

“Is something broken?”

Producing and moderating Do-It-Yourself repair advice online

Ronja Trischler

Introduction

“Is something broken, damaged etc.? It doesn’t have to go straight in the bin! Children’s toys, electronic devices, furniture, cars, and clothes; everything can be repaired up to a certain point, usually even with the simplest means! Sometimes you pay a fortune to a specialist, but that doesn’t always have to be the case!” When everyday objects break, their owners can access support online through tutorials, forums, manuals, as well as in online groups – such as the one that the above description was taken from.¹ It demonstrates a wide understanding of Do-It-Yourself (DIY) repair of all kinds of everyday objects, both concerning what can be repaired and who can repair it. DIY repair relates to manual tasks to either care for or fix belongings or household matters (i.e., using one’s own free time, materials and tools, instead of hiring professional crafts persons or buying something new (Hitzler and Honer 2014, 430)). While it does not take place through gainful employment, as a form of care and reproductive labor it is work, as studies on repair have pointed out (Graziano and Trogal 2021; Jackson 2014). DIY repair advice online makes this work both visible and also debatable. This chapter examines the interactional accomplishment of producing DIY repair advice online: it requires not only time and effort by those engaging in asking for and giving advice, but also relies on the platform infrastructure, including a common form of digital volunteer work: the moderation of online interactions.

1 The German-speaking online repair advice group will be introduced and discussed in greater detail throughout the course of this chapter. All quotes from data – such as the one right at the beginning of this chapter –, including platform vocabulary, have been translated into English by the author and written in double quotations and italics. Excluding the original German wording is part of an effort of anonymization. There are grammatical or syntactical errors in the quotes, something typical for online communications, but these are limited to writing in upper or lower case, which will only be indicated and discussed if they are analytically relevant.

Although online DIY repair advice promises ‘easy’ access to help with making repairs, examining its practical accomplishment reveals the specific challenges posed to those involved. This chapter examines the interaction in the online group from which the description was taken, a group specialized in the repair of everyday objects. It is based on an ongoing study that consists of focused ethnographic episodes conducted since autumn 2023. For this chapter, fieldnotes, and particularly screenshots of posts and comments, were analyzed using “trans-sequential coding” (Scheffer and Trischler 2023) in order to trace the *temporal* unfolding of the production of advice.²

The following analysis illustrates the work of members of a large online group to communicate their local repair problems and potential solutions – as well as how they organize their interactions with each other. Here, manual tinkering with the objects – described in Science and Technology Studies (STS) as an essential part of repair as practice (Dant 2010) –³ is communicated and ‘translated’ into providing repair advice. In the case of the online group, this takes place within the digital infrastructure of a platform through posts and comments. As will be explained, this sociotechnical interaction is subject to both “content moderation” and “volunteer moderators,” who take care of the group in their free time. In practice, this “civic labor” (Matias 2019) often remains “invisible work” (Star and Strauss 1999) that facilitates the collaborative production of repair advice, but can also sometimes become the subject of group discussions itself. Examining the sociotechnical accomplishment of producing and moderating DIY repair advice in interaction emphasizes the practical efforts required to create a ‘participatory culture.’

“Join group”: participating in an online repair group

The description of the group anticipates specific reasons to participate in online discussions of *DIY repair* in contemporary society. For instance, it refers to social issues relating to the motivations for DIY repair, such as limited financial resources or limited access to expert repair knowledge. Thereby, DIY repair work is positioned as against social issues. With it, the group becomes a means to both handle and process their effects in the everyday: here, people can seek and find trans-local help. This relates to other popular collaborative civic repair practices offline, such as repair

-
- 2 While ethnographies are helpful for understanding repair, given the instructive materiality of repair practices (Strebel; Bovet and Sormani 2019), research methods need to be adapted for an adequate study of repair advice as *online* interaction (Hine 2015).
 - 3 According to STS, repair sustains all kinds of social practices: the world is constantly in need of repair and maintenance (Graham and Thrift 2007; Jackson 2014; Denis, Mongili and Pontille 2015).

cafés or markets (Baier, Hansing, and Werner 2016; Kannengießer 2020; Bradley and Persson 2022). These local initiatives often "politicise repairing as an act against the throwaway society" (Kannengießer 2018a, 76; author's translation R.T.) – a phrasing that is indeed mirrored in the continued group description by its admin who wants to work "*against the throwaway society!*" DIY repair is both a matter of social inequality, with regards to unevenly distributed resources to buy and/or repair everyday objects, and of addressing other "existential problems" (Scheffer 2021), including the climate crisis and related issues, such as global production and finite raw materials.⁴ Conserving resources, cost savings, and reducing waste, as well as other motives, such as self-empowerment, joy in the activity of repairing, or passing repair knowledge on, all motivate participation in repair cafés (Kannengießer, 2018b, 213–214).

