THEME 2
# *Crowdsourcing*: shared culture

by **Tíscar Lara**
http://tiscar.com/tiscar-lara
@tiscar

## PARTICIPATIVE CULTURE ON THE NET

The ability to share any everyday experience through the use of mobile devices and social networks has also given rise to new kinds of cultural consumption, mixing the codes of professionals and amateurs and changing forever the meaning of a musical event or a visit to a museum.

Going through an experience is not enough if one cannot say in real time that you are doing so and say so not just to groups close to you, but also other sectors of the public, unknown and potentially massive. These days it is hard to imagine a TV programme or an exhibition that does not have a label or "hashtag" in the corner calling for comment from the networks, a call to action that connects you in a moment to the whole of the social flux that we are just one click away from sharing the experience with. The strength of the power for viralisation that the Internet possesses through the content that circulates on it, the contamination of ideas and user-produced material on it make up what Delia Rodríguez (2013) recently called "memecracy", which she defines as a new social revolution.

This set of new tools for network collaboration has given rise to user behaviours that the American researcher Henry Jenkins dubbed several years ago "participative culture", with the following characteristics:

1. It imposes scarcely any barriers on artistic expression or public commitment.
2. Strong support is perceived to make and share personal creations with others.
3. A sort of informal tutelage is offered by which the knowledge of the more expert is passed on to the less experienced.
4. The members believe that their contributions are valued.
5. The members feel some sort of social connection with each other (in which at least account is taken of what other people think of what has been created).
6. Not all members need contribute, but at least they all feel free to contribute when they are ready, in the confidence that their contribution will be valued appropriately.

Isaac Mao coined the term "sharism" to refer to participative culture from another viewpoint. For Mao, it is a mental state that drives us to share knowledge through an innate property of our brains which is always ready to establish neuronal relations and participate in creative processes:

> The more open and strongly connected our social neurons are, the better the sharing environment will be for all people. The more collective our intelligence, the wiser our actions will be. People have always found better solutions through conversations. Now we can put it all online.

## WHAT IS CROWDSOURCING?

To answer this question let us begin with a source that is unconfirmed, whose author is unknown, and yet is regarded as one of the most useful reference

tools of the present day. It is not backed by a grand academic institution, nor does it guarantee a system of ongoing revision by experts. On the contrary, it has millions of contributors, who are not recruited on the basis of any particular criterion, but who feel motivated to contribute, improve and filter the content without anyone receiving any kind of payment. We are talking about Wikipedia, an experiment that had scarcely taken its first steps as the Twin Towers fell and which served, together with globalisation, to bring in the 21st century. In this case, the change of era on the Web catalogued on the self-written or social Web.

Wikipedia is, undoubtedly, the greatest exponent of what we call crowdsourcing. In it, we can find the definition that has been consensualised within its community:

> *Crowdsourcing is the practice of obtaining needed services, ideas, or content by soliciting contributions from a large group of people, and especially from an online community, rather than from traditional employees or suppliers. This process is often used to subdivide tedious work or to fund-raise startup companies and charities, and can also occur offline. It combines the efforts of numerous self-identified volunteers or part-time workers, where each contributor of their own initiative adds a small portion to the greater result. The term "crowdsourcing" is a portmanteau of "crowd" and "outsourcing"; it is distinguished from outsourcing in that the work comes from an undefined public rather than being commissioned from a specific, named group.*

The first recorded use of the term crowdsourcing was in an article by Jeff Howe in the journal *Wired* in 2006. As can be observed, the term arrived years after its manifestation in practice, since Wikipedia, repeatedly cited as the paradigmatic example, had already been in existence for some time.

In fact, Wikipedia was not the first to use crowdsourcing as such. The practice of massive collaboration, externalised and with open entry, is not exclusive to the 21st century, because in human history, as anthropology makes clear, we could find many examples of this sort of practice. What is new

and differentiating at the start of this new century is the role of digital technology, the Internet as a whole, networks and personal digital assistants and the growing connectivity that favours the creation of interest groups, their internal organisation and the distribution of tasks between members.

