various social and political movements after the disaster, such as anti-nuclear protests (Tabuchi, 2012). Hashtags and retweeting are the two most representative features of Twitter used in the disaster. They show both positive and negative aspects of the use. In one sense, they contributed to distribute and obtain necessary information under the severe circumstances (Acar & Muraki, 2011; Yoshitsugu, 2011). In another sense, they also brought about confusion and uncertainty due to the overflow of similar hashtags and retweeting of irrelevant content (Acar & Muraki, 2011). However, what was significant is that some users could perceive the negative aspects of affordances and autonomously functioned to guide novice users who began to use it in the disaster and filter more relevant information for them (Acar & Muraki, 2011; Kaigo, 2012). Consequently, the majority of tweeters in the disaster evaluated the service positively, as indicated by results of a survey that showed people regarded Twitter to be helpful for obtaining information in the situation (63.9%), compared to Facebook (34.7%) or a Japanese social network service, Mixi (26.0%) (Peary et al., 2012).

Aside from the literature on the disaster, there are a few studies focusing on cross-cultural perspectives. Notable characteristics of national culture have been studied, such as preserving group solidarity and working collectively, valuing personal privacy, and holding a high-context
culture. In a collectivistic culture, such as those common in Asia, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean, people prefer high-context communication that uses implicit and indirect messages often involving non-verbal communication, since they tend to rely on close information networks with family members, friends, and colleagues and do not need in-depth or background information for daily information transactions (Acar & Deguchi, 2013; Hall & Hall, 1990). However, the literature on Twitter use seems to produce inconsistent results with these dispositions. For instance, many Japanese users posted self-related or self-promoting tweets, contrary to the assumption of preserving group solidarity (Acar & Deguchi, 2013). In addition, Japanese college students were not so anonymous on social network sites, contrary to the assumption of valuing privacy and anonymity, which has been noted as one of the key factors for Twitter to gain rapid popularity compared to other services such as Facebook and MySpace (Tung & Scott, 2012). It is argued that the loose structure of networks on Twitter makes people less interested in using it as an interpersonal communication tool and less worried about social norms (Acar & Deguchi, 2013). However, the assumption that Japan is a high-context culture was supported by the result that Japanese users do not ask questions so often on Twitter (Acar & Deguchi, 2013).

Regarding technological affordances, a study examines cross-language differences of top 10 languages used in Twitter in adoption of Twitter features (Hong, Convertino, & Chi, 2011). It revealed that Japanese scored one of the lowest rates among other languages in the frequency of retweeting, hashtags, and using URL links in tweets. However, this trend might be changed after their study, as retweeting and hashtags were often and effectively used in the East Japan Disaster as reviewed as above.
From the linguistic perspective, it is usually assumed that Japanese tweets should be richer in content than other languages with non-character based scripts. It is because character-based languages can contain more content in the same amount of space and do not need a space between words (Bell, 2006). The Japanese writing system consists of Chinese characters and the Japanese syllabary (kana). However, a study rebuts this assumption by stating that there are only a few correlations between information per character and information per tweet (Neubig & Duh, 2013). It is argued that tweeters with character-based languages do not necessarily use all spaces in a tweet.

Selective Exposure in Political Discussions on Twitter

Selective exposure is one of the most popular and debated topics in communication studies. Specifically, in terms of media studies, the topic has continued to attract scholarly attention related to the historical shift of media, such as the growth of the mass media and the emergence of the new media. Political topics have gained much attention, as selective exposure is considered as a significant factor harming democracy. There have been inconsistent results about whether the media leads people to be exposed to information which is consistent with their opinions (selective exposure) or rather leads them to be exposed to dissimilar opinions (cross-ideological exposure). Recent research suggests that selective exposure does not necessarily involve selective avoidance of dissimilar opinions, and it is induced by people’s dispositions towards political issues. The research about political discussions on Twitter seems to support these arguments. The detailed literature review will follow in three sections. First, the definition of selective exposure and the history of the research on the topic are introduced. Second, related
research in the context of the Internet is reviewed. Last, the research focusing on the concept in the context of Twitter is examined.

**Definition and the history of studies on selective exposure.** The concept of selective exposure is defined as “individuals’ prefer exposure to arguments supporting their position over those supporting other positions” (Garrett, 2009, p. 678). It is a long discussed topic specifically in the scholarly areas of communication and psychology. For instance, Lazarsfeld and Merton (1954) define the concept as people’s tendency to associate with others like them using the term, ‘homophily.’

The mechanism of selective exposure is explained based on Leon Festinger’s (1957) cognitive dissonance theory, which states that a decision-maker feels positive feeling from the information which is consistent to his/her attitude before decision-making, on the other hand, feels dissonance towards the information which is inconsistent (Garrett, 2009). Thus, people tend to seek opinion-reinforcement information (selective exposure) and avoid opinion-challenging information (selective avoidance) to reduce dissonance (Garrett, 2009).

Selective exposure is one of the most used topics in communication research (Bryant & Miron, 2004). The research on the topic became popular specifically from the 1960s to the late 1990s on the platform of the mass media, but the emergence of the new media revitalized the topic again (Garrett, 2009; Stroud, 2007). Various topics have been studied as cases of selective exposure such as preference of commodities, implementation of techniques, and search for political information (Stroud, 2007). However, political topics have been the major focus of the studies, as selective exposure is considered as a significant problem to harm democracy. Cross-ideological exposure has been considered as a preferred condition for democratic discussion and consensus making, which can be traced back to the idea of John Stuart Mill in 1850s
(Himelboim, McCreery, et al., 2013). More recently, Habermas (1996) considers consensus making out of diverse opinions and information as a basis for deliberative public sphere. Moreover, Calhoun (1988) argues that the role of the media for cross-ideological exposure becomes more important, as direct interaction with people of different opinions is less expected in modern societies.

Regarding the mass media and selective exposure, it is suggested that selective exposure also leads people to prefer media sources that are consistent to their opinions over less consistent alternative sources (Mutz, 2001). In Unites States, one of the significant issues was segmentation and polarization of the media due to the growth of cable television channels (Himelboim, 2014).

**Selective exposure on the Internet.** With the above concerns for selective exposure as background, the emergence of the Internet was initially welcomed as a platform for more democratic discussion (Himelboim, McCreery, et al., 2013; Hindman, 2008). The structural factors of the Internet led scholars to expect its allowance for cross-ideological exposure (Himelboim, McCreery, et al., 2013; Papacharissi, 2002). For instance, the capacity of information archiving allows people to retrieve political information that is not easily found in offline contexts. People can interact with each other online without the limit of time and space. The relative anonymity of the Internet also allows people to discuss about sensitive or non-mainstream political opinions.

On the contrary, the counter argument that the Internet does not necessarily enhance democracy is also prominent. Hindman (2008) points out that the architecture of the Internet is based on link structure, and the system of major search engines leads people to fewer top sites rather than exposing them to more sites with broader perspectives. Thus, it is technically easy to voice any political opinion online, but it is difficult to be heard equally at the same time.
Sunstein (2006) also argues that the Internet allows people to find like-minded opinions more easily and the growing volume of information sources leads people to narrowly choose news and content that they expose themselves to (Sunstein, 2006). Van Alstyne and Brynjolfsson (1996) accord with same argument using the term, ‘balkanization.’

Empirical research has shown inconsistent results for this issue of cross-ideological exposure or selective exposure in the context of the Internet, and the debate seems to continue with scholars on the both sides (Garrett, 2009; Himelboim, McCreery, et al., 2013; Stroud, 2007). However, two prior studies should be noted for their significance in reframing the issue. Garrett (2009) reframes the concept of selective avoidance from dissimilar opinions with the result of an empirical study on the 2004 United States presidential election. The scholar suggests that although people tend to be exposed to like-minded online political information, they do not necessarily avoid exposure to dissimilar views. Thus, opinion-reinforcing information is a more powerful predictor of exposure than opinion-challenging information. Stroud (2007) argues that more personally relevant beliefs generate more affective exposure, thus people with more strong political dispositions should show more selective exposure to information sources which are consistent to their dispositions. The author’s hypothesis is supported by the meta-analysis of the 2004 National Annenberg Election Survey examined in the United States across media types including the Internet. The author also suggests that research should focus more on long-term and habitual exposure patterns than a single event.

Hargittai, Gallo, and Kane's (2007) study on web links of political blogs accords with the reframed definition of selective exposure by Garrett (2009). They found that political bloggers were much more likely to engage with other bloggers with like-minded views, but they also address others with cross-ideological views. Kobayashi and Ikeda (2009) conducted a
comparative analysis of Japan and the United States on selective exposure in political information-seeking on the Internet based on the survey data. They argue that selective exposure to like-minded arguments was also supported in Japan, however, it occurred only if the given issue was perceived as important. In addition, selective avoidance from dissimilar opinions was not supported. Therefore, this study supports both Garrett's (2009) and Stroud's (2007) arguments. Aside from this study, any significant research on selective exposure in the context of Japanese Internet cannot be found.

**Selective exposure on Twitter.** The emergence of social media is considered to make the problem of selective exposure more complicated. Conceptually thinking, social network sites can enhance the problem due to the high tendency of like-minded friends’ networks. However, such sites also have potential to enhance cross-ideological exposure by facilitating more contacts with people beyond friends’ networks (Mutz & Young, 2011).

Prior empirical research on Twitter has two common key findings. One is that selective exposure is rather found than cross-ideological exposure, but the latter is not necessarily avoided, which supports Garrett's (2009) redefinition of the concept. The other finding is that Twitter’s unique technological affordances such as retweeting, mentioning, following, hashtags, and URL links affect the tendency of selective exposure or cross-ideological exposure. Retweeting and following relationships seem to enhance selective exposure, though mentioning seems to facilitate cross-ideological exposure. In addition, hubs of clusters, hashtags, and URL links can be predictors of like-minded opinions which can induce selective exposure.

It should also be noted that recent research on selective exposure has significance in terms of method of analysis. Surveys have been a major method to analyze selective exposure (Himelboim, Smith, et al., 2013). However, the method has an issue on validity because it relies
on recall of participants. Another issue is that it focuses on direct exposure, though the Internet highlights the importance of second and third forwarded exposure (Himelboim, Smith, et al., 2013). Moreover, it is practically difficult to recall for users to what they are exposed in automatically flowed streams of Twitter’s timeline. Several significant studies are reviewed below.

Himelboim, McCreery, et al. (2013) studied clusters of following networks of Twitter using social network analysis and content analysis at the time of the 2010 United States midterm elections. They found polarization of political (conservative and liberal) opinions on Twitter, which suggests the strong influence of following relationship on selective exposure. They also found that tweets of each polarized group tended to link to different media sources: conservative tweets link to grassroots media and liberal tweets link to traditional media.

Himelboim, Smith, et al. (2013) studied clusters of networks of Twitter based on social network analysis examining the United States State of the Union Speech in 2012 as a case. The results support fragmented interactions and segmented exposure to politically oriented information sources. However, selective avoidance from cross-ideological exposure was not as prominent as selective exposure. In addition, they argue that hubs of clusters that have a large number of followers, mentions, and replies can be good indicators for selective exposure, as well as political tendencies of external linked resources and hashtags.

Himelboim (2014) examines Twitter conversations evoked by politically oriented cable television hosts using social network analysis and content analysis. The result also supports selective exposure to politically like-minded information sources. The study also suggests that Twitter users’ major exposure to political tweets stems from the users they follow.
Yardi & boyd (2010) analyze tweets about the shooting incident of a late-term abortion doctor focusing on the relationship of mentioning. This study also supports Garrett's (2009) redefinition of the concept. Both selective exposure and cross-ideological exposure were observed. Mentioning between like-minded tweeters strengthened group identity, on the other hand, mentioning between cross-ideological tweeters strengthened affiliation between in-group and out-group. The users tended to reply to like-minded people. However, tweeters who actively engaged in the discussions usually used both pro and con hashtags related to the incident to engage in both sides’ discussions.

Choi (2014) studied Korean Twitter-based public forum, Twitaddons.com, using social network analysis and content analysis based on Jürgen Habermas’s public sphere theory. The result also supports Garrett's (2009) redefinition of selective exposure. Participants of the forum referred primarily to the posts of other like-minded participants. Information sources and ideological perspectives of the discussions tended to be a one-sided view, but it does not necessarily mean that participants intentionally avoided challenging information or views.

Conover et al. (2011) examine the relationships of retweeting and mentioning at the time of the 2010 United States congressional midterm election. They found that networks of political retweets showed a highly segregated polarization. However, interestingly, tweeters in mentioning networks, which were dominated by a single politically heterogeneous cluster of users with ideologically opposed opinions, rather interacted with each other at a much higher rate.
Social Curation

Social curation is a recently emerged phenomenon so limited studies on the subject have been done, and most of them are exploratory studies. However, it seems that scholars agree on some common definitions of social curation, that is, the process of categorizing, organizing, and collecting of online contents by the general web public. The subject of this study, Togetter, is also categorized in this new web genre, as curators can collect tweets from Twitter, organize them, and share lists of them with others via this service. The detailed literature review follows in three sections. First, a definition and key concepts of social curation are argued. Second, prior research on social curation sites is reviewed. Last, the history and major features of Togetter are reviewed.

Definition and key concepts. Social curation has recently become a buzzword as an emerging trend on the Internet (Duh et al., 2012; Zhong et al., 2013). Social curation is also described as content curation. The representative sites are Pinterest, Storify, List.ly and so on. The term is used relatively freely in the popular discourse (Duh et al., 2012).