Online communication can broaden who can participate in repair works. This is certainly a main feature of the group's mission, given that its description ends with: "*Just get in touch with us if you have something, nothing is impossible!*" This echoes the promise of inclusivity and participation, common for online communities more generally (Stalder 2018, 58ff.). This promise has been criticized – and proven wrong empirically on many levels, such as concerning unequal access (Dijk 2020) and hate speech (Kalsnes and Ihlebæk 2021; Eickelmann 2017). However, this group's inclusive approach seems to be fruitful overall: it was founded over ten years ago and during the course of this study, it has gained over ten thousand members over two years since 2023, rising to over 50,000. There are also a lot of "*activities*" in the group that drew my attention to it initially – and continued to capture it; new repair enquiries are posted daily, asking for repair advice about a very wide array of everyday objects – like washing machines, television sets, lawnmowers, hairdryers, speakers, toilet flushes, faucets, furniture, clothing, etc. – that commonly receive up to 100 replies over the course of a day or two. This shows a vivid online community; its members are eager to help each other with their repair work.

However, while the online group is "*visible*" to anyone on the platform, it is a "*closed group*," requiring admission by clicking the "*join group*" icon. In the subsequent process of becoming a member of the group, its "*rules*" have to be affirmed; these rules focus on etiquette, trying to prevent judgmental comments about *who* wants to repair *what* and *how* – as well as on their capabilities to *communicate* (see below). The membership admission also includes a small, but easy, test that seems to be an attempt to make sure new members actually read the rules. This is part of the work by its three "*admins*" and four "*moderators*" who grant admission to the group. While the

4 This is of course not only addressed through civic initiatives, given that reparability of products is also a legislative question: In June 2024, an EU Directive came into force that aims to make it easier for consumers to either repair products themselves or to have them repaired. These regulations must be transposed into national law by the end of July 2026.

former were part of the group's founding, the latter were recruited from the members a couple of years ago as a response to the increased number of members. In a post directed particularly at "*old hands*," (i.e., those members who have been involved in the group for "*a couple of years*") the group's admins asked for volunteers to support them. In a comment they specified that the group had gained 10,000 members in two months and also – humorously – highlighted the *unpaid* labor involved in moderating, thereby arguing not only for the necessity of the additional support, but also advertising themselves as "*quite nice colleagues*" and as an overall friendly group that "*adheres to the rules*." Several members replied, some explicitly applying and indicating their previous experience in the group and as moderators of other online groups. Others expressed their interest, admitting that they had only recently joined and some had no time for volunteer work. Five days later, the three admins announced their selection of three new moderators, who accepted this "*vote*" by the admins (according to their status as "*moderators*" in the group).

These voluntary roles, as well as the formal enrolment in the "*closed group*," are part of how platforms are organized as digital infrastructures and this is usually described using the term "content moderation." In practice, this takes place *sociotechnically*: While platform companies rely heavily on algorithms and increasingly on 'artificial intelligence' for the organization of their online services, these technologies are integrated in the organization in their development, execution, *and* when making potential changes (Gillespie 2019). This means, in practice, that they are intertwined with human work: this includes the platform company's small internal teams and programmers, a larger number of badly paid "crowd workers" (i.e., contractors primarily from the Global South who are exposed to harmful content (Roberts 2019; Gillespie 2019, 120)), both the unpaid volunteer moderators in different groups, and users who post and report posts for review.⁵ In the repair advice group, posts can be reported to the group admins and/or to the platform. There are different reasons that can be selected, such as "*breaking the rules*," "*spam*," or "*irrelevant content*," but also "*harassment*" or "*member conflict*." The report form also states that the posting person will not be informed about who reported them, thereby making not only the work of moderators, but also that of users, invisible to other members.