The philosophical and scientific basis that underlies crowdsourcing is the recognition that the aggregated value of a critical mass is potentially greater, for basically statistical reasons, than a limited system. To this is added the benefit arising from the fact that it is open systems that offer the opportunity to participate in a group not subject to prior control, which also increases the success factor. Digital tools act as catalysts and enablers of these major properties: the scale effect and the accessibility effect.

Inspired by this affirmation, in recent years dozens of books have been published that tend to confirm this thesis, such as *The Wisdom of Crowds,* by James Surowiecki (2004), *Collective Intelligence,* by Pierre Lévy (2004), *Wikinomics,* by Don Tapscott and Anthony Williams (2006), *The Alchemy of Crowds,* by Francis Pisani and Dominique Piotet (2009) and, more recently, *Manifiesto Crowd,* by Juan Freire and Antonio Gutiérrez Rubí (2013).

**Crowdsourcing is the practice of massive, externalised collaboration through the use of an open call for solutions**

One way of looking at crowdsourcing is to examine it from the point of view of the trigger: the one that provokes an action, which designs the community and which handles the products that are generated. The most classic view of crowdsourcing, but also the one that has most popularised the term, is the one based on the company as a way of reducing costs, ensuring profits and getting closer to customers.

There are many books, experts and success stories that have documented crowdsourcing in the corporate sphere, normally set within what has also

been called "open innovation": to open up the processes of internal decision-making, product design or problem-solving so that it is a community of participants who contribute a diversity of ideas, knowledge and visions to help achieve the company's objectives. The experience of the Lego groups, the Lilly pharmaceutical communities or the designs of Opel, IBM and Ikea supply the most popular examples that typify the most basic crowdsourcing: maximise the involvement of the customer at various points in the value chain of the company's processes.

## TYPES OF CROWDSOURCING

Crowdsourcing is broad enough and flexible enough to inspire and harbour a great many experiments that have adopted new forms to resolve concrete problems. This practice takes from Web 2.0 the involvement of cooperation and participation by the users in multiple aspects of the processes of production and distribution of knowledge in which they are involved. These processes vary in scope: from the conclusion of the acceptance process (crowdvoting) to the intermediate production process (crowdcreating), to the origin of the idea itself (crowdwisdom) or financial sustainability (crowdfunding).

In their book *Manifiesto Crowd*, Juan Freire and Antonio Gutiérrez Rubí extend this classification and identify several other settings in which to the key factor of "crowd" ("crowd" being "multitude" rather than "mass") is added the cooperative spirit. The authors distinguish this constellation of crowd manifestations on a matrix according to whether collaboration occurs fundamentally to create or produce the project (crowdthinking, crowdcreating and crowdworking) or whether it is to fund it or market it (crowdfunding, crowdplanning, crowdcuration, crowdvoting and crowdbuying). At this point it is worth observing that crowdsourcing is not a synonym for any collective practice. At a basic level, we could say that the simple voting of videos on YouTube, which is certainly the outcome of an action by multiple users

who generate a certain knowledge through their aggregated actions, is not an instance of crowdsourcing in the strict sense, since it lacks the following characteristics:

1.  Planning or direction by a group, company or institution with the aim of obtaining certain results through the cooperation of a large number of users.
2.  The existence of a group or potential community of users with a certain willingness to take part.
3.  That there be a distribution of tasks so that participants can deal with some part of them in a conscious and deliberate way.
4.  That there be a desired calendar of work, with a beginning and an end. Hence also it is common to talk about crowdsourcing "campaigns" or "projects".
5.  That the greater resulting benefit redounds fundamentally to the goal planned in advance by the group, person, company or institution that launches the crowdsourcing project.

Although not essential, it is usual that the system of recompense, profit or payment for participants is clearly defined from the start. These may take a variety of forms: material, with a financial return; or intangible, such as social reputation, personal achievement, learning, etc.

## CROWDSOURCING IN ART AND CULTURE

Although crowdsourcing is largely known thanks to big companies, the essence of participation by users and amateurs, in terms of open, distributed collaboration, is found in many other sectors of society: ranging from science, with distributed genome research, to politics, such as the Obama campaign in 2008, or the public activism of the 15-M Movement or the "opendata" journalism of Wikileaks.