Different scholars have defined social curation with slight differences; however, a common definition is that it is a manual process of categorizing, organizing, and collecting contents on the Internet (Duh et al., 2012; Hall & Zarro, 2012; Zhong et al., 2013). It is not professional people but the general web public who engage in these ‘curatorial’ activities using social curation sites. Hall and Zarro (2012) and Zhong et al. (2013) emphasize social media features of the sites that allow users to share, ‘like,’ comment, and follow.

Duh et al. (2012) emphasize that curators remix the user-generated content of social media “for the purpose of further consumption” (p. 447). Liu (2010a, 2010b, 2012a, 2012b)
emphasizes a socially-distributed and collaborative way of curating by narrowly defining it as ‘socially-distributed curation.’

The fundamental role of social curation is commonly considered to be solving the problem of information overload, since the amount of online user-generated content reaches a critical mass due to the popularity of social media (Duh et al., 2012; Liu, 2012a; Zhong et al., 2013). However, it should be noted that a casual use of information overload to suggest an excessive amount of information may be misleading, as an empirical study reveals that the general web public is not so overwhelmed but rather actively manages media messages (Hargittai, Neuman, & Curry, 2012). With that having been said, there are three types of filtering to solve the problem: an algorithmic filtering; a filtering by dividing the stream into substreams; and a hand-curated filtering (Grineva & Grinev, 2012). Social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter support these filtering tasks with their designs to some extent (Liu, 2010a, 2010b, 2012a; Zhong et al., 2013). It is also argued that social media sites are implemented with curatorial functions not only for filtering but also for ordering and searching online artifacts (Hogan, 2010). Social curation sites implement the third type (hand-curated) filtering which can provide a context to the filtered content with a curator’s point of view, so that the content becomes more personalized, relevant, and interesting to read (Duh et al., 2012; Liu, 2010b; Zhong et al., 2013).

**Preceding research on social curation.** Very limited studies have been done on social curation specifically from the standpoint of communication studies due to the recent emergence of this phenomenon. The most popular site, Pinterest, is often taken as a subject of the studies.

Hall and Zarro (2012) conducted an exploratory research on Pinterest based on content and descriptive analysis of popular ‘pins’ (curated items on Pinterest). They focus on social features of the site, such as repining (recurating), liking, and commenting. The significant
finding is that user-generated content leaves original authorship when it is pinned (curated) by curators, and their context and meaning change when content is repinned or comments are added.

Zhong et al. (2013) study two social curation sites, Pinterest and Last.fm, based on a quantitative research combined with user interviews and a survey. They found two major findings. The users of the two sites tended to curate items of a niche interest that were difficult to find by an algorithmic search such as Google. In addition, a small amount of curated items represented most of the curatorial actions, which suggests a synchronized community.

Both studies of Gilbert, Bakhshi, Chang and Terveen (2013) and Ottoni et al. (2013) focus on gender differences of Pinterest use, analyzing that female users are more active than male users in repinning, reciprocating social links, and generating content.

**Together as a social curation site.** Togetter (together.com) is considered a social curation site (Duh et al., 2012). It functions as an add-on application for Twitter, though its website and lists are viewable by anyone who can browse the Internet. As the site is operationalized only in Japanese, most of the users are Japanese language speakers. The main function of the service is that a user (curator) collects tweets from Twitter, organizes them as a list of successive tweets, and publishes it to be viewed by others.

The original creator of the application, an engineer in Yahoo in Japan, created a tool for his own purpose to bring together tweets about an IT event and use them in an internal, corporate presentation (Okada, 2010; Okada, 2012). The creator launched Togetter as a service in September 2009. In accordance with the growing popularity of Twitter, Togetter is considered to be popular among Japanese Twitter users. As of 2013, Togetter had about seven million unique users and 30 million monthly page views, and more than 500 lists were created daily (Fujii, 2013).
The major features and functions of Togetter are as follows. See image of the features in Figure 1 on page 25. A curator has to login with his/her Twitter account to start curating. A curator can drag-and-drop tweets to edit them on an editing window in the site from his/her own timeline, lists, or favorite folder on Twitter. A curator can also pick up tweets that he/she directly searches via relevant hashtags or keywords. A curator can change the order of picked-up tweets, and annotate a list of them with a title, heading, subheadings, and other online content. Words in curated tweets can also be changed by color and size. Lists in Togetter can be created individually or collaboratively with other users. A curator can decide if he/she publishes a list in public, keeps it in private for his/her own archiving purpose, or limits people who can view it by selecting Twitter accounts.

When a curator publishes a list, he/she can post a tweet semi-automatically that notifies followers that he/she has published a Togetter list with its URL. This is considered to be the most common way to lead tweeters to read Togetter lists. A curator can also post a mentioning tweet semi-automatically to notify Twitter accounts that he/she picked up their tweets.

If a viewer likes a certain Togetter list, he/she can evaluate it as ‘favorite’ by clicking the ‘favorite’ button to archive it in his/her favorite lists in Togetter. That viewer can post a tweet semi-automatically that notifies the followers that he/she evaluated the list as ‘favorite’ with a URL to the list. This tweet also includes a mentioning syntax to the list’s curator, so that the curator can also know the list has been evaluated. These semi-automatic tweets are considered to contribute to diffusion of Togetter lists based on networks of followers. Moreover, those notifying tweets can become more widespread on Twitter by retweeting to wider networks of followers. The number of views and favorites are displayed on a list.
Togetter has some features of social network sites. For instance, a user can follow curators or add a comment to a list. A curator can close a commenting section of a list or erase any comments on it, which is sometimes seen when a ‘flaming’ happens. On the other hand, tweeters can erase their tweets that are used in a Togetter list or eventually ‘block’ a specific curator to prevent their tweets from being used by the curator.

Duh et al. (2012) conducted an exploratory study on Togetter combining statistical analysis and content analysis. No study has been conducted other than their study from the perspective of communication studies. They found that there were relatively large number of tweets (median was 40 tweets) and tweeters whose tweets were used (median was 6 tweeters) in a list. Bimodal distribution of lists was also seen between those mainly consisting of self-tweets and those consisting of tweets by various users. Serious topics such as society, politics, and economics were well represented in Togetter, constituting 10% of the data. Curators’ various list editing formats were categorized into seven categories by the authors: recording a conversation (19%); writing a long article via tweets (19%); summarizing an event (18%); gathering complex information and problem-solving (16%); just playing (14%); diary (9%); and TV/radio show transcript (4%).

It can be assumed that publishing a list in Togetter functions as to posting a collective retweet that consists of multiple tweets with a context generated from a curator’s point of view. Curators’ various ways of formatting lists (Duh et al., 2012) also resemble the various ways of retweeting studied by boyd et al. (2010).
Figure 1.
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Japanese Secrecy Law

In this section, the controversy about Japan’s state secrecy law (Tokutei himitsu hogohō; 特定秘密保護法) that occurred in 2013 is reviewed as a case for this research. Since it relates to citizens’ right to know about government activities, and the enactment of the law was processed in an impetuous manner, a great concern and debate appeared in online community including Twitter. Scholarly research has been very limited due to the very recent incident, so newspaper articles are the main subject of review in this section.

In December, 2013, the Japanese National Diet passed a bill for the secrecy law amid strong opposition, and the law was enforced in December, 2014. The purpose of the law is to allow officials to keep sensitive information in four areas out of the public’s awareness to maintain state security: defense; diplomacy; counter-terrorism; and counter-espionage (McCurry, 2013). Legal experts, the media, and civic and human rights organizations have strongly opposed it. In addition, large public demonstrations were held outside the Diet (Takenaka, 2013).

According to a national poll held right after the passing of the bill, the majority of the population (60.3%) was opposed to the bill and only a small population (24.9%) supported it. Regarding the future of the bill, 54.1% answered that it should be revised, 28.2% answered that it should be completely abolished, and 9.4% replied that it was all right to be enforced as it was (“Seventy percent of the respondents expressed anxiety over the secrecy law: Sudden 47% decline in approval rating for cabinet (Himitsu hogohō ni fuan nanawari: Naikaku shijiritsu kyūraku 47%),” 2013).

There are two main concerns about the law. One is that the definition of state secrets was too broad and ambiguous, and the other is that the penalties of imprisonment, which can be extended to 10 years for public servants and five years for journalists who relate to a leak of a
state secret, are harsh (Corrales, 2014). The law will affect whistleblowers and journalists, which consequently results in harming citizens’ right to know (Corrales, 2014; McCurry, 2013). The governmental party, the Liberal Democratic Party (DLP), and its coalition was also criticized because they only spent four weeks to pass the bill, which was exceptional in Japanese “consensus-driven political world” (Fackler, 2013, para. 2). Some critics were even concerned that the law “marks a return to the days of prewar and wartime Japanese militarism, when the state used the Peace Preservation Act to arrest and imprison political opponents” (McCurry, 2013, para. 3).

The citizens’ right to know is considered as one of the fundamental human rights in many international bodies (Corrales, 2014). The UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression voiced his concerns for the bill (“Japan: ‘Special Secrets Bill threatens transparency’ - UN independent experts,” 2013). However, the history of implementation of the right in Japan is still a few decades old (Corrales, 2014). There were several famous lawsuit cases that fought for the citizens’ right to know state secrets since 1960s. Finally in 2011, the Administrative Information Disclosure Law, which mirrored the United States Freedom of Information Act, was created as a fruit of the preceding cases and lobbying activities. Therefore, the secrecy law is considered to nuance these democratic victories (Corrales, 2014).

The LDP initially submitted a draft of the law in 1985, which was rejected. The same party proposed the new bill in 2013 when they came back to power in the general election in December 2012 after three years of being out of power. The East Japan Disaster that happened during the administration of the opposing party, the Democratic Party, is considered to have influenced national policy. The law is regarded as a part of conservative projects of the LDP that is escalating tensions between other Asian countries such as China, North Korea, and South
Korea (McCurry, 2013). It is also considered that the United States pressured Japan to protect state secrets in the aftermath of the incident regarding Edward Snowden’s leak of information about the United States National Security Agency (McCurry, 2013).
3. Research Questions

Based on the literature review above, research questions are presented in this chapter. As there are still limited preceding studies about Togetter due to its recent emergence as an online artifact, no hypothesis can be drawn. To investigate the role of curatorial activities in political discussions, nine research questions were articulated. A definition of variables and key terms follows, in order to explicitly articulate those questions and provide conceptual definitions, which will be later operationalized in the Methods chapter.

Research Questions

The aim of this study is to investigate, with a focus on the issue of selective exposure, how curatorial activities of Japanese tweeters using Togetter play a role in online political discussions. The above literature review suggests that selective exposure to like-minded opinions tends to be enhanced in political discussions on Twitter, although cross-ideological exposure is not necessarily avoided. Given the major functions of Togetter that allow curators to curate others’ or their own tweets from Twitter and annotate them to form a list, the first research question asks:

RQ1: Do Togetter lists contribute to selective exposure more or cross-ideological exposure more regarding the issue of the Japanese secrecy law?

RQ1-1: How do tweeters express their opinions towards the secrecy law in curated tweets?

RQ1-2: Where and how do curators express their opinions towards the secrecy law?
RQ1-3: Do lists mainly consist of like-minded tweets or cross-ideological tweets about the secrecy law?

The prior research suggests that technological affordances of Twitter, such as the relationship of following, retweeting, mentioning, and hashtags, can contribute to the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure. Among these affordances, mentioning and #hashtags can be observed in tweets in Togetter lists. Therefore, the second research question asks:

RQ2: Is there an association between the uses of mentioning and #hashtags in Togetter lists and the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure in political discussions about the secrecy law?

RQ2-1: How often do lists have tweets with mentioning or hashtags respectively?

RQ2-2: Is there an association between the frequency of mentioning and hashtags and the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure?

Moreover, the prior research suggests that links to the media sources in tweets can indicate opinions of the tweets. Thus, the third research question is:

RQ3: How are media sources used in Togetter lists in relation to the secrecy law?

RQ3-1: How often do lists have links to, or citations of, media sources?

RQ3-2: What kinds of media sources are used in lists?

RQ3-3: How are media sources used in lists according to opinions towards the secrecy law?

Since there is a comment section that viewers can add comments about a Togetter list and curators can decide whether the section should be opened or closed for each list, the use of the section can indicate curators’ openness to cross-ideological opinions. Based on this assumption, the fourth research question is:
RQ4: How do curators’ decisions to open or close comment sections of lists function in political discussions on the secrecy law?

   RQ4-1: How often do curators open or close comment sections of their lists?

   RQ4-2: Is there an association between the presence or absence of a comment section and the tendency of like-minded opinions or cross-ideological opinions of a list?

   RQ4-3: How do commentators express their opinions towards the secrecy law in comments?

It is considered significant to know what kinds of lists are more shared and evaluated positively, as these factors indicate an exposure to such lists. Thus, the fifth research question asks:

   RQ5: Which kind of list is more viewed and liked: like-minded opinions or cross-ideological opinions?

The prior study on Togetter by Duh et al. (2012) categorized lists by authors of curated tweets and editing format of tweets. Since there are still very limited studies on Togetter, it is meaningful to examine lists based on their categorizations and analyze their relevance, though they are not directly related to the issue of selective exposure. Thus, the sixth and seventh questions are:

   RQ6: Whose tweets do curators pick up to form lists?

   RQ7: What kind of formats do curators apply to edit lists?

The prior research suggests that anonymity plays a significant role on Twitter, though mixed results existed. It is meaningful to study how curators self-identify themselves. Thus, the eighth question asks:
RQ8: How do curators self-identify themselves?

Lastly, popularity of curators on Twitter’s following relationship is considered to be important to examine their role for selective exposure, since following relationships enhance selective exposure, and moreover, hubs of clusters that have a large number of followers, mentions, and replies can be good indicators for it. Thus, the last research question asks:

RQ9: How much popularity do curators have in their networks of followers on Twitter?