Platform companies provide volunteer moderators with (oftentimes extensive) guidelines for moderation online. However, these remain "discursive practices" (Gillespie 2019): Empirically, moderation can vary both on and between platforms and depends both on the kind of "content" that is being moderated and the participants involved. As has been stated in the (ethnographic) study of other infrastructures, platforms are embedded, built on an installed base and embody

5 From the perspective of the sociology of organization, these connections between core and periphery are typical for digital platform as a form of organization (Ametowobla and Kirchner 2023).

standards; they are transparent to use and link to conventions of practice, yet these are learned as part of membership (Star and Ruhleder 1996, 113; Star 1999). Thus, we will now look at the *practices* of producing and moderating repair advice online. How is DIY repair advice produced, participatorily *among* the group members and the moderators and admins, *with* this digital infrastructure?

"Is there a trick?": asking for repair advice online

"Is there a trick to rethreading the zip so that it closes properly? 😞 I got a knot in my head. I opened the zip and now I've rethreaded it the wrong way round. 🙄" (14-06-2023) This is a typical enquiry in the group, in which most of the posts consist of requests for repair advice on current repair issues relating to everyday objects. Solved or potential issues are addressed in such posts, albeit less often. Although they differ in length, detail and style, these enquiries usually identify a specific object (here *the zip*), indicate an existing problem (*unthreaded zipper*), express a wish for repair ("*so that it closes properly?*"), address both the recipients of their enquiry (here implicitly the whole group: "*is there a trick?*") as well as a recipient for the advice ("*I,*" also supported by the infrastructural reference to the user as "*author*" in the post). As with this example, they might also report the cause of the repair problem ("*I opened the zip and now I've rethreaded it the wrong way round*"), explain previous attempts to either repair or describe the objects to be repaired in greater detail (e.g., naming the manufacturer, the name or number of the model, its age, etc.). The posts often include images or videos: likewise, this post was accompanied with a close-up photo of the end of a closed zip (for some sort of bag) and two fingers holding the detached zipper in front of it.

First, to ask for advice, the repair issues relating to the object need to be communicated. While media such as manuals (Schröter 2018) are commonly consulted during DIY repair, members of the group can and need to articulate their problems *themselves* in order to receive advice. They use images, videos, and descriptions to make both the objects that are to be repaired and practices understandable and discussable for other participants of the online interaction who are addressed as peers with repair expertise. Advice, as a conversational form of help, is a common genre online which developed early (Briggs and Burford 2002; Suzuki and Calzo 2004), particularly through peers (i.e., giving advice is not limited to professional experts). Depending on the object and the issue with it, this takes more or less effort – whether it is successful can only be judged through the subsequent comments (see below).

Second, *a new conversation was started* with this post. This is typical of the organization of the group. Although it might seem like 'digital common sense,' this allowed for a sociotechnical organization of repair advice interaction that focused on one specific broken object. This practical use of the digital infrastructure is key to the success of creating advice online (Vayreda and Antaki 2009; Stommel and Lamerichs

2014; Locher 2013):⁶ it creates a shared ‘here and now’ for members that are concerned with *this problem* – generally allowing its members to participate with different requirements, not only relatively and regardless of their specific repair expertise, but also on the basis of their prior involvement in the group. In ethnomethodological terms (Garfinkel 1967), it is an accomplishment to ask for advice online.

“Just open the zip again”: giving repair advice online

How to start asking for advice is important, as advice interaction, because it is organized through sequential turn-taking (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974). But how (and if) repair advice is accomplished in the group can only be answered in the subsequent comments: most responses offer advice – of some form, including hints, suggestions, tips, and assessments, but also encouragement, jokes, and disapproval – or ask questions to obtain additional information in order to give advice. Similarly, Morrow (2006) classifies three types of posts in an advice forum: problem messages, advice messages, and thanks messages that differed in features and in terms of discursive function. While new enquiries receive “*replies*” and “*reactions*” in the repair group, their sequential unfolding as interaction is more complicated.

Comments responding to requests usually appear in a matter of hours of the repair advice enquiry, sometimes within either minutes or a few days. In our case, the first comment appeared within a minute after the post, suggesting opening the zip again to thread the zipper. Three minutes later, the author followed up, pressing the idea that there could be a “*trick to spare them this work*,” thus, repairing the zip without having to open it. The first commentator answered right away, detailing how to press open the zip with “*something sharp*” (suggesting a way to make “*this work*” easier, rather than to “*spare*” it), which got backed up (after 25 minutes) by a second commentator suggesting that a pen would work. One hour later, a third commentator replied to the first comment, arguing that opening the zip was not enough, the thread also had to be opened in order to include the zipper. In the meantime, a small number of other replies had been posted with no direct reference to the initial comments, stating similar problems with their own zips or one suggesting to “*just pop it back in*.”

