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Abstract

Many tertiary students, within New Zealand Aotearoa and other Western countries, regularly engage in binge drinking episodes. These are often subsequently displayed on Facebook in photos. Most of the previous research has not addressed the significant role these photos play within contemporary student drinking cultures. The current thesis aimed to explore how New Zealand university students use photos on Facebook, within their drinking experiences, and how these related to their social relationships and student drinking cultures. A social constructionist framework and key conceptualisations from visual ethnography were employed as the theoretical framework for this study. Nine participants (aged 19; 5 female, 4 male) engaged in individual interviews with a researcher and an internet-enabled laptop. The participants showed the researcher their Facebook photos, and discussed their online practices, drinking and socialising. The interviews were transcribed and a discourse analysis was performed. Three primary discourses were identified. The first discourse, the normal, natural and everyday discourse, reflected the embedded and normalised camera culture and Facebook photo culture within the participants’ socialising and drinking practices. The second, the fun, pleasure and humour discourse, demonstrated the positive, light-hearted environment that the camera, Facebook photos and their subsequent online interactions provided. Participants were able to reconstruct and share their drinking episodes because the photos provided the participants with a visual online drinking story. The viewing and interactions with these photos became a post-night-out ritual that allowed participants to relive and continue the drinking experience after it had ended. The third discourse, acceptability and appropriateness, created a boundary or line that was individually and collectively negotiated and used by the participants to constrain and limit what was shared online. In combination, these discourses allowed the participants to present and participate in a normalised, positive and socially acceptable online student drinking culture. The results add to the growing body of literature around online student drinking cultures, and also extend our knowledge of context collapse, unintended audiences, impression management, identity and friendship. The findings are considered in relation to institutional policy, Facebook privacy, corporate ownership, and health promotion, and directions for future research are suggested.
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Chapter One: Young Adults, Drinking Cultures and Social Networking Sites

New Zealand Aotearoa has a long and prominent drinking history (McEwan, Campbell, & Swain, 2010). It has shifted from social public drinking traditionally confined to men, to now include both young women and men who are actively engaging in this drinking culture (McEwan, et al., 2010). In fact, the latest New Zealand Alcohol and Drug Use survey reported that New Zealanders between 18 and 24 years of age had the highest rates of weekly (or more frequently) consumption of large amounts of alcohol; enough to feel drunk (Ministry of Health, 2009). Moreover, New Zealand university students between 17 and 24 years old have been reported to drink more hazardously than their non-university peers (Kypri, Cronin, & Wright, 2005). The participation of young adults, and particularly university students, in drinking cultures is a common and continuing problem, which has many individual and societal costs. Conversely, what is relatively new within the last decade is the uptake in Social Networking Site (SNS) use within this age bracket, so much so that youth culture is now said to be mediated. Drinking and SNS use will be examined within this chapter and it will become apparent that these two cultures have merged, in that drinking cultures are now prominently displayed in these online SNS environments, particularly on Facebook, seemingly to the point that it has become integrated into contemporary university drinking cultures. To understand contemporary youth drinking cultures is to understand how they work within a mediated SNS environment. It will be argued that despite the rapidly growing amount of research focused on university drinking on Facebook, one aspect that seems to be continually underexplored is photos, which will be the focus of this thesis.

Drinking Cultures

Young adults and university students are engaging in heavy drinking practices to the point it is normalised and integrated into their social lives (Griffin, Bengry-Howell, Hackley, Mistral, & Szmigin, 2009). In order to further explore this student drinking culture, there is a need to understand exactly what it is, and why these students continually drink in this manner despite the negative effects. Research demonstrates many issues influence youth and
student drinking cultures, namely context, socialising, friendship and gender. The rest of this section will briefly summarise the student drinking research and provide some context that may partially help to understand why these students persistently drink hazazzously.

The drinking culture of young people is labelled in many ways including ‘binge drinking’, ‘heavy drinking’, ‘hazardous drinking’, a ‘culture of intoxication’, ‘bounded consumption’, ‘calculated hedonism’ and a ‘controlled loss of control’ (Kolind, 2011; Kypri, Langley, & Stephenson, 2005; Kypri, Langley, McGee, Saunders, & Williams, 2002; McEwan, et al., 2010; Ministry of Health, 2009; Moore, 2010). Within this thesis, the term ‘student drinking cultures’ will be used to encapsulate what is common within most of these definitions. That is, the emphasis is on drinking large quantities of alcohol in a single drinking session, often with the aim of intoxication. That is not to say the intoxication in itself is the only aim. International literature has described that young people and students aim for an ‘ideal’ level of intoxication, or a ‘controlled loss of control’ (calculated hedonism), where consumers can “let go and experience the pleasures of indulgence without attendant in a hedonistic yet bounded drinking style” (Measham & Brain, 2005, p. 274). Maintaining the ideal level of intoxication is, therefore, a self-regulating practice (Banister & Piacentini, 2008; Borloagdan, et al., 2010; Measham, 2004; Measham & Brain, 2005).

The numbers of young adults and students who consume alcohol in these singular heavy drinking occasions or ‘binge’ episodes are substantial. According to the New Zealand Ministry of Health and other academic literature, by definition, one of these sessions counts as four or more standard drinks for women and between five and six or more standard drinks for men, with one standard drink containing ten grams of ethanol (Kypri, Langley, et al., 2005; Kypri, et al., 2009; Kypri, Paschall, Maclennan, & Langley, 2007; Ministry of Health, 2009). Consumption rates for students are consistently very high, with one study reporting 81 percent of students having drunk alcohol in the past month (Kypri, et al., 2009). Another New Zealand study found that 60 percent of male and 58 percent of female students living in university hostel accommodation drank above recommended national guidelines in a single drinking session within the past week (Kypri, Langley, McGee, Saunders, & Williams, 2002). The average weekly consumption was 24.3 and 13.5 standard drinks for men and women respectively (Kypri, et al., 2002). These high rates of drinking come with a range of negative consequences, including physical consequences, such as blacking out, hangovers, unprotected sex, vomiting, physical aggression, emotional
consequences such as outbursts, academic problems, and legal problems, for example, being arrested and drink driving (Kypri, et al., 2009; McGee & Kypri, 2004).

Additionally, 3.9 percent of overall deaths are related to alcohol, and the burden of these deaths is on youth compared to other age groups (Connor, Broad, Rehm, Hoorn, & Jackson, 2005). Despite these reports, young adults, within New Zealand and internationally, have believed their drinking to be unproblematic and just part of their social context for a short period of time, and therefore not holding any long-term risks (Griffin, et al., 2008; Lyons & Willott, 2008; Seaman & Ikegwuonu, 2010). This excessive drinking is a common feature in students’ lives, which contributes to the normalisation of student drinking culture, and thus is seen as socially acceptable (Kypri, Langley, et al., 2005; Lyons & Willott, 2008; McEwan, et al., 2010). It is unsurprising then that alcohol has been the target of several governmental and global strategies to reduce the associated harm with its use (Ministry of Health, 2012; World Health Organisation, 2010).

Although most male and female students participate in this mainstream student drinking culture, it is not necessarily in the same way. In fact, young people’s drinking is highly gendered. Alcohol marketing and media have reinforced the gendered nature of alcohol consumption, as women’s drinking is glamorised in one instance, but then deemed unfeminine and a threat to traditional femininity in another; while young men represent typical pub culture (Atkinson, Elliott, Bellis, & Sumnall, 2011; Hastings, 2009). Losing control while drinking is unfeminine while ‘determined drunkenness’ is part of the masculine identity when drinking (Griffin, et al., 2009). Females struggle to balance these feminine identities while participating in binge drinking. However, Lyons and Willott (2008) report that although New Zealand young women participating in the traditionally masculine practice of binge drinking did utilise traditional feminine discourses, they also actively created new versions of femininity, thereby feminising binge drinking.

While these drinking cultures appear to be normalised and mundane, the negative effects and societal costs have not gone unnoticed by the New Zealand public mainstream media either, with numerous reports of drunken students and associated damages (e.g. Turner, 2012). Despite dangerous consumption rates, negative press, and ill-effects, students within New Zealand and in other Western countries continue to participate in heavy drinking cultures. Therefore it is necessary to understand why they do so. Although there are many factors that influence this drinking, like genetics, developmental stage, positive
expectancies and community (see (Ali & Dwyer, 2010; Borloagdan, et al., 2010; Bremner, Burnett, Nunney, Ravat, & Mistral, 2011; Committee On Substance Abuse, 2001; Logan, Henry, Vaughn, Luk, & King, 2011; McEwan, et al., 2010; Seaman & Ikegwuonu, 2010), that social context and friendship have been shown to be integral and often inseparable from student drinking cultures, as reviewed below.

Heavy drinking, for young adults including students, is almost always done with peers in a social context (Seaman & Ikegwuonu, 2011). Studies from Western countries have shown that drinking is seen by many to be integral to young people’s social lives. It is seen as a source of pleasure, as prosocial, and it increases moods and confidence as it is used as a social lubricant (Atkinson, et al., 2011; Guise & Gill, 2007; Keane, 2009; Leyshon, 2011; Monahan & Lannutti, 2000; Waitt, Jessop, & Gorman-Murray, 2011). Drinking is often viewed as a pleasurable activity, providing confidence and an atmosphere of friendliness (Moore, 2010). For young adults in the United Kingdom (UK), including students, intoxication was the ‘default’ for socialising with their peers, as it promoted group interactions (Seaman & Ikegwuonu, 2010). Young people in Australia have been shown to plan their drunkenness, and often considered alcohol as integral to their social lives and enhancing an event, making drinking a pre-requisite for participation (Borloagdan, et al., 2010). In fact, those who ‘deviated’ from the drinking norm have very limited options as young people who were non-drinkers or light drinkers struggled to construct a ‘legitimate’ social identity within this heavy drinking culture (Borloagdan, et al., 2010). The context of university and student status also supports, normalises and enhances these student drinking cultures. Within New Zealand, living in a hostel, being a first year, and drinking before university are all associated with drinking to intoxication (Kypri, Paschall, Maclennan, & Langley, 2007). Furthermore, students from the UK believed that alcohol was a marker between their serious academic life and their fun social life with their friends (Banister & Piacentini, 2008). In fact, student status or ‘studenthood’ provided support for their drinking culture as they were satisfying society’s expectations (Banister & Piacentini, 2008). This youth, and more specifically student drinking culture, is so normalised and integral, it is often synonymous with most socialising itself.

As well as alcohol being embedded within young adults’ and students’ socialising, alcohol is often embedded in the formation and consolidation of their friendships. The act of drinking and socialising between peers and the subsequent intimacy that is created serves to instigate and reinforce friendships (Banister & Piacentini, 2008; Griffin, et al., 2008; Nayak,
Griffin and colleagues (2009) concluded that “Part of the allure lay in the integral relationship between excessive drinking and ‘fun’ as central to the cohesiveness, intimacy and care provided by young people’s social friendship groups” (p. 19). Even negative drinking experiences were reframed positively when drinking stories were shared amongst friends and “with tales of fun, adventure, bonding, sex, gender transgressions, and relationships.” (Sheehan & Ridge, 2001, p. 347). Drinking stories are retold amongst students as part of the ‘post-night-out’ ritual and focus on the fun had between friends, but they also serve to illustrate capitalising on their student years (Banister & Piacentini, 2008). This fun, camaraderie and pleasure that is associated with the social nature of drinking reinforces student drinking cultures.

All of these influences serve to support the fun aspect that is part of planning, living and reminiscing about the drinking experience between friends. This means that potential and actual harm can be justified as they are outweighed by the continued good times that accumulate due to drinking. Drinking culture is often synonymous with, and integral to, student socialising and student culture within New Zealand and other Western societies. Given how drinking has been integrated into students’ social lives and friendships, these influences need to be included when trying to understand drinking as a contemporary health issue. However in order to fully understand youth culture, and therefore youth drinking culture, we need to examine what else they do in their social worlds. SNS use and more specifically Facebook have also become thoroughly integrated into these students’ lives and it is therefore unsurprising that these two worlds have become intertwined. Drinking cultures are increasingly mediated online through SNS like Facebook.

Social Networking Sites

New technologies have been rapidly assimilated in contemporary society. While this includes an array of gadgets, like cellphones, digital cameras, computers and laptops, the use of SNSs is a particular phenomena that has become increasingly popular (Joinson, 2008). SNSs are used by a diverse number of people of different ages, ethnicities and socio-economic backgrounds who have a variety of interests, resulting in hundreds of millions of users worldwide. The most dominant of all of these SNS is indisputably Facebook. Within New Zealand Aotearoa, the 2011 World Internet Report showed that 64 percent of internet users have SNS accounts, and 96 percent of these people primarily use Facebook (C. Smith,
Gibson, Crothers, Billot, & Bell, 2011). Although the age range of people using SNSs is continually expanding, adolescents and young people have been particularly fast to integrate SNSs and especially Facebook into their everyday lives (Caverlee & Webb, 2008; Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Livingstone & Brake, 2010; Murachver, 2011; Pempek, Yermolayeva, & Calvert, 2009; Tufekci, 2008). American university students have been found to spend an average of up to 30 minutes a day on Facebook, some of whom log in several times daily (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Pempek, Yermolayeva, & Calvert, 2009). Facebook has become dominant in mainstream culture, within New Zealand and internationally, but before we attempt to understand students’ use of SNS and Facebook some context needs to be provided.

Since their conception, hundreds of SNSs have been developed with varying levels of success, with different designs and target markets (boyd & Ellison, 2008). Some SNS are global, whereas others are specific to countries and participation in those networks differs by culture and language (boyd, 2007). SNSs can be considered a ‘catch-all’ term to include a variety of new technologies that are focused on meeting and communicating with others online (Harris, 2008). A widely used definition in the academic literature is:

“web-based services that allow individuals to (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system.” (boyd & Ellison, 2008, p. 211)

Earlier forms of anonymous ‘online’ worlds that were confined to strangers connecting in chatrooms on desktop computers (S. Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008), have shifted to become integrated within our lives. There has also been a shift as many SNSs are now used to connect individuals that already have some form of connection offline (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2006; Subrahmanyam & Greenfield, 2008a; S. Zhao, et al., 2008). The increased availability, affordability and portability of new technologies, such as smart phones and laptops, today mean SNSs are accessible to the masses. The once distinct boundaries of our ‘online’ and ‘offline’ worlds are now blurred, suggesting that SNSs are mundane and highly integrated (Beer, 2008). While there are many SNS connecting users across the world, one clearly dominates, Facebook.
Facebook started in 2004 as an exclusive SNS to connect Harvard students (boyd & Ellison, 2008; Ellison, et al., 2007). It quickly opened up to other university institutions and then high schools, finally becoming public in September 2006 (boyd & Ellison, 2008; Ellison, et al., 2006, 2007; Joinson, 2008). Facebook is currently the most popular SNS with over 901 million active users and 526 million people use it daily (Facebook, 2012c). In other words, Facebook is ‘sticky’ (Hearn, 2008), that is, it is visited frequently by its users. Despite this mainstream use, youth have been at the forefront of this popularity.

The architecture of Facebook is aimed at connecting, and letting people interact with others online as they participate in an array of activity. This consists of an individual profile page, a ‘wall’ where users can do status updates (microblogging) and friends can post messages, videos, or pictures. It also has an ‘information’ section where users can share their birthday, relationship status, political views and so on. Personal profile pages also have a photo and video section where users can upload albums or display pictures that they have been ‘tagged’ in by other users (a tag in the photo creates a hyperlink connecting both users’ profiles). User profiles also have a ‘friends list’ that visibly displays the people or ‘friends’ the user has connected with on Facebook. A ‘friend’ on Facebook is a bidirectional relationship in that it gives access by both users to each other’s pages. However the level of access can be managed through privacy settings. Profiles are connected to a central ‘newsfeed’ which filters all the Facebook activity of the users’ friends to display their Facebook activity. The newsfeed is divided into two sections, where the ‘ticker’ gives an instantaneous report on all their friends’ activities, while the important activity is published in the main feed. It should be noted that Facebook has a continually changing architecture. Within the course of this study, Facebook introduced ‘Timeline’ which has changed users’ profile pages into a timeline format that shows the dates of all their past Facebook activity. Therefore constant attention to the changing face of SNS is necessary because it is likely to impact on how users interact with each other online.

Young adults’ use of SNS

Before issues of gender, privacy, identity, and friendship are discussed, the social aspect of Facebook needs to be understood because, for young people, Facebook appears to have mainly social functions. It is a place where students keep in touch with their friends (Pempek, et al., 2009) and build and maintain social relationships and social capital (Ellison, et al., 2007). Clearly, SNSs have captured the social side of life. Furthermore, it seems to
provide a new place with more freedom for young people than previously online spaces or the physical world have provided. For example, boyd (2007) concluded that MySpace allowed United States (US) adolescents to participate socially without the usual ‘structural and social’ constraints that are imposed on them by society. CyWorld offered Korean adolescents and young adults a place for emotional communication that was not necessarily available in their offline culture (Kim & Yun, 2008).

Despite these new, seemingly positive social freedoms for youth, the sheer amount and type of information being shared on SNS by young people, and the subsequent issues of privacy, have also been consistently an issue within public and academic discourse. International studies have focused on several issues, a few of these being loss of privacy (Albrechtslund, 2008; Barnes, 2006; Livingstone & Brake, 2010), self-promoting content (Mehdizadeh, 2010), inappropriate and negative content (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008; Forest & Wood, 2012), low self-esteem (Forest & Wood, 2012; Mehdizadeh, 2010), and narcissism (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008; Mehdizadeh, 2010; Ong, et al., 2010). Young adults and adolescents have used various strategies to curb this threat, like fake names or limiting the amount of information that is shared online (Kim & Yun, 2008; Tufekci, 2008). However, the privacy settings on Facebook are not necessarily easily navigated, and as Lawler and Molluzzo (2010) suggest, this is because Facebook is a business and personal data is valuable to the marketers. Corporate ownership, as Mejias (2010) suggests, is often disregarded within the research. Conversely, the continually negative focus has created a moral panic over SNS use, particularly focused on youth and females (Albrechtslund, 2008; Harris, 2008; Mallan, 2009; Marwick, 2008). It has also produced a ‘misalignment’ between the actual users’ and broader perceptions of SNSs (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2006). Larsen (2007) argued the non-users’ lack of understanding about young people’s SNS use reinforces the moral panic and negative conclusions. This potential lack of understanding may indicate gaps in the academic literature.

The research has also identified that SNSs appear to be used in a gendered manner. Elm and (2007) discussed hegemonic gender roles, norms and stereotypes that are guided by culture and society expectations of each gender. The authors drew on Goffman (1959, 1990) to explain how gender roles and performance are ‘done’ across different situations and contexts, as certain parts of the self are suppressed or emphasised depending on the audience and feedback the individual gets. A content analysis of 500 Lunarstorm ‘nests’, a Swedish SNS, for users between 15 and 20 years old revealed that
although some interests were similar across genders, such as culture, other interests conformed to hegemonic gender stereotypes, such as relationships for women and sports for men (2007). However, some of the gender stereotypes were challenged. While relationships, for example, were emphasised more heavily on female ‘nests’, they were still ranked number one for both genders, suggesting difference might be more about the lack of a one aspect, rather than a specific preference. Further case studies revealed varying levels of that conformity and challenges to gender stereotypes, for example one female user emphasised friends (traditionally feminine) and cars (traditionally masculine). It was concluded that the various challenges around femininity and masculinity are present in both the online and offline worlds (2007). Like drinking, gender appears to still influence SNS use, however it seems to be transitioning away from traditional hegemonic roles.

Similarly to gender, identity construction and maintenance are also being ‘done’ online as young adults and adolescents construct their identities. Interestingly, this does not appear to be an individual process. For example, Australian and Danish studies that focused on adolescents on MySpace and Arto (Larsen, 2007; Mallan & Giardina, 2009) found SNS activity had also allowed friends to be ‘co-constructors’ of their identities by participating in collective identity work, as friends contributed content that built their online identity. It was a reciprocal process. Mallan and Giardina (2009) suggested that due to the co-creational nature of SNS identities, that identity can be explained as “This is who we understand ‘me’ to be” (para.22, emphasis added).

It is also clear that users’ identities on Facebook actually exist because they relate to the users’ real life (S. Zhao, et al., 2008, p. 1832). It should be noted that this ‘real’ identity may be limited because some aspects of identities potentially would be unacceptable in online environments and restricted because users still have to fit in the social norms of the group (Mallan & Giardina, 2009). As previously discussed, identity (and gender) performance is done on SNSs as users emphasise and suppress parts of their identity according to group norms (e.g. boyd, 2007; Marwick & boyd, 2010; Pearson, 2009; Siibak, 2009a). Larsen (2007) argued that identity construction is not as erratic and disjointed as previous researchers have believed, but they do have a relational and reflexive nature. Lemke (2008) proposed that two forms of identity are built up using several repertoires from past experience, ‘identity-in-practice’ and ‘identity-across-timescale’. They are simply split for analytical convenience but they are still deeply interconnected. Identity-in-practice is used
in smaller groups and timescales, while identity-across-timescales is accumulated across many interactions and contexts (Lemke, 2008). An interconnected and important concept is that of ‘impression management’. Goffman (1990) originally proposed the concept of impression management, which captures the interactive component of identity management on SNSs as users literally, consciously or unconsciously, manage others’ impression of themselves (Siibak, 2009a, 2009b; Strano, 2008). Therefore, feedback on social media is important for impression management and identity performance (Marwick & boyd, 2010), like friends commenting on Facebook.

Friendship is the central component that is interwoven into the social identity, management and interactions that happens on SNSs, therefore it is necessary to understand online friendship when considering university students on SNS. Multiple international studies have shown that keeping in touch and reconnecting with friends was a very essential, if not the primary use of SNS activity for young adults (Hei-man, 2008; Joinson, 2008; Kujath, 2011; Pempek, et al., 2009). A US study on university students showed that most participants felt that SNSs are not detrimental their friendships, some felt it even made them stronger (Subrahmanym, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008).

