A Survey of Revenue Models for Current Generation Social Software's Systems

Kevin Chai, Vidyasagar Potdar, and Elizabeth Chang

Digital Ecosystems and Business Intelligence Institute, Curtin Business School, Curtin University of Technology, Perth, Australia
Kevin.Chai@student.curtin.edu.au,
{Vidyasagar.Potdar, Elizabeth.Chang}@cbs.curtin.edu.au

Abstract. In this paper we survey a number of different social software websites and analyze their revenue models. The main revenue models that we analyzed included - advertising, premium memberships, affiliate programs, donations and merchandize sale. The survey will categorize different social software based upon the revenue model being adopted. The main aim of this paper is to highlight the need for studying revenue sharing models which attempt to reward the users in the online community for participating in a particular social software website. A total of 7 revenue sharing websites would be discussed to show the importance of revenue sharing.

1 Introduction

Social software is software that allows people to socially interact with one another. The main idea behind the concept of social software, dates back to 1945, when the idea of people using computers to collaborate with one another was first proposed [1].The development of a computer assisted teaching system, called PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching) in the 1970s gave birth to perhaps the first online community and it offered collaborative tools including discussion forums, e-mail, chat rooms, instant messaging, remote screen sharing and multiplayer games [54].

The term, "*social software*" was first introduced in 1987 by K. Eric Drexler in his paper, "*Hypertext Publishing and the Evolution of Knowledge*". In this paper, social software is referred to as "*filtering hyperlinks based on user voting and evaluation schemes*" in addition to facilitating group collaboration [14]. The term, social software, however did not gain popularity until late 2002, most likely attributed to Clay Shirky who organized the "*Social Software Summit*" in November 2002 [1]. From late 2002 or early 2003 we have seen a sudden interest in the adoption of social software. Social software mainly comprise of communication and interaction tools e.g. instant messaging programs, chat programs, discussion forums, blogs, wikis and collaborative real-time editors. These tools provide the building blocks to develop complex, robust and reliable social software services which include social networking, social bookmarking, video sharing, e-commerce as well as many other specialized services [40, 41].

O. Gervasi and M. Gavrilova (Eds.): ICCSA 2007, LNCS 4707, pp. 724 – 738, 2007.

Although the concepts behind social software stem back from over 60 years ago, it is a term that is taking structure and it has been defined in many ways. [1, 15, 39]. One particular definition of social software states that it is "*software that allows individuals to collaborate, groups to self-organize and communities of individuals to evolve into an emergent structure*" [15]. In simpler words it could be treated as software that helps people to socialize online, form groups and allows for democratic approaches to the generation of online content [37]. Based on this definition, examples of social softwares would include websites such as *Wikipedia* [49] which allows the collective authorship of encyclopedic articles, *MySpace* [30] which provides people with the ability to create their own social networks and network with other people, *YouTube* [56] which lets people manage and share videos and, *eBay* [16] that empowers people to buy and sell goods or services from each other.

Clay Shirky provides a much broader definition and suggests that social software encompasses "*software that supports group interaction"* [17, 39]. Additional tools, not mentioned previously, based on this definition would include e-mail, instant messaging programs and chat programs, which allow for real-time communication (synchronous) between people and groups of people. Examples of these programs would include *Windows Live Messenger* and *Internet Relay Chat* (IRC). Shirky's definition intentionally includes offline community interaction as part of social software. Examples of offline social software would include *MeetUp* [29] and *nTag* [32]. *MeetUp* is a social software website that allows people to organise meetings and then meet in person for discussions. *nTag* provides interactive name badges that fosters social interaction amongst conference attendees through individual profiling, targeted networking by identifying people that share similar interests within the badge wearers proximity and the easy exchange of contact information via the badge.

Based on these definitions we can identify that one of the key characteristics of social software includes people that participate in an online (or offline) community, The question however arises, why are people motivated to use social software and why are they contributing? The answer to this question could be that people are motivated to engage in online interactions and contribute content with the goal of developing new social connections, maintaining existing ones and/or earn good reputation from others in a community [17].