This shows the practical, and asynchronous unfolding of generating advice in the group; a piece of advice might be confirmed or criticized with reactions or replies. This includes what can be described as interactional “repairs” (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977) through a mutual evaluation of advice or by referring each other to

6 As argued in the previous part, technologies do not determine these practices, but rather participate in their organization (i.e., online interaction should be viewed as an interaction in its “own right” [Meredith 2019: 128, see also Meredith, Giles, and Stommel 2021]).

existing comments. Commentators reply to each other (e.g., semantically), by linking each other, or by creating "*threads*"; they might also delete their own comments retroactively, thereby using the infrastructure as a resource for repair advice interaction. In this example, the third commentator referred to her previous comment in her reply to the first commentator's reply: "*Separating the other side is what I suggested and did myself yesterday (it was a small bag for organizing luggage, nothing valuable).*" While sequential reference can be identified as a principle of order in the online interaction, in ethnomethodological terms, there is also a multitude of second "turns" (i.e., answers to an original post) that do not refer to each other.

Relevant information might also be missing, thereby prompting questions from other members, sometimes forming a lengthy back and forth. This often means both longer involvement and the necessity for patience from those asking for and giving advice who possibly need to wait for responses (as is typical with cooperation, see Trischler 2023). The author's involvement in the comments of their own posts is also remarkable: a lot of them answered questions, gave thanks for advice, or closed the comments underneath their post. For instance, the zip post was edited once (on the same day that it was posted): it initially only comprised of the first question, with the second part being added thereafter. The platform marks their actions with "*author*" next to the name, thereby highlighting their special accountability for their post.⁷ The work of asking for advice does not commonly stop after the initial request.

While replies differ in length, detail, and style (and, of course, usefulness), repair advice posts determine the *part* of the object to be repaired, suggest a *solution*, *qualify it* – and even define the *recipient* of the repair advice with reference to the repair enquiries. Discussions about suitable repair advice appear alongside these aspects: Which parts can/need to be repaired? How can they be repaired? How do we know this? (And: do we know enough about this?) These questions also relate to the question of specialization and expertise in DIY repair that is often discussed in the group (concerning specific objects, such as electronics). Importantly, they also relate to the recipients: repair advice also includes *who* could repair *this object*. As in the context of this group, skills vary a lot and members categorize differences in repair skills necessary for the solutions posed. Most commonly, this refers to practical knowledge, hinting at their own repair activities, like one commentator: "*I couldn't do it. I unraveled the other side, threaded it from there and then sewed both sides back together again.*" In other posts, members present themselves as professional craftsmen who participate

7 As this platform attribution is directed at the user that is *requesting* advice, it is a marginal form of authorship that is limited to producing a comprehensible problem description. However, as the focus of the advice interaction is on creating solutions to repair problems in the form of advice, it could be argued – contrarily to the platform attribution – that those *suggesting* repair solutions have a more plausible claim to their advice's authorship. For more on the concept of authorship in cultural production, see Göbel in this volume.

in the group in their free time – this relates to how the repair advice unfolds and also relates to the specific repair object. This also refers to the ways in which DIY repair workers encounter each other online and their roles, a topic that will be discussed in the following section.

In general, comments and reactions *affirm the new conversation* that the post opened with their suggestions as well as their critique. Most enquiries are concluded (or abandoned) after a few days. In this example, the author closed the comments without further explanation. Although this might indicate that she received sufficient advice, it is primarily a way to definitively end *this conversation*, thereby producing a closed repair advice interaction. Hence, the group displays a particular sociotechnical organization of online interaction through singular enquiries for advice about singular things. This organization represents a practical answer to the challenge of the ‘many-to-many interactions’ in the group, ordering the interactions in a comprehensible way. It allows group members to participate in these interactions without preconditions, more or less. While the group members, therefore, *use* the digital infrastructure (posts, comments, likes as well as reports, see below), the latter does not determine the practice. Similarly, taking the “*group rules*” into account, it is the admins’ and moderators’ wishes that replies should indeed *not* refer to previous posts. However, it is through their members’ skillful use of the forum that they – routinely – accomplish the production of advice together.