Art too has seen in the facility for network collaboration offered by the Internet a way of creating works in which the public's contribution is the main element of the experience. The public's artistic participation may take a great variety of forms, one that is closer to traditional passive reception, or one that is more nuclear, intervening in the design and production of the work itself. It is not accidental that Net Art began to take up the technology right from the early days of the Internet, exploring the limits of multimedia and of interactive and hypertextual language.

The fusion of participative culture with technology has enabled the creation of major artistic works based on crowdsourcing, as Aaron Koblin has shown throughout his career, becoming an indisputable leader in the production of visual and audio projects with thousands of on-line contributions. Notable amongst Koblin's crowdsourcing projects is the animated wood in *Exquisite Forest*, a videoclip of Johnny Cash with thousands of drawn stills, the composition with 10,000 sheep in *The Sheep Market*, the $100 bill made from 10,000 drawings and the song for 2,000 voices in *The Bicycle Built for Two Thousand*. Precisely in many of these works, which have even been exhibited in major museums, Koblin has used the services of Mechanical Turk from Amazon, a platform designed explicitly to commission tasks from a massive public and manage their micropayments for doing them.

Other works of this kind are the virtual choir for which the musician Eric Whitacre has been composing with thousands of on-line singers (which has been through several editions), the platform SwarmSketch, which each week proposes a sketch to be drawn collectively, the Trailer Mash portal, which invites users to create new trailers for well-known films, or the PostSecret Web site, which for years has been publishing physical postcards in which the senders share a secret anonymously.

In the field of re-mix or *mashup*, so typical of digital culture, major artists have capitalised on the interest of their fans to share their creativity with them. Probably the best known of these was George Lucas

in the project *Star Wars Uncut*, but there are other directors such as Lars Von Trier in the film *Gesamt*, Tim Burton and his collective story created on Twitter, Radiohead offering tracks from their songs to be remixed and *Plan B* by Carlos Jean in Spain, which collected 4,000 contributions and managed to put a collaborative song at Number One in the Top Forty.[1]

Practices of this sort necessarily involve a substantial change in the notions of creativity, authorship and

> **Its essential feature is the participation of users and amateurs who can intervene in both the design and the production of the work**

aesthetic meaning which canonically have been a mark of art during recent centuries. Each collective work possesses unique differences. A work that accepts all contributions on equal terms is not the same as one in which there is a selection by the principle coordinator. Neither is a work in which all the participants are aware throughout the process the same as one in which contributions are diluted in the end result. In this regard, the researcher Ioana Literat (2012) proposes an analysis of crowdsourcing participation projects in art in terms of several parameters: the importance attributed in each project to the medium (visual, acoustic or literary), the more or less directive, controlling role of the artist who brings the action about, the transparent or opaque nature of the overall result as perceived by participants, the degree of dialogic or independent interrelation between the contributions, the synthetic or multiple dimension of the final product and possible recompense for contributions.

Nonetheless, not all crowdsourcing projects are initiated by artists. Cultural institutions have also seen in these dynamics a means to mobilise interested members of the public and generate greater participation in the causes they pursue. The Horizon 2013 report, devoted specifically to museums' relationship with technology, cited crowdsourcing, together with BYOD (*bring your own*

*device*) initiatives, as one of the trends to be adopted in a generalised way in the short term. Some who have already walked this road are the 36 initiatives identified by Carletti, Giannachi, Price and McAuley (2013), who note in their analysis two great trends in formulas for involving the public: contributing to existing works or generating new ones.

In the first group, habitual tasks are the curation, review and localisation of works. Notable here are the Brooklyn and Steve museums in the United States and the Kröller-Müller in Holland, which invited their communities to label, document and review their collections.

> **Cultural institutions can involve their publics by inviting them to contribute to existing works or by creating new ones**

Libraries have also adopted this practice, as in the case of the University of Alabama with a plan to involve volunteers in the labelling of old photographs. University College London has transcribed more than 7,000 manuscripts by Jeremy Bentham by means of a wiki, while the Citizen Archivist Dashboard Project of the US National Archive has a call permanently open for the transcription of Greek papyri in the project *Ancient Lives* and WW II meteorological manuscripts in *Old Weather*.