Other than people, another important characteristic of social software is that it can experience *rapid growth* and popularity by allowing its users to create content e.g. *YouTube*, a video sharing portal is renowned as the fastest growing website in Internet history [45]. *YouTube beta* was launched in May 2005 and within a year it was streaming more than 3 million videos and receiving 8,000 user generated videos on a typical day [57]. This kind of active participation by end users in generating the content for a website is referred to as *user generated content* (UGC) and this can include items such as comments, articles, reviews, songs, pictures and videos etc. [44]. Another, popular and highly successful social software that has grown rapidly from UGC is *Wikipedia*, which is a free online encyclopedia that anyone can edit.

What we can understand from these examples is that the success of any social software or social service depends on the contributions made by the two key entities; the *infrastructure provider* and the *content provider*. The infrastructure provider provides the platform for a society to emerge and develop where as the communities in the society provide the content to add richness to the society. However, providing a

strong and robust infrastructure comes at a cost and the infrastructure provider may require sources of revenue to sustain the online community.

Currently social software relies on advertising, membership fees, affiliate programs, donations and selling merchandise, to recover most of their costs and to possibly generate a reasonable amount of profit. While the infrastructure provider generates revenue it would be reasonable to expect that some share of the revenue is passed to the active content providers for their effort. There are very few revenue sharing models currently deployed, and those that are deployed are not very realistic e.g. *VideoEgg's* [47] revenue sharing program is tailored for those content providers who received more than 50,000 unique visitors each month. This appears to be a very high expectation placed upon users; however it is not that the *VideoEgg* would not be making any revenue when it receives slightly less visitors than the prescribed limit. Although there are revenue sharing models in place, they are not really beneficial to the content providers.

The main aims of this paper is to *firstly*, study different revenue models adopted by social softwares and *secondly*, try to highlight the need for the development of realistic "*revenue sharing*" models that provide reasonable amounts of compensation to content providers who are actively involved in contributing to online communities.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces a classification of business models for social software and examines a survey conducted on business models currently employed in social software. Section 3 explores issues in current social software business models. Section 4 concludes the paper with some future research directions.

2 Business Models for Social Software

In this section we review the business models adopted by several key social software. We review nine different categories of social software which include; Bookmarking, Collaboration, Community, E-commerce, Project Management, Text, Video, Wiki. Based on the review we have classified the business models for social software in two different categories which include "*free*" models and "*free and revenue*" based models. The *free model* apply to social software that do not receive revenue and the *free and revenue* based models derive revenue from the following approaches; targeted advertising, membership fees, affiliate programs, donations and selling merchandise. The following sections provide a detailed overview of the two business models.

2.1 Free

Free models refer to social softwares that do not generate any form of revenue. One of the greatest advantages in providing social software for free is that it attracts more people to trial the software compared to software that people have to pay for. If the software is well developed and provides value to users then existing users would likely assist the growth of the social software through word of mouth promotion to other potential users.

del.icio.us [11] is an example of a popular and free social software that was created in 2003 by Joshua Schachter as a hobby to allow an informal way to tag and share bookmarks between friends. *del.icio.us* was acquired by Yahoo! in December of 2005 and has so far decided to maintain this business model, but this does not mean that Yahoo! or other companies that may acquire del.icio.us in the future will not incorporate revenue models into *del.icio.us* [12].

CiteULike [9] is another example of a social software that allows academics to store, share and organize academics papers they are reading. Currently *CiteULike* is hosted by the University of Manchester and is offered as a free service. The creator of *CiteULike*, Richard Cameron states that if CiteULike becomes more popular and if the demand surpasses existing infrastructure capacity then options of funding may need to be incorporated. These options include; academic funding, user donations, licensing the server software and, targeted advertising. Cameron has been empathic to the *CiteULike* user community by requesting their feedback on the possibility of pursuing these options and to identify how users think these options will impact them [10]. It seems that user feedback is a critical component in deciding future directions for social softwares.

Glypho [20] is a free website that allows people to collaborate in writing novels. The *Glypho* novel writing process involves, firstly, for a person to post their ideas for a particular story. People from the *Glypho* community would then provide character and plot ideas. From these ideas, people interested in this story will write their own version of the first chapter. The community will then vote to select the best contribution for the first chapter. This process is then reiterated through subsequent chapters until the novel is completed.

Doostang [13] is a free social networking website that supports an online career community to connect people through both personal relationships and affiliations. It provides an ideal place for people to share job opportunities with one another, identify potential employees for employers and allows people to network with each other. *Doostang* also offers free premium membership accounts to users that have referred 20 new members to join the *Doostang* community.

We now discuss the free and revenue based models.

