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ABSTRACT

Video content creation by “amateur” private users has taken on professional (i.e. work) characteristics. The emergence of user-centric video sharing services (e.g. YouTube, Twitch, Mixer) has set the scene for the rise of micro-celebrities and influencers making video content creation a valuable source of income. The development of occupational and commercial elements within the activity has gained a significant amount of attention from the mainstream media but also from academic research. This paper presents a literature review that aims to examine the nature of the available literature (75 articles) on the occupational characteristics of video content creation. The literature review examines the development of research and terminology of this topic, the theoretical and conceptual frameworks utilized in the examined research, and how the elements of work have been examined and perceived in the examined literature. The results reveal an ongoing development of entrepreneurial aspects in the activity and highlight the need for further research on video content creation in a work context.

1. Introduction

The pervasive growth of information and communications technology fuels the convergence of work and leisure. The development of digital economies (e.g. sharing economy, platform economy), digital environments (e.g. virtual worlds and games) and the digital collaborative culture (e.g. social media and participatory culture) has enabled the rise of entrepreneurial-like content creation and distribution through digital platforms. Consequently, work and occupational life is becoming more game-like (i.e. gamification) (Huotari and Hamari, 2017; Vesa et al., 2017), while leisure activities start to take on work-like characteristics where work and play are transforming into a hybrid form, frequently coined as playbour (Fuchs, 2014; Kücklich, 2005) or digital labour (Fuchs, 2014; Kücklich, 2005; Scholz, 2012; Terranova, 2000).

“Amateur” video content creation by private individuals (such as in YouTube and Twitch) has become a popular area of such forms of hybrid entrepreneurship, which is afforded by digital platforms that have become characterized by their long-tail nature (Anderson, 2006) and provide legitimate business opportunities for these amateur individuals (Tassi, 2018). The production and distribution of this type of asynchronous (pre-recorded video) and synchronous video content (live video content) became a popular co-creative activity for private amateur individuals through the emergence of dedicated video sharing platforms such as YouTube in the late 00’s. YouTube as a platform provided a way for individuals to express themselves through (asynchronous, pre-recorded) video formats and offered social recognition through the platform. With the development of YouTube advertising in 2010, the content creators were granted access to advertising revenue, which allowed the activity to begin to develop more professionalized features. Further developments of synchronous “live streaming” technology and innovative streaming and video sharing services such as Twitch and Mixer, have enhanced the professionalization and revenue potential for content creators through dedicated support/partner programs and systems. This has generated a global phenomenon around digital video content and nurtured the development of professionalized video content creator culture, as one of the most advanced manifestation of playbour (Fuchs, 2014; Kücklich, 2005).

Income generated from video content creation is typically a combination of different revenue streams derived from platform-specific
monetization services, external partnerships and collaborations, potential merchandise sales and cross-platform content syndication and interaction (Rose, 2019). The platform-specific monetization structures are one of the main sources of income for video content creators and have become more and more versatile during the last decade. Most of these revenue sources are made accessible through different forms of partnership and affiliate programs, which are based on a contractual exchange between the creator and the platform. For example, Twitch provides two different forms of collaboration for their creators, the affiliate program (lower-level access to revenue and services) and partnership program (higher-level access to revenue and services). Access to these programs is based on specific visibility, viewer engagement and activity metrics on the platform, and in Twitch is heavily gamified to incentivize creators to develop their presence and retain them on the platform (Siutula, 2018; Twitch, 2020). Most platform-specific partnership programs offer variations of similar revenue sources including, advertising revenue share, donations, and subscription services. Advertising revenue share is derived from ad placements during the creator’s content delivery, donations are either hard currency or virtual currency gifts from viewers and subscription share is derived from different types of subscription packages provided by the platform and the creator.

In addition to platform provided revenue streams, video content creators also increasingly take on the role as a spokesperson for different brands (Lancaster, 2018), and generate additional revenue through sponsorships, endorsements, and other means of brand collaborations as another prevalent commercial aspect of video content creation. Video content creators may generate these opportunities on their own, which requires significant entrepreneurial effort, or they can join a multi-channel network, that represents content creators and establishes, e.g. commercial collaborations, for them (Kozlowski, 2013). Content creators also sell merchandise related to their activities and have begun to further utilize cross-platform interaction to develop a level of digital “celebrity”, also known as “micro-celebrity” or “influencer culture” (Khamis et al., 2017), by utilizing other social media platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, Snapchat etc. to build a community and to further monetize their content creation (Aleti et al., 2019). However, the increasing occupational elements of such activities are still not acknowledged as legitimate forms of work, regardless of the increasing media coverage of issues related to the entrepreneurial aspects of this activity such as increasing fatigue and mental health issues related to work load as well as fame and fortune resulting from engaging in such activities (Parkin, 2018). Indeed, extraordinarily little support and organizational structures are provided for content creators at large.

