Cultural operators on the internet and the practices that contribute to their diversity

Pɪʟᴀʀ Tᴏʀʀᴇ Vɪʟʟᴀᴠᴇʀᴅᴇ

Assessora tècnica Technical advisor at the Secretary of State for Culture

pilar.torre@mecd.es
ORCID Code: orcid.org/0000-0002-2886-6135

Abstract

Digital technologies and Web 2.0 have shaken the foundations of artistic creation and of the dissemination of cultural content. From the point of view of cultural diversity, several of their characteristics potentially represent huge advantages and could further democratise culture: flexibility, deterritorialisation, the reduction in entry costs, the possibility for users to participate in creative processes, etc. But we must be aware of the dangers, the first being that the internet operates according to market logics that are difficult to avoid. Difficulties in access are another example, resulting from digital, cultural and knowledge divides.

In this context, the role of cultural operators necessarily changes. Just as new art forms have emerged in connection with technology (creative industries), new actors also appear and perform functions that were unnecessary in the past and that are very directly related to the defence of cultural diversity (e.g. curators). Whatever the activity or discipline operators work in, it is unthinkable for them to be removed from the digital world and the tools it offers, and which, moreover, the public demands.

Keywords
Creative industries, mediator, digital, curation, algorithm.

Resumen

Las tecnologías digitales y la web 2.0 han sacudido los cimientos de la creación artística y de la difusión de contenidos culturales. Desde el punto de vista de la diversidad cultural, varias de sus características representan enormes ventajas potenciales y podrían implicar una mayor democratización de la cultura: su gran flexibilidad, desterritorialización, caída de los costes de entrada, la posibilidad de que los usuarios participen en los procesos creativos, etc. Pero hay que estar atentos a los peligros, siendo el primero de ellos que Internet funciona bajo lógicas comerciales difíciles de sortear; por citar solo uno más, las dificultades de acceso derivadas de las brechas digital, cultural y de conocimiento.

En este contexto, el papel de los agentes culturales se modifica necesariamente. Al igual que han surgido nuevas artes al hilo de la tecnología (industrias creativas), aparecen nuevas figuras que realizan funciones que en el pasado no eran necesarias y que se relacionan de forma muy directa con la defensa de la diversidad cultural (como los curadores). Sea cual sea la actividad o disciplina para la que trabaje el agente, es impensable que lo haga al margen del mundo digital y las herramientas que ofrece, y que el público demanda.

Palabras clave
Industrias creativas, mediador, digital, curaduría, algoritmo.

McLuhan: the medium is the message
M. Castells: the network is the message
Aaron Koblin: the interface is the message

Introduction

Neither prophets nor visionaries nor the most active imaginations were capable of predicting what the digital revolution would look like. In *Blade Runner* (1982), the precursor to cyberpunk set in the future, cars fly and robots are like perfected humans; but when they need to make a phone call, they land and look for a booth.

Today, reality seems to surpass that fiction thanks to the development of digital technologies. While they appeared in the second half of the 20th century, it's in the 21st century that the use of the internet and new information and communication technologies has become a mass phenomenon, with an extraordinary upsurge in the last decade. Although now it may be difficult to remember because it seems like they have always been around, Apple's iPhone was launched in 2007, Facebook

Quaderns del CAC 43, vol. XX - July 2017   (55-62)

55

was created in 2004 (and floated on the stock market in 2012), YouTube was founded in 2005 and Twitter in 2013. The oldest has barely been around for more than ten years.

Nicholas Negroponte, the great predictor of technological changes and founder of the MIT Media Lab in Massachusetts, said in 1980: "Computing is not about computing any more. It's about life",[1] and at the time elicited many ironic comments. It's undoubtedly true, but there's also room for other approaches: "Society is a multifaceted whole that cannot be reduced to technological reason" (Kiyindou 2014, 142).