There are varying ideas about the notion of friendship on SNSs. Olson, Clough and Penning (2009) have gone so far as to conclude that SNSs have “confused and trivialised the meaning of the special relationship, friend” (para. 101). Hearn (2008), within a discussion of self-promotion and the branded self on SNS, has proffered that ‘collecting’ friends is the central goal. However, this is not necessarily reflected by the users, as terms such as ‘MySpace whore’ have been used to describe users with too many friends (boyd, 2007). The term ‘friend’ on Facebook and other SNSs has become problematic and misleading (boyd & Ellison, 2008). Users are often connected with acquaintances right through to close personal friends and family, and have different reasons for connecting with different users (boyd & Ellison, 2008; Ellison, Steinfeld, & Lampe, 2011). boyd (2006) suggested there are ‘Friends’ and ‘friends’, where the former is inclusive of all these different relationships, while the latter is more in keeping with the everyday notion of friendship. In a response to boyd and Ellison’s (2008) review of SNSs, Beer (2008) noted that this distinction is again problematic because Friends can include friends. However, it is clear that the dichotomous notion of friendship on Facebook, where one either accepts or declines another user, does not really represent the varying types of relationships online. Recently Facebook has adjusted this inclusive ‘Friend’ term as it has introduced new categories of Friends, for
example ‘acquaintances’, but it is unknown whether this is actually being used. SNS users also have different motivations and practices around accepting friend requests, resulting in a range of Friends who do not necessarily accurately portray their network of friends. For example, US adolescents reported sometimes accepting some friends on MySpace because it was socially awkward to reject them (boyd, 2007).

Given this diversity, ‘online’ friendships are intertwined with the everyday understanding of friendship. boyd (2006) discussed different notions of friendship, in that different definitions have different implications. US users talked of friendship within these terms:

“friendship indicates an exceptionally strong relationship with expectations for emotional and practical support For many, the category of friend carries an aura of exclusivity and intimacy unlike the categories acquaintance or contact, which suggest familiarity but not closeness. Phrases like ‘best friends’ and ‘bestest friends’ appear in the vocabulary of (primarily female) American youth, suggesting that there are hierarchies even amongst intimates. Although there are general sentiments about the exclusive nature of friendship, the boundaries between friends and acquaintances are quite blurry and it is unlikely that there will ever be consensus on a formula for what demarcates a friend.” (boyd, 2006, para. 8)

It has been suggested that friendship has transitioned from traditional forms (based within local structures, like family and community) to become a reflexive, continually maintained and open friendship, emphasising acknowledgement, authenticity, reciprocity and closeness (Giddens, 1991 as cited in (Livingstone, 2008). This is what is now occurring online (Livingstone, 2008). However, it is unclear whether SNSs have been instrumental within this change or they are simply a space for this new type of friendship to be acted out. Beer (2008) suggested that SNSs have shaped the notion of friendship because it is very hard to imagine any circumstances that is unmediated in some way.

Marwick (2005) points out that SNS relationships still hold power differentials, and although this is ignored by the architecture of SNSs, it is still important to remember this within the context of these relationships because it affects the social networks of the users. This has meant that the SNS architecture can actually create tension or extra work to maintain harmony because of the ‘lack of segmentation’ between social groups (Binder,
This ‘context collapse’ where multiple types of relationships or audiences have been collapsed together (Binder, et al., 2012; boyd, 2007; Marwick & boyd, 2010) can be used to describe Facebook. Twitter and Goffman’s impression management have previously been used to illustrate this navigation of different audiences, and users have been shown to apply different strategies to manage it, such as not posting offensive material (Marwick & boyd, 2010). This serves to reinforce that relational management is highly important and, whether consciously or subconsciously, is taken into account by users.

Despite various notions of friendship, what is very clear about most SNS friendships, is that friendships on Facebook and other SNSs are predominantly based on pre-existing offline relationships (Ellison, et al., 2006; Joinson, 2008; Kim & Yun, 2008; Kujath, 2011), and few people connect with individuals that they have not had some offline contact with (Joinson, 2008; Pempek, et al., 2009). It does not appear that SNSs have taken away from face-to-face contact with friends, as only 18 percent of American university students communicated more with their friends online (Kujath, 2011). In New Zealand, 78 percent of those above the age of 12 reported the internet has not reduced their face-to-face contact and 63 percent of internet users say their contact has actually increased with friends (P. Smith, et al., 2010). Since 48 percent of all New Zealanders used SNSs, it would suggest they play a significant role in keeping in contact with friends (Bell, et al., 2008). SNSs have become a space where friends share their lives and maintain relationships (Greenhow & Robelia, 2009; Kim & Yun, 2008), maintaining and solidifying relationships that might have once been discarded due to geographical constraints, or remained latent (boyd, 2007; Ellison, et al., 2011; Greenhow & Robelia, 2009; Kim & Yun, 2008).

More specifically, these friendships are ‘done’ in a number of ways. Kim and Yun (2008) reported that CyWorld facilitated Koreans to resolve issues that could not be addressed in an offline setting. Danish adolescent expression between friends on Arto was described as a ‘love’ discourse (Larsen, 2007). US university students have primarily used Facebook to browse and communicate with mostly close friends in order to maintain friendships and do ‘social-information seeking’ including the discovery of information about offline contacts, like friends and classmates (Ellison, et al., 2011). Australian adolescents using MySpace desired closeness within their SNS experience, along with recognition (Mallan, 2009). These studies indicate that users look for some form of intimacy and closeness with certain SNS friends, which is consistent with everyday notions of friendship.
One tool that is particularly helpful in building, and maintaining relationships on Facebook is ‘participatory surveillance’ or ‘social browsing’ (Albrechtslund, 2008; Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2006; Mallan, 2009). This is where users keep in touch and updated with each other by surveilling or browsing their online activity without necessarily actively interacting (Albrechtslund, 2008). It is acknowledged that this may seem shallow, however it is practical within the online world of large social networks (Albrechtslund, 2008). Albrechtslund (2008) describes it as “potentially empowering, subjectivity building and even playful” (para. 1). Australian adolescents viewed it positively, did it themselves, but sometimes found it intrusive, and found keeping in touch could occasionally be a real effort (Mallan, 2009). Fuchs (2011) has noted that ‘participatory surveillance’ and ‘social browsing’ are based on the notion of neutral surveillance. Other studies have shown this is not always the case. Pempek, Yermolayeva and Calvert (2009) described this practice of viewing other users activity without obviously interacting as ‘online lurking’. American university students indicated dedicating a great deal of their Facebook activity to this practice, with 64 percent reporting ‘quite a bit’ or ‘a whole lot’. Reading other users’ profiles was the most popular type of lurking, and looking at photos and reading the newsfeed were done by over 50 percent of the participants (Pempek, et al., 2009). However, this term perhaps implies a sinister quality that is not assumed with other descriptions. This is noted by one of the students in the study who described online lurking as ‘great’ but also ‘creepy’ and ‘voyeuristic’ (Pempek, et al., 2009).

On a more cautionary note, although the literature around young people’s SNS use on issues of socialising, privacy, gender, identity and friendship appear to be reasonably wide-ranging, a large portion of SNS literature is from the US (boyd & Ellison, 2008; Kim & Yun, 2008), even though over 80 percent of users are outside the US and Canada (Facebook, 2012c). Therefore it is important not to presume these indicate universal norms, as culture has been shown to influence SNS practices, motivations and communication (Kim & Yun, 2008; Takahashi, 2010; Vasalou, Joinson, & Courvoisier, 2010). Nevertheless, we can see that socialising, doing gender, identity, and friendship is now commonplace on SNS environments. Despite the privacy concerns that have arisen, young adults share detailed aspects of their lives, and this also include their drinking behaviour. The rest of the chapter will examine the existing literature about student drinking cultures that occur on SNS.
Drinking Cultures on SNS

Given the parallels between SNS use and drinking that have already been outlined, such as fun, socialising, gender and friendship, and that both of these activities are common and central to young adults’ social lives, it is unsurprising to see that alcohol is a common theme on their SNS profiles. Multiple American studies have established that males and females, legal drinkers and underage drinkers are posting alcohol-related material online. Egan and Moreno (2011), using public Facebook pages, found that 85 percent of US male students posted an average of 8.5 alcohol-related references, with 4.5 times more references for those who could legally drink. Additionally, a content analysis of public MySpace pages revealed more than half of underage students (aged 17-20), mostly white and male, had alcohol images or text references, many of which were explicit (Moreno, et al., 2010). The amount of alcohol references on SNSs seems be directly related to alcohol use in real life. For example, one study demonstrated that for US university students, 76 percent of whom had profiles contained alcohol-related posts or photos, there was a positive relationship between self-reported alcohol use, alcohol content and perceived alcohol use by friends on Facebook (Fournier & Clarke, 2011). All these studies reinforce that online displays of alcohol use is common among university populations, and indicates that not only are student drinking cultures normalised in the everyday sense, they are also normalised on SNSs.

More than just normalising student drinking cultures, SNS are reinforcing and positively enhancing the fun and pleasure that is already associated with drinking. As with experiences of drinking, Facebook users frame drinking as a positive social experience, seemingly without negative consequences. Kolek and Saunders (2008) using accessible undergraduate Facebook profiles, found that 38 percent of their overall content contained positive text about drinking and 25 percent contained positive text about partying. Moreover, US adolescents who were exposed to drinking-related content on Facebook reported being more receptive and positive towards alcohol use, alcohol-related content, and alcohol beliefs, including consequences due to drinking (Litt & Stock, 2011).

Brown and Greggs (2012) used their own Facebook pages and connections to investigate young women, binge drinking and Facebook. The activities on Facebook indicated that binge drinking episodes were anticipated and subsequently ‘memorialised’ through an array of Facebook activity, including posts, messages and photos, effectively sharing their pleasurable activity with their Facebook audience. Mobile phones often let people
document the high points of the night while it was happening (Brown & Gregg, 2012). This showed the authors that the drinking experience and Facebook were often inherently intertwined, and often mutually reinforcing of each other. This activity was regular and reoccurring as part of the week and weekend, supporting the routine and mundane nature of drinking (Brown & Gregg, 2012). Within New Zealand, Griffiths and Casswell (2010) described one SNS, Bebo (a popular contemporary of Facebook), as an ‘intoxigenic’ social environment for New Zealand young adults and adolescents. It offered a space where they could interact with alcohol advertising and share in drinking experiences and activity, including online quizzes. Older adolescents appeared to want to be seen as ‘drunks’ and this online activity positioned youth heavy drinking as a normal practice (Griffiths & Casswell, 2010).

It seems that drinking experiences and SNSs are heavily intertwined for many young adults and university students. Despite the individual and societal costs of students drinking in this manner, SNS are viewed positively and contribute to the normalisation of drinking cultures within New Zealand and other Western countries. These drinking experiences are played out online, during and after the event, to continue the happy memories that are made while drinking with friends. These practices are both prominent and embedded in contemporary youth culture as they co-occur and reinforce each other as student drinking cultures are routinely and positively displayed on Facebook. SNS are so integrated into the everyday, it now seems almost meaningless to separate the offline and online. Therefore to understand student drinking cultures is to understand how they are mediated within these SNS environments. This chapter has provided a background of drinking and SNS use within New Zealand and internationally. Many of the studies have given detailed accounts of alcohol-related activity on SNS and within these studies photos have been mentioned. Nevertheless, this is not representative of the important place these photos hold in student drinking cultures. Chapter Two will explore this dimension.
Chapter Two: Visual Culture and Facebook Photos

Photos are an important medium on Facebook. Recently, Facebook revealed that an average of more than 300 million photos were being uploaded daily (Facebook, 2012c). 60 billion photos were uploaded by the end of 2010, and six billion more were being uploaded every month (Pixable, 2011). It was estimated by mid-2011, 100 billion photos would be on Facebook, and over 750 million were uploaded over the New Year weekend of 2010/2011 alone. The average user was calculated to have 97,000 photos within their network of friends (Pixable, 2011). Within New Zealand, 70 percent of SNS users (primarily Facebook) post photos or videos (C. Smith, et al., 2011). Given their undoubted popularity, it is relevant to explore how university students use photos on SNS, and more specifically within student drinking cultures. This chapter will justify the focus on photos and drinking cultures by reviewing the previous research and highlighting aspects that have been underexplored. The theoretical framing for this study and the research aims will follow. Before we turn to photos specifically on Facebook, it is necessary to understand the dominance of visual culture and digital visual culture that these drinking photos exist within. It will become clear that Facebook photos are not simply informative objects, but are socially, historically, and culturally located objects that have multiple meanings.

Visual Culture: Primacy of the visual

Visual culture can be said to be dominant, in that “Images are ‘everywhere’” (Pink, 2007, p. 21). It has been argued that the visual is an integral and central component of contemporary Western life (Jenks, 1995; Rose, 2005, 2007). Modernity and postmodernity, it has been suggested, are ocularcentric (Jenks, 1995; Rose, 2007), in that the visual has become a central part of culture or ‘visual culture’ because the visual is now integrated within social life (Rose, 2007). This is arguably what has happened on Facebook, as the popularity of photos has increased and the social lives of young adults in the form of drinking and socialising is now displayed online.

There is a belief that with photography and modernity, the world has been ‘demystified’ and photos have been aligned with realism and factual content (Slater, 1995). This was
emphasised in a US study that showed adolescents took drinking photos to be proof of real alcohol use (Moreno, Briner, Williams, Walker, & Christakis, 2009). However, an image cannot be judged simply on its content (Pink, 2006; Rose, 2005). Rose (2007) suggests five important points about the debates around visual culture and how images should be considered:

“An image may have its own visual effects (so it is important to look very carefully at images); these effects however, through the ways of seeing mobilized by the image, are crucial in the production and reproduction of visions of social difference; but these effects always intersect with the social context of viewing and the visualities spectators bring to the viewing.” (p. 12).

In other words, images can achieve or ‘do’ things as they still have an ‘agency’ within themselves. Photos create and re-iterate versions of social categories, stereotypes, and subject positions and therefore different power differentials, depending on what they are depicting, and how and who they are interpreted by (Rose, 2005, 2007). There are certain ‘ways of seeing’ where the audience always considers the images in relation to themselves, bringing their own experiences and constructions when interpreting the image (Berger, 1972, as cited in Rose, 2007). Lastly, the site in which the images are viewed is mediated by its own social context and practices (Rose, 2007). Accumulatively, this illustrates that images are not passive objects, but their meanings are fully dependent on a range of diverse factors.

The importance of the image producer and audience was also reinforced by Rose (2007), as she advocates that research should consider the image producer and the intended audience who base their interpretation on their own experiences of the world and their current social context (Rose, 2007). We cannot have ‘inside’ knowledge about the photo unless we talk to the actual producers of the image and the intended audience. On Facebook, the producer and the audience are frequently the same because self-produced photos and other-produced photos are both located on the users’ profile pages. When considering all of these aspects, it can be argued that people interact with a visually constructed experience (Rose, 2007), one where vision and images are historically, socially, and culturally constructed (Fyfe & Law, 1988; Jenks, 1995; Rose, 2005, 2007). In this way, photos can be considered discursive resources, which can ‘write’ individual and collective
identities. However, these photos are now online, which brings a whole new dimension to this visual culture.

Digital Visual Culture

Digital technology has not only been confined to transforming social interaction and communication, but it has also revolutionised visual culture into ‘digital visual culture’. Generally, images are now accessible to the masses. Advancements in cameras, particularly camera phones, support a photo culture where regular impulsive photos make the once everyday mundane aspects of life photo-worthy (Daisuke & Ito, 2003; Van House, Davis, Ames, Finn, & Viswanathan, 2005). However, because images can be digitally manipulated, the integrity or authenticity of the image has also been altered and images are usually now interactive in some way - “a product of ‘the mass’ itself” (Cham, 2009, p. 15). Mirzoeff (2009) argued that although visual images inundate our lives, these images are often not purely visual, but rather a mixed media. Digital visual culture has meant that new forms of images and modern art have been said to be ‘game-like’ (Coulter-Smith & Coulter-Smith, 2009) because of this interactive nature. Facebook photos are interactive because they allow tagging, liking and comments, instead of being a singular image.

The sites and stages of photo production are also important for understanding the meaning and experiences surrounding these photos (Kirk, Sellen, Rother, & Wood, 2006; Rose, 2007). When young adults are uploading their photos, the interactive nature of Facebook means that the photo activity does not end with uploading the image. ‘Photowork’ is a framework created to specifically understand the digital photographic process and experience (Kirk, et al., 2006). The framework includes capturing, editing, downloading, filing, and subsequently sharing the images. This process includes a ‘sharing criteria’ because certain photos can be excluded and not uploaded, therefore the photos that are not uploaded or the absent images can also be explored (Kirk, et al., 2006). Thus the importance of the ‘absent photo’ is acknowledged. Pink (2007) reinforced that what is not seen can be as important as what is seen, because this gives an understanding as to what is unwanted or concealed. In the context of SNSs, these are the photos that are untagged so they no longer appear on the users’ profile, or are not uploaded at all.

Facebook is a key example of what Lehman (2009) describes as new forms of media or spaces where the offline and online interconnect and are influenced by the cultural and
social world. Users interact through photo sharing and collaborate to form a unique environment that has not previously existed. SNSs now offer a distinct way of sharing photos that allows social relationships to play out through their unique features (Murray, 2008). The Internet provides more control for the user over the image. It makes the visual environment more dynamic than other more traditional forms of visual media, such as television (Cham, 2009). Facebook provides a space where people connect others to the image through tagging, and express their views through comments and ‘liking’. Instead of the once single image in a photo frame, Facebook is an interactive space where multitudes of photos can be collectively experienced between friends. In essence, the digital world provides a different environment from the traditional forms of creating, sharing, viewing and consuming visual images. The next section will review research which has explored young people and photo use on SNSs.

Photos, Facebook, and Drinking

Photos, like other SNS tools, can have a social function. In one US study, university students used Personal Network Digital Imaging (picture sharing on camera phones) to build and maintain relationships with others, create memories for the self and group, self-expression, self-presentation, and to provide information. This helped to maintain geographically constrained relationships by keeping in touch and sharing their lives through photos (Van House, et al., 2005). Photos were often shared between particular friends and although, on the surface, may have appeared to be purely informational, they often had in-jokes or messages of remembrance that were specific to the friendship, thus acting to reinforce friendship. The nature of new technology meant the students could casually and easily document their activities and manage large volumes of photos, as the individual and collective experience was captured (Van House, et al., 2005). Photos are a key tool that has captured the essence of SNS interaction, socialising with friends.

However, universal use of SNS photos should not be assumed, as culture and context need to be considered. For example, Chinese university students using Renren were more likely to customise their profile pictures than US university students on Facebook, who were more likely to have group photos (C. Zhao & Jiang, 2011). Moreover, survey data revealed that Caucasian US female university students publicly expressed and commemorated friendships through photos on Facebook, whereas Japanese female university students on
Mixi communicated and maintained closeness in the more private sphere of Mixi diaries (Barker & Ota, 2011).

Despite these differences, within many Western cultures student drinking cultures are prominent and the overt display of alcohol-related images, drinking and socialising have become the norm on SNSs. Fournier and Clarke (2011) reported that US university students had more alcohol-related images than posts. Morgan, Snelson and Elison-Bowers (2010) viewed publicly available drinking-related photos and videos from YouTube and MySpace. These images showed young adults and adolescents partaking in drug use, drunken behaviour and the consequences of drinking, like vomiting and slurred speech. The YouTube videos had been watched frequently and received positively by other viewers. The researchers also surveyed US university students who reported that 26 percent had uploaded drinking photos of themselves, and 30 percent had friends who had done it for them. The students had a generally accepting attitude to drinking photos on SNSs. Even if they would not do it themselves, they considered it to be ultimately the choice of the individual. Interestingly, posting about marijuana was viewed more negatively, and less accepted by these students (Morgan, et al., 2010). This would indicate that the positive acceptability and normalised attitude towards visual displays of drunken exploits might not extend to illegal drugs.

Ridout, Campbell and Ellis (2011) examined Facebook profiles and surveyed university students in Australia. An AUDIT (Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test) questionnaire and other related tests revealed 59 percent of surveyed students had harmful drinking habits, and unsurprisingly their ‘alcohol identity’ (measured by calculating the number of alcohol-related photos) was correlated with consumption. Nearly 50 percent if the students included alcohol content on their profile picture. Fan sites, quizzes and text about alcohol were also prominent on the Facebook profiles (Ridout, Campbell, & Ellis, 2011). Profiles contained more ‘other-generated’ (put up by Facebook friends) alcohol content that self-generated content, which the authors concluded was an implicit sanctioning of an alcohol identity. Collectively, this contributed to alcohol being a strong component of the profile users ‘hoped-for’ self (Ridout, et al., 2011). As previously noted, within NZ, Griffiths and Casswell (2010) reported that images of drinking added to the intoxigenic environment of Bebo. Explicit photos of teenage drinking, drinking games and the consequences of drinking (vomiting, passing out, and losing control of their bowels) were present, as well as alcohol brands in the form of fan pages and marketing material. The creation of this group identity
through these photos showed active and acceptable participation within drinking cultures (Griffiths & Casswell, 2010). These studies reflect the prominence and normalisation of alcohol-related content and friends contributing to each other’s pages, which seems to sanction the acceptability of these drinking cultures within peer groups.

Mendelson and Papacharissi (2010) examined 89 US university students’ profiles which contained 20962 photos and 13543 comments, using semiotic and visual anthropology methods to give a comprehensive account of the photo contents. Although some photos captured road trips, balls, graduations and sports events, partying and drinking photos were the most common, including drinking-associated holidays and dress-ups (e.g. Saint Patricks Day). Negative consequences of drinking were not apparent, but some potentially embarrassing photos did remain, which the authors interpreted as the ‘publicity’ the students gained from the photo overrode any potential embarrassment and (Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2010). Like other SNS activity, relationships were the main theme within these photos, as most people appeared with at least one other person (Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2010). Photos were frequently playful with exaggerated movements or facial expression, and many of the candid shots displayed drinking, drinking games, and laughing or messing around with friends who were often aware of the camera. Comments were used to reinforce group friendships and intimacy, and included in-jokes, compliments and ribbing (Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2010). The authors concluded that because all of the analysed images were tagged, they offered a ‘strategic representation’ of students’ social context. These photos illustrate the ‘primacy of relationships’ demonstrating that students communicate and interact visually through photos. They act as testimony to the genuine college experience, marking the transition and independence from their youth (Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2010). The authors also concluded these photos show a form of ‘collective narcissism’, but instead of self-absorption, they are about self-actualisation because of the students’ wish to better connect to society (Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2010). This somewhat negative conclusion was drawn without talking to the actual users or their peer group. However, Mendelson and Papacharissi (2010) acknowledged that in-depth interviews would help gain further knowledge about these photos.