These elements of commercialisation, merged with the hedonistic and expressive nature and background of these activities, make this form of playbour highly strategic and entrepreneurial at its core, but at the same time emphasizes the elements of commodification of the activities and individuals, resulting from the multitude of different revenue models available. This dichotomy between creative entrepreneurial work (Banks and Deuze, 2009; Bruns, 2009; Fish and Srinivasan, 2012; Senft, 2009) and commodifying labour (Postigo, 2016; Scholz, 2012; Smythe, 1977; Terranova, 2008; Van Dijck, 2009) has been a topic of debate around digital content creation for numerous years and highlights the complex nature of hybrid work, where labour and leisure merge.

Video content creation represents a novel hybrid form of work and play that has been enabled by developments of digital technology as well as trends in culture, economy, and society. It represents the most popular manifestation of playbour, which warrants the need for a thorough understanding how it may act as legitimate forms of work/profession and for further investigation into its current established forms and structures. To increase the knowledge about this complex phenomenon and the merger of work and play involved, this systematic literature review will examine existing literature (75 papers) highlighting occupational, commercial or strategic aspects of this activity, and analyse the elements and structures of work and labour emerging from the reviewed sources. The research will aim to provide an overview of the available literature on this subject and the nature of the collected literature. By examining the types of sources and literature included in the data of the paper (research interest, domain of research) and the associated terminology utilized in the examined literature, this research will aim to provide an answer to the following research questions:

RQ1: How has the research on the occupational elements of video content creation developed?

RQ2: How are the occupational elements of video content creation evident in the development of associated terminology?

The associated terminology as well as the associated definitions will be analysed for nuances of work and occupational developments. The terminology was selected for the analysis, as it is considered a reflection of the conceptual organization of a special subject as well as a necessary medium of expression and professional communication (Cabre, 1989). Therefore, the terminology could provide information about the current framing of the activity as work, but also reveal if the already established terminology for this activity is associated with the occupational aspects and developments of the activity.

The theoretical frameworks and outcomes of each examined paper were also analysed in order to examine the framing of this activity as work and the types of theoretical and conceptual foundations that may have been used to examine elements of work within video content creation. The outcomes of the sources were categorized and analysed, and the perception of the activity as creative entrepreneurial work or as commodifying labour was examined to answer the following research questions:

RQ3: What theoretical frameworks have been utilized in the examination of video content creation as an occupational activity?

RQ4: How are the occupational activities related to video content creation perceived within the examined literature in relation to the discussion of the activity as exploitative work or as an entrepreneurial form of creative labour?

A further understanding of the development of the professional practices, socio-economic relationships and innovative services related to video content creation provide valuable information about the processes and motivations behind this form of digital labour where the elements of leisure and work collide, and where the likelihood of stability and success are still relatively small. These insights could legitimize and provide structure for video content creation as a digital profession and extend our understanding of modern work and the contrasting processes related to the transformation of work such as gamification.

2. The review & methods

2.1. The review procedure

As the development of video content creation has largely been labelled by technology and popular global platforms, there is a lot of fragmentation in the terminology used to depict the activity. Most common terminology seems to be associated with specific processes or activities (e.g. delivery of asynchronous or synchronous video content) and specific platforms or content types (YouTuber, vlogger etc.) and the existing knowledge of the terminology associated with this activity was

| Table 1 | Terminology associated with video content creation. |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Asynchronous video content creation | Vlogger | Vlogging | Live streamer |
| Synchronous video content creator | YouTuber | Streamer | Twitch streamer |
| Synchronous video content creation | | | Streaming |
| Generic terms | | | Influencer |
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used to develop the search string for this literature review. In order to depict the commercial or professionalised aspects of this activity, the researchers also utilized the term “influencer” as a more commonly used term associated with strategic and commercial aspects of digital content creation (Khamis et al., 2017). The terms identified for the literature review, can be found from Table 1 below.

This literature review was conducted as a combination of a scoping review (Paré et al., 2015) and a theoretical review (Paré et al., 2015), in order to gain further insight into the research questions of this study and collect a representative sample for the analysis. A scoping review is primarily used to gain further insight into the nature and range of research on a specific topic (Paré et al., 2015). The utilization of the scoping review process allowed the researchers to gain an understanding of the current extent of research on this topic as well as the nature of the research. The scoping review process was utilized to answer RQ’s 1, 2 and 4. In order to extend the review, the scoping review was combined with elements of a theoretical review, to answer RQ 3. The theoretical review processes allowed the research team to identify, and analyse relevant theoretical frameworks within the texts (Paré et al., 2015) and extend the understanding of the topic based on them. The search for relevant literature was conducted using the identified search words (Table 1) on the title, abstract, keywords and full text, in order to gather an extensive sample of relevant literature. The search words were used to perform queries using the Scopus notation and the following search string for the data collection: ((ALL (streamer) OR ALL (youtuber) OR ALL (vlogger) OR ALL (influencer)) AND (ALL (twitch) OR ALL (youtube))). The search string development proved challenging due to the dispersed terminology associated with the activity, as well as the homonymous nature of specific terms such as “stream*” and “Twitch”. Some of these homonymous terms and more generic terms such as “live” had to be either removed from the string or further specified, in order to gather more relevant results for the topic of this research. In the end, the terms “Twitch” and “YouTube” were utilized as identifiers in the search string to specify relevant sources to the topic. The Scopus database was selected to be used in this literature review, as it offers a comprehensive abstract and citation database of international peer-reviewed resources. This allowed the researchers to focus on one database with extended coverage rather than numerous more specialized databases.

