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Questions of research

The influence of educational level and educational type on news participation, seeding behavior and seeding attitudes within web 2.0 environments
Questions of research

- Focus on Y-generation and their (past) educational level and current training which may affect
- (i) the consultation of several off- and online media for general and news purposes,
- (ii) actual degree of participation and distribution, or seeding behavior, in fun and news items
- (iii) attitudes toward laymen-participation in fun and news content (UGC),
- (iv) the role of trust in these consultation and co-creation processes
Target Group

Youth
Between 16 and 25 years old
“Internet” and “Einstein” Generation
“Digital Natives” <-> “Digital Immigrants”

- But: There is no such thing as the internet generation. Not all young people are skilled ‘cyberkids’. Dependent on age, gender, social background and schooling, teenagers differ in the way they make use of information and communication technologies (ICT)” TIRO, 2008-2009

Target Group

- Present data are based on a questionnaire
- Completed digitally - in April-May 2009 (!)
- 276 participants
- Mean age 19.14 year
  - 55.4% M♂ = 19.65 year
  - 44.6% M♀ = 18.51 year
Independent Variables

(1) (past or current) level of education at secondary school (referred to as SEL)

- General Education (GE: 51.8%)
- Technical Education (TE: 33.7%)
- Vocational, Art or Part-time Education (VE+: 13%)
Independent Variables

(2) current training type in higher education (referred to as *Major*)

- JOU: students Journalism (23%)
- INF: students Informatics and Multimedia (23%)
- YC: Young controls (16-18 yr) (34%)
- OC: Old controls (19-25 yr) (20%)
Consultation pattern of off- and online Media in General and for News Purposes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIA</th>
<th>General Mean</th>
<th>General Major</th>
<th>General SEL</th>
<th>News Mean</th>
<th>News Major</th>
<th>News SEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>INF&gt;JOU&gt;O&gt;Y</td>
<td>TE&gt;GE&gt;VE+</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>JOU&gt;INF&gt;O&gt;Y</td>
<td>GE=TE&gt;VE+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tv</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>JOU&gt;Y&gt;O&gt;INF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>O&gt;JOU&gt;Y&gt;INF</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>JOU&gt;Y&gt;O&gt;INF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>JOU&gt;O&gt;INF&gt;Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>JOU&gt;Y&gt;O&gt;INF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper free</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>JOU&gt;INF&gt;O&gt;Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>JOU&gt;INF&gt;Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper pay</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>JOU&gt;O&gt;INF=Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>JOU&gt;O&gt;Y=INF</td>
<td>GE&gt;TE&gt;VE+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teletext</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>JOU&gt;Y&gt;O&gt;INF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: never 2: a few times a year 3: a few times a month 4: a few times a week; 5: 1-30 min./day; 6: 30-60 min./day; 7: 1-2 hours/day 8: >2 hours/day
It seems that current *major* is more predictive and important than past or current educational *level* at Sec School.

“Intrinsic interest” may be more predictive than “educational level” or “mental capabilities” for consulting media and even more for consulting news!
Conclusions (media)

- Internet is *the* medium for the Y gen!
- But for news: television == internet
- Y “don’t spent more time on the internet then their parents”, but “do use more MSN and other web 2.0 apps than parents”
- Y do not *consider* themselves as *the* internet gen, not even the 16-18 years old
Conclusions (int. apps.)

- For general purposes, several apps reach values above 4 (~ a few times a week)
- MSN is the applications!
- *Older* internet apps like Google, mail and websites are second most used
- For news: use *older* and informational apps: news sites, google, mail, websites (but < 3.60)
Indeed: Y mentioned a discordance between fun and serious business

- in intensity and frequency of media/internet
- in kind of medium/app for different purposes

E.g., communic. within the private sphere

- *their* mobile cell phone, *their* MSN, *their* Netlog and Youtube, *their* Facebook, and “there’s is no place for news on those ones”

For news (perhaps all serious business?) they use (or trust ?) more the serious and ‘adult’ or ‘web 1.0’ apps
Degree of User Participation for ‘Fun’ versus for ‘Serious’ Purposes
### Degree Participation in UGC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree ↓</th>
<th>Type →</th>
<th>Videos</th>
<th>Photos</th>
<th>Text / messages</th>
<th>News items</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment on … from journalist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on … from stranger</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on … from friend</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch … of stranger</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch … of friend</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post … themselves</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) Seeding is mostly not participating at all but ... Watching

(ii) Seeding is all about photos, followed by text or messages, then videos and last news items

(iii) Seeding is about emotional proximity (intimacy): friends and acquaintances (including themselves) versus strangers.