2.2 Free and Revenue

This business models is adopted by social software to generate revenue. We found five basic revenue models which include; targeted advertising, membership fees, affiliate programs, donations and selling merchandise. A brief explanation of each of these models is provided in Table 1.

It has been seen that revenue generating models are incorporated into social software to help cover costs such as hosting and staffing and to possibly accrue profit. These costs can be passed directly or indirectly on to social software users. Typically, social softwares that employ revenue models also offer products or services for free to help generate quicker growth and repeat usage of the software. A more detailed explanation of each revenue model with examples is explained now.

Table 1. Revenue models

Model	Description
Advertising	Advertisements are displayed to users of the software. The software providers can be paid based upon on amount of times the advertisement is displayed and/or the amount of times the advertisement has been clicked.
Membership	Membership and subscription fees can be imposed on users to access the software. Some social softwares may offer some functionality for free but charge a fee for access to premium functions.
Affiliate Programs	Affiliate partnerships can be established between the infrastructure provider and other parties. Referrals can then made to other party's products and/or services to users of the social software. The infrastructure provider may then receive a commission for the referrals or sales made from these referrals.
Donations	Donations can be received from the community of users or other parties.
Merchandise	Social software branded products can be developed and sold. Products may include items such as t-shirts, hats and coffee mugs.

2.2.1 Advertising

Advertising is a popular form of revenue generation that is used on many websites and social softwares. A possible reason behind the popularity of advertising as a revenue model is due to the fact that costs are not directly imposed on to users. Advertising, however can degrade users' perceived quality of the software and their overall experience if the user interface is cluttered with unsightly advertisements. To help address this issue, websites like *Ning* [31] and *WikiSpaces* [52] provide membership plans that allow users to remove the display of advertisements for their accounts. Other users however may benefit if the advertisements displayed are relevant to their interests.

Google AdSense [21] is one of the most renowned forms of advertising amongst websites as it displays customized advertisements based on the content of a particular webpage. For example, if the content for a particular webpage is about software development then, *Google AdSense* advertisements displayed on that webpage will be related to software development. Advertisers bid for keywords and pay Google each time one of their advertisement links are clicked (this is referred to as pay-per-click advertising) or when specific advertisements are displayed every 1,000 times (referred to as cost per impression). A percentage of this payment is passed on to the owners of the website. This helps create a beneficial partnership between both Google and infrastructure providers which could be considered as the key behind the success of *Google Adsense* program. Alternative advertising providers include *The Yahoo! Publisher Network* [55] which provides pay-per-click advertising and *BlogAds* [4] which adopts a more traditional form of online advertising, in that advertisers will pay for their advertisements to be displayed a certain amount of time on selected websites.

The survey conducted shows that Advertising is the most popular form of revenue generation amongst the surveyed social softwares In this paper, a total of 66 different social softwares were reviewed and 53 of those relied on some form of advertising. This amounts to a total of 80% of social software websites which used advertising as a form of revenue generation. A detailed list of these websites is provided in Appendix A. We outline a few examples here.

YouTube [56] is a website that allows users to store, share and manage their videos. *YouTube* has on average 100 million videos streamed a day, 65,000 new videos uploaded a day and roughly 13 million unique visitors per month [45]. *YouTube* was recently acquired by Google in 2007 and now uses *Google AdSense* advertisements as its form of revenue generation. Although it is expected that Google would acquire a sizeable amount of revenue from their advertisements, it should also be noted that there would be significant infrastructure costs in providing this service free to users. *Friendster* [18] and *LinkedIn* [26] are two other popular social networking websites that use advertisements as a form of revenue generation. *World66* [54] is a travel guide wiki that allows people to contribute and maintain travel related information and also uses advertising as a form of revenue generation.

2.2.2 Membership

The second most popular revenue model is offering fee based membership accounts. Membership fees can be imposed onto users for software usage or the use of exclusive software functions. For example, you may wish to create your own personal wiki at *PBwiki* [34] for free but you also have the option to have your account upgraded which will increase the storage space of your wiki, provide you with the ability to make your wiki private, implement encrypted Secure Socket Layer (SSL) access and other premium functions for a fee.