The initial search identified 893 sources, of which 126 were selected for further review based on their title and abstract. The title and abstract had to reflect a commercial or occupational association to video content creation or structures that support the commercial or occupational development of video content creators (e.g. viewer engagement practices). These sources were further examined using a pre-determined selection criterion (peer-reviewed papers in an international publication, available in English, focusing on the occupational activities/aspects of private video content creators) and a final sample of 84 sources were identified for further analysis. During the final review of sources, 9...
papers were also removed as they were not full articles. The full review process can be seen in Fig. 1.

Each source was reviewed and coded by the members of the research team based on pre-determined units, which consisted of bibliometric identifiers (Authors, Title, Year, Source title, Volume, Issue, Art. No. and Abstract), paper type units (empirical/non-empirical paper, method, theoretical/conceptual framework), and topic or outcome specific units (domain of research, theme of outcome). Each article was also reviewed individually for common terms used to describe the activity of video content creation and the definitions for the content creator or the content creation activities. The analysis of terms and definitions was conducted using mixed methods, by combining more quantitative data analysis and content analysis (Bryman, 2012; Shelley and Krippendorff, 1984) to identify emerging themes and connections.

3. Results

3.1. Research interest

This section responds to RQ1 (How has the research on the occupational elements of video content creation developed?). The research interest related to video content creation has developed significantly during the last decade, with significant growth in the number of relevant publications appearing after 2014 and continuing to signal positive growth, as seen in the trendline for relevant publications per year in Fig. 2.

The increase in publications per year can be seen to follow a similar
trend to the development of professionalised aspects of video content creation, which is highlighted in Fig. 2, through the examination of growth in Twitch partners per year (Twitch Tracker, 2020). Annual growth in the number of publications related to occupational aspect of video content creation and the growth in the number of Twitch partners indicate a similar trend in the development of the phenomenon, but it should be noted that the increase in research interest may also reflect the slight lag associated with academic publishing.

The examined research articles were mostly based on empirical evidence as seen in Table 2, and the non-empirical papers were primarily conceptual papers, focusing on larger concepts (e.g. celebrity, economy) through specific examples/cases and themes, or papers developing frameworks or models, but with no clear empirical data. A full list of publications and their details can be found in Table A1. The empirical articles examined in our review were primarily based on survey data, platform-specific data collected through API’s and video content analysis. Interviews, other digital content analysis (e.g. forums, profile pages), and observations/ethnography were also popular data in the examined publications. It should be noted that some publications examined more than one data set, which is reflected in Table 2. All empirical and non-empirical papers were included in the further analysis due to their relevance to the topic of this research.

Each paper was also categorized based on the research domain of the focal/underlying topic and its relation to the phenomenon of video content creation as seen in Table 3. Most empirical research articles examined behaviour or psychology behind activities related to video content creation. Such papers either examined the behaviour of the video content creators themselves such as motivation (Gros et al., 2017; Hou et al., 2019; Sjöblom and Hamari, 2017; Törhönen et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2018; Zimmer, 2018), or the interaction and behaviour of

| Table 4 |
| Terminology frequency. |
| Terminology Synchronous | Frequency | Terminology Asynchronous | Frequency | Terminology Both/unidentified | Frequency |
| Terminology content creator | | | | |
| Streamer | 24 | Vlogger | 18 | Streamer | 5 |
| Broadcaster | 10 | YouTuber | 17 | YouTuber | 3 |
| Live streamer | 4 | YouTube Celebrity | 6 | Vlogger | 4 |
| Live-streamer | 1 | Content creator | 3 | Content creator | 2 |
| Livestreamer | 2 | YouTube creator | 3 | Live streamer | 2 |
| | | Creator | 3 | | |
| | | Uploader | 2 | | |
| Terminology content creation | | | | |
| Streaming | 16 | Vlogging | 13 | Content creation | 2 |
| Live streaming | 14 | Upload video | 7 | Live streaming | 5 |
| Broadcasting | 13 | Post video | 4 | Streaming | 5 |
| Live-streaming | 6 | Produce video | 2 | | |
| Livestreaming | 2 | Upload content | 2 | Upload video | 2 |
| | | Upload vlog | 2 | | |
| | | Broadcast | 2 | | |
| | | Amateur video making | 2 | | |
| | | Video blogging | 2 | | |
| | | Produce vlog | 2 | | |