Definition of Variables and Key Terms

Opinions towards the secrecy law. Different opinions towards the secrecy law with a focus on the time of passing of the bill are defined as a variable. As one of the prior national polls right after the enactment suggests (“Seventy percent of the respondents expressed anxiety over the secrecy law: Sudden 47% decline in approval rating for cabinet (Himitsu hogohō ni fuan nanawari: Naikaku shijiritsu kyūraku 47%),” 2013), there were more complicated opinions than simply yes and no towards the passing of the bill. Those who supported the bill (9.4%) and those who were against it and thought it should be abolished (28.2%) were less than those who thought the bill should be revised (54.1%). This last majority can be considered as a mix of two groups of people. One is those who basically supported the need of a such law but thought there should be more time for discussion and more room for future revision. The other is those who were rather opposed to the bill but hoped for future revision at best considering the situation that the enactment was unavoidable due to the strong political power of the LDP and its coalition.

However, it should be noted that this difference between two groups is may be too subtle to interpret from limited characters and clues of tweets. Therefore, opinions towards the secrecy law can be conceptually categorized into six groups: those who support the bill and do not think
it should be revised; those who do not want to admit as it is, thus think it needs to be revised; those who are opposed to the bill, thus think it should be abolished; those who are neutral towards the secrecy law; those who do not express explicit opinions towards the law; and those who tweet unrelated things about the law.

**Selective exposure or cross-ideological exposure.** Selective exposure in this research is defined as exposure to like-minded tweets on the subject of passing of the secrecy law. On the other hand, exposure to cross-ideological tweets on the subject is considered as cross-ideological exposure. As argued in the above section, there considered to be three major different opinions about the secrecy law.

**Indication of curator’s opinion.** There are four major ways for curators to indicate their own opinions towards the passing of the secrecy law based on the features of Togetter lists. First of all, a curator’s own tweet(s) can be a good indicator for his/her opinion, if a list includes his/her own tweet(s). Second, curators can reflect their own opinions on titles of their lists. Third, curators can express their own opinions in heading section of lists. Last, curators can indicate their own opinions by annotating lists with subheadings or change of colors or letter size of curated tweets.

**Mentioning and hashtags.** Mentioning refers to tweets which start with the syntax of @ followed by a certain account name. Since a mentioning tweet appears on the twitter timeline of a user who is mentioned in the tweet regardless of following relationship, this affordance encourages direct conversations between who mentions and who are mentioned. Other than these two actors, only those who follow both can see direct replying tweets between the two on their timelines. Hashtags refer to the indication of a certain keyword by using the syntax of # followed by that keyword. Users can see a list of tweets that have the same hashtag by clicking that
hashtag and can also search tweets with a certain hashtag. It can be considered that curators use those affordances as a clue to curate relevant tweets to the secrecy law.

Media sources. The media sources appear as a form of URL links in curated tweets or direct citations in tweets or in annotations of Togetter lists. There are two major groups of used media. One is those traditional mass media sources such as major newspapers and television channels. The other group is those independent media that often have outlets only online.

On the contrary to United States media sources that can be good indicators of polarized political opinions, the Japanese media do not take explicit political stances. It stems from a relatively dependent media system on official sources, called press clubs (Kisha kurabu 記者クラブ). Almost all public institutions from a national level to a local government level have their own press clubs inside them, which distribute common official news to major newspapers and broadcasting organizations (Takeshita & Ida, 2009). This dependency leads the media to passively distribute the news set by official sources and also makes it difficult for independent journalists who are not able to join the system to access that official source (Takeshita & Ida, 2009). Moreover, the Japanese major newspapers adopt neutrality principle that the media should take an observer or bystander’s point of view rather than any political sides (Takeshita & Ida, 2009).

Nonetheless, there is a popular consensus about the ideological tendency of newspapers among the general public. According to a national survey, the five largest Japanese newspapers score differently on the scale of liberal or conservative tendency: Yomiuri Shimbun (5.6), Sankei Shimbun (5.3), Nikkei Shimbun (5.2), Mainichi Shimbun (5.0), and Asahi Shimbun (4.4). Higher scores indicate the media are perceived as more conservative, and lower scores indicate the media are perceived as more liberal (Japan Press Research Institute (Shimbun Tsūshin Chōsakai),
2009). It is argued that the general consensus reflects the tones of editorials in these newspapers that express ideological stances more explicitly than routine reporting (Sun, 2007). Even routine and non-opinionated coverage itself can imply a nuanced ideological stance by differentiating volume of coverage, tone of headings, selection of photos, interviewees, and so on (Yoshino, 2013).

However, the majority of their routine coverage seems to show a neutral tone to maintain the reputation of objective and neutral media, and this non-partisan newsmaking is also common in other forms of media such as broadcast TV. The few exceptions are newspapers that are owned by or associated with political parties, such as Shimbun Akahata (the Japanese Communist Party) or Seikyō Shimbun (the New Kömei Party). Furthermore, this pervasive tendency of the mass media is often criticized for lack of media surveillance over the authorities (Takeshita & Ida, 2009) and leads people to claim for alternative media sources such as online independent media.

Based on these premises, it seems appropriate to categorize the media sources into three groups and see how they are used in Togetter lists. The three categories are: traditional mass media sources including newspapers, news agencies, TV broadcasting channels, radio stations, magazines, and mirror news sites of these sources; independent media sources; and limited partisan media owned by, or associated with, political parties.

**Presence or absence of comment section.** A comment section is displayed below curated tweets and any registered users can add comments about lists. The curator of a list can decide if he/she will make it open or closed for each list. A curator can even close the section after publishing a list and sometimes he/she mentions this in a list, which usually happens due to ‘flaming.’
**Diffusion and positive evaluation of Togetter lists.** Diffusion of a Togetter list refers to how many times that the list is viewed. Positive evaluation of a list refers to how many people evaluate it as useful or relevant by clicking a ‘favorite’ button on a list. The number of ‘views’ is automatically counted by the system, though the actual algorithm of counting is not published from the service. The number of ‘favorites’ is generated by viewers’ action of clicking the button. Counters for both variables can be found as number of ‘views’ and ‘favorites’ in each Togetter list below the heading.

**Authors of curated tweets in a list.** Curators can curate tweets generated by themselves and other tweeters. Thus, in terms of tweets’ authors, four patterns of lists can exist: a list of only self tweets; a list of single other’s tweets; a list of multiple authors’ tweets including the curator; and a list of multiple authors’ tweets excluding the curator.

**Editing formats of a list.** How curators edit their lists can be categorized into several formats. Based on the prior research (Duh et al., 2012), categories of formats can be conceptualized into five groups: recording a conversation; editing an article by curating successive tweets by a single author; summarizing an event about the topic; and recording broadcasting show transcripts; editing a story with multiple author’s tweets on the topic.

**Self-identification of curators.** Unlike other social network services, Twitter does not require users to complete their profiles. A user can make his/her profile blank, except for an account name starting with the syntax of @. Thus, users can be anonymous, though they also can display their real names or other detailed profiles voluntarily. Curators use the same account names and picture icons in the Togetter site as their Twitter accounts, though they can set different descriptive profiles aside from the Twitter accounts. Thus, they can identify them with real names or pseudonyms. Moreover, they can also disclose more detailed profiles such as
professions and occupations, which were sometimes observed in the sample analysis and considered to affect the perception of viewers. However, it should be noted that these identifications do not rely on reality but on self-representation.

**Popularity of curators.** Influence of a curator on Twitter can be observed to some extent by the number of followers that a Twitter account has, since it directly indicates the size of his/her audience. Prior research suggests that other measures, such as the number of retweets and the number of mentioning tweets containing one’s account name, also play significant roles in indicating influence, thus, the number of followers only indicate the aspect of popularity (Cha, Haddadi, Benevenuto, & Gummadi, 2010). However, a prior study suggests that popularity on Twitter is still significant for considering one’s influence on selective exposure (Himelboim, Smith, et al., 2013). Moreover, popularity of a curator also affects the viewership of their Togetter lists, as semi-automatic tweet can be posted in a curator’s timeline when he/she published a list, which means that, the more followers a curator has, the more potential his/her list has to be widespread.
4. Method

To answer the research questions presented in the previous section, content analysis was applied as a method. Content analysis is defined as “a technique for making inferences from a focal text to its social context in an objectified” (Bauer, 2000, p. 133). Since the subject for this research mainly consists of textual messages in tweets and the objective is to analyze them in the Japanese social context of political discussion about the secrecy law, this is considered to be an appropriate method. Moreover, as the focus is on the tendency of selective exposure and cross-ideological exposure, descriptive design of the content analysis research to count the frequency or availability of coded units suits the aim of the study. Below, the selection of content from the research population, the development of coding categories for analysis, and a data analysis plan are detailed. The relationship between the research questions, the key variables and terms, the coding categories, and the data analysis plan is summarized in Table 1 (p. 44).

Content Selection and Sampling

The unit of analysis was set as lists in Togetter that involve political discussions about the secrecy law. All lists in the sub-category of the secrecy law (Tokutei himitsu hogohōan 特定秘密保護法案) and all lists with one of five user-generated tags (Himitsu hogohō 秘密保護法, Himitsu hogohōan 秘密保護法案, Tokutei himitsu hogohō 特定秘密保護法, Tokutei himitsu hogohōan 特定秘密保護法案, and Himitsu hozenhō 秘密保全法) that indicate the secrecy law were collected, and duplicate lists were excluded. Since the focus of the research is on the controversy of the secrecy law at the time of passing the Japanese Diet, the lists first generated between October 1st, 2013, to February 28th, 2014, were selected.
According to these criteria, 519 Togetter lists were collected and saved as PDF files between August 22nd and September 29th, 2014. The sub-category for the secrecy law had 147 lists. Regarding the user generated tags, Himitsu hogohō 秘密保護法 was added to 275 lists, Himitsu hogohōan 秘密保護法案 to 25 lists, Tokutei himitsu hogohō 特定秘密保護法 to 106 lists, Tokutei himitsu hogohōan 特定秘密保護法案 to 66 lists, and Himitsu hozenhō 秘密保全法 to 33 lists.

Developing the Coding Categories

Based on the research questions and key variables presented in the previous chapter, coding categories were articulated to objectively analyze the frequency and availability of the variables. Below, 21 codes are detailed. See Table 1 (p. 44) for an overview of the relationship between the research questions, the key variables, the codes, and the methods for data analysis that are outlined in the next section.

**Code 1: Total number of tweets.** The total number of tweets in a list was counted.

**Code 2: Opinion of a tweet towards the secrecy law in a list.** In each list, 50 tweets were coded according to their opinions towards the secrecy law into six categories. The categories are: 1) agrees with the passing of the secrecy law; 2) thinks that revision should be needed for the secrecy law; 3) is against the passing of the secrecy law; 4) is neutral towards the secrecy law; 5) tweet is related to the secrecy law but the opinion is unclear; 6) tweet is not related to the secrecy law. If a list contained 50 tweets or less, all tweets were coded. If a list contained more than 50, 25 was subtracted from the total number of tweets, and the number was divided by 25 to find an answer, N, \( N = (\text{Total number of tweets} - 25)/25 \). If N was less than 1,
it was rounded up to 1. If N was 1 or more, it was rounded off below the decimal point. Then, all
25 tweets in the first page and every Nth tweet beyond the first page were coded until the total
number of tweets met 50. Based on the assumption that viewers should tend to see the first part
of a list rather than later part, the first 25 tweets were all coded.

**Code 3: Opinion of a curator in his/her tweet(s).** Opinion of a curator’s tweet(s)
towards the secrecy law were coded into seven categories: 1) agrees with the passing of the
secrecy law; 2) thinks that revision is needed for the secrecy law; 3) is against the passing of the
secrecy law; 4) is neutral towards the secrecy law; 5) tweet is related to the secrecy law but the
opinion is unclear; 6) tweet is not related to the secrecy law; and 7) no tweets. If there was no
curator’s tweet in a list, 7 was selected.

**Code 4: Opinion of a curator in title.** A curator’s opinion expressed in the title in a list
was coded in to seven categories: 1) agrees with the passing of the secrecy law; 2) thinks that
revision is needed for the secrecy law; 3) is against the passing of the secrecy law; 4) is neutral
towards the secrecy law; 5) title is related to the secrecy law but the opinion is unclear; 6) title is
not related to the secrecy law; and 7) no title is set.

**Code 5: Opinion of a curator in header.** A curator’s opinion expressed in the header
section in a list was coded into seven categories: 1) agrees with the passing of the secrecy law; 2)
thinks that revision is needed for the secrecy law; 3) is against the passing of the secrecy law; 4)
is neutral towards the secrecy law; 5) header is related to the secrecy law but the opinion is
unclear; 6) header is not related to the secrecy law; and 7) no header section.

**Code 6: Opinion of a curator in annotations.** A curators’ opinion expressed in sub-
headers and change of colors or letter sizes in curated tweets was coded into seven categories: 1)
agrees with the passing of the secrecy law; 2) thinks that revision is needed for the secrecy law;
3) is against the passing of the secrecy law; 4) is neutral towards the secrecy law; 5) annotation is related to the secrecy law but the opinion is unclear; 6) annotation is not related to the secrecy law; and 7) no annotation.

**Code 7: Hashtags.** The frequency of using hashtags was counted for 50 or less tweets selected for code 2.

**Code 8: Mentioning.** The frequency of mentioning was counted for 50 or less tweets selected for code 2. The number of tweets starting with or including the syntax of ‘@’ and ‘.@’ was counted.

**Code 9: Media source.** The frequency of using media sources was counted. Using URL links to media sources in tweets or citations from media sources was counted. A repeated citation or link from/to the same article was omitted and only the first appearance in a list was counted. However, different articles from the same media were counted each time as different sources.