Some studies also noted gender differences within the photos. Mendelson and Papacharisi (2010) noted gender biases, such as women having more photos of themselves and more ‘hanging out’ photos, while men tended only to have formal events. In general, women have twice as many photos uploaded and tagged as men (Pixable, 2011), and one US study
showed that female university students were more likely to untag images, mostly due to their appearance in the photo (S. Zhao, et al., 2008). Males also untagged photos due to their appearance, but also if photos displayed activities they chose not to share with others (S. Zhao, et al., 2008). This is likely to impact on the visual display of drinking because as we have seen, drinking and socialising photos dominate these students’ Facebook profiles.

Brown and Greggs (2012) concluded that:

“the ritual of uploading photos in the midst of and following drinking sessions is a further dimension to the pleasure of telling ‘a good story’ (Sheehan and Ridge 2001) and the ‘drunken narrative’ (Griffin et al. 2009). Facebook extends the ‘drama’ of the night out for a longer period. Depending on the moment of upload, it offers a little slice of the weekend, an indefinite extension of its pleasures. These traces linger in spaces and times following the singular ‘night out’, counteracting the banality of everyday life.” (p. 363)

This suggests photos on Facebook hold an important place within contemporary drinking cultures. Furthermore, photos appear to be central for the actual drinking experience, as the drinking stories that are integral to the positive drinking experience are now being displayed and documented visually online. The relative permanence of Facebook photos may mean that these photos are a continual and more potent visual reminder than the sharing of oral drinking stories. Indeed, all of this demonstrates that photos are now an integrated part of this student drinking culture, where friends participate and encourage each others’ visual displays of drinking.

Many of the conclusions about these photos have been derived from content analyses, survey information or other methodologies that have not involved the perspective of the user or the actual audience (e.g. Fournier & Clarke, 2011; Morgan, et al., 2010; Peluchette & Karl, 2010; Ridout, et al., 2011). However, as noted, photos are not simply universal objects, lacking in context or holding uniform, transparent meanings. It is important, therefore, to understand the meaning of the photos as viewed by the users and audiences. Salimkhan, Manago and Greenfield (2010) used video to capture screen activity during the interviews of US university students while on MySpace. Three themes emerged from the interviews; visual metaphors and insider jokes maintain and reinforce friendship, personal visual narratives are created through images on SNS that capture particular relationships
and events, and that self-promotion and advertising become intertwined within the users’ identity (Salimkhan, et al., 2010). These images on MySpace:

“[make] relationship communication more iconic and less verbal. Icons are utilized as metaphors, inside jokes, and representations of past history. These displays constitute the new language of the information age. Images become digital cultural products that take on social and relational significance within the online domain. Confirming previous studies (Pempek et al., 2009; Siibak, 2009; Strano, 2008), our data suggest that photos have become a primary mechanism for self-presentation on social networking sites.” (Salimkhan, et al., 2010), para. 46).

Ling (2008) also reported that photos shared on Facebook and MSN were used to maintain relationships and create intimacy among groups of older male Finnish adolescents. It was also revealed that photo sharing was actively managed, as some of the content, namely drinking photos, would not meet with the approval of wider audiences (like parents). Interestingly, impression management was achieved through the tagging of various photos because it can show being part of a friendship group but also unflattering and unwanted impressions (Ling, 2008). Drinking photos, easily captured and shared, therefore have seen the development of a local group ethic and trust, with a line between good-humour and anti-social activity. Potentially embarrassing photos were acceptable within certain social groups because the rules were more flexible within these friendships (Ling, 2008). Although there was a ‘carpe diem’ (“Seize the day”) and ‘anything goes’ attitude within the group, different rules applied to those outside the group. These types of images are managed differently (Ling, 2008). The author called this the ‘ethics of photos sharing’, and it is particularly important for drinking photos. The participants were aware of the potential dangers of sharing drinking photos and their potential to be interpreted differently by others. This was managed by who the images were shared with and which were uploaded, sometimes only sharing and trusting the images with a select few (Ling, 2008). As a side note, this humorous framing of embarrassing drinking photos could potentially explain why consequences of drinking, like vomiting and passing out, have been seen depicted in other studies (e.g. Griffiths and Casswell, 2010). If they are funny, maybe they are more acceptable.
Previous research provided some valuable insight into the visual display of drinking cultures online. However, there are many facets that still need to be explored in order to understand their place in mediated student drinking cultures. Although there is a need to give a voice to understand the user’s perspective and gain important contextual insight, there are other aspects that are also under-explored. Photos on Facebook are currently under-conceptualised and we need to understand how these photos, and more specifically drinking photos, are used as discursive objects to ‘write’ online identities. We know Facebook use and therefore Facebook photos are enmeshed within these university students’ lives and their friendships. This would indicate a need to understand how these photos work within their everyday lives and within their friendships, but also the broader meanings that surround these photos – how they impact on student drinking cultures.

The Present Study

This chapter has highlighted the dominance of the visual world, the transformation of digital visual culture, the heavy utilisation of SNS photos by young people and the prominence of drinking cultures within these photos. These photos not only work to normalise drinking cultures online, but young people draw significant meaning from them, in terms of themselves and their friendships. The rest of the chapter will focus on outlining the present study, in terms of the theoretical framing and the research aims. Given it has been argued that photos and their meaning are socially, historically and culturally constructed (Fyfe & Law, 1988; Jenks, 1995; Rose, 2005, 2007), this study will be located within a social constructionist framework and also employ notions from visual ethnography to explore the role of photos within student drinking cultures. Social constructionism is appropriate because a “social constructionist perspective is concerned with identifying the various ways of constructing social reality that are available in a culture, to explore the conditions of their use and also to trace their implications for human experience and social practice” (Willig, 2001, p. 7). Given this, visual ethnographic methodologies are often used to inform studies that focus on visual elements (Pink, 2007). Many of the ideas and theory about visual culture and digital visual culture have been developed within visual ethnography, making it appropriate to utilise in this study.
Social Constructionism

Social constructionism rejects the objectivist-empiricist approach of a single objective truth, and from this perspective the human experience and meaning are constructed in our social worlds through though culture, history and linguistics (Crotty, 1998; Gergen, 2010; Willig, 2008). This allows the object of interest to be released from previous values and ‘taken-for-granted’ realities and allows constructions from different social groups to emerge (Gergen, 2010). Consequently, different people can construct different meanings about the same objects of interest (Crotty, 1998). One additional advantage is that social constructionism places understanding of these object of interests in broader society (Gergen, 2010). Therefore instead of there being one knowledge about Facebook photos, there are multiple knowledges. Psychological research from a social constructionist position can explore how these realities are being created and represented instead of simply describing or reproducing them (Willig, 2001).

In a social constructionist approach, individuals’ experiences of the world and their meaning is the result of social processes (Cromby & Nightingale, 1999). All social objects are historically and socially situated, and their meanings are co-produced by people in a relationship (Gergen, 1985). Therefore nothing is produced in isolation. “It is the reproduction and transformation of structures, meaning, conventions, morals and discursive practices that principally constitutes both our relationships and ourselves” (Cromby & Nightingale, 1999, p. 4). Language is considered to be central to the construction of meaning in our reality, because this is how we convey ourselves to the world. In this context, ‘language’ is inclusive of all social interactions, including spoken language and body language (Burr, 2003). Language is the way we convey and construct meaning, maintaining certain knowledge and action, while excluding others (Gergen, 1985). It is also considered to be a form of social action that places importance on the social interactions of people to create meaning. This means that languages’ ‘performative’ function becomes the research focus (Burr, 2003).

Visual Ethnography

Visual ethnography focuses on understanding and representing knowledge of the context, culture or the individuals being studied using images (Pink, 2007). Therefore it is important to ask people about their images, like the ‘informant-produced images’ commonly used in visual ethnography. ‘Informant-produced images’ in an interview setting show the
photographic moments that are particularly meaningful to the participant. It means the multiple meanings elicited by the photo on a broad level can be understood, but also show the unwanted or concealed images in the form of absent photos (Pink, 2007). Facebook photos are also accompanied by other interactive functions. Visual methodologies also focus on text as well as images because this means the social practices, culture and the effects of viewing the images by different audiences, instead of just the visual content can be examined (Rose, 2007).

Using a framework like ‘Photowork’ (Kirk, et al., 2006), photographic processes can be explored retrospectively using the users’ SNS profile. Collectively, this could give insight into the experience that the photos capture, the co-constructed nature of photo activity, the ongoing interaction with the photos, and the broader rules and norms surrounding sharing photos on Facebook. These notions of visual ethnography can help within the context of digital visual culture because they are inherently meaningful to the students who upload and interact with them, something that has not been acknowledged by a lot of the research in this area.

**Summary and Research Aims**

Alcohol and drinking are a large part of young adults’ lives in New Zealand (Ministry of Health, 2009), and university students have been shown to drink more heavily than their non-university peers (Kypri et al., 2005). Despite the detrimental individual and societal costs associated with this drinking, it, along with SNS activity is occurring between friends and both are an integral part of many young adults’ social lives. These activities are so integrated that the drinking experience is now mediated and it is meaningless to talk about online and offline worlds. Therefore it is necessary to understand student drinking culture within mediated youth culture, which includes photos. These displays of drinking and times with friends are often posted online in the form of photos. Although these visual displays have been noted by multiple studies, few have included or focused on these drinking photos.

Young adults’ use of SNS, their drinking, and particularly their Facebook photos about drinking have caused a lot of controversy within mainstream media and academic literature, with conclusions of inappropriateness, unprofessionalism and riskiness.
However, this view does not align with those who use SNS and upload photos. Although previous research has given some valuable insight into drinking photos on Facebook, many facets are under-explored, under-theorised and under-conceptualised. However, it is necessary to keep in mind the digital visual culture they encapsulate. This study will endeavour to further understand the role of Facebook photos within young adults’ lives. The focus will be university students who are aged 18 and 19 because they are particularly active within the NZ student drinking culture and also SNS activity. In this way the study will gain insight into the place that photos hold within student drinking cultures. The overall aim of this research project is to explore how New Zealand 18 and 19 year old university students use photos on Facebook, within their drinking experiences, how drinking is displayed in photos online, and how this relates to student drinking cultures.

The specific research aims are to:

1. Explore how university students use photos on Facebook.  
   Why do they use Facebook photos?
2. Explore how drinking cultures appear in Facebook photos.  
   How and why do these university students use drinking photos. What parts of the drinking experience are displayed and what parts are absent? How does this impact on student drinking culture?
3. Explore the association between Facebook photos and social relationships.  
   Do drinking photos play a specific role?
4. Explore the photographic process and what part this plays within the Facebook photo experience.  
   How do young adults interact with their photos after they are uploaded onto Facebook, for example, commenting, tagging and liking.  
   What is the purpose and meanings surrounding this interaction?
Chapter 3: Method

As outlined in Chapter Two, this study was located within and social constructionism and visual ethnography. Chapter Three will outline the method that was used during the course of this study, in terms of sampling and recruitment, the interview format, transcribing and data management. The ethical considerations are also outlined, followed by the analytical approach employed. The chapter ends with the reflexivity section, which outlines and discusses how my own personal, academic and cultural background has informed and influenced my own approach to this study and its results.

Study Design

Nine university students were recruited and interviewed for this study. They each engaged in individual interviews with an internet-enabled laptop, discussing online practices around drinking, friendships and socialising, specifically focusing on Facebook photos. This was a form of photo-elicited interview with informant-produced images. The participants shared their Facebook pages and the photos were used as a talking point to gain understanding about their photos and their photo interactions. Individual interviews were used in this study for a number of reasons. The study aimed to provide an in-depth exploration of the individuals’ own meanings and experiences. Given this, individual meaning can be explored in more depth in a one-to-one setting (Gaskell, 2000), and participants are likely to reveal more and talk about more sensitive issues (Kaplowitz, 2000). Also, as the interviews required the use of a laptop computer (Macbook 5,1), this was made more manageable in an individual setting.

Sampling and Recruitment

The participation criteria was New Zealand university students, aged 18 or 19 years, who had a Facebook account, and spoke fluent English. Participants were recruited through my own personal network within Wellington and Christchurch. I distributed the Information Sheet (see Appendix A) to friends and family who indicated they might know people who might be interested in taking part in the study. Snowball sampling was also used, as
potential participants were also encouraged to ask friends who matched the criteria. Efforts were made to recruit both females and males however equal numbers were not required because this would have excluded potential participants. The interviews were arranged either through third-party contact (arranged by the friend in common through Facebook and text messaging) or through the participant emailing me and us agreeing on a mutually convenient time and location.

Nine participants (5 females, 4 males) took part in the study. Seven participants were from the same network of friends in Christchurch, six of whom went to the University of Canterbury while one went to Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology. The additional two participants were both friends from the University of Otago. The participants were studying a variety of courses, which included Engineering, Psychology, Health Sciences, Nursing, Physical Education, Geology, and Commerce. Pseudonyms, gender, ages, ethnicities and drinking status are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Participant Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicities</th>
<th>Drinking Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bella</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>Drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Indicated Māori descent</td>
<td>Drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamsin</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>Drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Non-drinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Non-drinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>Drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>Drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>Drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>Drinks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Format of Interviews

The interview locations were arranged by mutual agreement between the participants and myself. Seven interviews took place in a private room in a student flat in Christchurch and the other two took place in a private office on the Wellington Massey Campus. The interviews were all recorded using three types of software; audio, video and screen capture. The digital voice recorder (Olympus WS-110) was used for transcribing purposes, while the video camera (Panasonic SD/HDD SDR-H85) was used to provide information about physical gestures (like pointing and smiling). The screen capture software (iShowU HD v 2.2.4) recorded all of the screen activity on the laptop computer for the analysis stage. The screen capture software did not record keystrokes so no passwords were stored.
The interviews began with the participant being offered food and drinks, which were consumed throughout the interview providing a more relaxed atmosphere. The participants were then given the Information sheet (see Appendix A) to read again and a Consent form (see Appendix B) to fill in. They were asked if they had any questions about the study, and assured that every effort would be made to make sure the data was kept confidential and anonymous.

The recording equipment was switched on when the participants signed onto their Facebook page. The participant was then asked to state their age, residence, course, institute and ethnicities they identified with. The interview was semi-structured, which allowed for a comprehensive yet flexible style necessary for an exploratory study. I began by asking general questions to build up rapport. The participant was encouraged to navigate their own way through their Facebook page and show the interviewer their photos. The structure of the interview questions was guided by the way the participant navigated their Facebook page. I had a prepared interview schedule (see Appendix C), which included the stages indicated within the Photowork photographic stages (Kirk et al., 2006), which were covered in every interview. Due to the focus of the study, we spent more time on some photos than others, specifically the drinking-related images. These were the photos that the participant or myself found interesting or important in some way, for example represented a significant drinking experience or had had multiple comments by others.

The interview concluded with the participant being given the opportunity to add or clarify any of the topics discussed. Many of the participants volunteered further insight into our discussions in this last period of the interview. After the interview was completed, the participants were given an Support and Information Sheet (Appendix D) thanked for their time and given the choice between a $30 iTunes or New World gift voucher. In total, although the interviews were only meant to take an hour, due to the magnitude of photos on some of the participants Facebook profiles, some interviews lasted up to two hours. For each interview that ran overtime, the participant was asked if they wanted to continue. In each case the participants were willing to keep going.
Data Management and Transcription

A range of programs were employed to link the digital files together to create whole video and audio files of each interview which were of a manageable data size. The video recorder automatically segmented the videos into half an hour sections. These then had to be linked together (using D-Vision v 3.2) and then compressed (using Handbreak v 0.9.5 x86_64) to create individual video files of 700 MB. The audio was then was converter to mp3 format (using ALL2MP3 v 2.0820) so it could be uploaded into the transcribing programs, which were used (Express Scribe v 5.26 Intel; Transana-Intel v 2.42b-Mac). Multiple attempts were made to link the audio files with the screen capture files, using multiple programmes such as iMovie (version 7.1.4). However this proved to be very difficult and this idea was subsequently discarded.

The interviews were transcribed verbatim by the researcher and included non-verbal utterances and important physical movement and gestures. The transcription style, adapted from Silverman (2001, see Appendix E) was fairly general because this was all that was necessary for the analysis stage. The first three interviews were transcribed from the audio files (using Express Scribe v 5.26 Intel) and then uploaded into Transana-Intel 2.42. Then the remaining six were transcribed using the video files in Transana-Intel 2.42. Some parts of the interview were difficult hear, so the video and audio recordings were alternately used to provide the most accurate hearing possible. The screen capture recording was also used during these times to give more context to understanding the conversation. It should be acknowledged that a lot of the context is lost during the transcription process, as the spoken language becomes the focus of the transcript to the exclusion of other forms of language, like body gestures. Even though some of this was noted within the transcript it is impossible to include it all.

Transcripts of all the interviews provided intimate knowledge of the interview data. A database of the interesting parts of the transcript, contradictions and possible themes or discourses was developed during the transcription process to help inform the later stages of analysis. Once transcription was completed, the video and screen capture files were linked with the transcript in Transana-Intel. This allowed the video and screen capture files to run in-sync when a part of the transcript was played. Sections were time-coded between ten and thirty seconds, depending on the content of the conversation or the screen activity, to ensure the appropriate photo was being displayed in time with the talk of the interview.
Ethics

Several ethical issues were important to consider for this research project. The photos added further complication to the issues surrounding confidentiality and anonymity. Every effort was taken to try and ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants. The participants read and information sheet and signed a consent form at the beginning of the interview, informing them of their rights. They were also encouraged to ask questions about the study and their rights. Pseudonyms were used during the transcription process, and identifying information was removed or changed. Any visual content employed in the written results of this study were anonymised as names, faces, and other identifying information, like tattoos were blurred out. Due to the contentious nature of online photo ownership (Besmer & Lipford, 2010), the only captured screen activity that is within the results section was content that was directly linked to the participants’ own Facebook page. All other private internet content was simply described, which meant it did not violate others’ rights to privacy.

There was a potential conflict of interest between my participants and myself as a researcher because I recruited was done through my own personal contacts. However, this was expected to possibly create a rapport and help the participant feel at ease. This may also have helped to reduce the inherent power differences that are always present in an interview setting. As the participants were also informed of their rights as participants, this was intended to reduce any power imbalances as well.

It was possible that the interview might have brought up negative experiences for the participant around their drinking or Facebook activities. This could have included heavy drinking to the point it caused harm to themselves or others, or photo sharing that had harmed a friendship or included unpleasant content. To minimise this possibility and the detrimental impact, the participants’ were informed they could stop the interview at anytime, withdraw from the study without repercussion, or request to have information removed from the data within a week of the interview taking place. This was again verbally explained to them before the interview commenced. Although there was no illegal or compromising activity talked about or viewed in the interviews, I was prepared to delete this talk from the data immediately as to not put the participant in a vulnerable position in the future. My supervisors were to be consulted and further action was to be considered, like deleting the data. It was expected that due to Facebook research being a relatively new area of study some unforeseen ethical issues might have arisen during the course of the
study. If this was the case, we were prepared to gain additional assistance from the Massey University Human Ethics Committee. Luckily, no unexpected ethical issues occurred and the participants seemed to be at ease during the course of the interview, with many of them expressing great interest in the project. It was also expected that the participants may benefit from taking part in the interview because it might mean they gained some insight into the role drinking and Facebook play in their social lives, and become more aware of how their drinking activities are being presented online. This seemed to be true for some participants as they made comments about forgetting what photos they had online, and expressed a desire to review their online content and become more informed about privacy settings.

All ethnicities were welcome to take part in this study. Although Māori participants were not the specific focus of this study, it was expected that taking part in the interview would be comfortable for both Māori and non-Māori participants. Consultation with Dr Tim McCreanor and Associate Professor Helen Moewaka Barnes (Whariki Research Centre) was available to provide advice on any issues that might have arisen for Māori participant during the data collection and processing. The only participant that indicated Māori descent seemed to be comfortable and forthcoming during the time of the interview which meant no consultation was necessary.

The research tried to not misrepresent the participants’ Facebook photo and drinking experiences. It was explained to the participants that this research aimed to express their perspectives. The participants were fully informed of the purpose of the study. To safeguard the privacy of the participants, the electronic data was stored on a password protected computer and back-ups were stored on a password protected shared drive. The consent forms were locked away separately in a private office. All data and consent forms will be securely stored for at least the next five years. The Massey University Human Ethics Committee gave approval for this study in October 2011 (Southern B Application – 11/59; Appendix F).

Analytic Approaches

A content analysis was performed to give a background context to the participants’ Facebook profile pages. The data collected included the participants’ number of friends,
tagged photos, albums, photos within the albums, and finally the types of album names. It was intended that the total number of photos and albums on the participants’ profile would be gathered as well. However, given a sudden change in the architecture of the Facebook photo layout meant this was unfortunately not recorded.

**Thematic Analysis and Discourse Analysis**

This was a social constructionist *exploratory* study. Thematic analysis was used because it is consistent with such a study. It can be a data-driven inductive approach that is both flexible and comprehensive (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The transcripts were read several times to become familiar with their contents, before each was thematically coded in a data-driven manner allowing the themes to be identified. A theme can be defined as “some level of patterned response of meaning” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 10). Themes were developed as the transcripts were coded, and as themes were identified, it allowed others to be collapsed together, discarded, or restructured. This led to a thematic tree as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006; Appendix G). Six broad themes were identified. These were Drinking Activity, General Facebook Activity, Types of Photos, Reasons for Photos, Drinking Photos, and Photo Activity. Given the complexity of the various components of Facebook, several subthemes were also identified for each of these categories.

All relevant passages from each transcript were transferred electronically into separate word document databases according to their appropriate themes. It was not uncommon for passages to be in multiple databases. For example, a participant may have talked about a ‘funny’ photo and tagging within the same sentence. That passage would be placed in both the Types of Photo database and the Photo Activity database. The original transcripts and screen capture were used as a constant reference, to ensure the context of the participants’ talk was not distorted. This process was fully inclusive and comprehensive and resulted in six word document databases between 57 and 149 pages long.