Other platforms contribute to this "librarianship" project, although not initiated by major libraries. The Flickr image portal has an agreement with a large number of public archives and invites the cataloguing of historic photos from the macrocollection Commons on its Web-site. In Spain, the Bookcamping network shares books with CC licences, and in the United States, but with global intent, the incipient Hypothes.is proposes the massive collaborative labelling of all on-line knowledge.

On the other hand, there are many projects that arise precisely from the material contributed by the public that becomes part of the historical heritage,

such as home videos in the documentary *Life in a Day*, that compiled 80,000 contributions on YouTube, the pieces from the legendary programme *StoryCorps* in the United States, the private documents related with wars or the contributions to collaborative maps in acoustic maps such as Soundmap by the British Library.

## CROWDSOURCING, A FIELD OF RESEARCH

The analysis of all this gargantuan volume of data that users are contributing through networking on the Net, together with the new methodologies that digital tools bring to academic research, has created a new scientific discipline, Digital Humanities. This area of knowledge opens up new fields of cultural exploration which, without the intervention of the Net, the participative culture, crowdsourcing and information technologies, would be unimaginable.

Within this field, Antonio Lafuente and Alberto Corsín (2010) have researched into the culture of public ability and science on a historic and anthropological level, connecting the roots of the procommon (common assets) with the new riches and heritage the digital society is generating. One example of all this is free software, whose communities, also called "recursive publics" by Chris Kelty in his book *Two Bits* (2010), represent new procommons that build, manage and produce on the bases of collaboration, shared knowledge and distributed participation.

Creating networks for the exchange of knowledge and best practices is a key factor in a globalised society. Cultural entities are more and more aware of the need to build links with their interest groups by organising a variety of formulae for participation, but also realise that in a world that is so globalised and competitive their survival and sustainability requires the cultivation of peer cooperation. An example of this is the SLIC project that the Medialab-Prado has been stitching together since 2008 with cultural institutions within its ambit to

share resources and knowledge of the use of free software applied to archiving and access to digital content:

*The purpose of these contacts is to work on a project aimed at bringing together cultural institutions to share resources and knowledge on the problem of archiving and accessing digital cultural content, in order to meet their needs as entities at the service of the public. The most immediate aim consists of creating a system or platform that enables the sharing of content produced by the different cultural entities, in such a way that users can access it and download it simply, freely and without charge.*

## COLLABORATION IN THE PHYSICAL AS AN EXPONENT OF THE VIRTUAL

As we have been seeing, libraries, museums and cultural institutions in general are finding new challenges in their mission to serve the public with the advances of technology, but at the same time digital culture itself is provoking a transformation of physical spaces, leading them to reinvent themselves with respect to their main functions. Instead of being leisure facilities to entertain and arouse the love of culture, they are becoming laboratories to produce and generate direct participation by members of the public as cultural actors. Notable are the practices known as DIY (Do It Yourself), which with time are transcending their individual character and becoming enriched by group participation in dynamics also known as DIWO, or Do It With Others.

This new culture of the prototype and of collective making has been reflected by Chris Anderson in his book *Makers: the New Industrial Revolution* (2012), where he draws attention to the opportunity for this type of urban space as meeting-points for the exchange of ideas and the creation of practices. Thus, we are finding more and more examples of libraries and museums that are incorporating the participative culture of the makers, bringing the virtual to the physical, melding the spirit of

crowdsourcing and online collaboration with the creative synergies that are produced by sharing space.

## CROWDFUNDING, A NEW COLLABORATIVE WAY OF CONTRIBUTING TO A PROJECT BY FUNDING IT

Of all the evolutions of crowdsourcing, there are two that are attaining a high degree of maturity. The first of these is *crowdworking*, better known as *coworking*, a practice in which Spain is positioned third in Europe and which consists of sharing workplaces in communal spaces. The benefit of coworking, used a great deal by social and cultural entrepreneurs, is not so much as a way of cutting costs as a way of enjoying an ecosystem which is favourable to the creation of interdisciplinary synergies.