**Code 10: Type of media source.** The type of media was coded into three categories: 1) traditional mass media source; 2) independent media source; and 3) political party media source. Each media source was also recorded for analysis. If a list had multiple tweets using media sources, only three or fewer earlier curated sources were coded.

**Code 11: Uses of media source.** How media sources, which are coded in code 10, are used in a list in relation to opinions towards the secrecy law was coded into four categories: 1) to support opinion of a tweet or a list; 2) to critique the media source; 3) to neutrally cite as news; and 4) unrelated to the secrecy law.

**Code 12: Comment section.** Existence or absence of a comment section in a list was coded into two categories: 1) available; and 2) not available.
**Code 13: Opinion of a comment.** If a list was coded as 1 (a comment section is available) in code 12, opinions of the first 10 comments towards the secrecy law were coded into six categories. The categories are: 1) agrees with the passing of the secrecy law; 2) thinks that revision is needed for the secrecy law; 3) is against the passing of the secrecy law; 4) is neutral towards the secrecy law; 5) comment is related to the secrecy law but the opinion is unclear; and 6) comment is not related to the secrecy law.

**Code 14: Views.** The number of views of a list was counted.

**Code 15: Favorites.** The number of favorites of a list was counted.

**Code 16: Authors of curated tweets.** Whose tweets are curated in a list was coded into four categories: 1) only curator’s tweets; 2) only single other tweeter’s tweets; 3) multiple tweeters including a curator; and 4) multiple tweeters excluding a curator.

**Code 17: Editing format.** What kinds of formats are used to edit a list was coded into six categories. They are: 1) recording a conversation; 2) editing an article by a single author; 3) summarizing an event about the topic; and 4) recording broadcasting show transcripts; 5) editing a story with multiple authors’ tweets on the topic.

**Code 18: Curator’s account name and brief description.** Self-identification of a curator perceived from a profile in Togetter or Twitter was coded into two categories: 1) perceived real name; and 2) pseudonym. One was coded only if the full name was available.

**Code 19: Curator’s occupation and profession.** Whether a curator indicates their occupation or profession in their profiles on Togetter or Twitter that related to the secrecy law, such as lawyer, law professor, journalist, writer and politician, was coded into two categories: 1) available; and 2) not available.
**Code 20: Number of followers.** The number of followers in a curator’s profile on Twitter was recorded.

**Code 21: Number of following.** The number of accounts that a curator is following in a curator’s profile on Twitter was recorded.

**Data Analysis**

To answer the research questions, coded data were analyzed as follows.

**RQ 1.** Research question 1-1 asked about opinions of curated tweets towards the secrecy law. To answer this, the frequency of six categories of opinions, coded according to code 2, were analyzed. Research question 1-2 asks indications of a curator’s opinion. To answer this, presence or absence of a curator’s opinion in four areas of a list, coded according to code 3, 4, 5, and 6, were analyzed. Research question 1-3 asked about tendency of curating like-minded opinions or cross-ideological opinions of a list. To answer this, first, the number of unclear tweets (5 in code 2) and unrelated tweets (6 in code 2) were excluded from the number of opinions of tweets, coded according to code 2. Second, the number of unclear (category 5), unrelated (category 6), and not available (category 7) tweets were also omitted from a curator’s opinions in four areas of a list: own tweet(s) (code 3); a title (code 4), a header (code 5), and annotations of a list (code6). Then, the number of remaining opinions (categories 1, 2, 3, and 4) of the tweets and the four areas were combined and analyzed to see what percentage of them agree on the same opinion. Only lists that had three or more tweets with an opinion coded as 1, 2, 3, or 4 were analyzed. The reason for this cutoff was that lists with only one tweet expressing a distinctive opinion might be categorized as like-minded because of that tweet. In addition, lists with two tweets of distinctive
opinions were also excluded, since they were likely to be categorized as like-minded if one of the tweets was the same as the curator’s coded according to code 3.

**RQ 2.** Research question 2-1 asked about the presence or absence of mentioning or hashtags in a list. To answer this, the frequency of mentioning and hashtags, coded according to code 7 and 8, were be analyzed. Research question 2-2 asked about the frequency of mentioning and hashtags in relation to the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure. To answer this, the association between frequency of mentioning and hashtags, coded according to the code 7 and 8, and the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure, obtained to answer research questions 1-3, were analyzed using a Chi-square test.

**RQ 3.** Research question 3-1 asked about the availability of media sources in a list. To answer this, the frequency of used media sources, coded according to code 9, was analyzed. Research question 3-2 asked about the type of media sources used in a list. To answer this, the frequency of three categories of media sources and each media source, coded according to code 10, were analyzed. Research question 3-3 asked about the uses of media sources in a list. To answer this, the frequency of four categories of how a media source was used, coded according to code 11, were analyzed.

**RQ 4.** Research question 4-1 asked whether a curator opened or closed a comment section. To answer this, the presence or absence of a comment section, coded according to code 12, were analyzed. Research question 4-2 asked about the presence or absence of a comment section in relation to selective or cross-ideological exposure. To answer this, association between the presence or absence of a comment section and the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure were analyzed. Research question 4-3 asked about the opinion of comments. To answer this, the frequency of six categories of opinions, coded according to code 13, were analyzed.
RQ 5. Research question 5 asked about diffusion and positive evaluation of a list in relation to selective or cross-ideological exposure. To answer this, the number of views and favorites, coded according to code 14 and 15, were analyzed. Then, association between the number of views and favorites and the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure was analyzed using a Chi-square test.

RQ 6. Research question 6 asked about the authors of curated tweets. To answer this, the frequency of four categories of authors, coded according to code 16, were analyzed.

RQ 7. Research question 7 asked about the editing format of a list. To answer this, the frequency of six categories, coded according to the code 17, were analyzed.

RQ 8. Research question 8 asked about the self-identification of curators. To answer this, the frequency of real names and pseudonyms and self-representation of their occupation or profession, coded according to code 18 and 19, were analyzed.

RQ 9. Research question 9 asked about the popularity of curators. To answer this, the number of users who follow curators and the number of users that curators follow coded according to code 20 and 21, were analyzed.
### Table 1.

**Summary of Methods and Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Codebook question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opinions towards the secrecy law</td>
<td>Code 1 and 2</td>
<td>Frequency of six categories of opinions</td>
<td>Q. 1 and 5-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Indication of a curator's opinion towards the law</td>
<td>Code 3, 4, 5, and 6</td>
<td>Presence or absence of a curator's opinion in four areas of a list</td>
<td>Q. 6, 7, 8, and 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Selective or cross-ideological exposure</td>
<td>Code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6</td>
<td>Frequency of six categories of selective/cross-ideological exposure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mentioning and hashtags</td>
<td>Code 7 and 8</td>
<td>Frequency of mentioning and hashtags</td>
<td>Q. 5-1 and 5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Mentioning and hashtags</td>
<td>Code 7 and 8</td>
<td>Association between frequency of mentioning and hashtags and selective/cross-ideological exposure</td>
<td>Q. 5-1, and 5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Media sources</td>
<td>Code 9</td>
<td>Frequency of used media source</td>
<td>Q. 10-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Type of media sources</td>
<td>Code 10</td>
<td>Frequency of three categories of media sources</td>
<td>Q. 10-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Uses of media sources</td>
<td>Code 11</td>
<td>Frequency of four categories of how a media source is used</td>
<td>Q. 10-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Comment section</td>
<td>Code 12</td>
<td>Presence or absence of a comment section</td>
<td>Q. 13-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>Comment section</td>
<td>Code 12</td>
<td>Association between presence or absence of a comment section and selective/cross-ideological exposure</td>
<td>Q. 13-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>Opinions of comment</td>
<td>Code 13</td>
<td>Frequency of six categories of opinions</td>
<td>Q. 13-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diffusion and positive evaluation Authors of curated tweets</td>
<td>Code 14 and 15</td>
<td>Number of views and favorites, association between number of views or favorites and selective/cross-ideological exposure</td>
<td>Q. 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Editing format of a list</td>
<td>Code 16</td>
<td>Frequency of four categories of formats</td>
<td>Q. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Self-identification</td>
<td>Code 17</td>
<td>Frequency of six categories of formats</td>
<td>Q. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Self-identification</td>
<td>Code 18 and 19</td>
<td>Frequency of real names/pseudonyms and professional profile</td>
<td>Q. 14 and 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Popularity of curator</td>
<td>Code 20 and 21</td>
<td>Number of followers and following</td>
<td>Q. 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Results

In this chapter, the results of the study based on analysis of the coded data are presented to answer the research questions.

Research Question 1

Research question 1-1 asked about opinions of curated tweets towards the secrecy law. According to the criteria stated in the methods chapter, 18,311 tweets were collected from 519 Togetter lists that were archived in the sub-category of the secrecy law or with tags relating to the law. To answer the question, the frequency of six categories of opinions was coded according to code 2 and is shown in Table 2.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of opinion</th>
<th>1) Agree</th>
<th>2) Revision</th>
<th>3) Against</th>
<th>4) Neutral</th>
<th>5) Unclear</th>
<th>6) Unrelated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>59.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,234</td>
<td>10,916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that nearly 60% of all tweets were unrelated, followed by an additional 23.12% that were unclear. It was also found that tweets that were against the secrecy law outnumbered tweets that agreed with it or thought revision is needed.
Research question 1-2 asked where and how curators’ opinions were stated in four areas of a list: a curator’s own tweet(s) (code 3); title of a list (code 4); header of a list (code 5); and annotation of a list (code 6). The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3.

Curator’s Opinion in Four Areas of a List (n=519)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1) Agree</th>
<th>2) Revision</th>
<th>3) Against</th>
<th>4) Neutral</th>
<th>5) Unclear</th>
<th>6) Unrelated</th>
<th>7) N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curator's tweet</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>54.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>34.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Header</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotation</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>62.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the lists did not have their curators’ tweet(s). Nearly 70% of the titles did not have a distinctive opinion, so they were categorized as unclear or unclear. More than 90% of the headers were categorized as either unclear or unrelated. The majority of the lists had no annotation. In above all four areas, opinions against the secrecy law outnumbered the other opinions, if the categories of unclear, unrelated, and not available were excluded.

Research questions 1-3 asked about the tendency of curating like-minded opinions or cross-ideological opinions of the lists. To answer this, 276 lists that had more than three tweets
with an opinion towards the secrecy law were selected according to the criteria explained in the above data analysis section. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4.

*Percentage of Agreement of Opinions in Togetter Lists (n=276)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&gt;=70%</th>
<th>&gt;=80%</th>
<th>&gt;=90%</th>
<th>&gt;=100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td>89.49</td>
<td>81.52</td>
<td>75.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that the Togetter lists about the secrecy law have a strong tendency towards curation and editing of like-minded opinions rather than cross-ideological opinions. About 75% of 276 lists had 100% of agreement of opinions. If the threshold were lowered to 70% or more agreement of opinions, more than 93% of the lists showed the tendency towards curation of like-minded opinions.

**Research Question 2**

Research question 2-1 asked about the presence or absence of mentioning or hashtags in a list. To answer this, the frequency of mentioning and hashtags was coded according to codes 7 and 8. The results for mentioning are shown in Table 5.
Nearly 80% of curated tweets had no mentioning present. However, if compared by list as a unit, nearly 70% of 516 lists, which excluded three lists that had no tweets from the total 519 lists, had one or more instances of mentioning. The percentage of curated tweets that had mentioning in a list is shown in Table 6.

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentioning</th>
<th>0.00% - 20.00%</th>
<th>20.01% - 40.00%</th>
<th>40.01% - 60.00%</th>
<th>60.01% - 80.00%</th>
<th>80.01% - 100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.26</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>10.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that there was a large distribution of lists that had 20.00% or fewer tweets with a mentioning. The results for the frequency of using hashtags are shown in Table 7.
Table 7.

*Frequency of Hashtags in Curated Tweets and Lists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hashtag</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tweet</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>8,392</td>
<td>9,919</td>
<td>18,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.63</td>
<td>38.37</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were more tweets without hashtags than tweets with one or more hashtags. If compared by list as a unit, there were more lists with one or more hashtags than lists with no hashtags. The percentage of curated tweets that had hashtags in a list is shown in Table 8.

Table 8.

*Percentage of Tweets with Hashtags in a List (n=516)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tweet with hashtag</th>
<th>List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was found that there was an uneven distribution that was relatively separated between lists with fewer hashtags and more hashtags. Note that the majority of lists had 20.00% or fewer tweets with hashtags.

Research question 2-2 asked about the frequency of mentioning and hashtags in relation to the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure. Based on results for research question 1-3 and 2-1, above, lists that had more than 20.00% of tweets with instances of mentioning were categorized as having a high frequency of mentioning; lists that had more than 80.00% of tweets with hashtags were categorized as having a high frequency of hashtags. Regarding the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure, lists that had 80.00% or more tweets that fell into a single category were categorized as having a high tendency of selective exposure to like-minded opinions. Chi-square tests were performed and the results are shown in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9.

*Chi-Square Test for Association between Frequency of Mentioning and Tendency of Like-Minded Opinions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson chi-square</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of valid cases</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.83.
An association between the frequency of mentioning and the tendency of selective exposure was not found, $\chi^2(1, N=276)=1.01$, $p=0.32$. On the other hand, an association between the frequency of hashtags and the tendency of selective exposure was statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N=276)=5.77$, $p=0.02$. Therefore, it was found that high frequency of hashtags was related to selective exposure to like-minded opinions.