The research questions were then used as a lens to identify the relevant themes and subthemes for further analysis. Four themes, Drinking photos, Types of Photos, Photo Activity

---

1 The number of albums uploaded by the user was previously in brackets next to the “Photo” link. The researcher did not of this change at the time of the interviews.
and Reasons for Photos, were identified as being of primary importance. Some of the Facebook Activity subthemes were referred to during the discursive analysis stage in areas that became relevant through the progression of the analysis, such as the privacy sub-theme. As with the participants’ profile page, it was also necessary to provide a brief description of their drinking and socialising to provide a context for their Facebook photos, and more specifically, their drinking photos. Therefore, instead of discarding the Drinking Activity database, it was used for the descriptive section which will be seen in the next chapter.

Discourse analysis was the next stage of the analytical process. It is also consistent with the social constructionist theoretical and epistemological underpinning this study. Discourse analysis goes further than a simple thematic analysis. It allows an investigation into how subjectivity (particular ‘ways-of-being’ and ‘ways-of-seeing’ the world), practices, and the context work to build these knowledges (Willig, 2008). These all have implications for a persons’ actions, experience, feelings and talk (Burr, 2003; Willig, 2008). A discourse can be defined as a “system of statements which constructs an object” (Parker, 1990, p. 101). Prevailing discourses legitimise and re-legitimate certain types of knowledge and allow particular power structures and social realities to be dominant (Willig, 2008).

Discourse analysis is consistent with the research aims because it allows us to understand the way young adults construct their immediate social and psychological realities and experiences, while placing it in its wider social and cultural context. Since visuality (and visual culture) also includes power relations (Mirzoeff, 2009), it also allows us to investigate the different positions that young adults take up within the discourses around Facebook photos, their implications and how they negotiate and work within the power structures surrounding these constructions.

For the discursive analysis, the databases were read multiple times. The researcher noted the language used, noting the similarities and differences across the participants. The linguistic devices, such as metaphors and tropes, subject position, and action was also explored at this stage (Willig, 2001). This resulted in a summary of the participants’ talk, in terms constructions, functions, similarities, differences, tensions, and how the participants were constrained, facilitated, and finally negotiated between these various tensions. The summaries and databases were then re-examined and three major discourses were identified. Although many more could have been identified, these three primary discourses
were used by all of the participants to construct their Facebook photo experience. Four extracts were then identified that reflected the intersections of the separate discourses. These were re-examined, along with the corresponding photos, to examine how the actual photos and photo tools reflected the intersecting discourses.

**Reflexivity**

The social constructionist and visual ethnographic approaches acknowledge the role and influence the researcher has on the actual study. Therefore, my own influence as a female, Pākehā, Health Psychology Masters student, needs to be considered. Also, I have an academic background in Psychology, Philosophy and Statistics, and a personal interest in Photography.

As an undergraduate student and active Facebook user who logged in at least once daily, I had become very aware of the drinking culture that is heavily present in New Zealand and its appearance on Facebook in the form of photos. I have continued to notice the central part that drinking plays on Facebook through my own personal network of friends. This has made me aware of the central role that Facebook, Facebook photos and drinking play in students’ lives. More particularly, photos of my own socialising on Facebook have allowed me to be constantly reminded of activities with my own friends, making photos a unique component of my Facebook experience. This all helped frame my approach to my study as I aimed to represent the view of the actual student users that did not seem to be adequately represented in the previous research.

This was also important during the analysis stage. I noted the similarities and differences between my own personal experiences on Facebook and those of my participants. As a Facebook user I was familiar with the architecture and uses of Facebook. Although this was an advantage at times, it was also a disadvantage at others. Some aspects of Facebook use and drinking activities would go unexplained and I found that I had to sometimes be the ‘naïve enquirer’ in order to gain more insight into the participants’ online activity. During the analysis, I found it helpful because it allowed me to quickly navigate the integral components of their ‘Photo Activity’ database with ease.
My age and similar experience helped to build a rapport with the participants to provide easy access to their Facebook and socialising experiences. I was only four years older than all of my participants at the time of the interviews. I also have a reasonably similar background to most of my participants as I lived away from home for my undergraduate study and stayed in a university hostel in my first year like all of the participants. I was surrounded by student drinking cultures, which were prominent at my university, but have also socialised with people that did not drink. This meant I felt comfortable talking with all both the ‘non-drinker’ and ‘drinker’ participants. My own personal knowledge meant that I had to treat the data carefully so I did not presuppose the importance of certain areas of importance.

As a Pākehā, I felt had different implications for the interviews. It usually meant I could easily identify and understand the other Pākehā’ cultural and drinking background, while I needed to explore this aspect more with the Chinese and Indian participant. The Māori participant did not seem to identify strongly as Māori, her comment being that she “fills in the box when I need to {laughs}”, giving the impression this was not a large part of her identity. A similar ethnic and social background meant that I did not ask the obvious questions that may have given more insight in my analysis stage, however, I felt it meant that there was more rapport with some participants. On the other hand, differing backgrounds meant that I had to explore these issues more thoroughly with these participants because it often impacted on their drinking and Facebook experiences. During the analysis stage, I noted it would have been useful to have explored this perspective more fully at the time of the interview.

Being female meant an instant rapport with some of the female participants which led to easy discussion around gendered online activity. In saying this, the male participants seemed comfortable and relaxed and reasonably open and communicative. However, I got the impression some were more reluctant than others to make gendered statements about Facebook and drinking activities.

Lastly, my strategy of recruitment did have some impact on some of my interviews. Sometimes drinking stories were cut short or photos were skipped over because the participants realised I recognised someone. I tried to make the participants feel at ease when this occurred but I allowed the participants to lead the interview at these points so
they could skip ahead if they wanted to because it was important they only shared the information they were comfortable with.
Chapter Four: Results

As described in the previous chapter, a discourse analysis was performed on the participants’ talk. Three distinct discourses were identified. These were the normal, natural and everyday discourse, the fun, pleasure and humour discourse, and finally the acceptability and appropriateness discourse. Each of these discourses will be described to show how the participants draw on each to construct, explain and justify their Facebook photos. These discourses work to present a normalised, positive, and socially acceptable online student drinking culture. In the final section, it will be shown how these three discourses intersect within the participants’ talk and the corresponding photos. Before these discourses are discussed, the participants’ Facebook profiles and their drinking and socialising practices will be described to provide a context for rest of the chapter.

Background and Context

This section aims to provide a brief descriptive overview of the participants’ Facebook pages and drinking activities, as shown in Table 2 (all names are pseudonyms). The nine participants had a range of 181 to 423 Facebook friends listed on their profile and were ‘tagged’ in 44 to 454 photos. Some participants uploaded very few albums themselves, like Kieran who only had three albums on his profile. One of these albums is automatically generated by Facebook and contains the profile pictures, meaning, he actually uploaded two albums. On the other hand, Tamsin had 17 albums which contained between two and 200 photos (maximum amount possible within an album), while Bella had 400 photos of one trip which spanned two albums.

The names of the albums the participants had created were diverse and ranged from having very specific labels, for example, party and place names, to very general or generic labels, for example, ‘2009’. Others referenced pop-culture, for example song lyrics, while some were emphasised using capitalisation or emoticons, for example ‘:)’ (smiley face). Photo content was also highly diverse, and included socialising with friends, drinking, pranks, road trips, family holidays, high school and university formal events, birthdays, scenery, and artistic endeavours, to name a few.
The participants reported uploading photos for a number of reasons, but primarily because showing, sharing and storing photos on Facebook was common, easy and functional. Danielle was the most extreme with this functional storage in that she purposely uploaded everything she wanted to keep onto Facebook simply because she did not have the capability of storing it on her laptop. Some participants did not consider themselves’ active users and uploaded only a few photos, particularly Quintin and Kieran. However, if and when they did upload photos, it was for showing, sharing and storage purposes. All of the participants, irrespective of their amount of time of Facebook, reported looking and interacting with photos on Facebook demonstrating that all were involved within this online photo culture to some extent.

Table 2

Descriptive information about the participants’ Facebook profiles and drinking practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Friends</th>
<th>Number of ‘Tagged’ Photos</th>
<th>Reported usual amount of alcohol per drinking session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bella</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>5-6 standard drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>8 standard drinks*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamsin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>5-9 standard drinks*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Doesn’t drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Doesn’t drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10-15 standard drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>8 standard drinks*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>15-16 standard drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10-12 standard drinks*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amounts calculated according to the type of beverage they consumed (ALAC, 2012)

Seven of the participants reported drinking alcohol. All of these participants reported drinking episodes that met or exceeded the New Zealand ‘binge drinking’ criteria of four or more standard drinks for women and six or more standard drinks for men (Ministry of Health, 2010), as shown in Table 2. Some participants said this varied across different occasions, for example a few glasses of wine for “casual drinks” or one “stubby” (can of beer) after a big day at university, to an excess of sharing a 50 litre keg with six others or a “goon sack” (two litre box of wine) with another friend. Although these amounts seemed to vary with the type of activity or event, the amount consumed during their drinking occasions exceeded the safe drinking criteria.

The frequency of these drinking sessions had changed for all of the drinking participants. At the time of the interviews, although the drinking participants drank heavily - between once
a week and less than once a month - all of them reported drinking more often during the preceding year (first year at university). This was due to the hostel environment, which was more conducive to frequent drinking. Also, the Christchurch earthquakes, which happened after they left the hostel, meant fewer opportunities to drink. When the earthquakes hit Christchurch in September 2010 and February 2011, measuring 7.1 and 6.3 on the Richter scale respectively (Geonet, 2012), the city centre with its pubs, bars and clubs was lost. The only bars left were too crowded, had long queues or door charges. The drinking participants also said that they did not drink due to commitments, or being in certain situations, like not knowing the people at the party.

Drinking was often synonymous with socialising as it was consistently described as fun, having a good time, social, and enjoyable. Quintin described his drinking experiences as “socialising, I drink in social situations. I don’t go to my room and drink by myself because it could be indicative of a lot of problems I think but I- I drink around other people with other people.” Their drinking was often seen as normal due to their age, stage in life and student status. Some problems or consequences due to drinking were described. Some were serious, like Kieran’s description of a friend that kept knocking himself out when drinking. Other consequences were often minimised and not seen as a problem, especially in relation to participants over drinking. For example, Kieran referring to “pulled a blank” instead of loss of memory while being really drunk, and Tamsin referring to being comatosed after drinking as having “a wee rest and ended up asleep I was quite drunk”.

The two most prominent locations for drinking were student flats and organised events. These were still available to Christchurch students after the earthquakes and moving out of the hostel. Student flats were the place for parties, casual drinks, pre-loading before big events, and ‘red cards’. Red cards are described in the following extract:

Extract 1:

Owen: Ah it's like a red- like each flat can pull one and one person can pull a red card each year and it normally involves a lot of drinking and stuff and peop-well people having to do a really like um terrible things like um, I dunno sitting out in the snow or something so that- that was someone's or running around the field while finishing a box of beer or something like that. And then yeah. And they make everyone everyone in the flat has to do it. If- if someone pulls a red card type of thing.
These flat drinking events normally included drinking games, like “Beer Pong” and “Circle of Death” which all had specific rules which the participants were able to describe in great detail.

Kieran and Tamsin noted another impact of the earthquake and the subsequent loss of ‘town’. Flat parties got much larger, more chaotic and sometimes involved the police in riot gear. This is explained in the following extract:

**Extract 2:**

Tamsin: we just go round to the party wherever it was and whatever we’re doing, and drink some more (laughs), and just go round and talk to people that we haven’t seen for a while or, yeah music’s normally going, normally a fire (laughs), um police normally come (laughs).

... Um since the earthquake the police have been quite heavy handed with parties and they’re not very tolerant of them, and if they get any noise complaints at all they come round and shut it down, and then of course I went to one and everyone there was heaps and heaps and heaps of people there and this was probably 10 o’clock on a Saturday night and um, then, the police formed a wall and you could only go one way down the street and that really annoys people. So a bottle gets thrown and police start chasing you down the street (laughs), um so yeah it’s kinda funny but (laughs) not if you’re one of the people that gets arrested or gets fined for having an open bottle or something (laughs) that’s not very fun. Not that that’s happened to me but yeah.

Events, which were often costume themed, were another opportunity for these participants to drink. A prominent one being “Tea Party”, which was an end of lectures party organised by the University of Canterbury. These events often involved heavy drinking, and pre-loading before the event.

Danielle and Stella did not drink. Danielle did not drink because she did not like the idea of drinking, was scared by the potential consequences and saw it as a waste of money. Stella did not drink for family reasons and did not see the point because socialising could still be fun without being drunk. The drinking and non-drinking participants talked about similar social activities that did not involve alcohol. These were, hanging out with friends and doing activities such as watching movies, shopping and going out for meals together. Alcohol and being drunk seemed to be the point of difference in their social lives. While Stella had sometimes been to clubs with friends, she did not seem to interact with people that drank heavily, and Danielle specifically mentioned avoiding a hostel event because there were other students who were drinking.
Normal, Natural, and Everyday Discourse

Participants frequently construct the camera and subsequent photos as a routine part of socialising. This is prominent within certain activities, like road trips, outings, holidays, social events, particularly those involving alcohol. The participants draw on the normal, natural and everyday discourse to integrate the camera and the Facebook photos into their everyday socialising experiences. Having a camera, taking photos and uploading them to Facebook, often becomes synonymous with drinking activities. This works to create a normalised camera culture and normalise Facebook photo culture.

The following extract shows how, for Stella, the camera is a natural part of socialising, and how it seamlessly integrates into socialising with friends.

Extract 3:

Stella: I've got photos of when we've just been in the room- in one of the rooms at the hostel just having fun maybe sitting there talking and one of the girls reached for the camera and just started taking random photos, or there was a night when I was actually doing henna patterns on the hands and we were just taking random photos as well of the others sitting round and, what everyone else was doing in the room.

As Stella recalls this scene in her room, she draws on the normal, natural and everyday discourse to show how the camera and therefore the photos are embedded and natural within everyday social activities. Although the use of the camera is constructed as being spontaneous, and the “random” photos produced as aimless, this shows how easily a camera can be seamlessly and naturally integrated into friends’ social interaction to document their time together.

This construction of the camera as a natural component of the participants’ socialising is reinforced within their drinking activity. So much so that, particularly at events, there is usually one and often multiple cameras. Quintin described this as people getting “trigger happy” at parties. Tamsin explained that while drinking, the camera came out because “you’re with your friends.” This is simply because, at the time, friends drank and socialised together. In this way, this construction normalises and thoroughly embeds the camera within the drinking experience. Even Kieran, who is the least actively involved within this drinking camera culture in terms of uploading and interacting with photos, is almost resigned to the fact that drinking with certain (female) friends means a camera will be
involved. If there were females around, such as his girlfriend or mates’ girlfriends, then there would be a camera.

The gendered nature of photography is a key part of this discourse. Kieran draws on the normal, natural, and everyday discourse to position girls as the photographers who capture the drinking and socialising activity. Other female and male participants reinforce this idea of girls predominantly taking photos. Jared and Quintin both support this subject position and Rebecca goes so far as to talk about certain “camera girls” who can be relied on to have their camera.

Extract 4:

Rebecca: So like um I don’t know because I’m not really one of those camera girls, you know you’ve got those camera girls and they take photos of everything... you have those girls and they’re always they’ve always got their camera like where you always go out and you can turn round and rely on them to have their camera there taking photos of everything or um yeah {laughs}, and I would never ever take my camera out to the pub or out around.

AT: So is there one person who takes most of the photos in your group or is there =
Rebecca: = Um yeah. So normally it would be um either Beatrice or um, Bailey. I don’t know if Beatrice was there at the time. But yeah they seem to be the main (5) can’t actually but yeah normally Beatrice or Bailey or um, who else takes photos? No boys. Boys don’t tak- the boys don’t take photos.

Although these “camera girls” are Rebecca’s friends, she reinforces this gender stereotype in two ways. Firstly, she reinforces the general stereotype that “boys don’t take photos”. Then, instead of generalising to all females, she constructs a specific type of “camera girl” who always has her camera. Rebecca rejects this label for herself by stating it is not something she would do, but easily identifies specific female friends within her peer groups who fit this subject position. Rebecca’s construction seems to position herself higher in the social hierarchy by not being a “camera girl”. This is reinforced by Tamsin when she speaks of a female friend who always uploads the first photos on Sunday morning. Although it is “useful” it is also “a little sad”. Although they are happy for other females to do this, they do not associate this with themselves, and are slightly derisive of this position. Kieran, although not actively involved within this normalised camera culture does takes advantage of it. He sometimes opts for a “spur of the moment” boy’s photos. Therefore, although he positions himself as being uninvolved and his participation as spontaneous, he draws on the normal, natural and everyday discourse to explain his involvement. His gender is able to take advantage of this female pursuit. This photo culture is so normalised and embedded
within their drinking activity, it is not really possible to reject it. Therefore, even though it is not an integral part of his drinking and socialising practices, Kieran still draws on the normal, natural, and everyday discourse to explain his Facebook photos, because socialising with certain friends means having a camera.

The participants also construct uploading these photos onto Facebook as normal. They draw on the normal, natural and everyday discourse to explain that uploading these photos onto Facebook is the natural progression of the drinking episode. It is embedded within their drinking activities and Facebook interaction. The participants use casual language to describe the mundane ease in which these photos are uploaded. Owen describes his and others uploading as “just do it cause it- cause everyone does it, it's just you know it's just a common thing to put your photos up there of people, and I dunno I just chuck them on aye.” It is constructed as an easy and normative practice. He positions himself as one of many, relying on the group norm to justify his own uploading practices. Although some participants reinforce the effort and time it takes to put these photos online, they upload them because it is expected by their friends. Facebook is the normal platform to share these photos. Quintin, who describes himself as not being a “devote” or “regular” user, explains how regularly he views drinking related images on his newsfeed or friends profile pages. This is shown in the following extract when he talks about their class Facebook group page.

Extract 5:

Quintin: Yeah ah yeah, there's definitely photos of drinking.
AT: Yup.
Quintin: Because well university social interaction revolves around alcohol. (So it really occurs) on Saturday nights and Thursday nights when people are drinking and drunk and photos are taken getting drunk and they're all up the next day on facebook and people can like them and (sniffs) and then talk about them and things and they go around and they end up on th- on the [Facebook group], on the class website so everyone can see what Dylan did on the weekend.
AT: Oh ok.
Quintin: Stuff like that but, but yeah there is definitely a lot of stuff about alcohol there.
AT: So it spreads sort of?
Quintin: Yeah, yeah.
AT: Yup.
Quintin: It's a good place to go for rumours and gossip.

In this extract, alcohol is centrally located within Quintin's construction of university socialising. Being drunk, he presents as a normal and cyclical activity for a regular university
student. It is then normal to disclose this on Facebook the next day as it spreads among the class through Facebook. These interactions with alcohol and Facebook appear to be an entrenched activity within their regular week. He positions his peers’ involvement within this drinking photo culture as part of their normal routine social interactions at university, which normalises student drinking cultures on Facebook.

The participants often use their age, student status, and the university social life as reasons to justify the dominant drinking content in their own and their friends’ photos. It is acceptable and normal for them to be drinking; therefore it is acceptable and normal to have drinking photos. Rebecca untags photos of herself holding alcohol because she does not like the ‘heavy drinker’ label that might be attached. However, she still justified photos of her peers’ blatant displays of excessive drinking.

**Extract 6:**

**AT:** So like, it doesn’t worry you but do you think it would worry other people?
**Rebecca:** Umm (2) maybe I guess because also because of like uni students and it’s kind of almost expected. Like that sort of thing but like if you showed I dunno maybe a family members or like your nana or your grandad might be like OH MY GOODNESS like what are you doing {laughs}. But yeah it’s sort of (2) being made okay by like that student sort of way about things, like drinking. Sort of being made to think it’s alright, it’s not shock horror what are you doing.

**AT:** So what makes it ok?
**Rebecca:** I don’t know. Just because I dunno I guess, I’ve seen it happen before like you’ve seen people do funnels and keg stands and that sort of thing (2) and it’s yeah sort of (4) mm.

**AT:** So you mentioned um sort of what's expected of a =

**Quintin:** Oh within my friends, me personally as well and I think that’s the general feeling you get from uni students and people aged 18 to 19 just despite whatever the health risks are despite the dangers and the damage, its still its still enjoyable and then in 5 years people will grow out of it and have families and mature.

**AT:** Ok cool.

**Quintin:** So I don’t think it’s a problem. I dunno I dunno the fact that it gives it an image that people binge drink and it certainly gives an image that I seem to spend a lot of my time drinking but I think the drinking happening anyway and the fact is that Facebook is here now where it wasn’t 5 years ago, so the photos are online now where they weren’t. So it shows it shows the drinking but I and and sort of a historical perspective I don’t think it is any any worse or any more serious than it would have been 20 or 50 years ago.
In extract 6, Rebecca acknowledges the possibility of a negative response by family or others outside of their social group, but she shows how her peers resist this problematic positioning. This can be done because student drinking is nothing new. It is not “shock horror”. These drinking photos are “made okay” because student drinking is so normalised, including explicit displays of drinking, like keg stands and funnels. She then further justifies and resists this problematic positioning because students are fulfilling expectations by drinking and socialising in this extreme manner. By using the “work hard play hard” motto, she paints them as the hard working and responsible, yet fun-loving students who are simply doing the drinking activities expected of them, again normalising their drinking photos and off-setting any blame. In extract 7, Quintin also draws on this normalised non-problematic construction of binge drinking. He acknowledges the health risks but resists and brushes aside this negative construction by anchoring this “binge” style of drinking to a developmental stage and university context. Drinking in this way will not happen in the future, according to Quintin, as they mature and take on more responsibilities in life. This construction is then transferred to his construction of Facebook photos. Quintin explains that although his photos might give the image of drinking a lot, this is not necessarily the case. Drinking was no worse that it has been historically; it simply is made more “public” by Facebook. He draws on the normal, natural and everyday discourse within a historical perspective to position himself and his peers within a long line of New Zealand drinkers. He also challenges and counter-acts any moral panic over today’s ‘youth’ in terms of Facebook and drinking. He introduces Facebook as the new element within this normalised drinking culture, integrating the two. He rationalises that drinking is still ordinary, but it is simply now ordinary online as well. This collectively minimises the possible problematic associations with these drinking photos and legitimises their presence on Facebook.