The second is *crowdfunding*, a system of managing microfunding for projects whose main aim is to collect enough economic resources to make them viable and sustainable. In general terms we could say that while in crowdsourcing campaigns a commitment of talent or time is generated, those more specifically of crowdfunding contribute basically money, turning the collaborator into a "partner", "investor" or "sponsor".

It is true that crowdfunding is as old as making donations or volunteership in the cultural world. Nonetheless, what is unique about initiatives of this sort, and at the same time their driving force, is the application of digital tools for the management, viability and transparency of the system of participation. As a result of this, recent years have seen the appearance of specialised platforms which support crowdfunding campaigns in such a way that it becomes easy and accessible to collaborate in the funding of a specific project, and which have the traceability required for the monitoring of the

process and its results. Amongst them we could cite some of the most popular, such as Kickstarter in English-speaking countries and Goteo and Verkami in Spain.

Just as we find major examples of crowdsourcing campaigns on the idea of innovation that is open and closely linked to large companies in which the problem is not financing, but rather gathering information from, or strengthening links with, the customers, crowdfunding is consubstantial with projects that emanate from small companies, groups or individuals who wish to develop an idea but do not have the necessary resources to do so.

Here the sharing of tasks is not so critical. The main thing is to contribute to the incubation of the project and to its sustainability in order to make it a reality. Hence, while in the case of the former, the tendency of crowdsourcing as open innovation, the projects tend to be top to bottom, more corporative and institutional, seeking enrichment and diversity in the dedication of volunteers, in the latter case of crowdfunding the projects are bottom to top, more related with social settings where the benefits are not usually financial, that incorporate a tradition of self-financing and which furthermore are suffering from the reduction of public funding: cultural, scientific, environmental, educational, etc. It is not surprising, therefore, that most of the projects we find on Kickstarter, Verkami and Goteo are of this sort.

According to a study by Infocrowdsourcing, the amount obtained in 2012 from crowdfunding in Spain was 9.7 million euros. Furthermore, in the field that concerns us here, of the 62 platforms identified in Spain and y Latin America, 16% are devoted to solidarity projects, 13% to artistic projects, 10% to musical and 5% to scientific ones.

It is a sign of the maturity of the system that three out of four crowdfunding projects raise the amount requested. An analysis of activity on Verkami in 2012[2] indicated that 75.3% of campaigns launched on the platform attained their financing aims. In the sphere of culture, the sectors with the highest

success rates were publishing projects in first place, followed by musical and thirdly social ones.

It is also interesting to note that the amount of money requested for projects is inversely related to their success rate, so that projects whose target amount is greater than €5,000 to €10,000 have more chance of achieving it than those with lower targets.

There is no better way to get an overview of the growth of this practice than to browse through the crowdfunding platforms of Performing Arts, Dance, Theater, Publishing, Music, Photography, Film, Design, Art, Comics, Science and Craft to discover the hundreds of projects that are cofinanced on microdonations.

It is surprising to look at the figures for the projects that have raised most money. On Kickstarter, in the USA, we find

**Crowdfunding springs from small companies, collectives or private individuals who are seeking the financial resources to bring an idea to fruition**

amounts ranging from the $600,000 raised by artist Marina Abramovic for her Institute and the $175,000 raised to conserve a classic cinema, or the more than $45,000 raised for a dance performance. In Spain the numbers are more modest, but there are still examples from the performing arts, such as the home performance by Latung La La with €14,000, the more than €40,000 for the concert #Primaveravalenciana, the €50,000 for the comic *Brigada,* the €60,000 for the scientific submarine ICTINEU 3 and the record €350,000 raised for the documentary *L'Endemà* (The Day After)*.

## COLLABORATIVE CONSUMPTION AS A FORM OF CULTURE

The culture of participation also modifies how we buy, eat and travel, to the point of making "collaborative consumption" a cultural form in itself.

Within the so-called *sharing economy* of which it forms part, user participation does not seek to contribute to a third-party project but rather to have a direct effect on the practice of consumption, a consumption which in turn is shared within a community. It is a way of embodying certain values such as sustainability and respect for the environment, while still generating savings by eliminating the intermediary role of traditional economic agents and substituting them with shared-interest communities.