![Fig. 3. Number of terms for content creator and content creation per year displayed in columns and yearly growth of publications examined on the trendline.](image-url)
the viewer in relation to the video content creator (Lee et al., 2019; McRoberts et al., 2016). Another major domain of research was the media production of video content. Papers in this domain examined themes such as the practices of video content creation (Aran et al., 2014; Bishop, 2019; Scolari and Fraticelli, 2019; Tang et al., 2016) as well as the performance elements (Bhatia, 2018; Wotanis and McMillan, 2014; Zhang and Hjorth, 2019) within video content. Different digital media formats and structures were also examined in relation to video content creation and papers in this category primarily focused on the structures (e.g. economy, restrictions) and elements in different video sharing platforms (Cullen and Ruberg, 2019; Lessel et al., 2018; Postigo, 2016; Siutila, 2018; Sjöblom et al., 2019; Wattenhofer et al., 2012) or the way in which elements such as popularity can be formed within these structures and services (Jia et al., 2018; Koch et al., 2018).

More direct characteristics of work and occupational elements were examined in the domain categories related to celebrity, the commercial aspects of video content creation and work and entrepreneurship. Celebrity was examined in particular in the context of micro-celebrity and through examination of specific examples and channels (Garcia-Rapp and Roc-Cuberes, 2017; Jerslev, 2016; Raun, 2018; Ribl and Wegener, 2019). The commercial aspects of video content creation primarily focused on the brand effect of video content creators (Munnukka et al., 2019; Xiao et al., 2018) and advertising or marketing such as the value of video content creators in advertising and marketing efforts (Gerhards, 2019; Xiao et al., 2018), whereas the papers in the work and entrepreneurship domain examined the value and structure of work and entrepreneurship in video content creation.

3.2. Terminology & definitions

This section answers RQ2 (How are the occupational elements of video content creation evident in the development of associated terminology?). For this study, the collection and analysis of terms and associated definitions of those terms was conducted to examine if elements of work, or the professional structures within the activity were evident in the development of the terminology, or within the established terminology. Terminology and terms are often used to describe human activities and possess the communicative power to organise and structure activities and reveal relationships forming within them (Cabre, 1989). In order to distinguish and analyse the terminology used in the scope of digital video content creation, the papers were categorized based on the type of content or content creation they examined (synchronous, asynchronous, both or undefined), and terminology for content creation and content creator was collected from each paper. While some sources used different terminology synonymously to describe the same activity or the creator, these variations were also collected for analysis. The development of the terminology was contrasted to the number of publications per year and most prominent terms per year (Fig. 3). Table 4 also lists the most frequently used terminology. The full list of analysed terms per year can be found in Table A2.

The early terminology, as seen in Fig. 3, reflects the emergence of the activity, with lesser fragmentation in terms from 2009 to 2015. Greater activity, with lesser fragmentation in terms from 2009 to 2015. Greater video content creation, the papers were categorized based on the type of

| Theoretical framework | N |
|-----------------------|---|
| Uses and Gratifications theory | 5 |
| Affordance theory | 2 |
| Field theory | 2 |
| Self-Determination Theory (SDT) | 2 |

Note: Nine studies utilized more than two theoretical or conceptual frameworks.

established occupational content creation activities within mainstream media (Gutelle, 2016).

The term “broadcaster/broadcasting” seems to be the most prominent term within the analysis with a direct association with our previous understanding of media work (Newby, 2006), where the term has been used to describe a broadcast media professional or the activity of delivering media content. In the collected data, the popularity of the term stays consistent with the increasing fragmentation and development of terminology, and from the occupational terms seems to be consistently used to describe the activity of creating video content. Based on the examination of available definitions for the terms, it seems that the term “broadcaster” was used as a descriptive term for the activity of media content delivery and the provider of content, for example: “Unlike other social media, the content on a live streaming platform is broadcast and viewed synchronously. Broadcasters can broadcast their own screens and receive live comments from viewers around the world.” (Zhao et al., 2018). The examined definitions did not reveal a connection between the occupational characteristic of this specific term and the activity of video content creation within this review.

Other occupational or commercial terms associated with the content creator/content creation were terms reflecting celebrity (YouTube celebrities), the influencer culture (YouTube influencer) and entrepreneurship (entrepreneurial broadcasters, entrepreneurial online video creators, entrepreneurial content creators). The inner conflict of professional-amateur work within this activity is evident with the prominence of the term “amateur” (amateur filmmaker, amateur videographers, amateur video making) and hybrid terms such as “semi-professional” and “amateur-experts”. The occupational nuances seem to be more evident in the terminology for the content creator, also known as the professional, and the terminology for video content creation seems more fragmented and mechanically descriptive of the process of video content creation with terms such as upload video, create video content, post video and produce video.