“Top comments,” “rising contributors,” “moderators,” & “group rules”: producing ‘good’ repair advice online

A varied practical etiquette seems common to the group in online repair advice interactions. There is a general etiquette in replying to the original post, whose base line can be characterized as ‘staying vaguely on topic’ in the reply. This etiquette intensifies if contributors discuss a specific suggestion with each other and they reply to each other’s comments, thereby creating a conversational thread and accountability for their contributions. In the example of the zipper, they disagree politely (“*I don’t think so*”) or agree with each other (“*you’re right*”) or “*like*” the other’s reply. Yet, there are also cases in which members show their disagreement concerning repair advice more strongly, disqualifying each other’s expertise in some cases. As a form of *help*, advice interaction constitutes a mutual, albeit asymmetrical, form of relationship (Wagner 2019). Whether online or offline, advice is an interactionally delicate undertaking because it raises questions about competence and can, thus, be face-threatening for both those seeking and those giving advice. Thus, peer-advice and expert-advice online both showcase “relational work” (i.e. work on the relationship as part of the discursive mitigation strategies (Locher; Bolander and Höhn 2015)). These are “interaction rituals”; i.e., ‘little’ acts of (im-)politeness in the ways members

address each other and interactively and construct each other as members of the group (Goffman 1967). The ways in which members participate and encounter each other is facilitated infrastructurally, not only by becoming members of the closed group, but also through different statuses awarded to them by the platform *for their participation*. Members can become a "*rising*" or "*top*" or "*major contributor*" in the group by posting; this status is then listed next to their name with every post or comment that they make (this is also effective retroactively for the posts that have been made by the user prior to receiving the award). For instance, one of the third commentator's replies was marked "*most relevant*;" it only had two likes, but one of them was by a "*top contributor*" to the group and its author marked as a "*rising contributor*."

The group's "*rules*" display a strong emphasis on etiquette, too, and attempt to facilitate repair advice *without judging* the repairer, their work, or the way in which they communicate it in the group. In practice, these rules are sometimes mentioned – or even enforced: occasionally, there are 'calls for' and complaints about moderation. From an ethnomethodological point of view, moderated conversations (not just online) are specialized or "institutional interaction" (Heritage 1998): they have particular speakers and contributions. Moderation facilitates this through an asymmetrical interaction between moderators and other contributors (Rebstein, Rabl, and Schnettler 2011) who adopt different roles in interaction. In the case of the online group, moderators are granted other sociotechnical resources by the platform in order to moderate groups: they decide upon the group's rules and who can join, posts can be reported to them (using a drop-down menu that can be opened in each post), they can delete posts and comments, and even close the comments section – and they are listed (and marked) as moderators and admins when they post, thereby making them accountable for the group. *Calling for* moderation, then, is one way of addressing a general problem for members of the group: the gradual invisibility of group moderation. First, the digital infrastructure allows for different ways to make moderation visible (Kalsnes and Ihlebæk 2021): in the group, deletion is indicated only if somebody had already replied to a post; thus, sometimes when returning to a post, I could only tell a difference through screenshots taken previously. Thus, users often perceive these socio-technical selections and closures, if at all, as opaque and as a cause for speculation (Myers West 2018), asking: *was this moderated?* Second, it is also not visible how much time volunteer moderators spent reading comments: the "civic labor" (Matias 2019) of volunteer moderators requires time-costly monitoring, as well as care and emotional labor, which is made difficult through the platform logics (Ruckenstein and Turunen 2020). In replying to these questions, in the group, the moderators repeatedly pointed out that they actually did not delete the comments or would explain their ways of moderating. They were walking the tightrope between creating trust (Squirrell 2019) and facilitating the common goal of generating peer advice by evaluating and (potentially) deleting posts. In so doing, group moderation was primarily concerned with specific contributions to these online in-

teractions: moderators would delete *specific* comments or close the comment section of specific posts; they also granted entrance and (potentially) banned members from the group. Yet, the calls for and complaints about moderation show that this can be perceived differently by the members and by the moderators in the context of the group more generally (beyond the individual post), sometimes asking explicitly about the ‘state of the group.’