The before and after of culture with internet

Something that invades all aspects of citizens' lives could not exclude culture, which has also undergone some unprecedented transformations. The internet is not only a technology; it's a medium that has changed and is changing our societies, introducing new ways of producing and of relating with others. It therefore has a significant effect on the development of new cultural forms, both in the broad sense as vehicles of identity and for the transmission of society's values and mindsets, and in the stricter sense, focusing on cultural and artistic creation.

Now there's not even room for analysis in analogue/digital terms. A revolution has taken place that has changed creation, reading and writing; it operates according to network logic, with actions that are increasingly hyperlinked and multiplatform, based on multimedia and interactive devices, resulting in a complex but at the same time exciting scenario.

Cultural operators now act in a world where new and old forms of expression coexist with a fully digitally created world, and with a combination of real and virtual elements. Traditional cultural manifestations have also undergone changes in how they are managed and how they communicate and relate with receivers or audiences, as well as in many other aspects that will be discussed below. In view of all of this, we cannot proceed to any analysis without first providing some context.

An essential feature of the changes that have occurred is that digital works are independent from their original format and now any product can be mixed, re-edited, changed or improved. The concept of a closed piece of work has disappeared and, related to this fact, new figures are emerging, such as the so-called "prosumer", a hybrid term combining "producer" and "consumer", because these functions are now not necessarily separate. Remixes have gained in importance. They may appear to be complex or conscious operations but that is not necessarily the case. Copying and pasting, including comments, adding photos, making collages and amusing alterations, etc. now constitute remixes because they transform the initial content and represent some of the most common actions in the "digital conversation". There is debate regarding the boundaries of the transformative appropriation of content and there is no unanimous opinion on their legality. It's also worth mentioning transmedia culture or transmedia storytelling (an expression coined by Henry Jenkins in 2003 to refer to the flow of content

through multiple channels), which "is a particular narrative form that spreads through different systems of signification (verbal, iconic, audiovisual, interactive, etc.) and media (cinema, comics, television, videogames, theatre, etc.)", according to Carlos Scolari's definition (Scolari 2013, 24). By using different media, it multiplies its communicative capacity and presence.

In terms of individual appropriation and interpretation, both remixing and transmedia involve undeniable advantages for cultural diversity and are also highly flexible narrative forms.

The piece of work is also decontextualised and, once it begins to flow online, loses its connection with its origin. Access of a cultural object or good becomes more important than possession and streaming is widespread for audio and video. Copyright issues have become complicated and concepts such as copyleft and Creative Commons licences are gaining ground.

Other relevant phenomena include the fact that geographical borders and references have lost importance and collaborative forms abound, from the so-called "wiki method", an ocean of voices creating something that's constantly changing, to collective production and funding (crowdsourcing and crowdfunding, respectively). In the new creative industries that have emerged in connection with the digital explosion which combine art, culture, trade and technology, the traditional top-down forms of generating and transmitting, from the elite to the consumer, are beginning to be replaced. We now have bottom-up forms and inputs from the margins, digitally based. The back end, which is the platform for creating and organising content, has been democratised and creative tools are now within everyone's reach. The front end, previously occupied by viewers and audiences, has been taken over by the prosumer who interacts and serves as co-author. The value chain of cultural products is shifting, as are the intermediaries, and barriers to entry are falling in many types of art. This presents an "opportunity for increased democratisation, and also the risk of increased commodification by reinforcing digital industry logics" (Frau-Meigs 2014, 158).

All the changes mentioned and many more have been possible thanks to "the Net", or the internet. Already in 2001, Manuel Castells said "The network is the message" (most certainly he was not referring to internet as we understand it now), and he compared the Internet Galaxy with the Gutenberg Galaxy. He also indicated that "volatility, insecurity, inequality and social exclusion go hand in hand with creativity, innovation, productivity and the creation of wealth in these first steps of the internet-based world" (Castells, 2001, 4). Years later, digital artist Aaron Koblin took this quote and adapted it to the new times: "The interface is the message"; "19th-century culture was defined by the novel, 20th-century culture by the cinema, and the culture of the 21st century will be defined by the interface".[2]

Manuel Castells writes that "Networks became the most efficient organizational forms as a result of three major features of networks that benefitted from the new technological environment: flexibility, scalability and survivability" (Castells 2004, 5). For Steven Johnson, their main characteristic is

that they form connections between peers or equals, and they constitute the true "native" social architecture of the online world (Johnson 2013, 73), in the same way that hierarchical structures are the dominant social architecture in the world of institutions, religion or business.