**Research Question 3**

Research question 3-1 asked about the availability of media sources in a list. To answer this, the frequency of using media sources was coded according to code 9. The results are shown in Table 11.
In 516 lists that excluded three lists that had no tweets from the total 519 lists, the majority of the lists had one or more citations or links from/to media sources. The distribution of the frequency of media sources in a list is shown in Table 12.

Table 12.

*Frequency of Using Media Sources in a List (n=516)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media source</th>
<th>List 0-20</th>
<th>21-40</th>
<th>41-60</th>
<th>61-80</th>
<th>81-100</th>
<th>&gt;100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that the lists had relatively few media sources, even though the majority of them had at least one.

Research question 3-2 asked about the type of media sources used in the curated tweets. Only the first three media sources in each list were coded according to code 10. A total of 716 media sources were categorized into three types of media as shown in Table 13.
Table 13.

*Types of Media Sources in Lists (n=716)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of media source</th>
<th>1) Traditional</th>
<th>2) Independent</th>
<th>3) Political party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>57.96%</td>
<td>39.66%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that traditional media sources constituted the majority. This result was also coded according to each media source as shown in Tables 14, 15, and 16.
### Table 14.

**Media Sources in Traditional Media (n=415)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media type</th>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>News agency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kyodo Tsushin</em></td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Jiji Tsushin</em></td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newspaper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Asahi Shimbun</em></td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chunichi/Tokyo Shimbun</em></td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mainichi Shimbun</em></td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sankei Shimbun</em></td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nikkei Shimbun</em></td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Yomiuri Shimbun</em></td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other local newspapers</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily goship newspapers</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>NHK</em></td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TV Asahi (ANN)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBS</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuji TV (FNN)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nihon TV (NNN)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other TV channels</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magazine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15.

*Media Sources in Independent Media (n=284)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Independent Web Journal (IWJ)</em></td>
<td>65.85</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>OurPlanet TV</em></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nico nico douga</em></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent web media</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots streaming media</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent YouTube media</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16.

*Media Sources in Political Party Media (n=17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Akahata</em></td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other media</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In traditional mass media, the most cited or linked media source was *Asahi Shimbun* (15.18%) followed by NHK (11.81%), *Chunichi/Tokyo Shimbun* (11.81%), and *Mainichi Shimbun* (11.33%). Citations and links to TV broadcasting media were fewer than newspaper media, except for NHK. In newspapers, a large gap was found between two groups; *Nikkei Shimbun* (3.13%), *Yomiuri Shimbun* (1.69%), and *Sankei Shimbun* (4.34%) were used fewer than the abovementioned three newspapers. In independent media, *Independent Web Journal* (65.85%) constituted the majority, followed by independent web-based media (13.73%) and grass-root
based streaming media (10.21%). In political party media, Akahata (82.35%) constituted a large majority.

Research question 3-3 asked about the uses of media sources in the lists. To answer this, the frequency of four categories of how a media source was used was coded according to code 11 as shown in Table 17.

Table 17.

*Uses of Media Sources in Curated Tweets (n=716)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of media source</th>
<th>1) To support tweet</th>
<th>2) To critique the source</th>
<th>3) To neutrally cite</th>
<th>4) Unrelated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.24%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>49.86%</td>
<td>36.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Media sources were mostly used to neutrally cite as news, followed by unrelated posts. In contrast, to support opinion of a tweet or a list and to critique the media source were used relatively less frequently.

**Research Question 4**

Research question 4-1 asked whether a curator opened or closed a comment section. However, it was found that Togetter changed their policy so curators could not choose to close comment sections in their lists any more. The timing of this change is unclear because Togetter does not generally publish updates about their change of format. Thus, all lists had a comment
section coded according to code 12. Consequently, research question 4-2 asking about the relationship between the availability of a comment section and the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure was unable to be answered.

Research question 4-3 asked about opinions of comments in the lists. To answer this, opinions in the first 10 comments in a list was coded according to code 13 as shown in Table 18.

Table 18.

*Opinions of Comments towards the Secrecy Law (n=1,035)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of opinion</th>
<th>1) Agree</th>
<th>2) Revision</th>
<th>3) Against</th>
<th>4) Neutral</th>
<th>5) Unclear</th>
<th>6) Unrelated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>88.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 90% of the coded comments were not related to the secrecy law.

**Research Question 5**

Research question 5 asked about diffusion and positive evaluation of the lists. To answer this, first, the number of views of each list was coded according to code 14 as shown in Table 19.
Table 19.

**Number of Views of Lists (n=519)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of views</th>
<th>List</th>
<th>0-500</th>
<th>501-1000</th>
<th>1001-1500</th>
<th>1501-2000</th>
<th>2001-2500</th>
<th>2501-3000</th>
<th>&gt;3000</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3,736.78</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>240,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that there was a large gap between less-viewed lists and more-viewed lists. Almost half of the lists (48.55%) had 1,000 or fewer views, while 21.97% of the lists had more than 3,000 views.

Next, the number of favorites for each list was coded according to code 15 as shown in Table 20.

Table 20.

**Number of Favorites of Lists (n=519)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of favorites</th>
<th>List</th>
<th>0-20</th>
<th>21-40</th>
<th>41-60</th>
<th>61-80</th>
<th>81-100</th>
<th>&gt;100</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>456</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.86</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that nearly 90% of the lists had 20 or fewer favorites, including 33.14% with no favorites.

To see the relationship between the frequency of views or favorites and the tendency of curating like-minded or cross-ideological opinions, Chi-square tests were performed. Lists that
had 1001 or more views were considered as having a high frequency of views. Likewise, lists that had 21 or more favorites were considered as having a high frequency of favorites. Regarding the tendency of selective or cross-ideological exposure, lists that had 80.00% or more tweets that fell into a single category of opinion examined for research question 1-3 were considered as having a high tendency of selective exposure to like-minded opinions. The results of Chi-square tests are shown in Tables 21 and 22.

Table 21.

**Chi-Square Test for Association between Number of Views and Tendency of Selective Exposure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson chi-square</td>
<td>1.046a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of valid cases</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.39.

Table 22.

**Chi-Square Test for Association between Number of Favorites and Tendency of Selective Exposure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.051a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 1 cell (25.0%) has expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.31.
An association between the frequency of views and the tendency of selective exposure was not found, $\chi^2(1, N=276)=1.05, p=0.31$. Moreover, an association between the frequency of favorites and the tendency of selective exposure was not found, $\chi^2(1, N=276)=0.05, p=0.82$.

**Research Question 6**

Research question 6 asked about the authors of curated tweets. To answer this, the frequency of four categories of authors in a list was coded according to code 16 for 516 lists (excluding three lists with no tweets from total 519 lists) as shown in Table 23.

Table 23.

*Authors of Tweets in a List (n=519)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List</th>
<th>1) Only curator's tweets</th>
<th>2) Single author's tweets</th>
<th>3) Multiple including curator</th>
<th>4) Multiple excluding curator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>34.69</td>
<td>35.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of lists that included multiple tweeters (3 and 4, 70.16%) was more than that of lists that included only a single tweeter (1 and 2, 29.84%). The number of lists that included a curator’s tweet(s) (1 and 3, 46.12%) was fewer than that of lists that did not include a curator’s tweets (2 and 4, 53.88%).
**Research Question 7**

Research question 7 asked about the editing format of the lists. To answer this, the frequency of six categories of editing format was coded according to code 17 for 516 lists (excluding three lists with no tweets from total 519 lists) as shown in Table 24.

Table 24.

*Editing Format of Lists (n=519)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editing format</th>
<th>List %</th>
<th>1) Conversation</th>
<th>2) Single author</th>
<th>3) Summarizing event</th>
<th>4) Broadcast transcript</th>
<th>5) Multiple author's tweets on a topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>39.15</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that nearly 40% of the lists were for recording broadcasting show transcripts, followed by editing a story with multiple author’s tweets and editing an article by a single author.

**Research Question 8**

Research question 8 asked about the self-identification of curators. To answer this, the frequency of real names or pseudonyms and availability of self-representation of their occupation or profession were coded according to codes 18 and 19. The results for the frequency of real names or pseudonyms are shown in Table 25.
Table 25.

**Frequency of Curator’s Real Name or Pseudonym in Profile (n=159)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curator's account name</th>
<th>1) Real name</th>
<th>2) Pseudonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>81.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large majority of the 159 curators used pseudonyms. The results for the availability of their occupation or profession are shown in Table 26.

Table 26.

**Availability of Curator’s Occupation in Profile (n=159)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curator's occupation</th>
<th>1) Available</th>
<th>2) N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>81.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-representation of their occupation or profession was not available for a large majority of the curators.
Research Question 9

Research question 9 asked about the popularity of curators. To answer this, the number of users who followed curators (followers) and the number of users that curators followed (following) were coded according to codes 20 and 21. Since five curators’ accounts had been deleted and did not exist on Twitter when the data was retrieved, the number of followers and following for 154 curators were coded. The results are shown in Table 27.

Table 27.

Number of Followers and Following for Curators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Followers</td>
<td>2,312.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42,384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following</td>
<td>1,185.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,012.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of followers and following for each of the 154 curators were compared to see their popularity on Twitter. The results are shown in Table 28.

Table 28.

Comparison of Number of Followers and Following for Curators (n=154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of number</th>
<th>63.64</th>
<th>36.36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was found that the majority of curators had the same number of or more followers than they followed other tweeters.

**Inter-coder reliability**

To examine the reliability of coding, another coder other than the writer herself performed coding for eight codes that had subjective factors to judge: code 2 (opinion of a tweet in a list); code 3 (opinion of a curator in his/her tweet(s)); code 4 (opinion of a curator in title); code 5 (opinion of a curator in header); code 6 (opinion of a curator in annotations); code 11 (uses of media source); code 13 (opinion of a comment); and code 17 (editing format). The coder coded 26 lists, which was 5.01% of all lists. The percentage of matched coding between the writer and the coder was high for all codes as follows: 97.22% for code 2; 100.00% for code 3; 96.15% for code 4; 100.00% for code 5, 96.15% for code 6; 100.00% for code 11; 96.15% for code 17.
6. Discussion

In this chapter, findings from the results are discussed to investigate the roles of curatorial activities on Togetter lists on the secrecy law with a focus on the concept of selective exposure. The findings are discussed in three sections. First, why the tendency of curating like-minded opinions was significant in this study is discussed. Second, how key technological affordances of Twitter and Togetter affected that tendency is highlighted. Last, how the curators played a role in the Togetter discourse is explored.

Enhanced Selective Exposure on Togetter

The preceding studies on selective exposure in political discussion on Twitter suggest that selective exposure is rather found than cross-ideological exposure, although the latter is not necessarily avoided (Choi, 2014; Himelboim, McCreery, et al., 2013; Himelboim, Smith, et al., 2013; Himelboim, 2014). The results of this study support this argument. As research question 1 demonstrated, there was a strong tendency of curating and editing like-minded opinions in a list towards the law. In 276 lists that had more than three tweets with an opinion towards the secrecy law, opinions of 209 lists (75.72%) fell into a single category of opinion. If the threshold was lowered, more lists had the tendency of selective exposure. There are three key factors that contributed this strong tendency: tendency of public opinion against the secrecy law; Togetter’s application reflecting polarization of political opinion on Twitter; and the role of unrelated or unclear tweets about the law. These three factors are discussed below.
First, it is likely that the Togetter lists reflected the general public opinion that was relatively against the secrecy law. As examined in the literature review, the majority of the population (60.3%) was opposed to the passing of the law and only a smaller number (24.9%) supported it (“Seventy percent of the respondents expressed anxiety over the secrecy law: Sudden 47% decline in approval rating for cabinet (Himitsu hogohō ni fuan nanawari: Naikaku shijiritsu kyūraku 47%),” 2013). Therefore, if this tendency was reflected in Twitter discourse, tweets that were against the law should comprise the majority.

Moreover, it appears that the Japanese tweeters have a more critical stance towards the politics than the general public. Since Twitter gained great popularity in the 2011 East Japan Disaster when the government withheld information (Willacy, 2012), tweeters have tended to look for alternative information that is not distributed through the mass media, which rely on official sources. Besides, they have often used Twitter as a platform for social and political movements, including protests against the secrecy law (Tabuchi, 2012), which was seen in some lists in this study. Hence, the Twitter discourse on the secrecy law was likely to have a more critical tone than the general public. Considering the stances of the curators of the lists, this tendency appears significant. As examined in research questions 1-2, the curators’ opinions were concentrated on being against the law (20.23%), compared with opinions that supported the law (0.58%) or thought revision was needed (1.73%). If the percentage of lists that did not have curator’s tweets (category 7, 54.34%) is excluded, the result becomes as follows: 44.30% were against the law; 1.27% supported the law; 3.80% thought the revision is needed. The preceding research suggests that Twitter’s following relationship strongly influences selective exposure to politically like-minded opinions (Himelboim, McCreery, et al., 2013; Himelboim, 2014). Therefore, it is likely that a large percentage of the curators of lists about the secrecy law were
more exposed to tweets opposing the law that stemmed from the users they followed, which accordingly should affect the tendency of the lists that they curated.

Furthermore, it appears that the curators had strong political dispositions that should contribute to selective exposure. The prior research suggests that people tend to expose themselves to like-minded opinions if they perceive a given issue as politically important (Kobayashi & Ikeda, 2009; Stroud, 2007). The passing of the secrecy law was a major political issue involving a great concern and debate. Hence, it is highly likely even the general public had strong dispositions towards the issue. Moreover, the Japanese tweeters have shown strong dispositions towards political issues as argued above. Consequently, the curators should have strong dispositions to the secrecy law that contributed to selective exposure, although it was not known if they have stronger political dispositions than other tweeters.