According to a study by Cetelem (2013), 52% of Europeans will opt for mutual help or interchange in the coming years, 75% are prepared to buy directly from producers and more than half are seduced by the idea of barter. From travelling exchanging sofas or sharing a car, to creating environment-friendly purchase groups to buy directly from producers or forming networks for the loan or exchange of clothing, books or DIY tools, collaborative consumption as a way of life is not just a way of confronting the economic crisis, but also has social implications such as the change from a property culture to one of efficient use. It is the public itself that sees in digital technology and social networks the capacities for self-organisation, transaction management—and not necessarily economic transactions—and creating links of confidence with the design of new systems for transparency.

The Net questions the role of traditional intermediaries in the distribution of information and becomes an ideal platform to create new markets under new rules. For cultural producers, whether professionals or amateurs, designers, musicians, photographers or artisans, the Internet is also a place to offer your work and build a public without the intervention of publishers, record companies, producers or agents. Thus, platforms such as Etsy, Threadless and Creativemarket provide a virtual shop for artisans and designers who otherwise would not be able to sell their creations.

# KEYS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CROWDSOURCING PRACTICES

So far we have looked at all manner of advantages in setting up crowdsourcing campaigns for companies, artists, institutions and groups. However, we must not ignore the many dilemmas faced by those who wish to do so and who need strategies to ensure success and satisfaction for all those taking part.

One matter is the need to regulate the fact that involvement implies the acquisition of author's rights to users' contributions, be they originals or the modifications of prior works, and the responsibility that both parties have for them. This necessitates the design of a system of guarantees that validates the rights in a way that is sufficiently flexible in a context of digital culture.

Another is that it is also necessary to take account of the influence of the voluntary nature of the work—which being unrewarded financially may also call forth less commitment—on the quality of the results and the time-scale for execution.

**The practice of shared consumption through the Net is an ideal platform for creating new markets with new rules**

Also, from the point of view of the company, group or institution that is considering a crowdsourcing campaign it is essential to devote the necessary resources to ensure the success of the project—resources which might be material (support for technology or remuneration) or human (community stimulators, managers with negotiation skills, etc.). This goes hand in hand with the costs of organisation and coordination (a community does not arise spontaneously, but needs to be cared for and fed, guided and mobilised) and the ability to assume risks in terms of the quality of the results,

access to privileged information and the possible dependence that might be generated with respect to the collaborators.

To sum up, in order for a crowdsourcing campaign to be successful it is fundamental that there is already an organisation able to deal with a number of critical issues. Notable amongst these are the following:

- Identify tasks well. Number the various phases of the project and break it up into tasks taking account of how accessible these are.
- Propose a diversity of tasks. Make it so that everyone can find just the task that attracts them and connects with their abilities and interests, so that they can give the best of themselves.
- Design a time chart. Mark milestones and provide periodical information on the attainment of intermediate goals so that the community always knows what point has been reached.
- Design the recompense. Consider the different motivations that might mobilise participants. These may be extrinsic (material payment or social recognition) or intrinsic (the learning or entertainment deriving from the process or the satisfaction of collaborating as part of a group with a common aim).
- Use simple, intuitive technology. Use tools and technologies that impose no technical barriers but rather facilitate the process for the development of contributions.

- Stimulate the community. Establish fluid channels of communication, build links of confidence to avoid people feeling isolated in the development of their task.

## BY WAY OF CONCLUSION

Institutional bodies, as agents at the service of the public, as well as the artists, musicians, writers, etc., themselves, as cultural producers, whether professional or amateur, have new technological

tools available to them to connect with their public and to build links of confidence and commitment through collaboration and distributed participation. Crowdsourcing practices offer ways to tackle ambitious projects that would benefit from the contributions of thousands of volunteers, whether through donations or the exchange or loan of time, talent, goods or money. The Net provides the technology to channel, stimulate and sustain the system of collaboration, but also, and this is very important, provides the participative culture that has emanated from the social practices of users with relation to the Internet, mobile devices and connectivity.