Information has multiplied and, thanks to portable devices, we're attentive and available at all times, and we demand that content also be available, at anytime and anywhere. Daniel Innerarity, at the opening ceremony of the 5th Ibero-American Culture Congress, *Digital Culture, Networked culture*[3], provided a shrewd and critical perspective on the phenomenon. Among other observations, he noted that mass communication informs without guiding, that the excess of information makes having a view of the whole increasingly difficult, and that the accumulation of information creates submissive users. He also said that, in the digital world, creativity is not about adding up data, which machines do, but rather their meaningful organisation. He pointed to the management of information as essential and, going a little further, its deletion, praising the use of the digital bin. *S'informer fatigue* was how Ignacio Ramonet titled his 1993 article.[4] These are issues worth reflecting on.

We connected and can find any information on the internet. Web 2.0 has changed the serendipity of Web 1.0, where searches were active and users moved on their own initiative from one place on the internet to another, through algorithmic intermediation. With Web 2.0, consumers' tastes are determined through prior behaviour, creating profiles and adding search engines that favour the most cited web pages or operate according to commercial logic. Big data is used to develop profiles, which can be good, but this is also combined with more questionable elements such as the use of personal data and control of private information, as well as being exploited as an opaque marketing tool. Users have access to all these conveniences without knowing very well in whose hands they are or how they work, because they're not transparent.

Cultural diversity in the digital context

The concept of cultural diversity emerged in the 1980s within a context of the early stages of globalisation and as a response by the cultural sector to trade policies led exclusively by commercial considerations. The UNESCO *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (2005) defines the dual nature of cultural goods and services: their economic nature, on the one hand, and their nature as products of the spirit and bearers of symbolic value, on the other. Under this Convention, states are entitled to regulate and support their own cultural creation and a principle of cooperation is established between the most and least developed countries so the latter can improve the circulation of their cultural products.

Although this Convention is quite recent, it did not take the digital phenomenon into account at the time it was drafted. In the last two years, a huge effort has been made to integrate it, preceded by a reflection on the status quo. The first conclusion

was that cultural policies in general are very much anchored in the analogue model of creation, and that considering the internet is a place for creation, access and social participation, the freedom of expression, the right to privacy and human rights must be promoted.

Official UNESCO documents also highlight that the impact of the digital world cuts across the entire value chain, in turn influencing systems for governing culture. They also point to the North-South technological gap, which could destabilise the flow of cultural goods and services, as indicated earlier. Lastly, they claim that major platforms entail a certain threat and present a challenge to integrating culture within a sustainable development framework.

The digital world also presents economic problems in terms of products that affect cultural diversity and other management-related aspects. Françoise Benhamou identifies five key issues regarding the conservation, the characterisation of property (a product is similar to a service and it's a non-rival good), the limits of creators' rights (mechanisms for establishing payment have become more complex), the transformation of the value chain and the production of metadata (Benhamou 2014, 113).

There has also been a lot of talk about the digital divide, a concept often referred to as the cultural or knowledge divide (Alain Kiyindou); in other words, highlighting differences in culture and education. According to Kiyindou, the concept of the digital divide involves taking for granted "appropriation skills shared by all and focuses on the obstacles faced by certain individuals to turn technological opportunities into concrete practical advantages" (Kiyindou 2014, 142).

The internet has been described as a free and happy world with access to everything, where people socialise, share their opinions, visit museums and participate in cultural production, but not everyone has the same access. This was already reflected in the 2005 Convention:

> "The processes of globalization […] afford unprecedented conditions for enhanced interaction between cultures, they also represent a challenge for cultural diversity, namely in view of risks of imbalances between rich and poor countries."