Therefore, it is assumed that the Twitter discourse reflected the tendency of public opinion against the secrecy law, which was enhanced by selective exposure due to the key function of following relationships on Twitter and the strong political dispositions of the Japanese tweeters. Consequently, this tendency of Twitter discourse should affect the high tendency of curating like-minded opinions opposing the secrecy law.

Second, the fundamental features of the Togetter application is discussed as a key factor to contribute to selective curation of like-minded opinions. As an add-on application on Twitter, Togetter’s application has two large frames: one for editing a list on the right side; the other one on the left side showing a user’s (curator’s) Twitter timeline. Accordingly, the fundamental way of curating tweets is for curators to drag-and-drop tweets from the left to the right, that is, from the timeline frame to the editing frame. Thus, curators necessarily curate most tweets from their timelines. There were also buttons below the left frame to show users’ lists and favorites on
Twitter. It is also possible to retrieve tweets according to users’ interests by typing a keyword or hashtag in an input bar below the left frame. However, it should be perceived as a default way for curators to drag-and-drop tweets from their timeline. Thus, this is considered to be a key technological affordance of the Togetter application influencing the way of curating (Baym & boyd, 2012; boyd, 2011). Moreover, among other curating methods, curating according to favorite tweets also reflects his or her timeline, since it is relatively common to add a favorite flag on a tweet from the timeline.

The results for question 2-1 suggest there was an uneven distribution of the frequency of hashtags in a list: it was concentrated on two ranges, 20% or less in a list (56.98%) or more than 80% in a list (33.33%). The latter are considered lists curated according to hashtags; and this type of curated list is discussed in the later section. The lists with fewer hashtags are assumed to be lists that were curated from the curators’ timelines. As argued in the former section on the tendency of public opinion to be against the secrecy law, tweets on the curators’ timelines were tended to express like-minded opinions due to the strong influence of Twitter’s following relationships and the Japanese tweeters’ strong dispositions against the secrecy law. Thus, it is likely that the lists curated from the curators’ timelines had the tendency of selective exposure to like-minded opinions. Therefore, it is assumed that the perceived feature of the Togetter application that was supposed to encourage curation from personal timelines should contribute to selective curation of like-minded opinions towards the law.

Last, it is argued that unclear or unrelated tweets about the secrecy law could contribute to the tendency towards selective exposure to like-minded opinions. As demonstrated in research question 1-1, nearly 60% of all curated tweets were unrelated (59.61%) to the secrecy law, followed by unclear tweets (23.12%). However, it should be emphasized that they were not
necessarily unclear or unrelated tweets if their contexts changed. As seen in the literature review, context collapse is an important concept to understand how a tweet is separated from the original context that the tweeter intended and is perceived differently by others (Marwick & boyd, 2010). Although tweeters can imagine their audiences to some extent based on their followers, their tweets are essentially viewable by anyone. In addition, Twitter’s stream-based update system makes it difficult to see a particular tweeter’s tweets successively (Marwick & boyd, 2010). Also, note that its limitation of 140 characters makes it difficult for a tweeter to explicitly write that the tweet is about the secrecy law. Thus, it is possible that some of the unclear or unrelated tweets had clear opinions towards the secrecy law, if they were reviewed in the series of tweets. However, analysis of opinions was focused on respective tweets based on the assumption that Togetter lists could collapse the original contexts by curating and editing.

In addition to the problem of collapsed context, the Japanese high-context culture is likely to contribute the high frequency of unclear or unrelated tweets (Acar & Deguchi, 2013). There were many cases that tweets were too nuanced to categorize. There were also some cases that tweeters tweeted sarcastically about the law or criticized other opinions. Thus, unclear or unrelated tweets constituted more than 80% of all tweets due to collapsed context and high-context culture.

However, the significance of those unclear or unrelated tweets is that they can be perceived with another meaning or opinion in a different context of Togetter lists. For instance, an unclear tweet can be perceived as a tweet opposing the secrecy law, if it is curated in the middle of other opposing tweets, under an explicitly opposing title, or with annotations that imply objection. Even an unrelated tweet that did not explicitly mention the secrecy law can be perceived as having an opinion towards the law if it is put in a list that is clearly about the
secrecy law. Since curators often pick up tweets from their timelines that include their and their followers’ tweets and retweets, it is expected that they can perceive intended meanings or opinions of the tweets to some extent, so they can curate them in a list in a way to regain the intended meanings or opinions. This is specifically seen when a curator makes a list only with a certain individual’s tweets. However, the perceived meaning or opinions of unclear or unrelated tweets are essentially context dependent. Thus, if other tweets or a curator’s opinion in a list were like-minded, unclear or unrelated tweets were often perceived to support or accord with the like-minded opinion. It is also theoretically possible to include an unrelated tweet that does not mention the secrecy law but states a certain opinion (i.e., “I am for/against it”) that is different from other tweets or a curator’s opinion in a list. However, such cases were not often seen in this analysis, since unrelated tweets were often unclear about opinions as well.

Therefore, it is assumed that unclear or unrelated tweets rather contribute to selective exposure to like-minded opinions of the lists on the secrecy law, though it is unknown how much the curators could perceive them in the original contexts and whether they intentionally curate them to edit any like-minded tendency of the lists.

In sum, it is assumed that the high tendency of selective exposure in the Togetter lists on the secrecy law was caused by the three main factors: the tendency of general opinion that opposed the secrecy law was enhanced on the Twitter discourse because of following relationships; Togetter’s application showing a curator’s timeline as default influenced the curators’ curating of like-minded opinions; and unclear or unrelated tweets were used to complement the tendency of curating like-minded opinions by replacing them in different contexts of the Togetter lists.
Influence of Key Technological Affordances of Twitter and Togetter

The prior research has found that some technological affordances of Twitter influence selective exposure. Retweeting, mentioning, following, hashtags, and URL links are those affordances (Conover et al., 2011; Himelboim, McCreery, et al., 2013; Himelboim, 2014; Smith, Rainie, Shneiderman, & Himelboim, 2014; Yardi & boyd, 2010). Among them, mentioning, hashtags, and media sources including both URL links and citations were examined in the Togetter environment. Retweeting and following were not observable through content analysis. However, how the lists were diffused on Twitter can be assumed by seeing the number of views and favorites for each Togetter list. It was found that hashtags contributed to selective exposure, and links to and citations from media sources indicated the tendency of using like-minded media sources. However, a relationship between mentioning and selective exposure was not found. In addition, a relationship between the number of views or favorites and selective exposure was not found. Below, how these technological affordances influenced the tendency of selective exposure is discussed.

First, it appears that hashtags played a key role as a marker for curators to edit lists for recording broadcast show transcripts. In the analysis for research question 2-2, it was found that the higher frequency of hashtags was related to the higher tendency of curating like-minded opinions. Examining the lists with a higher tendency of hashtags revealed significant points. Among 172 lists that had between 80.01% and 100% of tweets accompanied by hashtags, 110 lists (63.95%) were curated by the same curator. Moreover, 150 lists (87.21%) had the same editing format, namely, recording broadcast show transcripts. That same curator (@IWJ_matome) was one of the accounts for an independent media source named Independent Web Journal (IWJ) and was specifically used for creating Togetter lists to record their online,
streamed broadcasts. This media source uses Ustream as a platform for their stream broadcasting. Ustream has a function called social stream, which is a chat-screen that viewers can use to communicate with each other while watching a broadcast. A certain hashtag can be set as the default in social stream, so each chat message appears with that hashtag. Moreover, these chat messages are simultaneously posted as tweets in viewers’ Twitter timelines. Thus, @IWJ_matome or other accounts picked up these tweets by hashtags to record online broadcasts as a Togetter list.

There are two reasons why such lists had the tendency of like-minded opinions. One reason is that independent media like IWJ tend to broadcast public lectures, meetings, or protests as their subject; and these originally objected to the secrecy law. Since many chat messages are transcriptions of broadcasts, the opposing stance of the covered subjects should be consequently reflected on Twitter. The other reason is that default hashtags on social stream often include opinions against the secrecy law, such as “Press conference by journalists opposing the secrecy law.” Therefore, it is highly likely that using hashtags for curating broadcasting transcriptions contributed to the tendency of like-minded opinions in the lists. However, it should also be noted that hashtags were not so often used in the lists except for recording broadcasting transcripts. It may support the preceding study that Japanese tweeters scored lowest in the number of hashtags used when compared with other countries (Hong et al., 2011).

Second, it is considered that media sources in the lists indicated the tendency of like-minded opinions among the curated tweets in the lists. The preceding research suggests that tweeters tend to show selective exposure to politically like-minded information sources (Himelboim, McCreery, et al., 2013; Himelboim, Smith, et al., 2013; Himelboim, 2014). The most significant finding from this study on media sources was that liberal newspapers were more
linked to or cited from the curated tweets than conservative newspapers among traditional media, as analyzed for research question 3-2. As reviewed in the definition of variables section, the five largest Japanese newspapers rank from more conservative to more liberal as follows: *Yomiuri Shimbun* (5.6), *Sankei Shimbun* (5.3), *Nikkei Shimbun* (5.2), *Mainichi Shimbun* (5.0), and *Asahi Shimbun* (4.4) (Japan Press Research Institute (*Shimbun Tsūshin Chōsakai*), 2009). The results of this study demonstrated a highly liberal tendency of newspapers used for curating lists on the secrecy law. *Asahi Shimbun* (15.18%) was most linked or cited in the Togetter lists followed by *Chunichi/Tokyo Shimbun* (11.81%), *Mainichi Shiumbun* (11.33%), *Sankei Shimbun* (4.34%), *Nikkei Shimbun* (3.13%), *Yomiuri Shimbun* (1.69%). Although *Chunichi/Tokyo Shimbun* is not measured in the above conservative-liberal scale, the paper is generally considered as liberal. Thus, the percentage of used media sources clearly shows the tendency of selective exposure to liberal media.

In addition, the results show that independent media sources were also often linked or cited in the lists. However, it should be noted that the majority of them were concentrated on a single media source, IWJ. Furthermore, those tweets with a link to or a citation from the media were almost always curated by their own account (@IWJ_matome). Therefore, further exploration is required to know if independent media were generally used as frequently as in this study.

There are two main factors contributing to the selective exposure to liberal media. One factor is that the Japanese tweeters generally have a more critical stance towards political issues, as argued above. The other is that the problem of the secrecy law was likely to be criticized by liberal people due to a great concern about interfering with citizens’ right to know (Corrales, 2014). As for the uses of media sources in the curated tweets, the tweeters neutrally cite them as
news in nearly 50% of the cases, as analyzed for research question 3-3. It was relatively rare for them to use sources to support their opinions or to rebut the media sources. It should be also mentioned that URL links of media sources were sometimes unable to reach due the media deleted or moved the links, which made it difficult to know the tweeters intention for using media sources. As for this problem, how tweeters solved it is discussed in the next section.

Third, the relationship between the frequency of mentioning and tendency of selective exposure was not found in this study, although the prior research suggests that mentioning relationships on Twitter facilitate cross-ideological exposure rather than selective exposure (Conover et al., 2011; Yardi & boyd, 2010). This means cross-ideological exposure did not necessarily occur even though there was a certain number of lists with mentioning (68.22%, Table 5) or lists for recording conversation (8.33%, Table 24).

Last, a relationship between the frequency of views or favorites and the tendency of selective exposure was not found, as analyzed for research question 5. This means lists that had a like-minded tendency did not necessarily have more views or favorites. Since the number of views and favorites indicates the diffusion and positive evaluation of Togetter lists on Twitter to some extent, this finding is worthy of further research.

In sum, it was found that hashtags and links to or citation from media sources influenced selective exposure in the Togetter lists. The tendency of selective exposure was enhanced by using hashtags as a marker for curating; and media sources in the curated tweets suggest the tendency of selective exposure to liberal media.
Roles of Curators on Togetter Lists

Although only limited studies have been done on the subject of social curation due to its recent emergence, early findings suggest that it is a manual process of categorizing, organizing, and collecting online contents by the general web public to provide a new context to the filtered contents with a curator’s point of view (Duh et al., 2012; Hall & Zarro, 2012; Liu, 2010a; Zhong et al., 2013). The results of this study also support this argument. Below, the kind of people who curated the lists and how they curated them are discussed. More nuanced activities of curation that could be observed during the content analysis are also discussed.

One of the key features of social curation is that curators are not professional people but members of the general public using social curatorial services (Duh et al., 2012; Hall & Zarro, 2012; Zhong et al., 2013). As seen in the result for research question 8, about 80% of the curators on the secrecy law remained anonymous by not disclosing their real names or occupations. This high tendency of anonymity is inconsistent with some prior research that found Japanese social media users are not so often anonymous (Acar & Deguchi, 2013; Tung & Scott, 2012). It may be affected by the curated topic, which was a political issue involving citizens’ privacy and right to know. At any rate, the high tendency of anonymity suggests that the curators were likely perceived as members of the general public, even if some of them were actually not.

Considering the number of followers and following, the curators were relatively influential on Twitter -- the majority of them had more followers than the people they were following, as examined for research question 9. Based on the significance of following relationships as a key function on Twitter, having more followers indicates that a curator may be considered an information hub, influential via distribution of their own tweets and retweets. This
is significant when considering potential diffusion of their curated lists, since it enhances the
selective exposure to the lists consisting of like-minded opinions.

In terms of their methods for curating, they tended to curate multiple tweeters’ tweets
rather than single tweeter’s. Also, they were likely to curate other tweeters’ tweets rather than
their own tweets, as seen in the analysis for research question 6. In terms of editing format,
editing a story with multiple accounts’ tweets was observed as the second most popular option as
examined for research question 7. This focus on multiple other tweeters would be expected to
lead to cross-ideological opinions. Nonetheless, the lists showed a high concentration on like-
minded opinions, which is likely to mean that curators had a high tendency of exposing
themselves to like-minded opinions.