A further analysis of the available definitions for the terms seem to have various ways in describing the occupational elements of this activity, and most are associated with the commercial aspects rather than the elements of organised work. For example, various definitions reflect the interaction with viewers and the revenue through interaction e.g. “In the live streaming platforms, online streamers can interact with viewers via various objects like audio, video, and text, and they attract a large scale of viewers by singing, chatting or shout-wheat. In return, every viewer can purchase and send virtual gifts during the live process, which is one of the most important business models in these live streaming platforms.” (Tu et al., 2018). And other definitions highlight the brands
3.3. The theoretical and conceptual frameworks

This section responds to RQ3 (What theoretical frameworks have been utilised in the examination of video content creation as an occupational activity?). The examined literature presented great fragmentation in terms of theoretical and conceptual frameworks, which could be associated with the relatively novel and developing nature of the topic of video content creation as a hybrid form of labour and its commercial aspects. Only three frameworks were directly associated with elements of labour or work (Foucauldian neoliberal theory, affective labour, as the platform economy (Andersson Schwarz, 2017) have also been associated with commodifying or exploitative features (T. Scholz, 2012; Smythe, 1977; Terranova, 2000), as they are often seen as “free” and afford several enjoyable/entertaining experiences, and create dimensions with social and communal aspects. However as the occupational elements and user centric revenue models of online platforms develop, these activities have also been increasingly considered as novel forms of creative work in related research (Banks and Deuze, 2009; Fuchs, 2014; Van Dijck, 2009). As the development of this type of framing can extend our understanding of this digital activity as work, the outcomes of the examined sources were categorized based on their perception of the activity as commodifying/exploitative work, as productive creative work or as other/neutral.

Although the debate around exploitative/commodifying aspects of digital platforms and interaction has been ongoing for the last decade (Fuchs, 2014; Postigo, 2016; Scholz, 2012; Smythe, 1977; Terranova, 2000; Van Dijck, 2009), the development of this perspective in the context of video content creation seems to have stabilized in the last few years (see Table 7). From the analysed papers, ten provide outcomes related to the exploitative nature of the activity, with three papers highlighting issues related to commodifying the increased sense of intimacy generated through video content creation and the digital environments, and three papers focus on the commercial impact of video content creators on children or young people. The papers draw on concepts such as affective labour (Woodcock and Johnson, 2019) and neoliberal work (Ashman et al., 2018) but also utilize more novel concepts such as parasocial intimacy (Woodcock and Johnson, 2019) and autopreneurs (Ashman et al., 2018) to reflect on the commodifying nature of the activity.

Instead the perception of video content creation as a novel form of creative work has gained significant popularity over the last few years, and significant growth in this perception can be seen during 2019. The examined papers in this category highlighted themes such as new forms of celebrity, through concepts such as celebrification (Jerslev, 2016) and

### Table 6
Studies examining motivation.

| Paper                     | Theoretical/conceptual framework | Topic of examination | Motivations examined                                                                 |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (Zhao et al., 2018)       | Self-determination theory        | Video content creation | Challenge, Task enjoyment, Self-presentation, Extrinsic reward, Self-esteem, social benefits, feedback |
| (Torhonen et al., 2019)   | Self-determination theory        | Video content creation | Social interaction, Altruism, Skill development, Career Development, Reputation, income |
| (Zimmer, 2018)            | Uses and gratifications          | Video content creation | Entertainment, Information, Social interaction, Self-presentation (Celebrity) |
| (Hou et al., 2019)        | Uses and gratifications          | Viewing/consumption   | Interactivity, Social status, Humour, Sex appeal                                     |
| (Sjöblom and Hamari, 2017)| Uses and gratifications          | Viewing/consumption   | Flow, Entertainment, Social interaction, Endorsement                                 |
| (Gros et al., 2017)       | Uses and gratifications          | Viewing/consumption   | Cognitive (learning), information gathering, Personal integrative, social integrative, tension release |
| (Wohn et al., 2018)       | Social support                   | Viewing/endorsement   | Entertainment, information, socialisation, Entertainment, support (content improvement), learning, attachment, interaction, support (offline actions) |

### Table 7
Research outcome perspective.

| Year | Commodifying digital labour | Neutral/other approach | Creative work |
|------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| 2019 | 3                            | 13                     | 28.3         |
| 2018 | 3                            | 15                     | 32.6         |
| 2017 | 1                            | 7                      | 15.2         |
| 2016 | 2                            | 5                      | 10.9         |
| 2014 | 0                            | 2                      | 4.3          |
| 2013 | 1                            | 1                      | 2.2          |
| 2012 | 0                            | 2                      | 4.3          |
| 2009 | 0                            | 1                      | 2.2          |

3.4. The outcomes and the nature of occupational video content creation

This section responds to RQ4 (How are the occupational activities related to video content creation perceived within the examined literature in relation to the discussion of the activity as exploitative work or as an entrepreneurial form of creative labour?). As discussed earlier in this paper, digital content creation activities associated with digital economies such as the platform economy (Andersson Schwarz, 2017) have also been associated with commodifying or exploitative features (T. Scholz, 2012; Smythe, 1977; Terranova, 2000), as they are often seen as “free” and afford several enjoyable/entertaining experiences, and create dimensions with social and communal aspects. However as the occupational elements and user centric revenue models of online platforms develop, these activities have also been increasingly considered as novel forms of creative work in related research (Banks and Deuze, 2009; Fuchs, 2014; Van Dijck, 2009). As the development of this type of framing can extend our understanding of this digital activity as work, the outcomes of the examined sources were categorized based on their perception of the activity as commodifying/exploitative work, as productive creative work or as other/neutral.