And as Castells claims:

> "The differentiation between internet-haves and have-nots adds a fundamental divide to existing sources of inequality and social exclusion in a complex interaction that appears to increase the gap between the promise of the Information Age and its bleak reality for many people around the world" (Castells 2001, 247).

Karl Benedict Frey, expert in the so-called fourth industrial revolution, which goes beyond the digital to focus on nanotechnology and robotics, has ventured[5] to talk about employment of the future when robots are fully developed. One of the few areas (specifically, three) where humans would be irreplaceable is creativity.

It's clear that the digital world offers great opportunities for creativity and sociability, and that it's an instrument for

democratising the tools of production and distribution. It has also generated previously unknown ways of participating and there are better instruments for facilitating personal and social inclusion and development, replacing the old role of the passive subject with a more active one. But it also presents a certain threat if the digital and cultural divides are not kept in check, and it could potentially cut off local creators in the absence of policies to increase their visibility and protection. The development of a more critical society could be promoted, one that experiences culture as an identity-building element, taking all variables into consideration and establishing policies and actions designed specifically for this end. The disappearance of location as an "admission" factor could also be taken advantage of, although two new conditions arise: access to technology and the skills to use it; once again, the digital and cultural divides.

Coexisting with cultural institutions, a virtual world has been created and informal manifestations have gained in importance. The barriers to accessing the world of culture, be it music, literature or cinema, have to some extent been lifted. These processes are extremely interesting because they allow for active participation and a direct relationship between producer or creator and consumer, but they're not risk-free. There's an international battle over content that is altering maps of exchange and phenomena are coinciding such as increased homogeneity and increased heterogeneity, both of which are essential for the study of cultural diversity.

Véronique Guèvremont, in "Réflexion préliminaire sur la mise en oeuvre de la Convention sur la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles à l'ère numérique", describes the characteristics of this new order, which should be understood within the framework of cultural diversity:

- Increase and diversification of the cultural supply, with greater storage and access possibilities from anywhere and independently of where the content is generated.
- Transfer of the power of prescribers to the public, which no longer depends on traditional prescribers but freely accesses content. They transform from receivers/consumers into critics, promoters and even prescribers, and they also participate in creation.
- Changes to the structure of value chains due to the possibility of self-production and self-distribution. Certain intermediaries become less powerful and new actors appear, such as content aggregators, search engines, browsers, exploitation systems, etc.
- Accentuation of the power of the "major players": the cultural supply constantly evolves and, in theory, this benefits everyone but the major players dominate and there is a very high risk of marginal players becoming even more marginal. The quantity of cultural material is huge but, in order to understand it in terms of the protection of cultural diversity and expressions, we have to consider its accessibility and visibility.
- We must avoid deepening the digital divide by investing in infrastructure and averting "the second digital divide" or "digital inequality".

Some sectors argue that the best defence for diversity must come through "free culture"; that is, free access to and use of all content. This is linked to the "hacker ethic", which combines a passion for innovation with the action of freely sharing, a collaborative spirit, and the promotion of free access to information and social equality, without any relation to the negative connotations that have lately accompanied the term "hacker". There are innumerable movements in favour of free culture, even in some governments. In Brazil, for example, the Ministry of Culture, when Juca Ferreira was minister (2015), implemented different public policies supporting free culture. [6] It's not clear which are still in place.

How cultural management and its operators adapt to the internet

Cultural operators have the means to participate in education and in the creation of a critical spirit among citizens accessing culture, with a wide range of instruments, formats and possibilities, although the context is also, as Innerarity says, one of infinite dissemination. Any action geared towards improving how cultural works are made available to citizens already operates in favour of cultural diversity. Although we must also consider, as Jean Musitelli argues, that "the much-praised abundance of the cultural supply does not guarantee the diversity of the expressions that form it" (Musitelli 2014, 308).