Some membership websites however do not provide free accounts but may provide free trial accounts to users in which users can trial the software for a number of days before making a decision to apply for a paid account. *ServerSideWiki* [38] and *SocialText* [42] are wiki providers that offer free trial accounts to users. This model is applicable to social software which is believed to be well designed, easy to use and effectively satisfies its target users' needs. In essence, it should also provide additional value when compared to free alternatives to be a successful revenue model to adopt. Some form of user support is generally provided by the infrastructure provider in adopting this revenue model.

The survey conducted shows membership to be the second most popular form of revenue generation. 16 social software websites imposed membership fees on users as a medium for revenue generation, which forms a total of 24% in the total number of social softwares surveyed. A few examples of these websites are outlined here.

CarbonMade [8] is a website that allows people to manage their portfolio or portfolio projects that include items such as photos, drawings and electronic art. *CarbonMade* offers a free account which allows users to manage 5 projects and upload 35 photos. Their professional plan is offered at $12 per month and allows users to manage up to 50 projects, 500 high resolution images and 10 high quality videos.

OurStory [33] is another website that allows people to capture, share and preserve stories about their lives based on a timeline format. *OurStory* offers both free and premium user accounts. Premium accounts provide additional functionality including the ability to create an unlimited amount of private circles in which stories are only visible to selected people, add up to six images and three videos for each story, gain access to using a rich text editor for publishing stories and access to technical support for a cost of $39.95 per year.

2.2.3 Affiliate Programs

Affiliate programs are the third most popular form of revenue generation adopted by the social softwares surveyed. These programs allow webmasters to generate revenue through commissions received from referring visitors to other people's products or services. These referrals are typically tracked through a uniquely generated Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address which contains the affiliate partner's unique ID. Affiliate programs are also advantageous to the referred company as it equips the company with an online sales force to make additional sales which may not have been made through their own marketing means. *Amazon* [2] is an excellent example of a company that offers affiliate partnerships to webmasters to help promote their products ranging from electronics, apparel, computers, books, DVDs and other goods. Google also offers affiliate programs for webmasters to promote new users to Google services. Referral commissions will then be paid out to the referrer once certain referral conditions have been met. For example, if a referred publisher signs up for *Google AdSense* [21] and earns $5 within the first 180 days of being signed up then the refrerrer will be credited with $5. Detailed information on Google's referral commissions can be found at [22].

The survey conducted shows that Affiliate Programs is the third most popular form of revenue generation. A total of 5 social websites used affiliate programs as a medium for revenue generation, which forms a total of 7.5% share in the social software surveyed. A few examples of these websites are outlined here.

Read It Swap It [35] is a website that allows book lovers to exchange books with one another. This website allows users to browse through catalogs of books and individual book webpages are presented with affiliate links to *Amazon* [2]. These links allow users to view *Amazon* reviews on these as well as to gain referral commissions from *Amazon* if users decide to purchase the book from the *Amazon* website.

Lib.rario.us [25] is a social media cataloging website that allows people to catalog and write reviews on books, DVDs, music and games. This website adopts the same strategy as Read It Swap It in linking product review pages back to the *Amazon* [2] website.

It appears that this revenue model is particularly applicable and popular in community review type social software websites that allow users to post reviews on products and services. A referral link can then be added for specific goods or services for each review.

2.2.4 Donations

Donation is another form of revenue generation model adopted a number of social software websites. Donations can be contributed by users or other parties to assist in

covering software costs and future software developments. This revenue model may not work effectively with the membership model as users will be unlikely to offer donations if they are already paying for software usage or the advertising model if advertising is used heavily throughout the software. Accepting user donations may also inflate users' expectations of the infrastructure provider to provide software support and/or continual development of the software.

The survey conducted highlights Donations to be the fourth most popular source of revenue generation. A total of 3 social software websites used donations as a form of revenue generation, which is a total of 4.5% share in the social software websites surveyed. A few examples of these websites are outlined here.

Wikipedia [49] is a website that allows for collaborative authorship of encyclopedic articles and has grown immensely in popularity. It currently hosts 5.3 million articles in approximately 250 languages [51]. It is interesting to note that *Wikipedia* is run entirely from user donations. In 2006, *Wikipedia* received approximately $1.5 million through donations and had outgoings of approximately $800,000 [50].

Butterfly [6] is a free service that allows people to save and categorize webpages by adding notes and tags. These notes and tags can then be shared with with other people. *Buterfly* is not supported financially by any organization and has requested donations from the community to cover hardware and administrative costs. In return for donations, donors will have their names added to a donation list that is displayed on the *Butterfly* website. For every €20 the font size of the donors name will be increased on the donations list webpage. Currently, *Butterfly* has not received any donations [7].