Collaborations and commercial partnerships appearing in video content “Vlogger enjoys public recognition and uses this recognition on behalf of a consumer good, service, or brand by appearing with that good, service, or brand in a vlog post” (Munnukka et al., 2019).
The analysis of theoretical frameworks utilized to examine the occupational and commercial elements of video content creation within the examined sources, also revealed fragmentation in the development of more theoretical and conceptual understanding of this activity and a lack of theoretical and conceptual frameworks directly related to the examination of occupational structures and elements within this activity. Similarly, as in the research domains, most theoretical and conceptual frameworks emphasized the analysis of behaviours and social interactions within video content creation, which were also evident in the outcomes of the examined sources. However, a deeper analysis of the use of the theoretical frameworks and the outcomes of the sources revealed commercial and occupational implications and uses.

4.2. The commercial agenda within video content creation

The terminology for video content creation was found to be fragmented. Moreover, the increase in publications has enhanced this fragmentation, instead of providing clarity and structure to the terms associated with the activity. The terminology analysis revealed various nuanced terms related to the occupational and commercial aspects of the activity (e.g. celebrity, entrepreneurship, amateur content production) and the findings seem to indicate an ongoing development of terminology for this nascent phenomenon, which may be associated with the emergent nature of this activity and the occupational aspects associated with it.

However, the findings yield interesting observations about the culture of occupational video content creation, by underlining the development of a hybrid form of work and play in terms mixing the “amateur” and “professional” elements e.g. “semi-professional” and “amateur-experts”. The fragmentation and overlap of terminology for video content creation as a leisure activity and the more occupational aspects of video content creation may point to a certain trade-off between work and leisure terminologies. This suggests the way future hybrid forms of work may be represented but may also lead to issues in recognizing the activity as more legitimate form of work, or the lack of necessary visibility and support for the occupational sides of the activity, which may lead to issues related to work life balance (Parkin, 2018).

4.1. The development of occupational video content creation

The increasing popularity and development of amateur video content creation can be seen in the development of the research interest on the occupational, commercial and strategic aspects of this activity. The amount of empirical and non-empirical research papers has clearly increased after 2016 and the research highlights an interest in the domain of social interaction and behaviour within the activity as well as on the media production aspects of the activity.

The terminology for video content creation was found to be fragmented. Moreover, the increase in publications has enhanced this fragmentation, instead of providing clarity and structure to the terms associated with the activity. The terminology analysis revealed various nuanced terms related to the occupational and commercial aspects of the activity (e.g. celebrity, entrepreneurship, amateur content production) and the findings seem to indicate an ongoing development of terminology for this nascent phenomenon, which may be associated with the emergent nature of this activity and the occupational aspects associated with it.

However, the findings yield interesting observations about the culture of occupational video content creation, by underlining the development of a hybrid form of work and play in terms mixing the “amateur” and “professional” elements e.g. “semi-professional” and “amateur-experts”. The fragmentation and overlap of terminology for video content creation as a leisure activity and the more occupational aspects of video content creation may point to a certain trade-off between work and leisure terminologies. This suggests the way future hybrid forms of work may be represented but may also lead to issues in recognizing the activity as more legitimate form of work, or the lack of necessary visibility and support for the occupational sides of the activity, which may lead to issues related to work life balance (Parkin, 2018).

4.2. The commercial agenda within video content creation

The analysis of theoretical frameworks utilized to examine the occupational and commercial elements of video content creation within the examined sources, also revealed fragmentation in the development of more theoretical and conceptual understanding of this activity and a lack of theoretical and conceptual frameworks directly related to the examination of occupational structures and elements within this activity. Similarly, as in the research domains, most theoretical and conceptual frameworks emphasized the analysis of behaviours and social interactions within video content creation, which were also evident in the outcomes of the examined sources. However, a deeper analysis of the use of the theoretical frameworks and the outcomes of the sources revealed commercial and occupational implications and uses.

