

Case study 10.4

google and youtube together



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

In your view and experience on YouTube, will typical YouTube viewers accept advertising while watching the videos? As a YouTube user, advertising is a pain and I try to avoid it whenever possible, but it could be much worse and is generally non-intrusive as possible.

Some videos provide a flash overlay at the bottom of the video that displays an advertisement similar to the Google ad words advertisements that appear when using Google for searching. This flash overlay can even be closed as soon as it appears. The advertisement does not hinder the viewer from being able to watch their video immediately. The text in the case study mentions how most viewers are dissatisfied with having to watch an advertisement before viewing the requested video, and over half will exit without watching the video in response to having to watch the ad (Laudon & Traver, 2009, p. 698) 2. What responsibility does YouTube have in removing copyrighted material from its site? YouTube claims it is in compliance with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, which requires owners of content to notify Web sites when their copyrights are infringed.

Why is it a good solution for YouTube but a poor solution for copyright owners? In *MGM v. Grokster* the Supreme Court said that some of the main reasons for finding the peer-to-peer site Grokster liable were that it did not sufficiently police infringement when they were responsible for doing so, and the owners of the site continued to receive a financial benefit from the infringing material in the form of ad revenue. YouTube does remove copyrighted materials from its website as an act to avoid being the target of a copyright infringement lawsuit. In a more recent lawsuit, Viacom claimed that YouTube was knowingly using its copyrighted materials to earn revenue

from advertising and from driving customers to its site (Mackrell, 2010). The judge found in YouTube's favor, and noted that their current system for removing media that infringed on copyright worked well; and that a list of 100, 000 videos reported by Viacom as infringing on their copyright were mostly removed by YouTube within 24 hours (Leiberman, 2010).

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act requires the owners of content to notify websites when their copyrights are infringed. This works for YouTube because the responsibility lies with the copyright owners to police the site and notify them when they see their material posted, but this places extra burden with those copyright holders. But if YouTube has to scan the vast numbers of videos uploaded every minute on its site, the concept of YouTube would not work because users expect their videos to be posted immediately. . Assume you were a manufacturer of sporting goods, and wanted to use YouTube videos as a marketing tool to establish your brand. What concerns would you have about using YouTube? Video advertisements have a response rate of 0.

4%, which is still greater than regular web advertisements such as banner ads, but is not an impressive number if I were a sporting goods manufacturer looking to use YouTube video ads as a major part of my advertising budget. I can expect that a large portion of the viewing audience would skip or block out my advertisement. The return on investment is potentially very small. Another concern I would have would be copyright issues, especially since 25% of the videos on YouTube contain copyrighted material and make up possibly more than half of the total views. There could be potential risks of lawsuits from advertisements appearing on videos which contain infringed

<https://assignbuster.com/case-study-104-google-and-youtube-together/>

material. A major factor would be how the advertisement would be accepted by the audience.

YouTube has a huge audience and could potentially have a huge positive or negative effect on your brand, and would be difficult to predict. A positive example would be the Old Spice-guy video ad and follow-up campaign, which generated a positive response and high level of user interaction. A negative example would be ESPN's attempt to advertise on the YouTube homepage for Monday Night Football. Within a few hours, the comments section of the video was filled with offensive material bashing American football in favor of the world game (Laudon & Traver, 2009, p. 00). 4.

Google claims that users are 10 times more likely to click on its Flash animations at the bottom of the video screen than a standard banner ad. Do you believe this response rate is reasonable, and do you believe it could be sustained over the long term of, say, five years? I believe this rate is reasonable because response rates to online advertisements are relatively low compared to other forms of media, but the user notices these ads more since they are focused in on watching the content they searched for. However, this increased rate will not be sustained over the long term. Viewers are getting savvier when it comes to these new types of advertisements, and will avoid them whenever possible, treating them like any other advertisement. I immediately "X" out of these ads when I am watching a video on YouTube, and I think they are clearly not effective since they take up part of the screen of the content I am trying to watch. Works Cited Laudon, K.

, & Traver, C. 2009). E-Commerce. Leiberman, D.

(2010, June 24). Judge sides with Google, YouTube in Viacom's \$1B suit .

Retrieved October 22, 2010, from USA Today: http://www.usatoday.com/tech/news/2010-06-23-google-viacom-copyright-lawsuit_N.

htm

Mackrell, F. (2010, July 19). YouTube finds a safe harbour. Retrieved

October 22, 2010, from ArtsHub: [http://www.](http://www.artshub.com.au/au/news-article/opinions/publishing-and-writing/youtube-finds-a-safe-harbour-181725?sc=1)

artshub.com.au/au/news-article/opinions/publishing-and-writing/y

outube-finds-a-safe-harbour-181725? sc= 1