It is not only Facebook friends who upload drinking photos, but third party organisations as well. Within the drinking participants, this is mainly photographers from university students associations. Quintin, Owen, Rebecca and Tamsin talked about connecting and interacting with these photos. These photographers document specific events like ‘tea party’ (end of year lecture party at the University of Canterbury) and upload them onto their organisations’ Facebook page. The students are ‘friends’ with the students associations, giving them access to the photos, and letting them tag themselves and their friends so they are connected to their own Facebook profile. The participants construct the viewing,
tagging, and any subsequent interaction as an anticipated and routine post-event ritual. This third party involvement is constructed as non-problematic and normal because the photographers are integrated into the event. The participants have little or no control over how the images are used, but they still construct it as normal and part of the fun surrounding the event. Only Quintin reports this as “slightly unsettling”. This is only because other users who are ‘friends’ with the students association could access his profile. However, he quickly side-steps this issue, therefore minimalises these concerns.

The normal, natural and everyday discourse is utilised by the participants to achieve three things; normalising the camera within their drinking activity and socialising, normalising sharing and displaying these drinking behaviours on Facebook, and therefore, normalising this student drinking culture online. Drinking, socialising, having a camera and Facebook have become integrated and synonymous. The camera and photos have been integrated into their actual drinking activity, to the point where it is normal for strangers to take their photos. The camera is embedded and a natural part of their socialising, particularly when drinking. This normalises a camera culture that is so thoroughly embedded that it is almost unavoidable and very hard to object to.

Moreover, this normalises Facebook photo culture in general. Again, it is so normal that it makes it very hard for anyone to object. In this way, the participants are only given two choices. Either the participants do not care what is uploaded or they have to actively manage how they are involved, through tagging, untagging, uploading and deleting practices. The photos on Facebook become an integral and synonymous part of their drinking activities. Viewing, commenting, ‘liking’ and tagging are a routine part of the drinking experience, a post-night-out ritual event that the participants engaged with when they logged onto Facebook. This constant interaction reinforces and continues the drinking experience online.

The participants utilise the normal, natural and everyday discourse to legitimate their participation within student drinking cultures. They place themselves within a larger student culture, justifying their position through group norms, student status, university context, and the broader normalised New Zealand binge drinking culture. As Facebook photos are now embedded within this student drinking culture, this works to normalise student drinking cultures online making these displays normal, common and routine. It
therefore validates the participants’ own participation within routine, everyday online student drinking cultures.

These photos are also a visual way of keeping in touch. This normalised culture of sharing photos on Facebook enables people to keep in touch and know what is happening in each other’s lives. The photos bridge physical boundaries for family and friends when these relationships are geographically constrained. Facebook provides a platform where these photos can be shared, enabling people to keep in touch easily. For these people, sharing and interacting with Facebook photos has become an everyday and normal event when they log on. There is something more potent about the visual aspect of these photos, seeing is better than just reading. Although Facebook photos are helpful in this way, they do not necessarily replace actual social interaction. In fact, they usually act as a starting point for further interaction between friends and family, and consequently reinforce these relationships. These photos are predominantly about physical socialising; therefore it makes sense that they do not replace face-to-face contact.

Fun, pleasure and humour discourse

The fun, pleasure and humour discourse is drawn on by participants to create a positive construction of their Facebook photos, and their surrounding activities. This creates a light-hearted and non-problematic environment in which to interact with these photos, and reconstruct the activities they represent. This discourse of fun, pleasure and humour is offered as an explanation and justification for the presence of most of the participants’ Facebook photos, even those that are potentially unkind or have potentially inappropriate content. These positive constructions function to allow the participants to reinforce their friendships by creating intimacy and camaraderie among peers. As these photos are constructed as fun, funny and entertaining in this way, it is easy to see why they perpetuate and are continually uploaded onto Facebook. This normalises a positive Facebook photo culture.

The participants use the fun, pleasure, and humour discourse to construct the camera as an object of fun and pleasure, acting to capture valuable memories and sometimes safeguarding against boredom. Danielle and Stella, who are removed from drinking episodes, both describe times that the camera allowed their friendship groups to have fun.
This also happens within drinking activities as well. Jared drew on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to construct these photos and the camera becoming a source of pleasure, even when the drinking experience was over.

**Extract 8:**

Jared: It’s cool to look at them in the morning and the next day and see- see what everyone looked like and how they did. I know some of my friends they used to say um they used to take photos of themselves and say “we’re not allowed to review or look at any of the photos until the next day”. I- I guess they just did that to you know like laugh at it so it’s a surprise and they can’t delete photos at the time or anything and just let all the photos be there.

Jared shows how his friends have created rules to ensure there are new surprises to enjoy and pre-empt any possible objections to the photos. This then continues indefinitely when the drinking photos are uploaded on Facebook. It makes sure the authentic drinking experience is documented because none of the photos are deleted.

These photos elicit reconstructions and accounts of fun nights drinking with friends. The drinking participants continually draw on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to positively describe and relive the funny antics and “crazy nights” facilitated by being drunk. Some of the best and funniest stories and memories were from the “biggest” nights and where the participants described themselves or their friends as “absolutely munted”. These stories are retold focusing on the specific moments depicted in the photo that made the night great. This is shown in the following extract:

**Extract 9:**

Kieran: Um oh that was one of the craziest nights yeah {grinning, shakes head}.
AT: Can you sort of just =
Kieran: = Oh we were just yeah got really drunk it was at the local pub in Auckland. And um we just got back to Auckland and having a catch up with all our friends. So yeah it was just a really good night.
AT: How was it a crazy night?
Kieran: Oh cause we ended up getting pretty drunk cause all my mates kept buying drinks for everyone cause they were so happy to catch up with us. So yeah.
AT: What did you guys do?
Kieran: Um oh we were just dancing um and talking catching up with them. Yeah and then went home.
AT: So what was it that made it crazy?
Kieran: Oh just cause I ended up getting SO drunk {grinning} like, I didn’t plan to drink that much, and yeah being nuts cause everyone was just buying us drinks like ( ).
A photo of grinning faces represents a great time Kieran had with his friends, and being extremely drunk was part of the fun. He draws on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to re-construct one of the “craziest nights”. Simply being in a local pub and catching up with friends becomes extremely enjoyable when alcohol is involved. Expressions of friendship are intertwined with alcohol because his friends buying him drinks are interpreted as them being pleased to see him. Kieran shows how alcohol and friends are the components that make this night great, and this is what he gains from a Facebook photo.

Participants consistently construct their photos within the oppositional dichotomy; the ‘good’ and the ‘bad’ photo. The positive discourse of fun, pleasure and humour was instrumental in the constructions of a ‘good’ photo and explains why participants put these photos on their Facebook page. These positive constructions include photos that are fun, funny, joking, cool, good appearance, and the good and fun times with friends. As Rebecca said, the photos that represent this positive framing, if any, are the ones that are most likely to be tagged.

Seemingly self-explanatory photos have deeper meanings for these participants. As shown in extract 9, these photos often have a back-story, a context, a deeper meaning above and beyond ordinary and mundane images on a computer screen. The participants draw on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to construct these photos in a positively. These often jovial, light-hearted and funny constructions allow the participants to re-tell and reconstruct good times had while drinking. This even includes times when friends have fallen over in photos while being drunk. Owen reframes this positively and minimalises it by saying “But yeah they’re all smiling like they’re having a good time.” Even stories that are sometimes extreme or risky, as Quintin retells a time “involving other chemicals”, are all positive. Most of the drinking stories involve funny antics or catching up with friends, made more fun with the involvement of alcohol. This is shown in the following extract:

**Extract 10:**

Quintin: Well tha- that is a drinking photo, obviously ah, we had had been on town in Dunedin and we were in the Night and Day shop on the way home, and there is a cake carousel just as you walk in the door with those really nice spinning cakes that are about $30 {laughs} but one of us said wouldn’t it be really funny if we bought one. So we bought a raspberry white chocolate gateau and I offered it to everyone we met on the way home and that’s the picture with {laughs} meth addicts, they actually do look a bit like meth addicts, that was me and one of my friends. Meth addict number 1 and 2 and they are just sniffing the gateau just to
see if its legitimate. A few people said we'd- we'd made their night by offering them
a piece of cake.
AT: Oh sweet.
Quintin: Oh but yeah that's taken by someone on his cell phone.
AT: Yeah.
Quintin: So this is something else that is quite common, cell phone pictures that
go up.
AT: Do they sort of get uploaded straight away or ?
Quintin: Ah no this one didn't, sorta ah a while after it happened I think, about a
month. He jus- he just must have been scrolling through pictures on his cell phone
and thought it would be funny to put this up.

Quintin, re-telling this drinking story, shows the funny moments that can happen while
drinking. He draws on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to explain why his friend
uploaded the photo. Even though this is not uploaded immediately it is still worth showing
on Facebook because it acts as a reminder of a funny time together. By tagging the photo in
this manner, they are able to bestow more substantial context in the photo giving it
significant meaning for those who understand and have insider knowledge of the event that
has taken place. It also works to continue the joke that was initiated during the drinking
episode, extending the fun in this online setting.

The participants centrally locate their friendships within these positive constructions. They
describe their photos as being taken with friends, of friends, and for friends, as well as
themselves. The fun, pleasure and humour discourse is utilised by participants as they
illustrate how seemingly bland, uninteresting photos were actually fun moments with
friends.

Extract 11:

AT: So do you do similar things when your drinking as to when you’re not
drinking with your friends?
Jared: Yeah yeah I ‘spose you have more control when you’re you know what
you’re doing but like when your with your mates you just I dunno you act stupid
anyway regardless because you know they’re like your good friends and it’s not
going to matter what you do around them.
AT: Mhm.
Jared: So yeah here I was sober as well we just played at MJ's and stuff.
AT: So why did you write that?
Jared: "Neil's a dick" I spose that's what he wanted to call it cause I was
probably being a dick (laughs) I guess I dunno.
AT: By being a dick what do you =
Jared: = Well like pulling a stupid face and putting on his glasses and things in
his room and taking photos of myself.
This extract shows how Jared draws on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to position himself as not taking life too seriously because he minimises his actions in the photo as “just being a dick”. By drawing on the discourse in this manner, it allows Jared to construct this photo as representing a close friendship. He is able to let his guard down with his friends and do stupid things. This construction and the subject positioning show the primacy of the friendship that is embedded within this photo. The comments, tagging and liking, all work to reinforce and continue these positive constructions.

“Just” having fun, being funny, being silly and being drunk were constantly offered as an explanation for displaying photos of silly poses, funny facial expressions, and activities on Facebook. The word “just” works to create a simplistic construction of these ‘good’ Facebook photos, and offered an uncomplicated explanation for why they were online. It implies the rationale for these photos is obvious and that they and their contents are no big deal. Being drunk minimises and excuses a lot of content online, because this non-problematic framing was consistent with the positive Facebook environment.

The participants also construct their photos to have additional benefits, which outweigh the potential consequences. These photos recall positive memories elicited by the photos as the participants retell the events with laughter and emphasise the fun and funny moments that took place that night. It is their intention to have a memory of the fun times shared together while drinking. Even those who said they did not actively get very involved with the photo culture on Facebook (Bella, Rebecca, Quintin and Kieran) still derive pleasure and retell their fun drinking stories on viewing their photos. Despite the simple descriptive terms, these photos have deeper ‘insider’ meanings representing shared times, shared memories, shared contexts, and shared jokes that create intimacy among the friends who share this personalised knowledge.

Kieran was not that interested in Facebook photos and he felt that his photos, in their totality, did not represent his actual drinking and socialising experience because his mates did not take photos. However, extract 12 shows how he derives more pleasure and satisfaction from certain photos than others. This is because they represent particular times with friends who are important to him.

Extract 12:

Kieran: Um I think these are the stuff um I added. That’s us at tea party. It’s like um sorta close friends, ahh I got like a few ah probably about 5 more but um like
really close guy mates. But then yeah we all went you have to go in cos- in costume to tea party so we all went as double brown cans yeah it was sort of a last minute thing yeah it was pretty easy to do cause it was cardboard so we just chucked on some paint and yeah.

AT: So why did you choose double brown?
Kieran: Um cause that was what we were all drinking at the time. That was at [hostel] and we thought it was quite a fun thing to do and um this guys name is [name] so we saw it as a bit of a joke as a joke year. There was six of us so as a six pack even though you can't get a six but yeah I dunno we thought it was a good idea.

This extract shows a photo that he has actually uploaded himself (although he hardly ever does this). He selects and privileges specific friendships, and embeds their alcohol use within this. This particular photo creates and represents a specific friendship circle and these costumes are a representation of their shared drinking experiences together. Their beverage choice as a group is reflected in their costumes, and serves to reinforce the pleasurable drinking experiences the friends have together.

All of the participants draw on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to reconstruct personal jokes that are represented by photos. These are photos that mostly occur when drinking, as shown in extract 12. Event the actual drinking culture can also become the butt of a joke. This is shown in extract 13 as Quintin retells the night of his ball when he and his friends created a sign. This sign was based on the Tui beer billboards which are throughout New Zealand, that create jokes out of political, social and cultural issues by making an ironic statement which is then counter-acted as a joke with ”Yeah Right”. Quintin’s sign “Going as sober as fuck. Yeah Right”, creates an ironic statement about the necessity to drink before going to the hostel ball.

**Extract 13:**

Quintin: Yeah. Ah that's a joke obviously... Ah well it's a play on the Tui billboard obviously. Cause people won't be coming sober. Um I don't know why they wrote “going as sober as fuck”, it just means going sober.

AT: Yeah right.

Quintin: Going very sober.

By utilising the fun, pleasure and humour discourse and using the well-known Tui construct, he and his friends ridicule the idea of not drinking alcohol before this event. They again construct the drinking culture as acceptable and encouraged because it is not even considered an option to go sober. He and his friends have been tagged in this image to acknowledge and share who was there at the time it was created.
Some participants also draw on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to explain how potentially troubling, inappropriate, or mocking photos can be available publicly on Facebook and yet still be interpreted as a joke. Here the participants constantly worked to justify, minimalise and negate any negative associations. Potentially problematic content is managed and defended because the person tagged always has the power to untag themselves if they do not wish to have it on their profile. By using the idea of individual choice, the participants are able to position themselves as friendly, joking, and not trying to create problems. Mocking photos or album names have been used to do this. Rebecca named one album with the purpose to “take the piss” out of someone within her social circle. She is safe from different interpretations that might clash with this positive, light-hearted mockery because it is a joke that is only shared with certain friends who can be relied on to also interpret this in the same way. Tasmin shows how these mocking photos can be reframed using the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to create in-jokes among certain friends.

**Extract 14:**

Tamsin: Oh yeah, um, there's this other oh (S) well there's this other girl that poses like that all the time {does peace sign with fingers} with her back to the camera so that's me doing it {laughs}.
AT: Why does she do that?
Tamsin: I don't know. We think it look ridiculous. And yeah she also has photos of her on a skateboard like just there going {makes peace sign again} like that that's why it says “skater girl Tamsin”. And she's one of my flatmates and knows all about the photos that we're talking about and that's my friend Bethany and that's her friend from um home and I think she knows about them I think Bethany tells everyone jus- well not everyone but tells her friends about it just cause it looks ridiculous.

In this extract Tamsin draws on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to construct her photo, which occurred while she was drinking, in a positive, light-hearted manner. She is framing her own posing as a joke, minimalising the mocking nature of the image. By reinforcing the extreme “ridiculous” nature of this other girl’s pose and the degree to which she does it, she achieves two things. Firstly, she is able to justify her own posing as acceptable because her own intentions are different. Her intentions are acceptable because they are a joke, while the other girl is simply “ridiculous”. She is also able to reinforce the acceptability of this joke by distancing herself from this girl and justifying why she can become the object of ridicule. She includes specific friends in the construction and retells how the friends have relived this joke on Facebook. Consequently it is shown to be a collectively sanctioned construction that legitimises its
place on Facebook. The comments and ‘likes’ have been used to acknowledge, sanction and continue the joke after the funny moments have finished.

It has been seen that these photos often depict specific relationships and special moments, acting as a reference point for anecdotes and stories, and serve as an anchor to re-create the memories of good times shared together. Facebook provides an easily accessible terminal for the storage and sharing of these memories. The commenting, tagging, and ‘liking’ tools can help to create the context, reminisce, continue the jokes and the re-live the antics these photos represent. These positive constructions of photos act as a visual gateway to positive memories of drinking. By predominantly constructing and representing drinking as fun online, it reinforces a very specific version of the student drinking culture. This is version where drinking is fun, exciting, and produces great stories. These are now easily accessible and visually represented on Facebook. Facebook drinking photos allow the fun to continue when the actual drinking episode is over. However, by only representing the good times on Facebook, the negative side of drinking goes unacknowledged. These absent photos suppress the negative elements that would contradict this positive, jovial environment.

Located within these positive constructions and good memories are friendships which play an integral and central role. Different types of photos often represent specific meanings and relationships. Personal jokes, specific group representations, shared context, inner knowledge and shared memories all work together to create an intimacy and cohesion to reinforce a particular in-groups of friends. Jokes and fun times are a large part of their actual drinking experience. Facebook photos transition the boundary between the offline experience and online interaction to continue these jokes and fun times indefinitely. The contents and intention of a photo, album names, tagging, commenting, and ‘liking’ have all played a part in creating and enabling certain friends to acknowledge and interact with these in-jokes. Owen reinforces that although many people may see the photo, only “people that are there are more likely to comment on it because they know what is going on”. This is achieved among the potentially thousands of people that have access to these photos. Tagging, commenting, and personalised knowledge of the context is all working to emphasise the importance of specific relationships because the ‘out-group’ cannot understand these interactions. This creates power differentials within these relationships, depending on their inclusion or exclusion within the group. The power dynamics that are present within real life are translated into their construction and interactions with these
drinking photos. In this way, photos work as discursive resources to create or recreate power dynamics that are inherent within certain relationships.

Acceptability and Appropriateness Discourse

While the previous two discourses imply free play or that anything goes, participants also draw on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse, which imposes restrictions on action in this context. In this discourse, the participants construct a boundary of appropriateness (referred to as ‘boundary’ in this section) that dictates which photos are uploaded, tagged, untagged and deleted. This boundary is negotiated and flexible for individuals, and between groups and contexts. Despite the flexibility, complexity and nuances within this discourse, all of the participants draw on it at some time during their talk, to impose limitations for their Facebook photo content. It individually and collectively works to restrain, moderate and regulate their content online. The participants construct boundaries in two ways; individual boundaries, and shared common boundaries that are negotiated between relationships. These boundaries are contextual and depend on the intended, unintended, invisible audiences that are inherent within the context collapse within their own and others profile pages.

The participants describe their photos in multiple ways. The previous two sections have introduced the most common way of talking about their photos, constructing them as positive and normal. Other photos are described as “probably inappropriate”, “borderline” or “a bit over the line”, where they were still acceptable to have on Facebook in certain circumstances. The absent photos are also described. These are the photos they untag, delete, do not upload or do not take. These photos are often described in the extreme as “worse ones”, “badder stuff”, “really bad ones”, “bad facials”, all of which focus on the negative. Rebecca describes this as “there’s kind of like a boundary or what’s ok and what’s not ok to put up.” Together, a spectrum is constructed between the good and bad photo, and along this spectrum, each participant constructs a point that marks the “line” or “boundary” of appropriateness. They explain their photos as being within and beyond this line, sorting them between what is “good”, wanted and acceptable, and others that are “bad”, unwanted and inappropriate. The following extract shows how Tamsin constructs the boundaries of appropriateness and utilises it within her uploading practices.
Extract 15:

AT: So do you think there are sort of any rules around what you would put on Facebook and what you wouldn’t?
Tamsin: Um I probably wouldn’t put up any really embarrassing ones. If they were, I dunno, partly naked or you know sort of thing where they really wouldn’t want people to see and, I dunno I’ve probably got photos on my camera that I could put on but I just wouldn’t because like if people look really bad they obviously wouldn’t want it on Facebook. I just wouldn’t do it.
AT: Yeah.
Tamsin: I dunno.
AT: Yeah. Do you think it depends on the person?
Tamsin: Yeah yeah um, some people wouldn’t mind if you put bad photos of them on, but others like untag straight away and ask you to remove it so there’s no point in like wasting your internet uploading it. Um but yeah it depends on the person some people take it a bit more lightly I ‘spose. Some aren’t that bothered by it, what they look like.

Tamsin tacitly agrees that there are some constraints around photo sharing, and she constructs this boundary by the photos she would not upload onto Facebook. She acknowledges the inherent flexibility for others within her peer group. Others would impose their own restrictions on her Facebook photo content by untagging themselves or asking her to delete the image. Therefore, it is pointless for her to cross the boundary she has constructed and negotiated between her friends. In this way, she draws on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to collectively negotiate action between friends. She assumes to know what her friends would and would not want others to see, negotiating her own boundary within the context of her friendships. In this way, a collective boundary is co-constructed between friends and based on the assumptions of group norms.

Tamsin defines these unwanted photos as “bad” photos. This dichotomous construction of Facebook photos introduced in the previous section is central to this acceptability and appropriateness discourse. As shown in extract 15, these are the photos that are beyond the constructed boundary. These consist of looking bad, or are embarrassing, inappropriate, or compromising in some way. Given the context collapse within these participants Facebook profiles, where latent ties and close family are able to view their contents, all of the participants are mindful of this line in some way. Most photos are interpreted as being within the boundary of appropriateness and do not cause tensions, but ‘bad’ photos do. Deleting, not uploading, not tagging, and not being tagged in photos are all strategies that help to manage the possible tensions within this context collapse. Specific knowledge of friends helps this process. Danielle manages this by reviewing and deleting photos at the time they are taken by letting her friends evaluate the images. Extract 16
shows how Stella is able to use her own knowledge of her friends to avoid any relational conflicts.

**Extract 16:**

Stella: I've a couple of friends who are Muslim and they wear the headscarf and they're not allowed photos online without their headscarf on, or no guys are allowed to see their hair. So we have photos that we've taken when they don't have their headscarves on but they're ones I keep on my computer rather than upload so everyone can see, so it's not offending them and their religion sort of thing.

The extract illustrates how Stella constructs and understands a ‘bad’ photo on Facebook as being entirely contextual. She draws on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to construct how this would be a ‘bad’ photo to have online because of the potentially damaging consequences for her friends, “offending them and their religion”. She positions herself as a caring considerate friend who is concerned about the potential consequences for those depicted in the photo. In this, she manages to protect her own personal friendship, the wider relationships for her friends, and their position within a religious institution. She shows how the context of Facebook plays a key role within this construction. If it was on Facebook, it would be an offensive image because of the potential audience. In an offline context, this photo is perfectly acceptable because the audience is much smaller and more controllable.