Analyzing the motivational theories used in the sources revealed that most of those papers examined some occupational elements as motivations to generate video content. Similarly, papers using the conceptual framework of parasocial interaction or parasocial relationships were found to deliver implications related to the commercial impacts of these. Although the analysis indicated that various sources examined this potential commercial impact of social interaction and behaviour, the findings also revealed that the activity was primarily perceived as neutral or creative entrepreneurial work, rather than commodifying at its core. However, it should be noted that the sources that examined the more commodifying elements of video content creation did emphasize...
the added commodifying impact generated by the intimate nature of video content creation and the social relations present in the activity.

Based on the findings of this study and the overall fragmentation seen in the results, the occupational structures of video content creation seem to be developing rapidly, but further research on this topic is necessary in order for more legitimate professional aspects and structures to develop within the digital economies and environments. There is a clear need for more economic research on the structures of video content creation in different regions and within the digital spheres. It is also evident that the management of parasocial relationships and the audience is becoming a more significant determinant in the pursuit of commercial gain and a career in video content creation, increasing the level of strategy, entrepreneurial skill as well as social skill required in this hybrid digital profession. As the occupational characteristics of the activity develop and more services become available with user-centric revenue share and interactive features, there is a need to extend the understanding of social interaction (e.g. parasocial interaction and parasocial relationships), the value and workload associated with managing them. This calls for more research focusing on the value creation and the digital economy forming around the activity, as well as the organizational structures, managerial and entrepreneurial aspects of the activity. This type of research could alleviate some of the current evident issues in the occupational endeavours of video content creators, such as mental health issues, fatigue and unstructured work conditions (Parkin, 2018). They could also enhance the understanding of the material and the immaterial value associated with this type of content creation, as well as audience work/interaction associated with the attention economy. This in turn could provide more information about what these types of hybrid forms of work, such as playbour, mean in the future and how they contribute to the future organization of work and also to the power-balance between different entities involved in the commercial processes related to these activities.

5. Conclusions

Online video content creation as an amateur media production activity, merges elements of work and play. Whereas the research interest in the characteristics of work within video content creation has clearly increased within the last decade, there seems to be a need for more variety in research but also more structure in the type of research that is conducted related to this emerging digital profession. This is especially evident in the findings related to the domains of research, the theoretical and conceptual frameworks and outcomes examined in the reviewed literature, which highlight a trend in the examination of social interaction and behaviour within the activity but also their association and impact on the commercial objectives of the activity. These findings emphasise the importance of social interaction in the creation of commercial gain, which require a level of strategy and community management from the video content creator and extend the entrepreneurial aspects of this activity, however more research is needed in the future, examining how these activities are organised, where the value of this type of activity is formed and the power-balance of different entities (e.g. platforms, service providers, content creators and audiences).

The findings of the study also found that video content creation as an occupation is increasingly perceived as creative entrepreneurial work, instead of commodifying labour, but it should be noted that this paper primarily focused on examining the perception of the activity of video content creation, not the activity of consuming video content creation or being susceptible to commercial content within it. The commodification of the audience is another aspect of this activity that could be examined further in the future, as the platforms for sharing video content become more user centric in their approach. Further research is therefore needed on the economic structures surrounding video content creators as entrepreneurs and their forms of work, but also on the material and immaterial value of their audiences.

The examination of terminology and definitions within the reviewed literature indicates the emergence of dedicated terminology for the activity, that has taken on descriptive terms of our previous understanding of media production work. However, the terms examined in the reviewed literature describe the activity instead of specific occupational activities or clearly emerging professions. The term “Streamer/streaming” seems to have established itself as a term to depict the overall cultural context for the activity at large, whereas more specific terms such as “vlogger/YouTuber/live streamer” depict the development of sub-cultures within this activity. The fragmentation of terminology also examined in the reviewed literature, presented some limitations to this study, as the fragmented terminology used in the context of video content creation, especially regionally, limits the results of this study to examine sources found based on the most popular terms for the activity. However, it should be noted, that this study aimed to examine the most common terminology and the nuances of work within the development of that terminology. The use of English in this study also limits the terminology to only English sources, and therefore may limit the cultural and geographical context of this study.

