

content online for free. I expected more on how and why sharing could increase pro-social behavior. However, he does not offer any definitive answers for it. Furthermore, in Chapter 5, John makes an argument about sharing as talking about feeling and emotions. He does not provide any answer to how SNS could benefit from the therapeutic sense of sharing, especially from a psychological point of view.

In addition, *The Age of Sharing* may be expending too much effort on giving examples to make most of the points. In other words, the book could benefit from more explicit identification of the key concepts before using rich evidence to illustrate. For example, in Chapter 4: Sharing Economies, it devotes several pages to explaining how sharing economy is no different than the human instinct of cooperation. However, it does not explain clearly which businesses use the idea of a sharing economy. John mentions a few peer-to-peer communities, such as Wikipedia, BitTorrent, and YouTube, but why not Uber and Airbnb? Do they fit into the notion of offline sharing? In addition, the same chapter argues that new technologies drive offline sharing because the Internet induces trust. I wonder whether this is a convincing reason, as we know that the credibility of Internet content is fragile. Moreover, John mentions sharing as self-expression several times throughout the book but does not provide further explanations.

Compared with other works that emphasize the power dynamics and discourses of sharing, *The Age of Sharing* focuses more on the meaning of sharing as a central term in the sharing industry. Similar to John, for example, Meikle agrees in *Social Media: Communication, Sharing and Visibility* (2016) that the practices of sharing bring new business models. However, Meikle uses Facebook's mission statement to show that the use of the term sharing is a strategic move and "a metaphor for sell." Facebook uses "share" to persuade users to contribute to its database, which is used to attract advertisers. Thus, while scholars like Meikle see sharing in terms of power and commodification, *The Age of Sharing's* major contribution is that it illustrates how the practices of sharing brings value to us, and what we think when talking about sharing. It explicitly conceptualizes sharing as telling, as communication, and as caring. People who are interested in the discourse on sharing could benefit from the book. Overall, *The Age of Sharing* represents a salutary addition to the current academic studies of sharing.

Social Media and Everyday Politics. Tim Highfield. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2016. 211 pp. \$69.95 hbk. \$24.95 pbk. \$24.95 ebk.

Reviewed by: Kay O'Donnell, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois, USA
DOI: 10.1177/1077699017726341

To say that author Tim Highfield has written about a timely, pertinent, and relevant topic would be an understatement. Although written prior to Donald Trump's election as U.S. president and framed using primarily Australian and British examples and anecdotes, it nonetheless offers a framework for studying politics and social media that trickles down to the everyday and the (as the author often calls it) "mundane." And

though the rise of Donald Trump and his unique, often against-the-rules, use of social media to gain political traction do serve as an outlier to some of Highfield's observations, the author still lays a firm foundation for how we examine the intersection between modern politics and the power of social media, particularly as it relates to the individual. "Consideration of the personal and the political of social media—and the internet in general—should not ignore how the platforms used are themselves parts of the political debate."

The book is an extension of Highfield's doctoral research and retains an academic construction in its organization, citations, and stated purpose. Yet it is highly readable, and filled with engaging examples that illustrate the author's concepts and viewpoints, such as discussions on a parody Twitter account for Queen Elizabeth II and the early use of social media by Howard Dean in his 2004 bid to garner the Democratic presidential nomination. On the subject of parody accounts, Highfield acutely recognizes how these types of accounts can resonate with broader audiences. "Topical comments in particular attract widespread attention from Twitter audiences," he notes; "tweets framed within the world of the parody have also been found to attract greater attention, and possibly have more appeal or salience for a wider audience, than their more mundane, everyday posts."

Highfield is right to focus on modern-day constructs such as memes, wordplay, and parody when analyzing the connections between individuals and their consumption, interpretation, and often resistance, to politicians or political acts. Memes, he says, by mixing "contexts that are otherwise unrelated . . . play with the media literacy of their audience, in the creation and understanding of the meme form, and also the comprehension of its social media context."

The author extends his reach into the broader sphere of "media" to show social media's particular place and function among more traditional journalistic venues. As a journalism educator, I found Chapter 3 to be a particularly rich section in which Highfield traces the role of early bloggers as "gate watchers" of the gatekeepers (i.e., mainstream media), and notes the predominance of "ideological clustering" among many Internet users. His statements again have particular resonance in today's political versus media culture in the United States when he raises the role of truth: "The accuracy of social media coverage of news and politics, and whether it portrays truth . . . is an ongoing debate . . . After all, the question of authenticity is central to the social meditation of everyday experiences . . ."

Highfield raises the idea of social media tools as backchannels for other events, actions, or information a few times throughout the text. This is notable in that it points to the often-insidious power of social media on the individual and that individual's consumption and use of social media content. He warns of the propensity for some to "engage solely in the backchannel without actually watching the programming that is ostensibly shaping the discussion." This reaction-without-context scenario deserves continued awareness and discussion. Backchannels take on a slightly different construction when Hightower places them in the form of protests and demonstrations; their role is more passive here where live social media interaction

such as live-streaming or live-tweeting merely provides the conduit to spotlight the event.

Because of the rise of social media, some politicians have found themselves in the role of “middleman” between the message and the messaging system. In some ways, those in politics have a broader direct line to their audience than at any other time in history. However, the very definition of social media and its potential to have a nearly immediate impact on one or many brings an array of dilemmas to the average politician. As Highfield discusses, there is no one-size-fits-all formula for the success of politicians and their social media use. At the top of the chart of potential missteps is misinterpretation of the intended message or worse, parody of the message.

It is in his analysis of politicians’ use of social media and the extended conversation into “The Everyday of Elections” that the author attempts to bring the discussion full circle. As stated by Highfield, “I have included elections as the focus for this final chapter because they act as a microcosm of the various practices and trends outlined in the previous chapters.” Indeed, the author does tie together several threads that supported earlier sections of the book in looking at the institution of elections. He correctly concludes that “for the coverage of politics and for everyday social media practices, the mainstream and the social, alternative and corporate-owned platforms are all interlinked.”