**A community is not created spontaneously, it needs to be cared for, nourished, guided and mobilised**

To take advantage of this synergy of abilities, technologies, creativity and goodwill is a great opportunity but also incurs responsibility on the part of any cultural entity, agent or producer who wishes to pursue their mission in today's digital society. A digital society which, as recent years have shown, wants, needs and demands first-hand, collaborative participation in cultural processes.

# NOTES

**1** In this regard, the book *The Power of Open* ([http://thepowerofopen.org/](http://thepowerofopen.org/)), published under Creative Commons and also available for free dowload in Spanish provides dozens of experiences in which the liberation of content in open source has been key for the involvement of communities in the consumption

**2** "¿Funciona el *crowdfunding* cultural en España?". Data display at [http://lab.rtve.es/crowdfunding-espana/](http://lab.rtve.es/crowdfunding-espana/)

# CULTURAL PROJECTS

## Institutions, archives and libraries

**Citizen Archivist:**
[http://www.archives.gov/citizen-archivist/](http://www.archives.gov/citizen-archivist/)
**Flickr Commons:**
[http://www.flickr.com/commons/institutions/](http://www.flickr.com/commons/institutions/)
**Alabama University Library:**
[http://www.lib.ua.edu/crowdsourcing/](http://www.lib.ua.edu/crowdsourcing/)
**Transcribe Bentham:**
[http://www.transcribe-bentham.da.ulcc.ac.uk/td/Transcribe_Bentham](http://www.transcribe-bentham.da.ulcc.ac.uk/td/Transcribe_Bentham)
**Bookcamping:**
[http://bookcamping.cc/](http://bookcamping.cc/)
**Ancient Lives:**
[http://ancientlives.org/transcribe](http://ancientlives.org/transcribe)
**Old Weather:**
[http://www.oldweather.org/why_scientists_need_you](http://www.oldweather.org/why_scientists_need_you)
**Life in a day:**
[http://www.youtube.com/user/lifeinaday](http://www.youtube.com/user/lifeinaday)
**StoryCorps:**
[http://storycorps.org/](http://storycorps.org/)
**SoundMaps:**
[http://sounds.bl.uk/Sound-Maps/UK-Soundmap](http://sounds.bl.uk/Sound-Maps/UK-Soundmap)

## Artistic

**Exquisite Forest:**
[http://www.exquisiteforest.com/](http://www.exquisiteforest.com/)
**The Johnny Cash Project:**
[http://www.thejohnnycashproject.com](http://www.thejohnnycashproject.com)
**The Sheep Market:**
[http://www.thesheepmarket.com](http://www.thesheepmarket.com)
**The Ten Thousand Cents:**
[http://www.tenthousandcents.com](http://www.tenthousandcents.com)
**The Bicycle Built for Two Thousand:**
[http://www.bicyclebuiltfortwothousand.com](http://www.bicyclebuiltfortwothousand.com)
**The Virtual Choir:**
[http://ericwhitacre.com/the-virtual-choir](http://ericwhitacre.com/the-virtual-choir)
**SwarmSketch:**
[http://swarmsketch.com](http://swarmsketch.com)
**The Trailer Mash:**
[http://www.thetrailermash.com](http://www.thetrailermash.com)
**PostSecret:**
[http://postsecret.com](http://postsecret.com)
**StarWars Uncut:**
[http://www.starwarsuncut.com](http://www.starwarsuncut.com)

# CROWDFUNDING PLATFORMS

**Kickstarter:**
[http://www.kickstarter.com/](http://www.kickstarter.com/)
**Goteo:**
[http://goteo.org/](http://goteo.org/)
**Verkami:**
[http://www.verkami.com/](http://www.verkami.com/)

**GENERAL INFORMATION**
**Infocrowdsourcing:**
[http://www.infocrowdsourcing.com/](http://www.infocrowdsourcing.com/)
**Cultural crowdfunding in Spain:**
[http://lab.rtve.es/crowdfunding-espana/](http://lab.rtve.es/crowdfunding-espana/)

**Twitter**
@Crowdsourcing_
@icrowdsourcing