Other complaints concerned the (admittedly rare) closing of specific comment sections by moderators, which users perceived as premature, indicating a problem specific to the moderation of this group: the question of expertise. For example, one member pointed out that suggestions for repairs concerning electricity were left undisputed, which they understood to be dangerous. They justified their complaint by means of expertise, through a reference to the regulations of a trade association. Thus, questions of moderation show a tension between the group’s claim of enabling *everyone* to participate in repair advice interaction with the specialized knowledge that also exists in this area. The question of who engages in DIY repair is also gendered: while members of the repair group present in different genders and gender is not often discussed *explicitly*, there is a remarkable volume of members read as male involved in the group (which gets acknowledged in the group conversations at times). Explicit gender constructions can sometimes be found in the address in the posts (such as “*good evening, men!*”). In an archival effort (using the search word “*men*”), I found some posts addressing gender: they sparked engaged (sometimes heated) conversations about the relevance of gender to repair, while also acknowledging problems in communication by some of the male group members.⁸

Conclusion

This chapter has analyzed the sociotechnical production of repair advice in a large online group. In cases like this, conversations between a large number of participants can be accomplished, specifically *because* they are organized as requests for

8 Both the historically gendered character of home improvement as well as the topicality of gender online is relevant here. While white middle-class women were commonly responsible for all household matters in the US in the 19th century (including hiring professional craftsmen), the emergence of “Mr. Fixit” marked a change in American family roles in the 1950s: “By taking over chores previously done by professionals, the do-it-yourselfer created a new place for himself inside the house.” (Gelber 1997, 67). As has been pointed out, current studies of repair oftentimes ignore the heterogenous histories of repair (Krebs, Schabacher, Weber 2018, 11). While (also more implicit forms of) doing gender is certainly worth discussing to a greater extent, it is not the focus of this chapter. For a discussion of gender online, particularly in the case of “the manosphere,” see Luger’s contribution in this volume.

advice. Yet, this labor is intensive, both due to the necessity to communicate manual repair problems comprehensively and due to the necessity to interact with each other in posts, comments, and reactions. This is facilitated through content moderation and volunteer moderators: The sociotechnical practices of moderation do not exhibit a sheer 'platform effect,' but instead depend on the specific topic of the conversation at hand.

On the one hand, the digital infrastructure of posts, replies, and reaction supports the organization of repair advice interaction. Although they are often rightfully described as problematic spaces for discourse, in the case of the DIY repair advice group, the platform is used in a way that makes it helpful to allow members to participate in advice interaction without previous participation or without a familiarity with the group. The group's interactions are organized by creating *closed conversations* on repair problems and by requesting and providing help for *particular* objects. Within the platform infrastructure, repair suggestions can be formulated without interruption as comments and "*likes*," thereby making it easy to reinforce a suggestion. The order provided by "*relevant*" and "*current*" posts, as well as by the different members' statuses (both important parts of content moderation) also helps to organize successful advice. Members can use these infrastructural forms of evaluation as orientation for their own judgment about the quality of the advice given. The actual implementation of the repair advice given routinely remains absent, though.

On the other hand, the organization of DIY repair advice is also made more difficult by the potentially high number of posts and replies, the lack of referencing between replies, and the fact that they can be posted simultaneously. Volunteer moderators may need to intervene where the production of advice is becoming hindered. The fact that they only rarely delete comments or close posts in this group, along with the occasional complaint about it, affirm that moderation is interactionally delicate. There is a particular tension between the group's claim to enable *everyone* to participate in advice interaction for DIY repair with the specialized knowledge that exists in this area. In this context, how repair advice is generated also depends upon the kinds of objects that need to be fixed, concerning commonality and expertise that needs to be explored further.

Online repair advice has become commonplace in DIY repairs, adding interactional and communicative labor to the situated practical tinkering with repair objects. Therefore, producing online advice for DIY repairs can be considered to be a form of volunteer or civic labor, supporting the (often individualized) reproductive labor of repairing everyday objects. Producing advice together makes the work of DIY repairs more visible, but it also makes them debatable: Producing good advice requires care from both users *and* volunteer moderators; the latter particularly so in the instances in which posts become careless, thereby hindering the interactional organization of producing advice. Moderation, however, is not only about monitoring specific or singular post, so as to enable a good conversation or to provide 'good'

advice; it is also, more generally, about continuous (even constant) care expressed for the current and future conditions of the conversations that take place within the group.