2.2.5 Merchandise

Finally, websites and social softwares can choose to develop and sell social software branded merchandise as a form of revenue generation. *Meetro* [27] is a location-aware Instant Messaging client and a real-time social network that that allows people to but also allows users to see and identify other users who are logged in nearby. As part of providing this service for free, *Meetro* also offers *Meetro* merchandise on their online store which includes items such as T-shirts, cups, hats, bags and buttons [28].

Bibli.ca [3] is a website that allows people to publish and share works including scripts, short stories, academic papers, poems and novels. The creator of *Bibli.ca* plans to publish a book compiled of the community works which is then presumed to be sold. Currently it is unknown whether profits generated from book sales would be distributed to its authors. The survey shows that selling merchandise is the least popular form of revenue generation amongst the social software population surveyed.

2.3 Survey of Different Revenue Models for Social Software Services

A survey was proposed in Section 1 to identify revenue models that are currently adopted by social softwares. A subset of the websites listed on a Web 2.0 website directory [48] was used to identify revenue generating social software websites and

Table 2. Survey of social software websites vs. adopted revenue models

Social Software Type	Advertising	Member-ship	Affiliate Programs	Donations	Merchandise
Bookmarking	8	0	2	1	0
Collaboration	6	1	1	0	0
Community	12	3	0	0	1
E-commerce	2	0	0	0	0
Project Management	1	4	0	0	0
Text	7	2	2	0	0
Video	12	1	0	1	0
Wiki	5	5	0	1	0
Total	**53**	**16**	**5**	**3**	**1**

their adopted revenue models. A total of 66 different websites was surveyed and from the results we can identify that advertising is, by a wide margin, the most popular form of revenue generation and, was adopted by 80% of the survey population. The membership revenue model followed with a 24% of websites. The survey results are displayed in Table 2. Please note that that social software websites have been categorized into social software types to assist in the display of the survey results. A detailed list of surveyed websites can be found in Appendix A.

3 Open Issues in Social Software Business Models

From the previous sections of this paper we identified from a survey of social software websites that the main forms of currently adopted revenue generation models are advertising, membership, affiliate programs, donations and merchandise sale.

It is also identified that a number of highly successful social softwares are web based and the contributions receive from their user community is the key behind their success. A few of these highly successful social software websites were discussed in earlier sections of this paper.

It is has been identified that social softwares can grow at viral speeds through the generation of content by regular repeat users and *word of mouth publicity* from existing satisfied users. User involvement in social software adoption is critical and the success of any social website depends largely on its users.

This raises a very important question - *Are users being rewarded handsomely for their contributions that they make in the online community or are the profits are only kept with the infrastructure providers?* From the survey that was conducted we found that only a small percentage of websites actually incorporated some kind of revenue sharing mechanism (10.6% or 7 out of 66 websites).

The term *revenue sharing* refers to passing on revenue, received from one of the previously mentioned revenue models, to the users that have helped generate that revenue. Some sort of contribution ranking scheme is required to identify how much revenue should be passed on to each contributing user. Implementing a revenue

sharing model can not only attract new users to social softwares but also encourage repeat usage from existing users and increases to the quality of their generated content so they can be ranked more favorably in terms of their contribution.

From the 66 websites that we surveyed we found that only 7 websites offered revenue sharing schemes. These websites include; Vizu, Ning, Broadband Sports, Pooxi, Videoegg, ZippyVideos and Revver. The revenue sharing model of these websites is briefly outlined in the following section. Additional details of these websites can be found in Table 3.

Table 3. List of Revenue Sharing Social Software Websites

Social Software	Social Software Type	Website
Vizu	Collaboration	http://www.vizu.com/
Ning	Community	http://www.ning.com/
Broadband Sports	Video	http://www.broadbandsports.com/
Pooxi	Video	http://www.pooxi.com/
Videoegg	Video	http://www.videoegg.com/
ZippyVideos	Video	http://www.zippyvideos.com/
Revver	Video	http://one.revver.com/

Broadband Sports [5] is a website that allows users to store, manage and share sports related videos. Currently this website generates revenue through Google advertisements and allows its users to earn rewards if they score as one of the top ten users for the week. User scores are calculated based upon the number of videos they upload and the cumulative score each video receives from other users. This clever incentive scheme helps encourage existing users to actively use the software and to produce quality content as this will help encourage them to attract more visitor views and higher video rating scores.