(iv) There is no participation in news.
Seeding does not concern

- News
- at least, not real, serious, hard, adult news
- Material originating from Strangers

Why? What stops Y to co-create serious stuff, to generate news content and comments of themselves?
Attitudes and Motivations towards User Generated Content for News
1. Willing to comment on news themselves?

- Q: motivational potential in order to comment on news items (via PCA)
  - information dissemination (M=3.11)
    - of content and opinion
  - social aspect (emotional proximity) (3.00)
  - external economic incentives (M=3.02)
  - journalistic skills (M=2.38)
  - fun (M=2.18)
2. UGComment on newsitems by laymen other than themselves?

- Clear comment from laymen (M=3.45)
- Citizens should only put a comment if they know something about ... (M=3.45)
- Y don’t agree much with positive UGComment outcomes (agg. M=2.72)
  - comment offers referrals,
  - comments are valuable/surplus,
  - comments help journalists to remain critical
Attitudes toward UGC news

Y are neither very negative (agg. M=2.67)
- comments have too many typos,
- are often off-topic,
- have too many false arguments,
- are useless, are nonsense

UGC shouldn’t really be supervised by gatekeepers, or include real names (agg. M=2.51)

But Y do not *trust* UGComment (M=1.88)
It seems as if UGComments can exist, may or may not be consulted and liked, may or may not have typos and false arguments, but laymen should be able to post comment, in their (wrong) way, as long as it remains clear that is comes from ‘just a citizen’, but this comment (mostly) will be evaluated as unreliable and not to be trusted.
3. UGContent (newsitems) by laymen other than themselves?

- News should be reported by professional journalists (M=3.14)
- by professionals in official news firms (M=3.21)
- citizen participation for important news, should be supervised and selected (M=3.07)
- intervention if indecent language (M=3.03)
Attitudes toward UGC news

- UGC will bear unreliable/untrustworthy news (M=3.27)
- Usage ≠ trust
- Popular ≠ trustworthy
- Wikipedia ≠ reliable
- UGC ≠ reliable

“I fail to see how filming the cat makes you a ‘citizen journalist’.”
Attitudes toward UGC news

- **Authenticity == trust**
- They actually trust (more) official news channels
- They trust teachers and journalists
- Who shouldn’t be funny or ‘their friends’
  - ~Youth Organisation « Happy Chaos » 2010
- Have less confidence in UGC
- Want gatekeepers/supervision with UGC for news
UGC: conclusion (1)

- You use a lot of internet
- For communication, social contact, entertainment, information gathering, even for news
- Embrace web 2.0 and interactivity
- But not for news (and serious business)
- ... at least: for serious/hard news
Fun & serious business do not mix
Not concerning content
Not concerning creators
Not concerning medium
:: *their* leisure media
Clarity and distinction above all !!
Y do not use web 2.0 to reach a broad public, to create new opportunities and new friendships, but they use it as an extension of their offline life.
Seeding news as in *distributing*?

In Questionnaire

- Each website has a *share or send* button.
- Y don’t share or send news items (2,15/5)
- Y don’t get news items redirected by others (2,40/5)
- Y talk ‘in between’ (2,99/5) offline about the news with their peers.
- Why, then, would they share news items and current affairs online?
Seeding news as in distributing?

Via extra interviews November 2009

- Conform: they spread fun, feelings, social conversations, movies, pictures ... via SNS
- Not serious business
- Only occasionally spread and receive news
  - If touched emotionally by the topic
  - The launch of a new popular film
  - Amazing news or fait divers
- Only to friends and family (inner circle)
Some “news” items spread on Facebook.
General Conclusion UGC/seeding

Y “use” a lot of web 2.0

- = watch: lurkers or leachers
- = within the inner circle
- = for fun

Less seeding for serious stuff / ‘hard’ news

~ Thelwall (2008): the emergence of web 2.0 has not involved the dissemination of news in any significant way

April 2009 !! Substantial increase since ??
UGC and effects SEL en MAJOR

No real / substantial effects of Sec Educ Level on seeding attitudes and behavior

Major -on the contrary - affected seeding attitudes and behavior to a much larger extend

Maybe it’s not about exclusion, but being exclusive when it concern UGC for news
Perhaps these results indicate another than classical segmentation – long time held by marketeers - and another distinction than exclusion - inclusion?

Maybe demographical segmentation based on educational level is less important than interest and motivation, at least based on effect sizes of this research and questionnaire.
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