References

- Ametowobla, Dzifa and Kirchner, Stefan (2023) The Organization of Digital Platforms: The Role of Digital Technology and Architecture for Social Order, *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 52 (2), pp. 143–156. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1515/zfsocz-2023-2012>.
- Baier, Andrea, Hansing, Tom, and Werner, Karin (2016) *Die Welt reparieren – Open Source und Selbermachen als postkapitalistische Praxis*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Bradley, Karin and Persson, Ola (2022) Community Repair in the Circular Economy – Fixing More than Stuff, *Local Environment*, 27(10–11), pp. 1321–1337. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2022.2041580>.
- Briggs, Pamela and Burford, Bryan (2002) Trust in Online Advice, *Social Science Computer Review*, 20(3), pp. 321–332.
- Dant, Tim (2010) The Work of Repair: Gesture, Emotion and Sensual Knowledge, *Sociological Research Online*, 15(3), p. 7.
- Denis, Jérôme, Mongili, Alessandro, and Pontille, David (2015) Maintenance & Repair in Science and Technology Studies, *Tecnoscienza. Italian Journal of Science & Technology Studies*, 6(2), pp. 5–15.
- Dijk, Jan van (2020) *The Digital Divide*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Eickelmann, Jennifer (2017) »Hate Speech« und Verletzbarkeit im digitalen Zeitalter: Phänomene mediatisierter Missachtung aus Perspektive der Gender Media Studies. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Gelber, Steven M (1997) Do-It-Yourself: Constructing, Repairing and Maintaining Domestic Masculinity, *American Quarterly*, 49(1), pp. 66–112.
- Gillespie, Tarleton (2019) *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.
- Goffman, Erving (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Garolen City and New York: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Graham, Stephen and Thrift, Nigel (2007) Out of Order: Understanding Repair and Maintenance, *Theory, Culture & Society*, 24(3), pp. 1–25. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276407075954>.
- Graziano, Valeria and Trogal, Kim (2021) Repair Matters, *Ephemera. Theory & Politics in Organization*, 19(2), pp. 203–227.

- Hine, Christine (2015) *Ethnography for the Internet: Embedded, Embodied and Everyday*. London: Routledge.
- Hitzler, Ronald and Honer, Anne (2014) Reparatur und Repräsentation: Zur Inszenierung des Alltags durch Do-It-Yourself. In Moebius, Stephan and Albrecht, Clemens (eds.) *Kultur-Soziologie*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, pp. 429–450.
- Jackson, Steven J. (2014) 'Rethinking Repair'. In Gillespie, Tarleton, Boczkowski, Pablo J., and Foot, Kirsten A. (eds.) *Media Technologies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 221–240.
- Kalsnes, Bente and Ihlebæk, Karoline Andrea (2021) Hiding Hate Speech: Political Moderation on Facebook, *Media, Culture & Society*, 43(2), pp. 326–342. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443720957562>.
- Kannengießner, Sigrid (2018a) Fair produzieren und reparieren: Versuche der Komplexitätsbewältigung in einer globalisierten und mediatisierten Welt. In Katzenbach Christian, et al. (eds.) *Neue Komplexitäten für Kommunikationsforschung und Medienanalyse: Analytische Zugänge und empirische Studien*. Berlin: Digital Communication Research, pp. 73–94.
- Kannengießner, Sigrid (2018b) Repair Cafés. In Hepp, Andreas, Kubitschko, Sebastian, and Marszolek, Inge (eds.) *Die mediatisierte Stadt: Kommunikative Figuren des urbanen Zusammenlebens*. Wiesbaden: Springer, pp. 211–230.
- Kannengießner, Sigrid (2020) Engaging with and Reflecting on the Materiality of Digital Media Technologies: Repair and Fair Production, *New Media & Society*, 22(1), pp. 123–139. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819858081>.
- Krebs, Stefan, Schabacher, Gabriele, and Weber, Heike (2018) Kulturen des Reparierens und die Lebensdauer der Dinge. In *ibid.* (eds.) *Kulturen des Reparierens: Dinge – Wissen – Praktiken*. Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 9–48.
- Locher, Miriam A. (2013) Internet Advice, In Herring, Susan, Stein, Dieter, and Vitanen, Tuija (eds.) *Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated Communication*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Brill, pp. 339–362.
- Locher, Miriam A., Brook, Bolander, and Höhn, Nicole (2015) Introducing Relational Work in Facebook and Discussion Boards, *Pragmatics*, 25(1), pp. 1–21. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.25.1.01loc>.
- Matias, J. Nathan (2019) The Civic Labor of Volunteer Moderators Online, *Social Media + Society*, 5(2), pp. 1–12. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119836778>.
- Meredith, Joanne (2019) Conversation Analysis and Online Interaction, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), pp. 241–256. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2019.1631040>.
- Meredith, Joanne, Giles, David, and Stommel, Wyke (2021) *Analysing Digital Interaction*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