Ning [31] is a website that allows users to create their own online community. Ning adopts a revenue sharing model along with other revenue generating approaches. Firstly, Ning generates revenue from Google advertisements and monthly membership plans that allow users to secure their online community to selected users, use their own domain name, manage advertising within their online community and to increase their allocated storage space. Their revenue sharing model revolves around the advertisement management feature in their membership accounts as it allows users to display their own advertisements in which they can generate revenue from.

Revver [36] is another video sharing website that generates its revenue through advertisements. The advertising revenue received by Revver through video views is split 50% / 50% between Revver and the video creator. Sharers (users that promote other Revver user's videos) can also help advertise Revver videos and will receive 20% of the advertisement revenue. The remaining 80% is then split 50% / 50% between Revver and the video creator. Revver's revenue sharing model appears to be the most appealing revenue sharing model when compared to other revenue sharing websites surveyed in this paper.

The survey also found that the majority of revenue sharing websites were from the video sharing domain e.g. - Broadband Sports, Pooxi, Videoegg, ZippyVideos, Revver. A further investigation of the revenue sharing schemes would reveal important insights into the operations of such schemes.

This new trend of revenue sharing in social software raises another very important question – *what would the existing social software websites do if they wanted to change their revenue model or adopt revenue sharing?* This is a very important question, in particularly for social software websites that currently do not enforce any form of revenue generation e.g. – *CiteULike* [9], *Wikipedia* [49], *del.icio.us* [12]. If these websites begin to generate revenue then should a share of this revenue be shared with their users? Fundamentally, the success of social software is largely dependent on the contributions of their users within their online community.

If, these websites decided to share some of its revenue with its users then we are faced with interesting and challenging research question - *how do we determine user contributions for social softwares that do not currently incorporate a revenue sharing scheme?* This is a question that *YouTube* [56], could be attempting to answer as it has recently moved from a free business model into a revenue generating model (advertising) after being acquired by Google™. These are research questions that need to be addressed by the social software community.

4 Conclusion

In this paper we surveyed 66 different social software websites and analyzed their revenue models. They were selected from 8 different categories, which included; Bookmarking, Collaboration, Community, E-commerce, Project Management, Text, Video and Wiki. It was identified that the main revenue models were; advertising, premium memberships, affiliate programs, donations and merchandise sale. Some issues were then highlighted with the way revenue was distributed back to users which largely contribute to the success of social software websites. A total of 7 revenue sharing websites were discussed to show how some of these websites have rewarded their contributing users. These revenue models however are very simple and further controls may be required to detect and handle fraud. This initial study has opened several new research questions and directions; which would be the best combination of revenue model for certain types of social software, how would a well established free social software website handle the migration to adopting revenue generating models, how can we assess the contributions made by the users if a revenue sharing model is to be incorporated? The survey conducted in this paper was focused on social software listed on a Web 2.0 website directory [48], therefore there may be other websites listed in this directory but were not included because they do not satisfy the adopted definition of social software.

References

1. Allen, C.: Life With Alacrity: Tracing the Evolution of Social Software (2004) (Retrieved April 11, 2007) from http://www.lifewithalacrity.com/2004/10/tracing_the_evo.html
2. Amazon homepage, http://amazon.com/
3. Bibli.ca homepage, http://bibli.ca/