In terms of drinking-related images, the previous two discourses have construct a positive normalised photo culture and Facebook photo culture, which might imply that everything is on Facebook. However, the participants draw on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to construct their limits. This discourse is particularly important when the participants navigate their drinking photos. Quintin explains this: “[People] I think are slightly more careful but when they're drunk obviously those inhibitions are are reduced a lot.” ‘Bad’ photos were more likely to happen when the participants were drunk.

The drinking participants work to maintain their individual boundaries and collectively work within their peer groups and wider social context to negotiate shared boundaries of appropriateness. The acceptability and appropriateness discourse enables the participants to reject any problematic constructions and justify their own drinking photos by juxtaposing them against those that were more extreme. Their own, as Jared describes, were “pretty PG” (using the media programme rating system) in that they were fairly appropriate for all
ages and audiences, but they are particularly appropriate for the intended audience; their friends. Furthermore, their drinking Facebook photos are also justified because they are expected of students at their age and stage in life. In this way, they position themselves as sensible Facebook users, sensitive to the potential risks of Facebook photos, while still being able to enjoy themselves within the student drinking culture. These drinking participants achieve being appropriate to their wider audience while being consistent with their age, stage, context and drinking status.

The following extract shows how these boundaries are constructed and negotiated among friends. Jared has shown on his Facebook page how a friend untagged a photo of herself because she was not happy with her appearance. On this occasion untagging was enough, but “terrible” photos would not be uploaded.

**Extract 17:**

Jared: Umm the really chronic ones I leave like me and her have a lot of really terrible photos of each other so there is sort of a line that we don't put the really really bad ones on Facebook. That's going to be more of a 21st type thing I think. But um yeah this would probably be one of the- since she untagged it yeah I think this is one of the bad ones.

AT: So by line can you explain?

Jared: Oh just like putting like a really hideous face or something like that or just like yeah it's normally a really bad faces but just a really terrible facial expression you just look like some sort of monster pretty much.

AT: Is it just facial expressions?

Jared: Yeah yeah it's nothing like yeah. Nothing worse than that I don't think.

AT: Ok so you wouldn't take photos of, like is there any times that you have taken different photos that you wouldn't put up on Facebook?

Jared: Umm, nah I - I like normally there's not much of a line I'd put most things up, but yeah like um Natalie doesn't appreciate it she's got a terrible photo up and she can blackmail me with like um, yeah it's more just um, it's normally it's normally involves in like I suppose social situations and things but um, like it's not just like you just pull a face at a camera or something and it will turn out really bad and wrong.

Jared draws on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to show how he and his friend have negotiated a “line” that dictates the content they upload. Some seemingly ‘bad’ photos are acceptable because they can be untagged, but “really really bad” photos don’t make it onto Facebook. Although he acknowledges many drinking photos are acceptable, some go beyond the “line” they have negotiated. He confirms and justifies the negotiated boundary by what is absent and he respects that Natalie would not appreciate him uploading certain images. He also acknowledges that it is worth while not uploading these images because she has similar “terrible” photos of him and can blackmail him. These
photos obviously exist, and since their friends have them, it also obliges friends to respect these negotiated boundaries. Like Stella in extract 16, Jared shows a more appropriate use for these “terrible” photos than sharing them on Facebook. He later explains that twenty first birthday parties are aimed at embarrassing people and a more socially appropriate platform to share those images.

This is consistent with how the participants deal with displaying photos of the consequences of drinking. Any consequences that cannot be re-constructed positively or minimised are not uploaded onto Facebook. The participants consistently draw on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to explain why their friends and they would not upload that particular type of photo. Even Owen, who claims “everything goes up” and “nothing’s missed out”, admits a photo of a person vomiting “would be a bit weird”. He draws on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to distance himself from the individuals who might upload these types of photos. This is reinforced by Jared who put a picture up that alludes to his friend vomiting but would not put up a video about the surrounding drinking activity because it would be too “intruding cause you can actually see like exactly what's happening and stuff whereas, I dunno you sort of make guesses about what's happening here and that like you know what's happened but well you don't actually see it as such”. The ambiguous nature of a photograph helps maintain the constructed boundaries, while still being able to represent the memories online.

Maintaining and working within these boundaries requires work. Bella, Tamsin, Rebecca and Quintin all recount times they have untagged or deleted images that were ‘bad’ photos which involved alcohol. When friends are in the images, or the participant is responsible for uploading the photos, this creates more work. The following extract from Rebecca illustrates how tension can be caused within friendships by not staying within the accepted boundaries:

**Extract 18:**

Rebecca: Well cause um I get asked to put them up like “ooo you took all those photos and you haven't put the up” and its like “mhmm” so I just put them all up didn't even look through them just put them on and then they were like “WHY DID YOU PUT THEM ON THEY ARE TERRIBLE” {outraged voice} and I'm like I didn't look at them I just put them on everybody was asking me to put the photos up.

Her friends believed these photos are unflattering and place the blame on Rebecca. She is being pressured to participate in more acceptable uploading practices by editing her
photos, like Tamsin in extract 15. Rebecca positions herself as being naive about uploading practices, using this as her excuse for not doing it. This absolves herself of responsibility. Later in the interview she acknowledges that she learnt to “check” these images, utilising her knowledge of acceptability and positioning herself as a friend who becomes well versed in managing her relationships.

These types of boundaries are constructed between friends who are at a similar age and stage in life. The boundaries can be negotiated because friends share similar roles and responsibilities. However, these boundaries are flexible enough so the participants can navigate, manage or renegotiate them when they no longer fit. This is particularly important for individually constructed boundaries, because the users’ defer to their own context collapse. The participants manage these clashes by untagging or deleting images.

An extract from Bella, follows a discussion on how she would now untag or delete certain images of herself because she is transitioning between her time as a student and her new role as a teaching student going out on teaching placements. The once acceptable drinking photos became ‘inappropriate’ contents.

**Extract 19:**

AT: Pulling the fingers?
Bella: Yeah maybe [laughs] yeah because I’ve had to like last year because I’m at teachers college um we had to check our profiles to make sure they were private because kids can actually look you up.
AT: Ok.
Bella: So we had to like when I was- so I’m kind of just a bit worried about that but it is private but just in case like someone can look at it, like I’m just yeah

[[laughs]]

AT: [so just]
Bella: [like] just a really bad ones like these ones like their drinking ones but.
AT: So you’re concerned who sees?
Bella: Yeah like if like, like it was when I didn’t realise when my profiles were private what our lecture does- did was they looked up some people in our class on Facebook [laughs] and then they um found some really embarrassing photos and then showed them to the photo class to emphasise like you need to make your um your profile private.

The participants draw on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to construct boundaries that are appropriate for their immediate context. In extract 18, Bella describes her change in circumstance and where the previously constructed shared boundaries no longer worked. She needed to renegotiate her individual involvement within online student
drinking cultures and manage the unwanted audiences and competing contexts on her Facebook page. She did this by untagging and deleting inappropriate photos, and changing her privacy settings. Like Rebecca in extract 18, in the beginning Bella positions herself as naive, but she quickly learns by example. She knows these photos are inappropriate and clash with her role as a teacher, and the new relationships she will be forming with future staff, students and parents. The experts within her profession demonstrated the potential consequences and now Bella understands the importance of managing and maintaining a suitable identity online. She draws on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to negotiate and incorporate the opinions of her academic professionals and the already established peer group norms to construct her own individual boundary. Individual boundaries are intertwined within the group context but enable the participants to be able to maintain their own identity. By making her drinking photos less extreme and tightening her privacy settings, Bella is able to sustain her role as a drinking student and a teacher.

Privacy settings did not appear to be a huge priority for these participants. Although most of them used standardised versions of Facebook privacy settings, having either public profiles, “friends only” or “friends of friends”, the specific aspects of Facebook privacy were not really known. For example, Bella knew her profile setting were “private” but she did not know how to specifically control photo content. All of the drinking participants had some level of privacy on their Facebook pages. One of the main reasons for this being to control “randoms” (strangers) being able to view their page. However, the non-drinking participants were not so concerned. Stella had a public profile while Danielle did not even know about privacy settings. None of the participants used the ‘higher’ functionality of Facebook settings, by customising their settings to control their context collapse, and relied on the default settings of Facebook.

This might imply the participants are naive. However, as we have seen in extracts 15 to 19, they manage their privacy and context collapse socially. Some of them even appear to have quite a sophisticated understanding of their context collapse; they simply manage it in different ways, by tagging, untagging, deleting and not uploading. This is seen in the following extract as Quintin negotiates between his involvement with online student drinking cultures and being a potential employee and family man:

Extract 20:

Quintin: We went to a dance thing rave party something like that. We were there when that photo was taken. He may have been on other chemicals there umm
that’s me drinking, actually that's quite amazing almost all of these photos are me drinking. I don’t know if that is bad. See I can imagine if the looked at my profile wall an employer would go online, I imagine that happens quite often, look up the person you know check up on the person they have been interviewing seeing if they did stupid stuff or anything like they drank drank all the time, to see if they were a family man with their kids or if they were a bit wild or.

AT: Yup. So in t- =
Quintin: = so just to get an idea of their personality.
AT: Are you worried about ?
Quintin: Well I'm not worried about it at this stage. Ah because I am not applying for any jobs. But but in future it would be something I would think about yeah.

Quintin, by stating, “I don’t know if that is bad”, asserts that he does not know where the boundary of appropriateness is. He rationalises that it is wholly depend on the context. He has previously constructed his drinking photos as acceptable because of his age, stage, and lack of responsibilities in life. Like Bella, he shows how context and appropriateness of student drinking shifts when potential employment becomes an issue. Even though these photos are accepted within his group he does not have full control over who sees them. He is aware that particular people go online and interpret these images, and the people in them, in a different way. In this way the boundaries of acceptability are elastic. What is acceptable for one group is not acceptable for another and these boundaries will shift as he begins looking for a job. Part of the problem with this elasticity, is that although these photos are intended for their immediate social circle, they can be taken out of context by an employer. Therefore the image is reappropriated and reinterpreted in the participants’ new roles, as an employee and a family man. Unlike Bella, Quintin sees this as a theoretical matter to deal with in the future. This future theoretical problem shows how drinking photos should be confined to a certain developmental stage in life, one that is consistent with the expectations of a typical New Zealand university student. This is consistent with Rebecca because “photos of you out drinking with your friends and it kind of doesn't portray a very good image of yourself of being like the ideal mother.” She juxtaposed this construction against hers and others drinking photos, creating competing dichotomies between being a student and a mother. The context of the photo, that is so meaningful to the student group, no longer matters when the individual viewing the photos is not a member of that group because they will apply their own interpretation based on their own experience and meaning. These participants anticipate being forced to choose between being a family figure and employee, or a person who drinks. For Quintin and Rebecca, the drinking photos will have to be discarded when they take on these future roles.
Drinking photos are usually always intended for specific friends who are mainly within the participants’ immediate social circle, those whom they drink with. Although others might look at them, they are not intended for these invisible audiences, particularly older family members, such as parents and grandparents, or employers. To avoid any conflict, this requires the participants to have strategies to manage these various relationships within the context collapse. Owen and Jared spoke about older generations, like parents or grandparents, as a possible reason to untag or delete photos. Rebecca and Tamsin had real-life tensions caused by drinking photos. Tamsin and Rebecca now untag or delete photos to manage their relationships. Tamsin, particularly concerned about her mother, uses her as a reference point in making decisions about photos, while Rebecca is mostly concerned about her grandparents. Quintin does not have his parents as his ‘friend’ on Facebook and said he would not add them. Kieran does not see the problem with his drinking photos because he is open with his parents and positions himself as not caring. Bella is the only participant that has had to manage relationships outside her immediate friend or family context. She sometimes struggles between her role as a student participating in the student drinking culture and her role as a teaching student. However, as extract 15 shows she tries to manage her relationships with future colleagues, students and their parents.

This level of control is not always possible. It has been seen in extract 19 that others’ consider friends’ context collapse and unintended audiences. This has created a vaguer, wider, more diverse unintended audience, which depends on their friends’ context collapse. The following extract shows how intended, unintended and invisible audiences merge within a photo, and how this aspect is out of the control of the user. Quintin reflects on two drinking photos, one that is not acceptable due to his appearance, and one that is considered to be within the boundary he has constructed. He talks about the pitfalls of this wider unintended audience.

**Extract 21:**

Quintin: Um same thing. Don't know where that is I look I look like a sociopath {AT laughs} in that photo. Those are examples of photos that I would untag actually. I'm going to untag that now.
AT: So can =
Quintin: = Ah because I- I look unhinged.
...
Quintin: You have a choice, you can ask them to- I wouldn't ask them t- I wouldn't I wouldn't ask them to take the photo down, ah I I presumably the people that would see this photo recognise me would know that your intoxicated or something.
AT: So it's okay?
Quintin: So yeah [laughs] so it's okay. We have such a binge culture [AT laughs] that its completely acceptable as long as your drunk.

... Quintin: So actually that's- that's a good point {referring to a comment on the photo} her mother can see pictures of me because I'm friends with her I'm not friends with Deborah but, cause I'm tagged in photos with Tracey, Tracey's mother can see can see those picture where I look like like I'm about to do something violent.

AT: Do you mind that or ?
Quintin: {both laugh} Yeah I do mind that actually. Ah that photos not too bad.

Within this extract Quintin shows how he is self-reflective and self-critical about his own appearance, and he applies (untagging) his own individual boundary of appropriateness. He draws on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to show how one photo is beyond the individual boundary, while the other is acceptable. By untagging the photo and not deleting it, the photo is still on the other users’ profile. It is acceptable to still have online (but not connected to his profile) because being drunk and being in these photos is an acceptable excuse among his peers, and these are the people that would recognise. This is reinforced by locating himself within the wider New Zealand binge drinking culture. Therefore, within the context of the other persons' profile, it is “completely acceptable”. However, is not acceptable to have on his own profile. This reinforces the value given to contextual importance when drawing on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to construct these boundaries. However, Quintin also shows how he not only has his own unintended audiences, but those also tagged in the photo. He is only aware of this because his friends’ mother had commented. At this moment, the invisible unintended audience become visible. He connects this to his other photos, ones that he untagged because he looks “unhinged” and “about to do something violent”. This means his own unintended audience and his tagged friends’ context collapse. He now has to deal with a wider, vague, more diverse invisible unintended audience. Despite this, the extract shows the apparent ease of maintaining this boundary by untagging. Within a few clicks of a mouse it is no longer connected to his own profile.

However, maintaining his boundary requires constant maintenance. To effectively preserve the boundary and make sure his photos are appropriate for his own audience, he needs to check every photo. Self-surveillance is continuous. Regardless of any intention to maintain their own and others’ content within the context collapse, this extract shows that this is not fully within the control of the user. It depends on other privacy settings and their ‘friends lists’. It is understandable, therefore, why boundaries are both individual and collectively negotiated within the group. Individual boundaries can be constructed surrounding a
known unintended audience. However, given the nature of the group boundary, which takes place in a vaguer more public area, it is continually re-negotiated - something that is never quite fixed, but something that is always there. This makes them more complex, nuanced, dynamic, social and negotiated.

Uploading, tagging, deleting practices and controlling their friends list, are the main tools used by participants to actively manage these relationships. Often tagging was left up to individual to opt-in to the photo because it avoided any potential conflict. Otherwise, the participants did not care enough to actively manage their collapsed context or any potential invisible audiences. These participants (namely Owen and Kieran) did not mind being identified as a student who drank alcohol. Even though relational management seems to conflict with the light-hearted, fun, and normal construction of drinking photos because of the work involved, the participants cope with this tension by putting certain relationships first. Protecting and maintaining these relationships is of primary importance.

In summary, the acceptability and appropriateness discourse works to present a socially appropriate version of student drinking cultures online. The participants of this study work within the constraints of their context collapse and manage to present a version of drinking culture that, for them, is acceptable to those on their Facebook page. This is anchored within their group context, their student context, their age and stage in life, and their roles and responsibilities. Some participants are aware that this will need to change in the future. However, presently their displays of drinking are consistent with their current status as university students who participated in the student drinking culture. By utilising this discourse, the participants are able to join the online student drinking culture in a manner that is justifiably acceptable. These participants negotiate within their friendships and their wider audience to construct an appropriate space to share their drinking photos.

Drinking Photos and how the Discourses Intersect

The last section in this chapter will show how these three primary discourses interact to create a normalised, positive and socially acceptable online student drinking culture. This is expressed through the place of alcohol, which will be discussed first. Then four photos and their adjacent quotes will be used to demonstrate how the participants utilise these three discourses and the photo tools on Facebook to enable and facilitate their own participation
and negate any problematic connotations attached to these drinking photos. Finally, it will be shown how these three discourses are used to depict their social life and privilege a certain type of drinking culture.

The place of alcohol plays an interesting role within the construction of these photos because it illustrates how these three discourses are intertwined. Alcohol is often just part of the photo and was not usually the primary focus. The participants utilise the normal, natural and everyday discourse to normalise and minimise the presence of alcohol because it is “just” how they socialise. Owen points out that the bottle of tequila is him “doing the activity you are doing”, making the inclusion of alcohol secondary to socialising. The fun, pleasure and humour discourse is used by participants to construct alcohol as a source of amusement and pleasure. Jared’s photos of friends show comments that have references to the great taste of alcohol, “nomnomnom” (eating sound) or being “proud” of consuming a “goon sack”, expressing the positive aspects of consuming alcohol. Jared also talked about “others” being more inclined to upload drinking images to “look cool” and socially desirable. This is not the case with his photo because drinking is “just” a big part of his social life. Rebecca is uncomfortable with having actual alcohol within her Facebook photos because of associations with being a heavy drinker. She uses the acceptability and appropriateness discourse to resist and negotiated her role within these drinking displays because she is aware of her family being on her Facebook.

Age is also important for the portrayal of alcohol. Although used differently by Tamsin and Quintin, the centrality of alcohol in the image is consistently associated with a young drinker and younger Facebook user. Tamsin distances herself from this subject position and states she did not aim to be in or take photos with alcohol. She aligns this activity with younger underage drinkers who want to look cool. She utilises the fun, pleasure and humour discourse for the times when alcohol or an alcohol vessel is the focal point of her photo. She constructs these photos as exceptions because they are humorous or part of a special occasion. On the other hand, Quintin places his age group and his student peers within this subject position. He believes they try to capture and focus the photo around the alcohol, stating it will become more incidental as the users’ maturity with alcohol increases. By integrating the users’ relationship with alcohol within the Facebook context, he suggests these photos are a direct reflection of the way they drink. This diversity shows how participants use the various discursive resources available within these discourses to negotiate their own involvement within the online drinking cultures. The following extracts
will show how the participants draw on all the three discourse to justify seemingly inappropriate images.

Figure 1
Bella and her friends draw on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse and the fun, pleasure and humour discourse within the construction and comments associated with this photo. Bella offers being drunk as an excuse for this photo. Although she admits it is “probably inappropriate”, a humorous construction is used to recall the drunken antics of the nights and explain the actions within the photo. It simply represents good times with friends. This humorous construction is acceptable among her peer group and it allows her to side-steps dealing with any conflicting associations by reemphasising the funny quality of the photo. This is again sanctioned by the group because another friend took a very similar photo. By drawing on the fun, pleasure and humour discourse she shows how the boundaries of appropriateness can be flexible to accommodate “probably inappropriate” images.
Additionally, the comments and ‘likes’, show how the comical drunken activity is appreciated and accepted amongst her friends. They can “take the piss” out of her in a friendly manner because they have a solid friendship and this is acceptable drinking behaviour. They relive the night through the comments and even referring to other photos that have been taken that did not make it online. They even use the tagging tool within the comments to draw in a particular friend to include her in the revelry that occurred when they were drunk. The comments also show an awareness of the constructed boundaries because they are referring to absent images. These boundaries are constructed in a humorous manner, which means these potentially damaging photos can become part of the joke and mesh with the positive construction of the photo. This creates a light-hearted, jokey atmosphere of images that push the boundaries, while simultaneously they are constructed as acceptable to have online. These comments were all made within ten minutes of each other. The interactive nature of Facebook photos allows the participants to have a conversation online to continue the fun that had taken place while drinking. It appears the post-night-out drinking stories have now evolved to take place online, stimulated by these photos.

The next two images and extracts show how Jared and Owen, using the three discourses, to cross traditional gender lines. Again, a normalised funny construction means certain photos can be placed within the boundaries of appropriateness.
Extract 23:

Jared: He seems to have a sword in his mouth.
AT: Any reason why?
Jared: He's probably trying to seduce the cameraman I would say.
AT: {laughs} and you were the cameraman?
Jared: Yes. I was the cameraman for this photo.
AT: So he obviously doesn't mind having this tagged.
Jared: Nah well he's fine he's still tagged in it see so yeah he must be fine with it.
AT: Why do you think he's ok with that kind of photo?
Jared: I 'spose it shows he's just mucking around and being a, a dick I don't think too many people are going to take that seriously and think he' a cross-dressing-
sword-sucking man {both laugh}.

AT: So like for the people that did think that cause you know you do come across those =
Jared: = Yeah yeah yeah.
AT: Um what would what would your reactions be to that sort of thing?
Jared: Oh people that thought he was a cross dressing sword sucking =
AT: = Oh well like this wasn't ok to have on Facebook that [kind of thing.]
Jared: [yeah well] um I ‘spose you've got to be careful with like your security and stuff for who actually can see your photos. I ‘spose like with me I know it will be ok for m- for MY friends to see my photos like I don't know if Owen's friends but I guess if they think that then they don't have to look through them and, I ‘spose it's their choice if their looking through it and if Owen's not ashamed of it it's fine it's up and tagged.