Cultural action has evolved from a vertical and unidirectional relationship focused on attracting audiences and based on the concept of dissemination, to a relationship with horizontal components that favours citizen participation and allows for inclusion policies, and which at times becomes a web where information flows in multiple directions. This evolution could certainly help strengthen diversity and it also supports the development of a more critical and aware society through culture.

"Now nobody seems to have a monopoly over public and cultural expression" (Carré 2014, 172). The major challenge today for cultural consumers is to intelligently manage the enormous quantity of information offered to them. This is where prescribers come in who, in their traditional version, included the concept of *auctoritas*; i.e. they were experts whose wisdom was recognised, sometimes people and sometimes media. On the participative social internet, many more actors have come into play, whether specialists or not. The internet, which has the capacity to amplify and multiply any action, has filled up with bloggers and vloggers, youtubers and booktubers; in short, digital influencers who share their opinions with the world and have thousands of followers. The game has changed and, as Frédéric Martel repeatedly says, the cards must be reshuffled and redealt.

On the participative internet, and through the combined phenomena of social media and content aggregators, two central figures have emerged in cultural management: content curators and community managers. The latter are well-known

because they work in all spheres, and with today's obligation to operate 24/7, unceasing service is expected as well as permanent communication. Content curators are not as widespread, emerging because of the need to organise all the information circulating, as well as serving as a counterweight to the recommendation systems already mentioned. Chloé Girard defines curators as experts that add and present their own sources, counteracting the noise generated by the "cold tools" of the internet: automated systems. She compares their work with museum curators: like them, they evaluate, select, buy, conserve and make artistic heritage available. Also like them, the goal is not to conserve everything but to select based on certain criteria, bringing to light the weakest but most fundamental aspects of their field of specialisation. This is where they are most relevant and they contribute to greater cultural diversity, although they must necessarily struggle with the "recommendation economy": quality does not have an intrinsic existence, not in the pre-digital world either, and a source's authority comes from the number of times it is cited (Girard 2014, 95-96). It is, of course, up to internet users whether they take the first results found or explore further through their searchers (once again: *S'informer fatigue*).

In these changing circumstances, the role of cultural operators is constantly redefined. The classic quote stating that they are "carriers of everyday chatter" (Bassand, cited in Martinell 2013) has now altered slightly as, in the 21st century, this chatter comes from a multitude of voices that both address the operator and communicate among themselves. In the analogue world, cultural operators were defined as promoters of the cultural life of a community and "they represent a determining factor for the consolidation of social intervention and a guarantee for the defence of democratic principles. They can exist outside political structures and they change and evolve in accordance with the variables of space/territory-time/evolution-context" (Martinell 2013). Expanding upon the same idea, Martinell adds that this is the "result of a process from the individual to the collective through processes of social organisation and structuring according to the values, traditions and standards of their context". Essentially there have been three kinds of operators: those implementing public policies, private operators and operators related to the third sector. The latter were the last to appear and they did so due to the increase in citizen participation, which has developed its own instruments for cultural management.

Although this definition is now fifteen years old, it's still fundamentally valid while the context it refers to is radically different. The deterritorialisation and disintermediation (which actually means the disappearance of some intermediary professions and the appearance of others more linked to the dissemination of works) that characterise the world of the internet also contribute to the change of function among cultural mediators.

From a theoretical perspective, the role of "digital mediators" could be addressed within the framework of a theory of communication or a sociology of action; i.e. from the point of view of professional practices or of cultural policies. And when related to cultural diversity, they combine a theory of communication (what types of communication on which basis?) with political considerations (what access for which internet users?) (Dufrêne 2014, 209).