4. BlogAds homepage, http://blogads.com/
5. Broadband Sports homepage, http://broadbandsports.com/
6. Butterfly homepage, http://butterflyproject.nl/
7. Butterfly – Donate (n.d.). (Retrieved April 13, 2007), from http://butterflyproject.nl/about/donate.php
8. CarbonMade homepage, http://www.carbonmade.com/
9. CiteULike homepage, http://citeulike.org/
10. CiteULike: Frequenly Answered Questions (n.d.). (Retrieved April 11, 2007), from http://www.citeulike.org/faq/all.adp
11. Del.icio.us homepage, http://del.icio.us/
12. Del.licio.us: Team (n.d.). (Retrieved April 11, 2007), from http://del.icio.us/help/team
13. Doostang homepage, http://www.doostang.com/
14. Dexler, K.E.: Hyptertext Publishing and the Evolution of Knowledge. In: Proceedings of the 9th Conference on Hypertext and Hypermedia, pp. 87–120 (1987)
15. Dron, J.: Social Software and the Emergence of Control. In: Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies, pp. 904–908 (2006)
16. eBay homepage, http://ebay.com/
17. Farnham, S., Kelly, S.U., Portnoy, W., Schwartz, J.L.K.: Wallop: Designing Social Software for Co-located Social Networks. In: Proceedings of the 37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Track 4 – vol. 4 (2004)
18. Friendster homepage, http://friendster.com/
19. Green, D.T., Pearson, J.M.: Social Software and Cyber Networks: Ties That Bind or Weak Associations within the Political Organization? In: Proceedings of the 38th Annual Hawaii International Conference, pp. 117b–117b (2005)
20. Glypho homepage, http://www.glypho.com/
21. Google AdSense homepage, http://google.com/adsense/
22. Google AdSense Help Center (n.d.) (Retrieved April 11, 2007) from https://www.google.com/adsense/support/bin/static.py?page=common.html
23. History of social software – Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia 2007. (Retrieved April 11, 2007) from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_social_software
24. How much will I earn from referrals? Google AdSense Help Center (n.d.). (Retrieved April 16, 2007) from https://www.google.com/adsense/support/bin/answer.py?answer=25889
25. Lib.rario.us homepage, http://lib.rario.us/
26. LinkedIn homepage, http://linkedin.com/
27. Meetro homepage, http://meetro.com/
28. Meetro HQ Online Store 2007. (Retrieved April 13, 2007) from http://www.cafepress.com/meetro
29. MeetUp homepage, http://meetup.com/
30. MySpace homepage, http://myspace.com/
31. Ning homepage, http://ning.com/
32. nTag homepage, http://ntag.com/
33. OurStory homepage, http://ourstory.com/
34. PBWiki homepage, http://pbwiki.com/
35. Read It Swap It homepage, http://readitswapit.co.uk/
36. Revver Homepage, http://one.revver.com/

37. Rodriguez, M.A., Steinbock, D.J., Watkins, J.H., Gershenson, C., Bollen, J., Grey, V., deGraf, B.: Smartocracy: Social Networks for Collective Decision Making. In: Proceedings of the 40th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, pp. 90–90 (2007)
38. ServerSideWiki homepage - http://serversidewiki.com/
39. Shirky, C.: A Group Is Its Own Worst Enemy (Retrieved March 18, 2007) (2003), from http://www.shirky.com/writings/group_enemy.html
40. Shirky, C.: Ontology is Overrated: Categories, Links, and Tags. (Retrieved April 6, 2007) (2005), from http://shirky.com/writings/ontology_overrated.html
41. Social Software – Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (Retrieved April 11, 2007) (2007), from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_social_software
42. SocialText homepage - http://socialtext.com/
43. The Australian Frequent Flyer – Membership Levels. (Retrieved April 11, 2007) (2007), from http://www.frequentflyer.com.au/cmps_index.php?page=membership
44. The monetisation (revenue model) of user generated content? (Retrieved April 3, 2007) (2006) from http://soapbox.technovated.com/2006/10/12/the-monetisation-revenue-model-of-user-generated-content/
45. Thomas, D., Buch, V.: YouTube Case Study: Widget marketing comes of age - StartUp Review Blog. (Retrieved April 2, 2007) (2007), from http://www.startup-review.com/blog/youtube-case-study-widget-marketing-comes-of-age.php
46. Berners-Lee, T. (Retrieved April 11, 2007) (2007), from http://www.w3.org/People/Berners-Lee/
47. VideoEgg homepage, http://videoegg.com/
48. Web 2.0 Trends: Web 2.0 Directory. (Retrieved April 2, 2007) (2007), from http://web2trends.blogspot.com/search/label/Web%202.0%20Directory/
49. Wikipedia homepage, http://wikipedia.org/
50. Wikipedia Foundation, Inc. Financial Statements. (Retrieved April 12, 2007) (2006) from http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/foundation/2/28/Wikimedia_2006_fs.pdf
51. Wikipedia: Size comparisions – Wikipedia 2007. (Retrieved April 12, 2007) from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Size_comparisons
52. WikiSpace homepage. http://wikispaces.com/
53. Wooley, D.R.: Plato: The Emergence of Online Community. (Retrieved April 11, 2007) (1994) from http://www.thinkofit.com/plato/dwplato.htm
54. World66 Travel Guide homepage http://world66.com/
55. Yahoo! Publisher Network homepage. http://publisher.yahoo.com/
56. YouTube homepage. http://youtube.com/
57. YouTube – Press Release December 2005 (2005) (Retrieved April 11, 2007), from http://youtube.com/press_room_entry?entry=OcN9xXYar1g