There are some notable findings on the curating methods that are too nuanced to
understand only by measuring frequency in content analysis. For instance, some curators used
annotations very strategically to edit a list almost as if it were an online media article or blog post
by adding subtitles, links, and so on. Some curators made multiple similar Togetter lists, which
suggests they tried to elaborate better lists by trial and error. Moreover, it was observed some
tweeters wrote tweets expecting that they would be curated. For instance, some tweeters wrote
consecutive numbers at the top of their tweets so that curators could easily pick up and edit them.
Some tweeters were aware of the problem of deleted media links that is mentioned in the former
section; they often directly cited titles and contents of media articles or used archiving services to
link media articles. They were likely to know their tweets would be curated in Togetter lists and
that other people would face the problem of deleted links long after their tweets were published.
It was also observed that a tweeter repeatedly wrote a sentence expressing his or her opinion
towards the law at the top of his or her successive tweets to prevent the tweets from gaining
different meaning in a different context of a Togetter list. Therefore, it is assumed there are more nuanced attempts and experiments in curating Togetter lists not only by curators but also by tweeters.

It should be mentioned that how curators played a role in deciding to open or close comment sections was not be able to be examined, as seen in the result for research question 4, since Togeter changed their policy so that all lists had a comment section at the time of data collection. This reveals a unique challenge of investigating social media that evolve their infrastructure at a very rapid pace, often without warning in advance, even though those changes of the features affect the perceptions and practices of the users (Ellison & boyd, 2013).

In sum, it is assumed that the curators played a relatively influential role on Twitter, which should affect the tendency of selective exposure to like-minded opinions on the issue of the secrecy law. It is also interesting that there were nuanced ways of curation that sometimes involved the relationship between the curators and the tweeters.
7. Conclusion

This study focused the role of curatorial activities by the general web public using Togetter with a focus on the concept of selective exposure and social curation. Content analysis was applied to explore whether the tendency of selective exposure or cross-ideological exposure was found in the Togetter lists on the heated discussion about the secrecy law. Since this is an exploratory study on Togetter, no hypothesis was formed beforehand. However, it was found that major findings are consistent with the prior research on selective exposure on Twitter.

The most significant finding was that the Togetter lists on the secrecy law were highly concentrated on like-minded opinions, specifically opposing the law. It appears that Twitter’s tendency of selective exposure was enhanced by two major factors. First, the key feature of the Togetter application being based on the curator’s timeline encouraged the curators to curate from their already like-minded Twitter timelines. Second, unclear or unrelated tweets stemming from the context-collapsed Twitter environment contributed to enhance like-minded opinions by allowing them to gain new meaning in the context of a Togetter list. Moreover, two key technological affordances of Twitter, hashtags and media sources, contributed to the concentration of like-minded opinions in the Togetter lists. Furthermore, those highly like-minded lists were likely to contribute to selective exposure by being diffused through the following relationships of relatively influential curators. In conclusion, it is assumed that Togetter contributes to enhance the tendency of selective exposure on Twitter by condensing like-minded political opinions and distributing them as a concentrated Togetter list in a Twitter environment through the following relationships of curators.
The major limitations of this study are threefold. First, it lacks a more detailed and nuanced examination of tweets and lists due to the limitation of content analysis. Using content analysis, the general tendency of the lists was highlighted. However, considering Japanese high-context culture, a large percentage of unclear/unrelated tweets, and diverse way of curating, it would also be meaningful to examine each list with a focus on its details.

Second, this study lacks an examination of how the lists were actually distributed on Twitter and viewed by tweeters. Although the study revealed that the Togetter lists on the secrecy law had a high tendency of like-minded opinions that should also contribute to selective exposure, it would also be meaningful to consider other factors that may influence the viewership and perception of the lists. For instance, the reputation of curators may influence viewership and perception; an influential reader of a list may increase viewership; or the frequency of retweeting an original tweet that states a certain Togetter list is published may influence viewership.

Last, this study also lacks a more fundamental understanding of Togetter users. Although prior research was done by Duh et al. (2012), it is still unknown how they are motivated to curate lists and how they perceive and evaluate their curatorial work. That fundamental understanding will contribute to understanding their curation of tweets about the secrecy law.

Considering these limitations, some directions for future research can be highlighted. First, to focus on more nuanced factors of social curation and curated lists, more detailed discourse analysis is required. Second, to study the significance of Togetter lists with an understanding of their actual distribution and diffusion, an examination Togetter based on Twitter’s following relationships using research methods such as social network analysis is necessary. Finally, an examination with a focus on the curators of Togetter to more
fundamentally understand their activities is needed. Here, research methods such as surveys and interviews can be applied.

In conclusion, this study contributes to the emerging research area of social curation and selective exposure with the key finding that selective exposure of Twitter is enhanced by curatorial activities.
Appendix

Appendix A. Code Book

Code Book for the Analysis of Togetter Lists

You will analyze a list on the Togetter website. Each list is available either as a hard copy (paper) or PDF file that you can see on your device. Each list is labeled with its identical number. Input answers to all questions below in columns under that identical label.

Each Togetter ‘list’ is a collection of tweets picked up from Twitter. On the main central frame of the site, one list of tweets is displayed under its title and heading, and above its comment section. Tweets are displayed similarly to the timeline of Twitter. On the right-side frame, the curator’s (who generated the list) profile is displayed with an icon, account identical name starting with @, and a descriptive profile. See image of the features in Figure 1 on page 7.

Answer all questions unless there is a specific instruction to skip a question.

1. Date of the analysis.
   **Write down the date that you analyzed the list in Togetter** *(record as mm/dd/yy).*

2. Total number of tweets in the list. [Code 1]
   **Count the total number of tweets in the list and record the number** *(answer in numerals).*

3. Number of favorites. [Code 14]
   **Write down the number of favorites (‘favs’) shown under the curator’s icon in the main frame** *(answer in numerals).*

4. Number of views. [Code 15]
   **Write down the number of views shown on the right side of the favorites** *(answer in numerals).*

5. Analysis of each tweet
   - If the total number of tweets is **50 or less than 50**, answer all questions from 5-1 to 5-3 for all tweets.
   - If the total number is **more than 50**, subtract 25 from the total number (T) of tweets, then divide it by 25 to find an answer, N. \[ N = \frac{T-25}{25} \]
     If N is less than 1, round up to 1. If N is 1 or more, round off below the decimal point.
     Then, the first 25 tweets and every Nth tweet beyond that 25 will be coded for all questions from 5-1 to 5-3 until the total number of tweets meets 50.

5-1. Hashtags in a tweet. [Code 7]
Does a tweet have a hashtag? Hashtags are displayed as #keyword. If yes (1), record that keyword too.

1) Yes (Record the keyword)
2) No

5-2. Mentioning in a tweet. [Code 8]
Does a tweet mention a certain account? A mentioning tweet starts with @ or contains @ followed by a certain account name. However, if that account name is identical with the tweeter’s own account name, the tweet is not considered to be mentioning.

1) Yes
2) No

5-3. Opinion about the secrecy law. [Code 2]
Read the content of a tweet and categorize it into one of the categories below according to the tweeter’s opinion about the secrecy law. If the content of a tweet is cited from other source, categorize it as same as tweeter’s opinion (select single answer).
See detailed criteria for categorization in page 7.

1) Supports the secrecy law
2) The secrecy law needs revision
3) Does not support the secrecy law at all
4) Neutral about the secrecy law
5) Opinion is unclear
6) Unrelated to the secrecy law

6. Curator’s opinion in tweets [Code 3]
Find all the curator’s tweets in the list. Categorize them into one of the categories below according to the curator’s opinion about the secrecy law (select single answer).
See detailed criteria for categorization in page 7.

1) Supports the secrecy law
2) The secrecy law needs revision
3) Does not support the secrecy law at all
4) Neutral about the secrecy law
5) Opinion is unclear
6) Unrelated to the secrecy law
7) No curator’s tweet found

7. Curators’ opinion in title. [Code 4]
Read the content of the title of a list and categorize it into one of the categories below according to the curator’s opinion about the secrecy law (select single answer).
8. Curators’ opinion in header. [Code 5]
Read the content of the header of a list and categorize it into one of the categories below according to the curator’s opinion about the secrecy law (select single answer).

1) Supports the secrecy law
2) The secrecy law needs revision
3) Does not support the secrecy law at all
4) Neutral about the secrecy law
5) Opinion is unclear
6) Unrelated to the secrecy law
7) No content in title

9. Curators’ opinion in annotations. [Code 6]
See the annotations in the list. Annotations are made as a subheading, change of text size or color in tweets. Are those annotations made to emphasize any opinion for the secrecy law? Categorize it into one of the categories below (select single answer).

1) Supports the secrecy law
2) The secrecy law needs revision
3) Does not support the secrecy law at all
4) Neutral about the secrecy law
5) Opinion is unclear
6) Unrelated to the secrecy law
7) No annotations found

10. Media source
See all tweets in the list and find media sources used as URL links or direct citations.

10-1. Number of media sources. [Code 9]
Count the media sources used in the list. If an identical source appears in multiple tweets, do not count repetition. If there is no source used, count as 0 and skip Question 10-2 and 10-3 (answer in numerals).

10-2. Type of media sources. [Code 10]
Record the first three media sources used in the list, and categorize the media type of each source from the categories below (select single answer for each source).
1) Traditional media source refers to newspapers, television channels, news agencies, magazines, radio channels, and mirror news websites of those sources. 2) Independent
media source refers to independent or online only media sources. 3) Political party media source refers to publication of political parties. (e.g., Shimbun Akahata, Seikyō Shimbun)

1) Traditional media source
2) Independent media source
3) Political party media source

10-3. Uses of media source. [Code 11]

**Categorize how the first three sources are used in the list with regard to the opinion of tweets or list from the categories below** (select single answer for each source).

1) To support the opinion of a tweet or the list
2) To critique the media source
3) To neutrally cite as news
4) Unrelated to the secrecy law

11. Authors of tweets. [Code 16]

See all tweets in the list. Whose tweets are included in the list?

- If all tweets are written by single author, check if the author is the curator or not. If it is the curator, select 1. If not, select 2.

- If tweets are written by multiple authors, check if there are any curator’s tweets. If yes, select 3. If not, select 4.

1) Only curator’s tweets
2) Only single other tweeter’s tweets
3) Multiple tweeters including the curator
4) Multiple tweeters excluding the curator

12. Editing format of the list. [Code 17]

**See all tweets in the list. What kind of format is used to edit a list? Select from the categories below (select single answer).**

- If the list mainly consists of conversation of multiple tweeters, select 1. This is not limited to using mentioning (tweets starting with ‘@’ or ‘.@’).
- If the list mainly (90%) consists of single tweeter’s tweet, select 2. However, if it summarizes an event or record transcripts of TV/radio/online broadcasting, select 3 or 4 respectively.
- Summarizing an event (3) refers to a list consists of tweets on public demonstration, symposiums or events. Tweeters of the tweets should directly observe those events.
- TV/radio/online broadcasting show transcript (4) refers to tweets that tweeters record transcript via watching or listening to any media.
- If the list does not fall into any categories above, select 5.

1) Recording a conversation
2) Editing an article by single author
3) Summarizing an event
4) TV/radio/online broadcasting show transcript
5) Editing a story with multiple author’s tweets on one topic

13. Comment section

13-1. Existence of comment section. [Code 12]
Find a comment section below tweets in a list. If it is available, select 1 and go to Question 13-2. If it is not available, select 2 and go to Question 14 (select single answer).

1) Yes
2) No

13-2. Opinion of 10 comments. [Code 13]
Categorize the first 10 comments each into categories below according to the opinion towards the secrecy law (select single answer).

1) Supports the secrecy law
2) The secrecy law needs revision
3) Does not support the secrecy law at all
4) Neutral about the secrecy law
5) Opinion is unclear
6) Unrelated to the secrecy law

14. Curator’s account name. [Code 18]
Find the curator’s account name and a descriptive profile in the profile frame. If a profile is not set on the Togetter site, check the curator’s profile in Twitter. Find how he/she calls him/herself, and categorize it into perceived real name or pseudonym. Perceived real name should consist of first name and last name (select single answer).

1) Perceived real name
2) Pseudonym

15. Curator’s occupation or profession. [Code 19]
See the curator’s descriptive profile in the profile frame. If a profile is not set on the Togetter site, check the curator’s profile in Twitter. If any occupation or profession (see examples below) is mentioned, select 1. If not, select 2.
e.g. lawyer, politician, bureaucrat, journalist, law professor, activist.

1) Yes
2) No

16. Number of followers and following. [Code 21] [Code 20]
Check the curator’s profile in Twitter site. Find number of those who the curator is ‘following’ and those who are ‘followers’ of the curator.

16-1. Record the number of ‘following’ (answer in numerals).

16-2. Record the number of ‘followers’ (answer in numerals).

End of the questionnaire.
Figure 1.

Features of a Together List

- User-generated tags
- Title
- Header
- Favorites
- Views
- Curator’s Profile
- Sub header annotated by the curator
- Comments
Criteria for the categorization of opinions for the secrecy law

1) Supports the secrecy law
   If the content of a message (tweet, comment, title and so on) clearly support the need of the law or the passing of the law, it falls into this category. It should not mention about the need of revision of the law. It sometimes mentions that this kind of law was much needed for long or should taken for granted. It sometimes involves criticizing other opinions, specifically those who are strongly opposed to the secrecy law.

   “You shouldn’t mind the law if you have nothing ashamed of.”
   “I wonder if people who are opposed to the bill could take responsibility if China invaded the island.”