In this extract, Jared minimalises any possible offense because Owen is just “mucking around”. He utilises the idea of individual choice to justify this positive construction. He explains it is a joke that is acceptable among his friendship group and that it is the choice of the individual to interact with this type of photo. By being tagged in this image, it is assumed Owen was comfortable with this content online. Therefore, if Owen is comfortable with the image, the responsibility shifts to the audience, therefore avoiding any possible tensions with unintended viewers. Furthermore, Owen admits, in his own interview, “Oh tea party photos shouldn't be on Facebook but they are... Oh there are probably people that have problems with it I would think”. He acknowledges that although potentially inappropriate, he utilises the fun, pleasure and humour discourse to point out they are on Facebook “To have a laugh” between his friends. As we have seen in the last section, the boundaries of what is appropriate is completely contextual. Jared and Owen both draw on the acceptability and appropriateness discourse because they both conclude that within the context of their friends it is interpret as a joke. This implicit sanctioning of the group is also reinforced by Owen as he draws on the normal, natural and everyday discourse. This minimises any offense because he was “Just sharing what we did for the day. Just the same as everyone else.” He positions himself within the wider context of other Facebook users to show how this type of image is collectively sanctioned. This content falls within the co-constructed boundary of appropriateness.

The previous extract shows how the individual can push or break traditional gender boundaries. The next extract shows how this can be done between friends:
Extract 24:

Jared: He's stroking my leg. "Good god I was trying to look seedy but not that seedy."
AT: Can you sort of explain a bit?
Jared: Well obviously he was trying to look like a seedy creep or something, with me there. Touching my leg. Um just joking around and he obviously thinks he looks very seedy and did a very good job, there I'd say.
AT: Ok so do you take many of these types of photos?
Jared: Yeah some of them are a wee bit gay aye. Some photos we take. Just mucking around.
AT: So by gay?
Jared: Um like touching each other on the leg like that I 'spose. That's a- that's a wee bit gay. Crossing the line.
AT: What line do you mean?
Jared: Oh well you wouldn't grab someone in the crotch or anything {hand gestures} like that or but um, nah it's just like joking around and just and it's only with really good friends you know you do something like that.
AT: Why with only good friends?
Jared: Becau- {laughs} well I wouldn't go out and touch a stranger {both laugh} like that really it's not really socially acceptable if you know what I mean like.
AT: Yup.
Jared: It's acceptable to yeah if it's a good mate and like kid around like that and stuff I dunno your having a laugh it's I dunno it's a form of just joking around I guess.
AT: And is it because you know they won't take it the wrong way?
Jared: Yeah yeah yeah cause me and Nathaniel joke around like that yeah we have a good time together.

This photo depicts a time he is able “to cross the line” (touching male friends) with a good friend. This photo might be inappropriate to others but serves to reinforce the strength and trust within certain friendships. He reinforces the solidity of their friendship foundation by juxtaposing his actions with the social inappropriateness of doing something similar with a stranger. He also justifies his actions by comparing it to an action that was more extreme and more socially inappropriate (“grabbing someone in the crotch”). This positions his actions as harmless, and just as a joke between friends. He is able to break or “cross” gender boundaries because it is constructed as a joke. This implies that these participants can transgress these boundaries if it is framed as a joke, and done between good friends. The comments reinforce and continue the joking nature of the photo, showing it is positively interpreted and sanctioned by his friend. The acceptability and appropriateness discourse and fun, pleasure and humour discourses work together to justify the slightly risky content and illustrate the primacy of relationships that is inherent in these photos. Jared also draw on the normal, natural, and everyday discourse to explain that this is normal activity between himself and Nathaniel, specifically identifying they can “joke around” together. The drinking context and these three discourses allow these participants to cross these boundaries and present these pictures as jokes to their friends. They disregard any possible disapproval by privileging the opinion of their peer groups. Kieran reinforces, these are jokes amongst friends and because “he's not gay so it's ok”. By knowing the sexuality of their friends, Kieran confirms these jokes are acceptable because they will not be misinterpreted by their friends.

The following image and extract show how Tamsin and her friends use the discourses to construct acceptable and unacceptable Facebook content and behaviour.
Extract 25:

AT: So what would count as a funny one?
P7: Oh um there are these girls always posing the exact same way, and they have their head back (mimics actions) so their hair looks really long and hand on their hip and just every photo they put up... I’m always just um yeah making making fun of them.
AT: Oh ok (both laugh). Did the people that have commented know what you were doing?
Tamsin: Umm I don’t think they do. Mmm no I don’t think they understand, some- like people that see it and know what we’re talking about think it’s
really funny but they don't comment. Um so the people, this is not my photo this is just one tagged of me but um so I don't know these people. Oh that's um my flatmates um sister. She- and um I don't know that girl but that one's a girl from [hostel name] so I do know her.

AT: Yup.

Tamsin: But I don't think they understand what we're doing that we're joking (laughs).

AT: Do you um- cause lots of these are quite flattering like, do people often do this on photos (points at comments)?

Tamsin: Um yeah I think they do, um I've done it before tell people they look really good.

AT: Why do you do that?

Tamsin: Um just if I think it I'll out it on there hopefully it makes them feel good. Um yeah like um (2) I dunno it's just a nice thing to say.

AT: Yup. Do you ever see anything negative on photos?

Tamsin: Um not really. Unless it's I- um some people do it to themselves so like they put a photo up and they'll be like "Oh my god remove this" [high voice] but they like "oh my god this is so ugly" and they don't untag so they're looking for attention or for people to be like "no it's fine you look really nice" and a girl I know put up a profile picture and said "don't really like this photo of me" but had it as a profile picture and then all these people were like "oh why not hun? you look so good" [high voice] like I think it's just for attention why they probably do that. Say they look ugly in photos.

AT: Is it girls that do it?

Tamsin: Yeah I don't think boys really care that much. I dunno boys I know anyway wouldn't really worry about it.

In this extract it is shown that not all types of drinking photos are appreciated, namely posing. Tamsin and her friends interpret this repetitious posing as funny, and not to be misinterpreted as these girls being funny. Instead of laughing with them, she laughs at them. This interpretation means Tamsin and her friends can mock them, and justify this photo being on Facebook. On the other hand, Tamsin intends her own photo as a joke. These competing constructions of almost identical images make her photo acceptable because her intentions are different. This interpretation is reinforced by the other girls self-deprecating comments, because they are apparently attention-seeking and trying to elicit compliments. Tamsin outlines that it is alright to give these comments because it is simply being nice, but Facebook users should not try to obtain them. Certain friends among Tamsin’s peer group are in on the joke. This not only collectively sanctions the joke, but it reinforces these friendships. This photo seems innocuous to the outsider, but personalised knowledge of the joke and the group mean these friends can derive fun from its contents. To an outsider these images and comments appear to be very similar, but Tamsin is safe in the knowledge that her photo is a joke. Therefore she is not captured in the negative construction she created for the other girls.
In summary, these photos serve to depict the social life of the participants. Their collective socially acceptable, non-problematic, fun and normalised constructions of their own drinking portrays a biased view of student drinking cultures. Moreover, certain parts of the drinking experience are emphasised and suppressed. This works to present a biased representation of their social life and drinking practices. Even though the common and dominant themes within these drinking photos are costumes, red cards, and big events, this does not necessarily reflect their actual drinking experiences. Quintin points out they do not dress up every time they drink even if the photos suggest they do, while Kieran does not believe these photos represent his true social life because there is only a camera around certain friends. Kieran’s experience appears to contradict the normal outline camera culture that is inherent within the other participants’ socialising experience. However, the camera is an inherent quality of interacting with a certain social group for him, namely females. When comparing the ‘background and context’ section about what participants said regarding their drinking activities, the gaps in these visual representations are highlighted. Images of police in riot gear, vomiting, or bad incidents while drinking were not on these participants’ Facebook profiles. Some of these incidences were recorded on cameras, some uploaded, but untagged, or removed by the users, while other activities went unrecorded. These absent photos or unrecorded moments of drinking show the underbelly of drinking that conflicts with the positive and almost glamorised construction of their social life and drinking cultures. It depicts the unique drinking environment in Christchurch because they only show the limited places that exist for these participants to socialise and drink. Collectively, the participants present a normalised, non-problematic, positive and often humorous student drinking culture which focuses on the shared good times between friends. This construction of online drinking cultures is collectively negotiated and therefore sanctioned by the participants wider peer groups. They present a socially appropriate, normalised and positive version of online student drinking culture that rejects any negative associations, all justified because of their age, stage and context within the university setting.

Facebook photos are so embedded within these participants drinking practices they are synonymous with the actual drinking activity. These participants have embrace this online Facebook photo culture because it can prolong the positive aspects of the drinking experience. These photos visually represent stories and fun times, and trigger potent memories that allow the participants to reconstruct and retell the fun they have while
drinking. The drinking stories that are an inherent part of the post-night-out ritual are now within these photos. The actual photos, comments, tagging and ‘liking’ work in combination to re-create these stories from the night before. By continually uploading, interacting, and consuming these types of photos, the participant’s propagate and encourage this positive, normalised, and socially accepted depiction of their social lives. This continuing cycle promotes a certain representation of drinking culture and reinforces the normal fun times that drinking produces, and does not represent the other, more negative aspects of the drinking experience.
Chapter Five: Discussion

This study aimed to explore how New Zealand 18 and 19 year old tertiary students use photos on Facebook, and what role these photos play within student drinking cultures. More specifically, how and why these photos were used within the drinking experience, their social relationships, and how the actual photographic process connected to these activities. Three discourses were identified. These were the normal, natural and everyday discourse, the fun, pleasure and humour discourse, and the acceptability and appropriateness discourse. Within the following section, the main findings will be discussed in terms of the proposed research questions, how the study is situated within the previous literature, and how it extends those ideas. Intersections between the discourses will then be discussed in terms of key concepts that surround SNSs and drinking cultures.

The Discourses Within the Drinking Cultures and SNS Research

The first discourse, the normal, natural and everyday discourse, reflected the embedded and normalised camera culture and Facebook photo culture, within the participants socialising and drinking practices. The drinking practices themselves were also a normalised feature of their Facebook photos. Both the non-drinking and drinking participants described taking photos, and uploading them on to Facebook as a natural and expected part of their socialising experience, particularly in terms of drinking episodes. This is consistent with previous literature that shows images have inundated regular social life (Mirzoeff, 2010; Rose, 2007), and that everyday aspects of life are now photo worthy (Daisuke & Ito, 2003; Van House, et al., 2005). The results of the current study showed Facebook provided an easy avenue to store, share, and interact with these photos. Drinking photos were a common and often dominant theme on the Facebook profiles with multiple scenes of drinking with friends at flat parties and drinking events. Previous studies have noted this dominant and normalised drinking focus (e.g. Fournier & Clarke, 2011; Griffiths & Casswell, 2010; Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2010; Ridout, et al., 2011). These everyday displays of drinking through Facebook photos and the regularity of the participants’ routine interaction, work to normalise online student drinking cultures.
The results also demonstrated that the camera culture had become normalised within these drinking episodes, to the point strangers could take photos of them at university events. This camera culture was gendered. Not only was it the female’s role to be the photographer, with specific “camera girls” allocated within the peer groups as photographers. This dominant and normalised, and almost inescapable photo culture left very limited options for those who were not actively involved. This was translated on to Facebook because it often became the responsibility of the individual, through tagging and uploading practices, to monitor their involvement within the Facebook photo culture. This might indicate that if someone is involved within student drinking cultures, one is automatically involved with online visual displays of drinking cultures on Facebook. The dominance, regularity and routine nature of these drinking photos was presented as normal and expected for the age, stage and student status. The participants continually located themselves within the wider New Zealand drinking culture and student drinking culture to justify the normalcy of drinking images. The reasons given were similar to those used to rationalise actual drinking behaviours in previous studies. For example, student status was supportive of drinking practices (Banister & Piacentini, 2008) and now, student status is similarly supportive of drinking photos.

The second discourse was the fun, pleasure and humour discourse. This constructed a positive, light-hearted environment for the camera, Facebook photos, and their subsequent interactions. ‘Good’ photos reflected the positive, fun, jovial nature of the drinking experience and these were continually uploaded onto Facebook. This construction is consistent with previous literature that reported large amounts of positive alcohol-related content of students’ Facebook pages and photos (e.g. Kolek & Saunders, 2008; Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2010). The actual drinking episode and the resulting Facebook photos were heavily intertwined because the participants received on-going pleasure from the jokes, fun times and personal contextual information represented in the image. These positively constructed photos on Facebook allowed the participants to relive positive drinking experiences they had with their friends. This extends the concept introduced by Brown and Greggs (2012) who posited that drinking photos build on the drunken narrative and a good story. The current study provides evidence for this suggestion, while grounding it within the users’ experience and the specific photos that represent these drunken narratives. The participants, through their oral re-retelling of the drinking stories and their interactions with their friends online, created a visual drinking story. The viewing and online interactions became a post-night-out-ritual which allowed them to relive the pleasure brought about by
the drinking experience once it was physically over, and this can continues indefinitely. Research has noted the integral part storytelling plays in the drinking experience and young peoples’ socialising (e.g. Griffin, et al., 2009; Griffin, et al., 2008). These Facebook photos have encapsulated and transformed the traditional drinking stories. The photos act as an anchor for memories, which are reinforced and enhanced by the interactive nature of the photos. Tagging, commenting and ‘liking’ all work to allow students to re-live and reminisce the visual drinking story socially with their friends who have personalised knowledge of the drinking episode depicted.

The third discourse, acceptability and appropriateness, created a boundary of appropriateness that was used individually and collectively by the participants to negotiate what they shared online. Any photo that was constructed within the boundary was on their Facebook profile. The constructed boundary of appropriateness parallels Ling’s (2008) ‘ethic of photo sharing’ where different rules applied for sharing drinking photos to those outside of the peer group. The boundaries constructed by the participants within this study were flexible depending on the individual, friendship, group context, and the wider audience. It builds on Ling’s (2008) study because the boundary marked the difference between good and bad photos, placed restraints on the participants and limited what was shared online. For example, some consequences of drinking were acceptable, like being comatose, while others were beyond the boundary and not represented on these students’ profiles, like vomiting. Even though these photo constructions were entirely contextual, the participants’ interpretations and actions were individually and collectively negotiated between peers. By utilising the boundary in this manner, the participants were able present their drinking photos as socially acceptable, sanctioned by their peers, and therefore, appropriate for their wider Facebook audience. Like the other two discourses, the participants grounded their constructions within their development age and stage, peer group, university status and the wider New Zealand drinking cultures. This produced a socially acceptable online student drinking culture. This worked to offset any moral panic that multiple researchers have highlighted in the media and academic literature (e.g. Larsen, 2007; Marwick, 2008).

Being drunk, like the positive and normalised constructions, was a powerful excuse that could push the boundaries to include potentially inappropriate photos. These constructions enabled these types of images to be appropriate for the participants’ online social context. Everything else was not uploaded, untagged or deleted. This worked to regulate and
moderate their Facebook photos to make them consistent with the positive, light-hearted atmosphere on Facebook. There were similarities between the current study and the contents reported in Griffiths and Casswell’s (2010) investigation into New Zealand adolescents on Bebo, such as being comatosed. However, the current participants did not display all of the consequences of drinking noted by these authors, like vomiting. This may indicate a shift in boundaries within New Zealand youth, across SNS or age, surrounding the type of drinking consequences that are acceptable to display.

**Intersecting Discourses and Understanding Key Concepts**

*Relational Management, Context Collapse, Impression Management and Relational Identity*

The first key concepts to be discussed are the context collapse, multiple audiences and impression management, and how they relate to *relational management*. The participants managed their multiple, varying relationships within Facebook photos. This was particularly important for drinking photos because they often depicted more extreme behaviours and content, which sometimes caused tensions within certain relationships. The context collapse seen in other SNS settings (e.g. boyd, 2007), was present on these participants’ Facebook pages. This included unintended invisible audiences (users who are not within their peer group and do not visibly interact with the photo), such as family, employers and potential colleagues. The participants were aware of the various audiences and potential social browsing that could take place (also known as participatory surveillance and online lurking; Albrechtslund, 2008; Fuchs, 2011; Lampe, et al., 2006; Mallan, 2009; Pempek, et al., 2009). The participants’ belief that these audiences were actually viewing or able to view their photos, led to them to manage this context collapse.

The participants in the current study employed several strategies to manage these diverse relationships. This is explained in terms of Goffman’s (1990) impression management, where individuals manage their impression on others. This is consistent with previous studies. For example, Marwick and boyd (2010) found users on Twitter avoided posting offensive material to manage the context collapse, and Ling (2008) showed that some photos were not shared with wider audiences. The strategies used in this study were very diverse, and included photo-taking, uploading, tagging, untagging, and deleting practices that subsequently moderated the extremity of their drinking photos. Participants also
controlled the access of others through their own ‘friends list’. Those that had experienced tensions within certain relationships, or could see the potential danger of these photos, put more effort into actively managing their context collapse. Individual and collective group boundaries were central to these efforts because the individual boundaries were important for managing the individual users’ context collapse, while group boundaries were used to protect both the individual and their peers’ context collapse. These boundaries were expected to be re-negotiated and managed differently when the participants’ audiences changed, as they got older and took on new roles and responsibilities. In that way the participants managed their privacy socially, instead of acquiring a high level of knowledge about the privacy settings. The participants created a sense of self and an in-group between themselves and their peers excluding ‘others’, like family and employers. This determined how they managed these unintended audiences. By managing privacy socially, the individuals’ and group identity was protected from these ‘others’; the out-group and unintended audience. Very few photos were deleted because unwanted photos were usually managed through untagging, and, while not directly connected to the users’ profile, those who had access could still view the photos. This introduced a wider, vaguer, more diverse, invisible audience, not within the control of the user, which depended on other users’ ‘friends lists’ and privacy settings. Consequently, although these constructed boundaries were important because of the limits and constraints placed on online photo sharing in terms of context collapse, Facebook photos were not in full control of the individual user. Socially protecting privacy still did not guarantee there would be no risk or loss of control of privacy on Facebook.

The participants’ friends contributed drinking photos to each others’ profiles, and also interacted with the photos through the ‘liking’ and commenting tools. This was an all important process because it allowed their friends to express their approval, reinforce and socially sanctioned the normalised positive drinking culture. The extremity of their drinking photos was curbed in some instances because some of the sample in the current study received negative feedback often through offline communication from their unintended audience. The participants used their individual boundaries to maintain appropriate impressions in terms of their identity. This again mirrored Goffman’s (1990) impression management, where individuals use feedback from others leading on to expression and suppression of aspects of the self to form an identity. This study showed how the tools, specifically used in Facebook photos, and personal interactions with others, helped to shape online drinking-related identity presentation, which parallels Marwick and boyd’s
(2010) study on Twitter, identity and context collapse. The contributions and interaction by multiple users means identity is co-constructed, as suggested by Larsen (2007) and Mallan & Gardiner (2009).

More than this, self identity is really a relational identity because of the implications for both relationships and identity as dictated by the individual, the context collapse and group norms. This suggests relational identity in terms of drinking on Facebook is more complex that the ‘alcohol identity’ introduced by Ridout and colleagues (2011), which concluded alcohol was a strong component of the profile users ‘hoped-for’ self. However, the current study showed participants managing their relational identity, while considering themselves, their friends, and the impressions of the unintended audience, within their context collapse. This was all achieved while still interacting in a normalised, positive online student drinking culture.

**Implications for Friendship**

These intersecting discourses also had implications for friendship. Friends did not only collectively negotiate boundaries and protect their friendships, they also demonstrated friendship reinforcement. Within the seemingly semi-public environment of Facebook, the participants still managed to reinforce certain friendships. Friendships were centrally located and represented within the drinking photo construction because they depicted moments of friends together and were grounded in face-to-face interactions. Personalised knowledge, in-jokes, tagging, commenting, and ‘liking’ all reinforced and perpetuated the fun times had together that occurred during specific drinking episodes. Drinking photos depicted the primacy and solidarity of particular friendships. Participants even jokingly transgressed gender boundaries, due to those relationships and being drunk. This study showed how jokes were shared on Facebook in a similar way to students sharing jokes within images by picture messaging on cellular phones, as noted by Van House and colleagues (2005). However, on Facebook, intimacy and friendship reinforcement was achieved among a much larger audience. Participants were able to construct an in-group of friends that privileged certain relationships to create intimacy. This is consistent with previous research (e.g. Ling, 2008; Salimkhan, et al., 2010). However, for these participants, the creation of in-groups and out-groups reiterated and maintained the real life power differentials within various relationships and worked to distance those without insider
knowledge. This ‘othering’ reinforces the separateness of the wider out-group and further distances them from the participants’ online drinking experience.

The photos also offered an easily accessible visual way of keeping in touch. Van House and colleagues (2005) reported students maintained geographically constrained relationships through images shared on cellular phones. It is possible that Facebook provided an even easier platform because of the embedded everyday nature of photo sharing. The primacy of these relationships also counteracts conclusions of narcissism and self-promotion sometimes reported (e.g. Buffardi & Campbell, 2008; Mehdizadeh, 2010; Ong, et al., 2010). It is possible that this inconsistency was caused by a misalignment between broader perceptions of SNSs and the actual users. This again supports the necessity of including the actual users within the research.

_Drinking cultures and Facebook Photos_

This research offers a unique perspective on how Facebook photos have become increasingly embedded and intertwined within the students’ social experience, particularly their drinking activities. Collectively, the participants drew on the discursive resources available within the three discourses, to construct a normalised, positive and socially acceptable photo and Facebook photo culture. This was supported by their selective use of drinking photos and their subsequent interactions online. In this way a strategic version of their social lives was presented, consistent with the positive and light-hearted space on Facebook.

This builds on Mendelson and Papacharissi’s (2010) conclusions that Facebook photos showed a strategic presentation of the social life in college, because the current study has implications for online student drinking cultures. Mendelson and Papacharissi(2010) also concluded it was a form of collective narcissism, in terms of self-actualisation. This cannot be similarly applied to the current participants because the photo and Facebook photo culture was so dominant and thoroughly embedded within their drinking experience and social activity. For these participants, it was simply a normative practice to share their lives online instead of being motivated to by the “desire to better connect the self to society” (Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2010, p. 269). Their drinking photos were taken with friends, for friends, and they interacted with friends through their photos.
This construction also has implications for online student drinking cultures. As previously noted within each of the discourses, their constructions, rationalised through age, development stage, drinking and student status, located them within a wider student drinking culture. Their strategic construction of their own social life was translated to a collectively sanctioned strategic representation of online student drinking cultures, where students could display their excessive drinking as fun and normal, yet socially acceptable. This works to negate most problematic associations that are usually attached to blatant displays of student drinking online.