Appendix A: Survey of Social Software Websites vs. Adopted Revenue Models

Legend
R1 = Advertising
R2 = Membership
R3 = Affiliate Program
R4 = Donations
R5 = Merchandise
R6 = Revenue Sharing

Social Software	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	URL
Bookmarking							
9rules	X						http://9rules.com/
Blogmarks	X						http://www.blogmarks.net/
BuddyMarks	X						http://www.buddymarks.com/
ButterFly				X			http://www.butterflyproject.nl/
Digg	X						http://www.digg.com/
Lookmarks	X						http://www.lookmarks.com/
Ma.gnolia	X		X				http://ma.gnolia.com/
NewsCloud	X		X				http://www.newscloud.com/
Surf Tail	X						http://www.surftail.com/
Collaboration							
Asoboo			X				http://asoboo.com/
Favorville	X						http://www.favorville.com/
Hubpages	X						http://hubpages.com/
Lime	X						http://www.lime.com/
Rrove	X						http://www.rrove.com/
Standpoint	X						http://www.standpoint.com/
Vizu		X				X	http://www.vizu.com/
Wobblog	X						http://www.wobblog.com/
Community							
Wists	X						http://www.wists.com/
CarbonMade		X					http://www.carbonmade.com/
Homethinking	X	X					http://www.homethinking.com/
Stylehive	X						http://www.stylehive.com/
Consumating	X						http://www.consumating.com/
Friendster	X						http://www.friendster.com/
Ikarma	X						http://www.ikarma.com/
LinkedIn	X						http://www.linkedin.com/
Lovento	X						http://www.lovento.com/
Meetro	X				X		Http://www.meetro.com/
MySpace	X						http://www.myspace.com/
Meetup	X						http://www.meetup.com/
Ning	X	X				X	http://www.ning.com/
E-Commerce							
Ebay	X						http://www.ebay.com/
Esty	X						http://www.esty.com/
Project Managemnent							
Blue Dot Buzz	X						http://bluedot.us/
Basecamp		X					http://www.basecamphq.com/
CentralDesktop		X					http://www.centraldesktop.com/
Near-Time		X					http://www.near-time.net/
Project Spaces		X					http://www.projectspaces.com/
Text							
IloveTravelStories	X						http://ilovetravelstories.com/
LiveJournal	X	X					http://www.livejournal.com/
Reader2	X						http://reader2.com/
Read It Swap It			X				http://www.readitswapit.co.uk/
OurStory	X	X	X				http://www.ourstory.com/

Social Software	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	URL
World66	X						http://www.world66.com/
30daytags	X						http://www.30daytags.com/
TagCloud	X						http://www.tagcloud.com/
Video							
Blinkx	X						http://www.blinkx.com/
Broadband Sports	X					X	http://www.broadbandsports.com/
ClipShack	X						http://www.clipshack.com/
Dailymotion	X						http://www.dailymotion.com/
GetDemocracy		X		X			http://www.getdemocracy.com/
Openvlog	X						http://www.openvlog.com/
Pooxi	X					X	http://www.pooxi.com/
Video Bomb	X						http://www.videobomb.com/
Videoegg	X					X	http://www.videoegg.com/
Bolt	X						http://www.bolt.com/
YouTube	X						http://www.youtube.com/
ZippyVideos	X					X	http://www.zippyvideos.com/
Revver	X					X	http://one.revver.com/
Wiki							
Epic Trip	X						http://www.epictrip.com/
Schtuff	X						http://www.schtuff.com/
PBWiki	X	X					http://pbwiki.com/
Social Text		X					http://www.socialtext.com/
Wikispaces	X	X					http://www.wikispaces.com/
StikiPad	X	X					http://www.stikipad.com/
ServerSideWiki		X					http://www.serversidewiki.com/
Wikipedia				X			http://wikipedia.org/
Total	**53**	**16**	**5**	**3**	**1**	**7**	