- Morrow, Phillip R (2006) Telling about Problems and Giving Advice in an Internet Discussion Forum: Some Discourse Features, *Discourse Studies*, 8(4), pp. 531–548. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606061876>.
- Myers West, Sarah (2018) Censored, Suspended, Shadowbanned: User Interpretations of Content Moderation on Social Media Platforms, *New Media & Society*, 20(11), pp. 4366–4383. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818773059>.
- Rebstein, Bernd, Rabl, Marlen, and Schnettler, Bernt (2011) Communicating Knowledge across Language Borders “Moderating” as a Communicative Form at Bilingual Social Events among Spanish Speaking Migrants in Bavaria. In Busse, Miriam (ed.) *Innovating qualitative research: new directions in migration*, ForMig-Arbeitspapiere, Nr. 1. München: ForMig, pp. 53–70.
- Roberts, Sarah T. (2019) *Behind the Screen: Content Moderation in the Shadows of Social Media*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ruckenstein, Minna and Turunen, Linda L. M. (2020) Re-Humanizing the Platform: Content Moderators and the Logic of Care, *New Media & Society*, 22(6), pp. 1026–1042. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819875990>.
- Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A., and Jefferson, Gail (1974) A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation, *Language*, 50(4), pp. 696–735.
- Scheffer, Thomas and Trischler, Ronja (2023) Trans-Sequenzierend Codieren, *Sozialer Sinn*, 24(2), pp. 283–313. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/sosi-2023-0013>.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Jefferson, Gail, and Sacks, Harvey (1977) The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation, *Language*, 53(2), pp. 361–382. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1977.0041>.
- Schröter, Jens (2018) Reparaturwissen und Paratextualität. In Krebs, Stefan, Schabacher, Gabriele, and Weber, Heike (eds.) *Kulturen des Reparierens: Dinge – Wissen – Praktiken*. Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 225–238.
- Squirrell, Tim (2019) Platform Dialectics: The Relationships between Volunteer Moderators and End Users on Reddit, *New Media & Society*, 21(9), pp. 1910–1927. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819834317>.
- Stalder, Felix (2018) *The Digital Condition*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Star, Susan Leigh (1999) The Ethnography of Infrastructure, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(3), pp. 377–391. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027649921955326>.
- Star, Susan Leigh and Ruhleder, Karen (1996) Steps Toward an Ecology of Infrastructure: Design and Access for Large Information Spaces, *Information Systems Research*, 7(1). Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/isre.7.1.111>.
- Star, Susan Leigh and Strauss, Anselm (1999) Layers of Silence, Arenas of Voice: The Ecology of Visible and Invisible Work, *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 8(1–2), pp. 9–30.

- Stommel, Wyke and Lamerichs, Joyce (2014) Interaction in Online Support Groups: Advice and Beyond. In Hamilton, Heidi and Chou, Wen-ying Sylvia (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Health Communication*. London: Routledge, pp. 198–211.
- Strebel, Ignaz, Bovet, Alain, and Sormani, Philippe (2019) *Repair Work Ethnographies: Revisiting Breakdown, Relocating Materiality*. Singapore: Springer Nature. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2110-8>.
- Suzuki, Lalita K. and Calzo, Jerel P (2004) The Search for Peer Advice in Cyberspace: An Examination of Online Teen Bulletin Boards about Health and Sexuality, *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25(6 SPEC. ISS.), pp. 685–698. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2004.09.002>.
- Trischler, Ronja (2023) Bodies/Technology on Standby: The Importance of Cooperative Waiting for Digital Work. In Gießmann, Sebastian et al. (eds.) *Materiality of Cooperation*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, pp. 173–191. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-39468-4_8.
- Vayreda, Agnès and Antaki, Charles (2009) Social Support and Unsolicited Advice in a Bipolar Disorder Online Forum, *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(7), pp. 931–942. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732309338952>.
- Wagner, Greta (2019) Helfen und Reziprozität. Freiwilliges Engagement für Geflüchtete im Ländlichen Raum, *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 48(3), pp. 226–241. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/zfsoz-2019-0017>.