There are, of course, cultural operators linked to physical spaces or activities that involve concrete actions in real places. Nevertheless, how they operate is still affected by such changes in society's habits and those of their audience, often referred to now as their "public". In any case, their essential tasks are to create communities, to use social media to encourage loyalty among their public and to try to make their proposals stand out by curating content or creating attractive discourses. Important actions must also be designed on the internet to launch proposals, position content ahead of the algorithms, and ensure the community accepts the proposals. In the English-speaking world, another profession has emerged: the public engagement manager. "Public engagement" is also a recent term that describes the participation of specialists in listening to, understanding and interacting with non-specialists. This is a reflection of the shift towards a more outward way of looking and towards understanding what potential audiences are looking for. Moreover, the internet pervades all society and creates new needs, and it's useful to help relate these needs to culture. As Amber Venz Box said in a talk at the SXSW Conference (2016)[7], influencers establish consumers' tastes. Our relationship with cultural objects has changed in this world of the semantic internet, augmented reality and the Internet of Things, now Web 3.0.

These characteristics require a transformation on the supply side of cultural products because new models of exploitation and dissemination channels are being imposed, and the role of operators is being reconsidered. They come from all sectors, they're increasing their functions and it's now understood that value added must be created for cultural products, facilitating conversations, encouraging activities and generating contexts for the new "liquid creativity". In 2016, for example, Matadero Madrid, a dynamic cultural centre funded by the City Council, made a call for "cultural operators, creators and researchers", saying it "[…] sees artists and/or cultural operators as natural or legal persons that carry out work related to the creation, mediation or production of contemporary artistic discourses."

The important thing is to accept that the scenario has changed and the first challenge is to stand out and make oneself heard in the ocean of content. There are many more tools now than in the past and the goal is to learn how to use them, designing a route on the basis of the resources available and the objectives pursued, and also taking into account that not all technological innovations suit all management models.

In order to reach young audiences, for example, it's important to use their codes, which can be found on social media: over 90 per cent of internet users between 16 and 24 years of age use them and, among students, 98 per cent.[8] One related case is Radio3's efforts to "rejuvenate" its audience or to attract a younger segment: they designed a specific parallel service

that includes Radio3 Extra[9], online, which has special content intended for a different audience, much more in line with current trends, and even with a more dynamic and notably more modern website than the official one, as well as the concerts on *La radio encendida*. Fundación Telefónica, for its part, organises regular activities with young people: one session a month with youtubers, which often becomes a trending topic, another with booktubers, including "digital natives" in other sessions, providing space for their voices and opinions. They have thereby managed to attract very young and very involved people.

Cultural management is very different in heritage centres such as museums, where it's based on significant investment in computerising collections to allow for virtual tours and other uses demanded by society. For these centres, the internet is basically a tool for dissemination; the digital world does not transform the objects.

In 2016, the NMC Horizon Project[10] carried out a study and identified some key trends and advice related to the adoption of technology in museums: as a short-term trend, the concept of "visitors" is broadening and changing through global online connections and museums can benefit by focusing on the participative experiences of visitors, both online and in person. They also propose "gamification", involving users through games, challenges and prizes and, from a more long-term perspective, expanding these activities to the Internet of Things. Better advantage could also be taken of tools such as mobile applications, incorporating augmented reality and facilitating interconnection between users.

And, of course, it's also important to become part of large global networks. Europeana has 54 million works of art, objects, videos and sounds online; Google Arts&Culture, created by the Google Cultural Institute, allows for visits to over 1,200 museums and contains applications to create itineraries that include urban art, landscapes, etc. and provides the possibility to "be your own curator". In a similar way, the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, which offers 210,000 freely accessible digitised works, provides the option to "create your own Rijksstudio". These are examples of how to interact with users and get them involved in projects.

An interesting case of remix culture that serves as a good example of the above, but which stems from official bodies and encourages the social appropriation of heritage, is the contest *GIF IT UP*[11], organised by the DPLA (Digital Public Library of America) in collaboration with Europeana, Trone and Digital INZ. It proposes the creation of gifs using the DPLA's own material (digital video, images and text) which is in the public domain and openly licensed. Three editions have been celebrated so far, with surprising results.

All this combines elements of cultural management 2.0, based on social media, blogs, permanent communication, etc. with cultural management 3.0, which goes a few steps further and includes virtual worlds. In this type of management, operators are expected to generate online activities that are hybrids of the physical and the virtual, that connect and take advantage of networks and that, through a more participative approach, collaborate in the creation of "collective intelligence". Management 3.0 has some considerable assets: the lack of geographical and time limits; the cloud, which provides an unlimited storage capacity as well as the possibility to access any content from any device; augmented reality, which allows access to an invisible reality that exists alongside the real world; and the greater ease with which anything can be produced anywhere.