As the literature review for this study was conducted as a combination of a scoping review and theoretical review, the aim of the study was to gather a representative sample of available literature which would provide an initial indication of the nature of the research available of this topic (Paré et al., 2015). It should be noted that the sample may not include all available literature on this topic, and a systematic literature review should be carried out as this activity develops further and gains more extensive research. Furthermore, this study did not include research on the amateur video work within the field of mature video content. Mature video content creation was excluded from this study to better define the activity into amateur video content creation that is accessible and allowed for wider audiences and that can be distributed through the most prominent video sharing platforms such as YouTube and Twitch. We acknowledge that the occupational characteristics of video content creation are evident in mature amateur video content, but the characteristics, platforms and regulations would require a separate examination in the future.
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Appendix
| Publication                          | Journal | Conference | Empirical | Non-empirical | Qualitative | Quantitative | Mixed | Survey | Platform data | Interview | Video analysis | Content analysis | Ethnography/observations |
|-------------------------------------|---------|------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-------|--------|---------------|-----------|----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| (Aran et al., 2014)                 |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Arnett et al., 2019)               |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Ashman et al., 2018)               |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Beer et al., 2017)                 |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Berrymen and Nakva, 2017)          |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Bhatia, 2018)                     |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Biel and Gatica-Perez, 2013)       |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Bishop, 2019)                     |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Boxman-Shabtai, 2019)              |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Brownlee, 2016)                   |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Chen and Lin, 2018)                |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Churchill and Xu, 2016)            |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Cullen and Ruberg, 2019)          |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Cunningham and Craig, 2017)        |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Cunningham et al., 2019)           |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Deller and Murphy, 2020)           |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Fiazza et al., 2018)               |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Fletcher et al., 2018)             |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Friedlander, 2017)                |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Garcia-Rapp, 2017)                |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Garcia-Rapp, 2016)                |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Garcia-Rapp and Roc-Cuberes, 2017) |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Gerhards, 2019)                   |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Gros et al., 2017)                |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Guarriello, 2019)                  |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Harley and Fitzpatrick, 2009)      |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Iou et al., 2019)                  |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Iou, 2019)                        |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Jerslev, 2016)                    |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Jia et al., 2018)                  |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Johnson, 2019)                    |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Johnson and Woodcock, 2019a)       |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Johnson and Woodcock, 2019b)       |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Jorg et al., 2018)                 |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Kaytoue et al., 2012)              |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Keating, 2013)                    |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Koch et al., 2018)                 |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Lee and Watkins, 2016)             |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Lee et al., 2019)                  |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Lesso et al., 2018)                |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Li et al., 2018)                   |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Liu et al., 2019)                  |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Lu et al., 2018)                   |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Mardon et al., 2018)               |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Martinez and Olsson, 2019)         |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (McRoberts et al., 2018)           |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Munnikka et al., 2018)             |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Partin, 2019)                     |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Pellicone and Aha, 2017)           |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |
| (Postigo, 2016)                    |         |            | x         | x             |             |              |       |        |               |           |                |                      |                          |

(continued on next page)
Table A1 (continued)

| Year | Terminology content creator | Terminology content creation |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2012 | Content broadcaster, commenter, user, YouTube celebrity, streamer | Upload video/content, streaming, content distribution |
| 2013 | Amateur video-maker, vlogger | Amateur video making (2), post a video, Amateur film-making, vlogging |
| 2014 | YouTuber, YouTube performer, vlogger | Create video content, vlogging, video creation, produce videos |
| 2015 | YouTuber (3), vlogger (2), YouTube celebrities (2), streamer (2), amateur filmmaker, amateur videographers, YouTube vlogger, video blogger | Broadcast (3), post videos (2), upload video (2), streaming (2), amateur filmmaking, amateur creative production, uploading video content, content production, creative content production, vlog content, author video live streaming, live streaming, production, making videos, livestreaming, create video |
| 2016 | Streamer (5), YouTuber (4), vlogger (3), video creator, creator, YouTube Influencer, content creator, YouTube user, internet celebrities, online creator, broadcaster | Streaming (4), Live streaming (3), broadcasting (3), vlogging (2), upload vlog, upload content, posting video, video-sharing, produce materials, upload, live-streaming |
| 2017 | Streamer (11), YouTuber (7), vlogger (7), content creator (4), broadcaster (2), uploader (2), live streamer (2), YouTube personalities (2), amateur experts, actor, producer, SLSSs’ streamers, video blogger, YouTube influencer, online streamer, content makers, YouTube celebrities, amateur performers, YouTube creators, creator, content producer, professional-amateur, digital creator, semi-professional video producer | Streaming (7), live streaming (6), broadcast (6), Vlogging (4), live-streaming (2) upload video (2), posting video, amateur content production, video blogging, upload material, broadcast live videos, streaming video, video upload & share video, produce vlog, upload vlog, live video streaming, broadcast live video content, online video streaming, sharing UG video, upload content, produce video, share video, content production |
| 2018 | Streamer (10), broadcaster (7), vlogger (7), YouTuber (6), live streamer (4) YouTube celebrities (2), livestreamer (2), showroom hosts, content providers, YouTube creators, amateur video creators, video creators, creators, entrepreneurial broadcasters, Online video content creators, video content creators, social video content creators, vlogger, amateur producers, creator, live video streaming platform user, live-streamer, YouTube stars, amateur content producers, YouTube content producers, YouTuber videos, vidders, YouTube video blogger, |
| 2019 | Publisher, vlogger, YouTuber, video creator, creator, content creator, content producer, professional-amateur, digital creator, semi-professional video producer | Live streaming (9), streaming (7), vlogging (5), live-streaming (3), upload video (3), produce videos, broadcasting (3), livestreaming (2), content creation (2), video content creation, social video content creation, amateur video-sharing, lifeslogging, live video streaming, host daily streams, video sharing, upload content |
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