Photos are an integral component of an intoxigenic environment that is provided by Facebook. Bebo, a popular contemporary of Facebook, used to provide such an environment, as noted by Griffith and Casswell (2010) in their study of 16 to 18 year olds in New Zealand. Facebook photos develop this further because the photo tools facilitate a more interactive social experience. It encourages and perpetuates online student drinking cultures, capturing the fun and social aspects of drinking, while providing potent memories for the students. The intoxigenic environment is also shaped by the limitations imposed by the constructed boundaries of appropriateness. The participants were able to present an apparently socially acceptable form of online student drinking culture (for their context collapse), while still making it normal and fun. This intoxigenic environment is enabled, shaped and constrained by the intersecting discourses.

Limitations and Reflections

There were several limitations within this study. The first of these is the demographic uniformity within the sample pool. Given the recruitment process, this is not surprising, because convenience and subsequent snowball sampling is likely to produce a sample bias (Heckathorn, 2002). Even though the non-drinking participants were not Pākehā/NZ European (Chinese and Indian), within the drinking participant sample, six of the seven drinking participants were, and the seventh participant did not identify strongly with her Māori heritage. Past research has shown that drinking experience and SNS photos are influenced by a range of factors including culture, geographical location, and socio-economic status (e.g. Barker & Ota, 2011; Ministry of Health, 2009; C. Zhao & Jiang, 2011). The drinking participants were also all from the same peer group with similar student
drinking experiences because they had lived in the same university hostel and had experienced the impacts of the Christchurch earthquakes. These participants experienced a drinking culture that was location-specific, and not the experience of other students in New Zealand. A wider range of drinking participants would have offered a more diverse viewpoint, and exploration of the diversity within different geographical, cultural, ethnic, and student groups that are inherent within the New Zealand university populations. A more diverse sample base would likely have contributed alternative perspectives about drinking and Facebook photos that might have altered or reshaped the findings.

The laptop computer facilitated and constrained the interviewing process in different ways. The laptop was useful because participants could show and emphasis important photos. The photos were also used as a starting point to elicit in-depth contextual information about the social activities and Facebook photo tools (tagging, commenting and liking). This would not have been possible otherwise. However, the presence of the actual visual material meant some explanations about the photo were stilted because of the rich information they already provided. Some participants were more articulate when explaining details, while others struggled even when prompted and seemed unwilling to verbally express images that were perhaps more embarrassing or ‘inappropriate’. In spite of this, the present study was able to anchor the talk within the context of the visual information, building on the previous research in this area. Also, the visual data and the participants’ talk often produced a powerful combination, eliciting richer, insightful data than either the participants’ talk or the photos alone would have provided. This reinforces the need to have the participants’ voice within the research, alongside the photos. However, during the interview, the screen activity sometimes distracted from the talk. Stories and discussion were sometimes cut short for this reason.

The actual individual interview setting supported questioning individual participants about their specific experiences, particularly around the few negative experiences that were mentioned. On the other hand, the exploratory nature of the study made the interview slightly disjointed at times because the participants would jump between different aspects of the photo. This was representative of the architecture layout and interactive nature of Facebook photos, but it sometimes made it hard to explore the nature of each of the specific Facebook photo processes. Friendship group discussions might have been more conducive to examining the co-constructed nature of the photos, and the collective sociality of drinking activity. It could have helped guide the flow of the interviews as well.
Some studies and media have highlighted the gendered nature of Facebook and its photo contents (e.g. Barnett, 2012; Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2010; Strano, 2008). There were a few comments that supported those conclusions. Focus groups with participants of the same gender, and mixed gender, might have been more favourable to discussing these aspects. Friendship groups would have also reduced the inherent power dynamics present in an individual setting, especially because the participants would have a pre-existing friendship with each other. A combination of focus groups and individual interviews for case studies might be a valuable methodological approach.

Social constructionism and visual ethnography recognise the role of the researcher (Pink, 2007; Potter & Wetherell, 1995). Within the interview, the knowledge was co-constructed between the participant and myself. The setting, my own role as an academic student, and my age, gender and ethnicity, professional and personal knowledge of Facebook, and drinking photos on Facebook, would have played a part in shaping the interview and my own interpretation of the data. Knowing a person in all but one of the participants’ social circle may have influenced what participants chose to share with me. A different researcher, perhaps older who could better play the ‘naive enquirer’ and further removed from their social circle, would have elicited different talk. However, within an individual interview setting and assurances that every effort would be made to keep confidentiality and anonymity, the participants were usually openly frank about their views and experiences.

**Future Directions**

Many limitations of the study could be addressed with future research, including using a larger, more diverse sample group that would explore the inherent diversity within New Zealand student populations. The participants in this study located their participation with online student drinking cultures to be specific to the university drinking culture and while they were young adults. It would be interesting to see if the participants’ predictions were correct or whether older populations still displayed drinking images. Comparing these two groups, or following up the participants from this study in the future, would investigate this.
Alcohol consumption has been seen to differ across the young adult groups (generally age 18 to 25; e.g. Casswell, Pledger, & Hooper, 2003). It would be interesting to see if this is reflected in their photos. Alcohol consumption has also been seen to differ in New Zealand across socio-economic status, ethnicity and education level, therefore these populations are worth exploring (Casswell, et al., 2003; Ministry of Health, 2009). A dominant and seemingly almost inescapable photo culture, within the everyday socialising and drinking experiences of this study’s participants, was identified. Although, not all young people are on Facebook. boyd (2007) identified two youth sub-populations who did not use SNSs, the disenfranchised and conscientious objectors. Therefore, it would also be interesting to include the perspective of those who do not use Facebook to see if their drinking experiences are any different. This study has given a given some insight into the users’ perspective. However, more insight than provided by the standard interview and capture of the day-to-day interactive nature of these photos, could possibly be provided by using ethnographic methods, which allow a very in-depth exploration of people’s experiences (Pink, 2007). Future research should consider using this methodological approach.

An interesting dimension that was not the immediate focus in this study was gender. The last chapter showed drinking photos with females acting within traditional female norms by focusing on their appearance, while male friends transgressed traditional gender boundaries in their drinking photos. Previous research has shown how alcohol allows young people to cross traditional gender boundaries and justify these displays of violating traditional gender norms (e.g. Peralta, 2008). Gender and hegemonic masculinities and femininities were not the focus of the current study, but this could be an interesting avenue for future research. These drinking photos could offer an insight into how gender roles and traditional gender norms were being transformed within the visual display of young people’s drinking cultures.

Facebook is continuously being developed. During the course of this study the profile layout dramatically changed. There is a need to know how this impacts the users’ experience of Facebook photos and whether these changes encourage further disclosure of their social life, and whether the constructed boundaries are altered due to these architectural changes. Additionally, the commercial aspect of Facebook needs more consideration in terms of these Facebook photos. It is still not exactly known how Facebook uses these personal photos in terms of advertising. These visual displays of drinking culture are not only confined to Facebook. Other SNSs, such as YouTube, as studied by Morgan and
colleagues (2010), or websites, such as “Passed Out Photos” (2011), have multitudes of photos and videos of far more extreme displays of excessive drinking that the participants in the current study. Exploring the young people who upload this type of drinking content might give more understanding into these extreme images. Moreover, new apps are being developed that incorporate drinking photos as well, such as ‘drinklobby’ (iTunes, 2012), which encourages users to upload photos of the alcohol they are drinking. As these SNSs, websites and new technologies are constantly being developed, it is important to understand how they are being integrated, and transforming drinking cultures.

The popularity of this drinking photo culture has become commercialised within New Zealand and internationally. Commercial photographers photograph people out clubbing at different bars. These are uploaded onto an external website, and then Facebook users can tag themselves to connect the photos to their own profile. SnapStarLive (n.d.) is an example of this. This service appears to have become increasingly popular as part of the night time economy. The lack of ‘town’ in Christchurch meant this was not really a factor for the participants in the current study. However, these services are widely available in other main centres within New Zealand. This commercialisation is worth exploring because it is commodifying the Facebook drinking photo culture, which has strong parallels between paparazzi and celebrity cultures (e.g. Feasey, 2008; Feeley, 2012). These photos are no longer being confined to friends or those who are on the users’ Facebook page, but displayed on external websites where the individual has no control.

Implications

Student drinking is nothing new. However, New Zealand is in the midst of a cultural and political change focussed on its drinking culture. Currently the Alcohol Reform Bill is being considered before parliament and many of the amendments are focused on young adults’ consumption (McSoriley, 2010). Moreover, police and university institutions have been using Facebook and Facebook photos as information and evidence of law-breaking or violations of university codes within New Zealand and other Western countries (e.g. Blundell, 2012; TMC News, 2006). It was argued in chapter one and two that in order to understand and manage these drinking cultures, there is a need for them to be understood within the context of young peoples’ social worlds, which are heavily embedded within
Facebook. Research that contributes to this understanding can help inform governmental and institutional alcohol policy development.

Previous research has already tried to counteract the common assumption that young adults do not care or engage with privacy settings (e.g. boyd & Hargittai, 2010). This study and Ling’s (2008), illustrated that although the participants did not use features of Facebook privacy settings to customise and control their context collapse, they managed these relationships and their relational identities in other ways, by doing privacy socially. This confirming that some of the participants were concerned about sharing their drinking practices online and aware of some of these implications. In other cases the participants had not been confronted with the problems associated with having photos online. This is probably a natural response given the difficulties and changing nature of Facebook privacy. Educational strategies can build on this. These results indicate that young adults are already managing privacy in some way. Although this study did not specifically focus on privacy, this study suggests some interesting avenues of possible research. More specifically, focus could be on the implications of Facebook privacy terms and conditions, Facebook privacy settings, and the impact of the technological affordances in Facebook. This is particularly important now that third-party organisations might own these drinking photos. This visual disclosure of Facebook photos online has implications above and beyond parents and employers. None of the participants mentioned their concern about the commercial aspect of Facebook. The architecture of Facebook encourages disclosure, the privacy settings are complex and not user-friendly, and usually work on an opt-out basis, for example facial recognition.

Facial recognition scans the photo and matches the faces to a users’ friends list making suggestions for whom to tag. Danielle and Rebecca mentioned that they now leave tagging up to this Facebook tool. Facebook promote this as a helpful tool to save time. Although there have been some concerns about this from the media and technology experts (e.g. Effron, 2011), these tools are aimed to make sharing even easier, so more information is loaded onto Facebook. As Lawler and Molluzzo (2010) point out Facebook is a business and the personal data is valuable to the marketers. Facebook owns the rights to the material that is uploaded. The Statement of Rights and Responsibilities on Facebook states, “you grant us a non-exclusive, transferable, sub-licensable, royalty-free, worldwide license to use any IP content that you post on or in connection with Facebook (IP License).” (Facebook, 2012d, para. 6). This includes information about the photos such as the time and location of
when it was taken (Facebook, 2012b). Facebook has the right to sell this type of information to advertisers so users can have personalised ads targeted to Facebook content, including photo comments, and so forth (Facebook, 2012a). This normalised non-problematic online drinking culture that results in the disclosure of very personal details about the members social lives, is fruitful to Facebook and the marketers. This makes it easier to target and market alcoholic beverages and other products to this population because the advertising can be more relevant to their social lives and drinking experiences.

Health promotion on Facebook and other SNSs offer a cost-effective and direct tool to target these young drinkers. None of the main alcohol health promotion agencies appear to have an active presence on Facebook or other SNSs. Some national campaigns, such as FebFast New Zealand or Dry July in Australia (health promotion campaigns that focus on abstinence from alcohol for one month of the year), have utilised Twitter and Facebook (Dry July, 2012; febfast, n.d.). This is a good start, but Facebook and other SNS could be utilised fully and more frequently by health organisations. This offers a platform to directly interact with the audience they are trying to target. This study has shown that drinking cultures on Facebook are normalised, positive and socially acceptable, and visual images are particularly potent reminders of fun times drinking. However, the participants have shown the limitations and the restraints that are within these online displays of drinking. Health messages could build on this knowledge and target and promote the strategies that these young people are already using, such as not showing certain consequences of drinking. This would have more effect than promoting health messages that are oppositional to students’ beliefs about online drinking cultures. Placing negative health messages on Facebook would probably not work because it has already been established as a positive space. As Gold and colleagues (2012) pointed out, just creating these pages does not mean that people will interact with them. Photos could offer a unique way of getting the targeted audience to interact directly with health organisations or interventions aimed at curbing their online drinking cultures.

Conclusion

This study explored the role Facebook photos play in the social life and drinking experiences of nine university students. Drinking photos illustrate their social experience, and discourses facilitate the construction of a normalised, positive and socially acceptable
online student drinking culture. Drinking photos reinforce friendships and group cohesiveness. To that end, they are continually managed and negotiated within a context collapse to avoid tension within their relationships. An intoxigenic environment, provided by Facebook photos, encourages the disclosure of drinking activities. It is an environment where students can interactively relive their drinking experiences. These findings have a range of implications for governmental and institutional policy development, privacy settings, corporate ownership and marketing, and health promotion. Drinking photos and their contribution to online student drinking cultures need to be understood by those developing strategies to change drinking practices. This study also clarifies the need to protect the personal interests of the students from those who have a vested corporate interest in maintaining the current online drinking culture.
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Appendix A: Information Sheet

The Research Project

This project aims to explore young adults’ experiences with photos on Facebook, particularly around drinking and friendships. The focus is on young adults’ views and perspectives about their experiences of looking at and uploading photos on Facebook.

The researcher

My name is Anna Tonks. I am a Psychology Masters student at the Massey campus in Wellington. I am currently completing my final year of study. My supervisors for this project are Dr Antonia Lyons (School of Psychology) and Dr Ian Goodwin (School of English and Media Studies).

Who can take part?

You are welcome to take part in this study if you are a university undergraduate student aged 18-19 who has a Facebook page.

What’s involved?

If you agree to participate, you’ll take part in an interview with me. We can arrange a time and a place that is mutually convenient to do the interview. If you’re in Wellington, this could be in an office at the Massey Wellington campus.

During the interview I’ll ask you to show me your Facebook profile and photos on a laptop or computer (that I provide), as well as other photos that are relevant to you. I’ll be asking questions during this process about topics like friendships, drinking experiences, and photo-posting processes. The interview will be video recorded, and screen capture software will run to capture the screen activity. It is expected the interview will take about an hour.

I will type up a written record of our interview. All identifying information (like names of people or places) will be removed or changed. You will also be given a pseudonym and every endeavour will be made to ensure that the material remains confidential and that you are not identifiable.

To say thanks for your time, and sharing your knowledge and experiences, I will give you a $30 voucher, either for itunes or New World.

What happens to the information?

I will analyse the interview transcripts. All recordings and transcripts will be securely stored. The only people that will have access to the anonymised data will be me, my supervisors and the broader research team (details about this team is available at http://drinkingculture.info). I will email all participants a summary of my main research findings. The team will keep the data securely stored for at least five years, then it will be destroyed. The information will be disseminated through academic conference presentations and journals. If there are any photos used in these, all identifying information (e.g. place names, faces, tattoos etc) will be blurred out or deleted so no person or place is identifiable.
What are your rights as a participant?

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:
- decline to answer any particular question,
- ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview,
- withdraw from the study during the interview or within one week after the interview,
- ask for particular topics discussed during the interview to be deleted from any records for up to one week following the interview,
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation,
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher,
- be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded.

Contacts for the project

If you have any questions at all, or would like to talk about this research project with anyone, then please feel free to contact me or my supervisors.

Student Researcher:
Anna Tonks
tonks.anna@gmail.com
0276375674

Supervisors:
Dr Antonia Lyons
School of Psychology, Massey University, Wellington
a.lyons@massey.ac.nz
04-8015799 extn: 62164

Dr Ian Goodwin
School of English and Media Studies, Massey University, Wellington
i.goodwin@massey.ac.nz
04-8015799 extn: 62175.

"This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 11/59. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Nathan Matthews, Acting Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 8729, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz"
Appendix B: Consent Form

Photos on Facebook

Participant Consent Form

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

Please tick the box provided if you agree with the following statements:

☐ I understand I can withdraw from the study at any time without giving reason or penalty during the interview or within one week after the interview.

☐ I understand I can ask for topics discussed during the interview to be deleted from all records within one week after the interview.

☐ I agree to the interview being video and image recorded.

☐ I would like a summary of the main findings from this study emailed to me when they become available (please provide an email address below).

☐ I understand that all my information will remain confidential to the researcher and research supervisors. All identifying information will be changed or removed by the researcher.

☐ I understand that some of the materials I provide may be used by a wider Marsden funder project focused on social networking in NZ, provided that I will not be identifiable in any way (a pseudonym will be used).

☐ I agree to the conditions of this study as outlined in the Information Sheet.

Full Name

Signature

Date

Email (if necessary)
Appendix C: Interview Schedule

Undergraduates, friendships and drinking cultures: The role of photos on Facebook

Interview Schedule

The interview will start with the researcher and the participant giving their name, age, where they live, what and where they study, and which the ethnicities they identify with.

They will be reminded of their right of confidentiality, and the recording audio and video equipment can be turned off if requested. Additionally, they will be informed that they can withdraw at any time during the interview with no explanation or consequences.

Since this is an exploratory study and the direction of the questions will likely depend on the content shown to the interviewer on the participants Facebook page during the of the interview, it is hard to be sure of the exact questions that will be asked. However, the following questions indicate the intended focus of the interview.

Photos on Facebook
What do you do on Facebook?
What sort of photos do you post on Facebook?
How often do you post photos?
When do you post photos?
What influences you posting photos? What about other people you know?
Do your friends post photos of you? How often?
Do you untag yourself from photos? Why?
Why do you think others post photos?
Have you had any negative experiences involving Facebook photos?

Drinking cultures in photos on Facebook
Do you drink alcohol?
How much do you normally drink?
Why do you drink?
What do you do when you drink?
Do you interact with the people you drink with on Facebook? What do you do with them?
Do you have any examples of drinking photos?
Why do you post these photos?
Do you take photos specifically for Facebook when you are socialising? Why?
How do you organise taking photos when you are out drinking? What normally happens when you are drinking and there is a camera around?
Who sees these photos? Are you concerned by who will view these photos?
Who else do you think mainly posts photos of drinking?
What drinking experiences do you take photos of? Which ones make it on to Facebook?
Who else puts up photos of you drinking and socialising?
What do you look for in a good photo?
What photos do you untag yourself from?
What photos don’t make it on to Facebook?
What makes you chose this photos to upload?
Is there any inappropriate content on Facebook?
What do you take the photos with, e.g. digital camera, iphone?
How long does it usually take for you or your friends to post these photos?

Friendship and photo posting
How many friends do you have on Facebook?
Who do you have on Facebook? What counts as a friend on Facebook?
What do your friends post online?
Is there anyone you wouldn’t have on your Facebook? Have you ever deleted or rejected a friend request?
Do you talk about the photos that have been posted with your friends?
Who do you expect to view these photos?
What happens once a photo is posted online? (E.g. commenting, tagging, ‘liking’) Why do you do these things?
Has anyone put up a photo of yourself you didn’t like? How did you deal with it?
Are there any rules around posting photos? Is there any photos you wouldn’t post of a friend?
Appendix D: Support and Information Sheet

Thank you for participating in this research project. Your time and effort is very much appreciated. If you have any further questions regarding this research project, please feel free to contact me at tonks.anna@gmail.com. When the study has been completed you will be provided the opportunity to view a summary of the findings.

If anything that has been discussed today has prompted any questions about alcohol or any alcohol-related issues, or made you feel upset in anyway, one of the following information or help services may be helpful:

**Counselling Services**

**Youthline**
Wellington Centre
Phone: 0800 376 633
Email: talk@youthline.co.nz
Website: www.youthline.co.nz
Free TXT to 234
Open 24 hours a day

**Massey Counselling Services**
Wellington Student Counselling Services
Phone: 04 801 2542
Monday to Friday, 8.30 am – 4.40 pm

**Victoria University Counselling Services**
Student Counselling Services
Phone: 04 463 5310
Open Monday to Friday, 8.30 am – 5 pm

**University of Canterbury Health Centre (Counselling included)**
Phone: 03 364 2402
Opening hours available: www.canterbury.ac.nz/healthcentre/appointments.shtml

**Otago University Student Health Services (Counselling included)**
Free phone: 0800 479 821
Phone: 03 479 8212
Opening hours available: www.otago.ac.nz/studenthealth/about.html#hours

**Information Services**

**ALAC National Office and Central Region**
Phone: (04) 917 0060
Email: central@alac.org.nz
Website: www.alac.org.nz

**Al-Anon**
Phone: 0508 425 266
Email: nz-al-anon-gso@xtra.co.nz
Website: www.al-anon.org.nz

**Alcohol Drug Helpline**
Phone: 0800 787 797
Open daily, 10 am – 10 pm
Appendix E: Transcription Notation Guide

[ ] C2: quite a while [yea
Mo: yea

= W: that I’m aware of =
C: = Yes. Would you confirm that?

(4) Yes (2) yeah

__________

What’s up?

WORD I’ve got ENOUGH TO WORRY ABOUT

{laughter} {laughter}

{laughter} Any other significant behaviour – laughter, sighing, intake of breath, etc.

( ) Future risks and ( ) and life ( )

Empty parentheses indicate the transcribers inability to hear what was said.

(word) Would you see (there) anything positive

Parenthesized words are possible hearings.

Adapted from Silverman (2001).
Appendix F: Ethics Application Acceptance Letter

MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE RUNEKA RI PūREHUROA

11 October 2011

Anna Tonks
36 Harbour View Road
Northland
WELLINGTON 6012

Dear Anna

Re: HEC: Southern B Application – 11/59
Undergraduates, friendships, drinking cultures: The role of photos on Facebook

Thank you for your letter dated 16 October 2011.

On behalf of the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B I am pleased to advise you that the ethics of your application are now approved. Approval is for three years. If this project has not been completed within three years from the date of this letter, reapproval must be requested.

If the nature, content, location, procedures or personnel of your approved application change, please advise the Secretary of the Committee.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Dr Nathan Matthews, Chair
Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B

cc A/Prof Antonia Lyons
School of Psychology
WELLINGTON

A/Prof Mandy Morgan, HoS
School of Psychology
PN320

Dr Ian Goodwin
School of English & Media Studies
WELLINGTON

Dr John Muirhead, HoS
School of English & Media Studies
PN241
Appendix G: Summary of Thematic Tree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Photos</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camera-Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uploading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Liking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talking about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for Photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posting/status updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking and Socialising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types of Drunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consequences of drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for Socialising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>