2) The secrecy law needs revision.
   If the content of a message shows any concerns for the law and claim the need for future revision, it falls into this category. Even if he/she agrees with the fundamental need of the law, it should show opposition to the passing of the secrecy law at the Japanese Diet in December 2013. Concerns for ambiguity of what is secret in the law or limited time of discussion are often evident.

   “I agree with legislating secrecy bills, but I have a concern for legislating the bill as it is presented.”
   “I hope the problems of the bill will be amended by further understanding of the bill.”

3) Does not support the secrecy at all.
   If the content of a message show strong opposition to the law and often claims that the law should be abolished, it falls into this category. It often concerns that this law leads the country back to the time before the WWII when the right to know was limited. He/she often suggests that it is rather needed to expand the Administrative Information Disclosure Law.

   “I think it's an evil law.”
   “The bill should be abolished.”
   “When you noticed it, it’s too late. The WWII started like this.”
   “The right to know is still limited even now.”

4) Neutral about the secrecy law.
   If the content of a message is neutral, it falls into this category.

5) Opinion is unclear.
   Although the content of a message refers to the secrecy law, if the opinion is not clear, it falls into this category.

6) Unrelated to the secrecy law.
   Content of a message does not relate to the secrecy law, it falls into this category.
トゥギャッターリスト分析のためのコードブック

トゥギャッター（Togetter.com）の「まとめ」の分析を行います。分析する「まとめ」は、ハードコピーあるいはPDFファイルで用意されます。「まとめ」には、それぞれ固有の番号が付記されています。下記の設問の答えを、その固有の番号で始まる列に順に記入してください。

トゥギャッターの「まとめ」は、ツイッター上からピックアップされたツイートで構成されています。トゥギャッターサイトのメインのフレームには、「まとめ」のタイトルと見出しの下に、ツイートのリストが表示されています。また、その下には、コメント欄があります。ツイートは、ツイッターのタイムラインと同様に縦に羅列されています。右側のフレームには、まとめた人（キュレーター）のプロフィールが、アイコンと@から始まるアカウント名と紹介文で表示されています。（7ページの図を参照。）。
特に指示のない限り、すべての質問に答えてください。

1. 分析した日付。
   トゥギャッターの「まとめ」を分析した日付を、（月／日／年）で記入してください。

2. 「まとめ」内のツイート総数。 [コード1]
   ツイートの総数を数え、数字で記入してください。

3. お気に入りの登録数。[コード14]
   「お気に入り登録」の下に表示されている登録数を、数字で記入してください。

4. 閲覧数。[コード15]
   まとめた人アカウント名の右に表示されている閲覧数（View）を数字で記入してください。

5. 各ツイートの分析
   - ツイートの総数が 50 以下の場合には、すべてのツイートについて、5-1 から 5-3までの設問に回答してください。
   - ツイートの総数が 51 以上の場合には、総数(T)から 25 を引き、さらにそれを 25で割った数(N)を求めます。 \( N = (T-25)/25 \)
Nが1未満の場合は、切り上げて1とし、Nが1以上の場合は、小数点以下を切り捨ててください。そして、初めから25番目までのすべてのツイートと、それ以降のN番目のツイートを、最大50個のツイートになるまで、5-1から5-3までの設問に回答してください。

5-1. ツイート内のハッシュタグ。[コード7]
ツイート内にハッシュタグ（#で始まるキーワード）はありますか？あれば1と記入し、あわせて使われているキーワードを記入してください。

1) あり (キーワードを記録)
2) なし

5-2. ツイート内のメンション。[コード8]
ツイートには、他のアカウントに呼びかけたメンションがありますか？メンションは、「@アカウント名」で始まるツイートか、ツイート内に「@アカウント名」があります。ただし、そのアカウント名が、ツイートの発信者と同じ場合は、メンションとは考えてません。

1) あり
2) なし

5-3. 特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見。[コード2]
ツイートの内容を読み、特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見を下記の6つからもっとも当てはまる一つのみを選んで記入してください。ツイートの内容が、ツイートの発信者のものではなく、他の情報源の引用であった場合も、その内容を意見と考え、判断してください。
詳しい判断基準については、7ページを参照。

1) 特定秘密保護法（案）に賛成
2) 特定秘密保護法（案）に修正が必要
3) 特定秘密保護法（案）に反対
4) 特定秘密保護法（案）について中立である
5) 特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見が不明
6) 特定秘密保護法（案）とは関係のないツイート

6. 「まとめ」をまとめた人の意見。[コード3]
「まとめ」内の、まとめた人（キュレーター）本人のツイートをすべて読み、特定秘密保護法（案）について、まとめた人の意見にもっとも近いと思われる回答を以下の7つから、一つのみ選んで記入してください。
詳しい判断基準については、7ページを参照。

1) 特定秘密保護法（案）に賛成
2) 特定秘密保護法（案）に修正が必要
3) 特定秘密保護法（案）に反対
4) 特定秘密保護法（案）について中立である
5) 特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見が不明
6) 特定秘密保護法（案）とは関係のないツイート
7) 「まとめ」内に、まとめた人のツイートがない

7. タイトルに見られる、まとめた人の意見。[コード4]
「まとめ」のタイトルを読み、特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見を下記の7つから、もっとも当てはまる一つを選び記入してください。

1) 特定秘密保護法（案）に賛成
2) 特定秘密保護法（案）に修正が必要
3) 特定秘密保護法（案）に反対
4) 特定秘密保護法（案）について中立である
5) 特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見が不明
6) 特定秘密保護法（案）とは関係のないタイトル
7) タイトルがない

8. 見出しに見られる、まとめた人の意見。[コード5]
「まとめ」のタイトルの下にある見出しの内容を読み、特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見を下記の7つから、もっとも当てはまる一つを選び記入してください。

1) 特定秘密保護法（案）に賛成
2) 特定秘密保護法（案）に修正が必要
3) 特定秘密保護法（案）に反対
4) 特定秘密保護法（案）について中立である
5) 特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見が不明
6) 特定秘密保護法（案）とは関係のない見出し
7) 見出しがない

9. 注釈に見られる、まとめた人の意見。[コード6]
「まとめ」のツイートに施された注釈に注目してください。注釈は、ツイートの間に小見出しや画像を追加したり、ツイート内の文字色や文字の大きさを変更して、まとめた人が行います。その注釈（編集）には、特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見が反映されていますか？下記の7つの中から、もっとも当てはまる一つのみを記入してください。

1) 特定秘密保護法（案）に賛成
2) 特定秘密保護法（案）に修正が必要
3) 特定秘密保護法（案）に反対
4) 特定秘密保護法（案）について中立である
5) 特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見が不明
6) 特定秘密保護法（案）とは関係のない注釈
7) 注釈（編集）はない

10. メディア記事の引用。
「まとめ」内のツイートにある、リンクの貼付けや直接引用による、メディア記事（画像や映像を含む）の引用をすべて見つけてください。

10-1. メディア記事引用の総数。 [コード 9]
メディア記事の引用の総数を数えてください。同じ記事の引用は、まとめて一つに数えます。ひとつもメディア記事の引用がなければ、10-2 と 10-3 の設問はスキップしてください。

10-2. メディアの種類。 [コード 10]
まとめ内に引用されている3番目までの記事のメディアの名前を記録紙、メディアの種類を下記の3つの中から、もっとも当てはまる一つを選び記入してください。

1) 新聞、テレビ、通信社、雑誌、ラジオ、またその情報源を表示してウェブ上で配信されている、従来のマスメディア記事。
2) 1)に属さない、独立系またはオンライン限定メディア。
3) 政党機関紙メディア （赤旗、聖教新聞など）

10-3. メディア記事の使用方法。[Code 11]
10-2 の3つの記事が、特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見を述べる上で、ツイート内でどのように使用されているか、下記の4つのうちで、もっとも当てはまるものをひとつ選んでください。

1) 特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見をサポートする材料として引用
2) 特定秘密保護法（案）に関連するメディア記事を批判するために引用
3) 特定秘密保護法（案）に関連するニュースとして中立に引用
4) 特定秘密保護法（案）とは関係ない記事

11. ツイートの発信者。 [コード 16]
まとめ内のツイートの発信者を見てください。
-すべてのツイートがひとりの発信者（アカウント）によって書かれている場合は、そのアカウントがまとめた人本人であれば1を、そうでなければ2を選んでください。
-ツイートが複数の発信者（アカウント）によって書かれている場合は、その中にまとめた人のツイートがあれば3を、そうでなければ4を選んでください。

1) まとめた人のツイートのみ
2) まとめた人以外の、ひとりのアカウントのツイートのみ
3) まとめた人を含む、複数のアカウントのツイート
4) まとめた人を含まない、複数のアカウントのツイート

12. まとめの編集方針。[コード17]
まとめ内のすべてのツイートを見て、どんな編集方針でツイートがピックアップされているか、下記の5つからもっとも当てはまる一つを選んでください。

- まとめが、主にアカウント相互の会話で構成されている場合は、1を選んでください。メンション（＠で始まるか＠を含むツイート）を含まなくても、明らかに会話と判断できる場合を含みます。
- まとめの90%以上が、ひとりのアカウントのツイートで構成されている場合は、2を選んでください。ただし、その内容が出来事の記録（3）であったり、テレビ／ラジオ／オンライン放送の採録である（4）場合は、除きます。
- まとめが、デモンストレーションやシンポジウムやイベントなどの出来事をその場でツイートしたものによって主に構成されている場合は、3を選んでください。
- テレビ／ラジオ／オンライン放送を採録したツイートで主に構成されている場合は、4を選んでください。
- 上記の4つのどれにも当てはまらなければ、5を選んでください。

1) 会話の記録
2) 単独のアカウントのまとめ
3) 出来事の記録
4) テレビ／ラジオ／オンライン放送の採録
5) あるトピックについての複数アカウントのまとめ

13. コメント欄

13-1. コメント欄の有無。[コード12]
ツイートのまとめの下のコメント欄を探してください。コメント欄が存在すれば1を選び、13-2に進んでください。なければ、2を選び、設問14に進んでください。

1) あり
2) なし
13-2. 最初の 10 のコメントの意見。[コード 13]
最初から最大で 10 個のコメントの、特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見について、もっとも当てはまる一つを記入してください。

1) 特定秘密保護法（案）に賛成
2) 特定秘密保護法（案）に修正が必要
3) 特定秘密保護法（案）に反対
4) 特定秘密保護法（案）について中立である
5) 特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見が不明
6) 特定秘密保護法（案）とは関係のないコメント

14. まとめた人のアカウント名。[コード 18]
右側のフレームにある、まとめた人のアカウント名と紹介文を読んでください。紹介文がトゥギャッターのサイトになければ、まとめた人のツイッターサイトにある紹介文を参照してください。まとめた人が本名と思われる名前を表示していれば 1 を、そうでなければ 2 を選んでください。本名は、姓と名で構成されている場合に限ります。

1) 本名表示
2) 仮名表示

15. まとめた人の職業。[コード 19]
上の 14 の設問で見た紹介文で、まとめた人の職業や経歴が分かれれば 1 を、そうでなければ 2 を選んでください。（例：弁護士、政治家、役人、ジャーナリスト、大学教授、活動家など）

1) 表示あり
2) 表示なし

16. フォロワーとフォロー数。[コード 21] [コード 20]
まとめた人のツイッター上におけるプロフィールを参照し、フォロワー数とフォロー数を記入してください。

16-1. アカウントをフォローしている、フォロワーの数
16-2. アカウントがフォローしている、フォローの数 以上。
トゥギャッターリスト主要構成
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コメント
特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見の判断基準

1) 特定秘密保護法（案）に賛成
ツイート、コメント、タイトルや見出しの内容が、明白に特定秘密保護法（案）を支持していると考えられる場合が該当。法案の改善修正が必要と表明されている場合は、含まない。「以前から必要だった」と「このような法案は当然のもの」といった表現をされたり、法案反対派にたいする批判の形で賛成が表明されることもある。

例 「後ろめたいことがなければ、秘密保護法案に反対する理由がないはず」「秘密保護法案に反対する人は、中国が攻めてきたら責任とってくれるのかな」

2) 特定秘密保護法（案）は改善修正が必要
内容が、特定秘密保護法（案）への懸念を含んでいたり、修正の必要について触れている場合が該当。法案の必要性には原則的に賛成していても、2013年との国会での法案通過には、その懸念から反対の姿勢を示す。「何か秘密に指定されるか曖昧」なことへの懸念や、限られた期間での議論への懸念がよく表明される。

例 「秘密保護法そのものには賛成だけど、現案のまま成立させるのは反対」「秘密保護法の問題点が、もっと理解されて修正されればいいのに」

3) 特定秘密保護法（案）に反対
特定秘密保護法（案）に明確に反対していたり、廃案すべきと表明している場合が該当。日本がこの法律により、国民の知る権利が制限されて第二次世界大戦前や戦中のような状況に戻るのではないかという懸念や、むしろ情報公開法の拡充が必要だという意見があわせてよく表明される。

例 「秘密保護法は稀代の悪法だ」「秘密保護法は廃案」「特定秘密保護法が成立してしまって、あって気づいた時には遅い。第二次大戦もこんな風に始まった」「国民の知る権利が今でも制限されているのに、秘密保護どころではない」

4) 特定秘密保護法（案）について中立
特定秘密保護法（案）に、明確に中立の立場を表明している場合が該当。

5) 特定秘密保護法（案）についての意見が不明
特定秘密保護法（案）について触れていも、その意見が上記の4つに明確に当てはまらないときは、不明に該当する。

6) 特定秘密保護法（案）とは関係ない内容
特定秘密保護法（案）についてのツイート、タイトル、見出しやコメントであると明確に判断できない場合が該当する。
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