Today there is trend towards encouraging real participation by users, with efforts to develop open institutions and generate purely digital activities which are "born" on the internet. Other instruments have appeared that complement communication for the creation and attraction of audiences and that, although they come from the more commercial world, can be applied to and valid in the world of culture. These are the new marketing techniques that have been developed alongside the growth of the digital world; specifically, inbound marketing and content marketing. The Content Marketing Institute[12] defines this as "a way of creating and distributing valuable, relevant and consistent content to attract and acquire a clearly defined audience – with the objective of driving profitable customer action." It's complemented by recommendation marketing, which is the traditional word-of-mouth approach.

Here, social media are an extremely useful instrument that allows cultural institutions to interact with users, learn from their comments and, ideally, generate large cultural communities to exchange experiences, with the cultural institution as catalyst. *Cultura inquieta* has over 200,000 followers on Facebook, making it "the artistic and cultural website with the most loyal followers in Spain and one of the most powerful in Europe".[13] Why might this be? Because of many factors but certainly the most important is that they knew how to create a community and listen to and interact with their audiences.

To conclude with some words from Jean Musitelli, who was one of the writers of the 2015 Convention, the digital world has an ambivalent effect on cultural diversity: on the one hand, it offers an unprecedented opportunity to stimulate creation and facilitate the public's access to cultural works, overcoming the obstacles of the physical world; while, on the other hand, the way the digital economy actually works tends to sterilise these positive potentialities and cannibalise cultural content for purely commercial ends. "Either the digital revolution is piloted and guided towards the common good through suitable cultural policies or its benefits will be confiscated in the name of a purely commercial and instrumental logic" (Musitelli 2014, 307).

Notes

1. <https://www.ted.com/talks/nicholas_negroponte_a_30_year_history_of_the_future?language=es> [Consulted on 07/03/2017]
2. <https://www.ted.com/talks/aaron_koblin?language=en> *Visualizing ourselves ... with crowd-sourced data,* Ted Talk, 2011.
3. *La creatividad personal en el entorno digital, los aparatos*

tecnológicos y el exceso informativo <http://www.culturaiberoamerica.org/libro-recopilatorio-del-v-congreso-iberoamericano-de-cultura/> Zaragoza, 2013

4. <https://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/1993/10/RAMONET/45706> [Consulted on 30/05/2017].

5. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hn4iRF5mP54,> *Cuando yo no esté*, chapter 4 (part 1/2) [Consulted on 13/02/2017].

6. <https://www.articaonline.com/2015/07/7-politicas-publicas-de-juca-ferreira-para-la-cultura-libre/>

7. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f6ODPbpYOjs> *Digital marketing in the age of influencers,* SXSW, 2016 [Consulted on 28/02/2017]

8. National Observatory for Telecommunications and the Information Society (Observatorio Nacional de las Telecomunicaciones y la Sociedad de la Información), with data from the National Statistics Institute (INE) 2016.

9. <http://www.rtve.es/radio/radio3/radio-3-extra/>

10. <https://www.nmc.org/publication/nmc-horizon-report-2016-museum-edition/> [Consulted on 08/03/2017]

11. <http://gifitup2016.tumblr.com/> [Consulted on 08/03/2017]

12. <http://contentmarketinginstitute.com/>

13. <http://culturainquieta.com/es/notas-de-prensa-generales/item/464-cultura-inquieta-supera-los-200000-seguidores-en-facebook.html> [Consulted on 08/03/2017}

References

Barenboim, L. *Gestión Cultural 3.0*. Cuadernos del Centro de Estudios en Diseño y Comunicación. Ensayos no. 50. Buenos Aires, 2014.

Benhamou, F. *Économie des oeuvres*. Direction de l'information légale et administrative. Paris 2014. *Diversité culturelle à l'ére du numérique – Glosaire critique*. ISBN 978-2-11-009406-3.

Carré, D. *Innovation*. Direction de l'information légale et administrative, Paris, 2014. *Diversité culturelle à l'ére du numérique – Glosaire critique*. ISBN 978-2-11-009406-3.

Castells, M. *La Galaxia Internet*. Barcelona. Ed. Areté, 2001, 1st ed. ISBN: 978-84-01-34157-4.

Castells, M. (ed.). *La sociedad red: una visión global*. Madrid: Alianza editorial, 2009, 1st reprint. ISBN: 978-84-206-4784-5.

Colomer Vallicrosa, J. "Estrategias de desarrollo de públicos culturales". In: *Manual Atalaya. Apoyo a la gestión cultural*, 2013. <http://atalayagestioncultural.es/capitulo/estrategias-desarrollo-publicos-culturales>

Dufrêne, B. *Mediation(s) du patrimoine*. Direction de l'information légale et administrative, Paris, 2014. *Diversité culturelle à l'ére du numérique – Glosaire critique*. ISBN 978-2-11-009406-3.

Frau-Meigs, D. *Industries créatives*. Direction de l'information légale et administrative, Paris, 2014. *Diversité culturelle à l'ére du numérique – Glosaire critique*. ISBN 978-2-11-009406-3.

Girard, C. *Curation*. Direction de l'information légale et administrative, Paris, 2014. *Diversité culturelle à l'ére du numérique – Glosaire critique*. ISBN 978-2-11-009406-3.

Guèvremont, V. *Réflexion préliminaire sur la mise en oeuvre de la Convention sur la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles à l'ère numérique.* <http://www.diversite-culturelle.qc.ca/fileadmin/documents/pdf/Rapport_sur_la_DEC_et_le_numerique_-_Version_finale_-_francais_.pdf>

Jenkins, H. *Transmedia storytelling*, MIT Technology Review, January 15, 2003. <https://www.technologyreview.com/s/401760/transmedia-storytelling/>

Johnson, S. *Futuro perfecto. Sobre el progreso en la era de las redes*, Madrid, Turner Noema, 2013. ISBN: 978-84-15832-05-8.

Kiyindou, A. *Fracture numérique*. Direction de l'information légale et administrative, Paris, 2014. *Diversité culturelle à l'ére du numérique – Glosaire critique*. ISBN 978-2-11-009406-3.

Martel, F. *Cultura Mainstream. Cómo nacen los fenómenos de masa*. Madrid. Taurus pensamiento, 2011. ISBN 978-84-306-0803-4.

Martinell, A. "Los agentes de la cultura". In: *Manual Atalaya. Apoyo a la gestión cultural*, 2013. <http://atalayagestioncultural.es/capitulo/gestion-cultural/agentes-cultura>

Musitelli, J. *La diversité culturelle et le numérique: un nouveau défi pour l'UNESCO*. Direction de l'information légale et administrative, Paris, 2014. *Diversité culturelle à l'ére du numérique – Glosaire critique*. ISBN 978-2-11-009406-3.

Peña Aznar, J. de la. *¿Sirven para algo las redes sociales en el sector cultural?* Anuario ACE de Cultura Digital 2014. <http://www.accioncultural.es/media/DefaultFiles/flipbook/Anuario2014/AnuarioACE2014.html#p=1>

Scolari, C.A. *Narrativas transmedia. Cuando todos los medios cuentan*. Centro Libros PAPF, S.L.U., 2013. ISBN 978-84-234-1336-2.

61

Quaderns del CAC 43, vol. XX - July 2017

Links

<https://www.articaonline.com>
<www.culturepourtous.ca>
<http://canadacouncil.ca/en/research/research-library/2017/02/the-arts-in-a-digital-world-literature-review>
<http://teknecultura.com/bloc/innovacion-y-profesionalizacion/>

62

Quaderns del CAC 43, vol. XX - July 2017