

## **Generations and Media: The Social Construction of Generational Identity and Differences**

Nicoletta Vittadini, Andra Siibak, Irena Carpentier Reifová, Helena Bilandzic

### **Abstract**

The chapter aims at illuminating the relationship between audiences and the social formations called “generations”. It is based on the idea that “generational identity/belonging” is built through social relationships (mediated or not) and helps to define the social significance of generations. Media experience is relevant in defining generations and their audience practices (Aroldi 2011). For each generation, the so-called “generational identity” and the experience with media and technologies in their formative years shape some features of audience practices in the course of the whole lifecycle of its members. At the same time, media representations, repertoires, and technologies contribute to defining the particular “generational semantic” of generations (Aroldi 2011; Colombo 2011).

The chapter starts by reviewing the literature on relationships between media and generations. First we discuss technological(-deterministic) approaches (e.g. Tapscott 1998) and socio(-deterministic) approaches (e.g. Buckingham 2006). Then we turn to a discussion of the definitions of “generations” which assume that media technology contributes in shaping and creating common characteristics in each age group (Aroldi 2011, Bolin & Westlund 2009) . We also offer definitions of generations which emphasize the supposed common characteristics of a particular age group.

The second and third part of the chapter will focus on research conducted in different countries (e.g. Italy; Estonia; UK; U.S.; Finland) highlighting how similarities and differences between generations as media audiences influence specific practices of consumption, or produsage (Bruns 2007). and how media uses contribute to building a “generational identity” The fourth part of the chapter is dedicated to the role of computer-mediated communication (e.g. social networks, instant messaging), mobile technologies and web 2.0 tools (e.g. blogs) in co-shaping social relationships among different generations (Siibak 2009; Vittadini 2010), and acting as platforms for building a common peer culture. The last part highlights the implications of the concept of generation for media research and discusses potential venues of research.

### **1. Generations and media**

Media technologies seem to have some special allure which makes them very popular as generational attributes, symptoms or even manifestos. Media studies together with popularizing discourses escalate the production of labels which are grounded in supposed differences in the generational use of new

media technologies. In contrast, we never read about the “refrigerator generation” or the “dish washer generation”, in spite that – according to John Hartley – relevance of refrigerator’s advent was not far from the one of broadcasting (1999: 100). The explanation may be provided by Roger Silverstone who emphasized the “double articulation” of media, i.e. the inseparability of media as material technology and symbolic content (Silverstone, 1994). This duality impacts enormously on the way media organize our experience, which has been recently identified as an important cultural glue of generations.

With culture growing stronger as an independent analytical category in study of society, the concept of “generation” has expanded beyond the borders of demography and acquired new, cultural, meanings. The demographic perspective sees generations as age cohorts of people who were born and happen to be alive at about the same time. In contrast, the cultural approach stresses that generations are constituted on the basis of shared experience of the same formative events and collective memory<sup>1</sup>. Categories of “age” and “generation” are in similar relation to each other as e.g. categories of “sex” and “gender”. Age is biological quality manifested by external attributes which are not optional. Generation and generational belonging are cultural uses of age, opportunities for identity building, which people can take up and enhance, or not. The latter approach was first outlined by Karl Mannheim (1964) in his essay “On the Problem of Generations”<sup>2</sup>. Ron Eyerman and Bryan S. Turner define a generation as “a cohort of persons passing through time who come to share a common habitus, hexis and culture, a function of which is to provide them with a collective memory that serves to integrate the cohort over a finite period of time” (Eyerman & Turner 1998: 93). Nevertheless, even culturally defined generations (such as the Beat generation or Vietnam War generation) cannot be fully disconnected from time – rather they should be seen as synergies of temporal settings and cultural experience. Generations are not purely arbitrary outcomes of people’s agency. The rigid biological structure of age is of course an indispensable (even disciplining) element in forming of generations. Our biological age is steadfastly fixed and, in the same time, purely coincidental, meaningless. This tension is one of drives for filling it with some meaning through generation-building. Age proximity in experiencing the same cultural event or process matters simply because, as Wilhelm Pinder put it when writing of non-contemporaneity of the contemporaneous, we live together with other people of different ages and “for everybody ‘the same time’ is a different time” (Pinder quoted in Mannheim, 1964: 283).

The concept of media generations hence functions as a particular application of the cultural approach towards age, i.e. generations. Media generations are constructed as collectively produced, shared and processed responses to the availability or pervasiveness of particular technology, which

---

<sup>1</sup> Some authors even emphasize that the events which have the potential to form generations must be of radical, e.g. traumatic, nature (Wyatt, 1993: 2).

<sup>2</sup> The essay was published for the first time in 1928 as “Das Problem der Generationen”.

becomes an element of generational identity. David Buckingham confirms that refining the study of media audiences with a generational perspective usually means focusing on the “potential role of media and technology in construction and self-construction of generations” (Buckingham, 2006: 4). Self-construction is not always identical with awareness of, or theoretical reflection on, the constitutive dimension of media technologies. But it also does not mean that the technological conditions of becoming a generation deprive subjects of all human agency and socio-culturally grounded interpretative propensity, as the authors drawing on the technological determinist legacy often suggest. Donald Tapscott, for example, asserts that technology is totally invisible for children who are growing up in a digital world; it is for them literally “like the air” (2009: 20). Similarly, Marc Prensky takes the technological environment to be second nature for “the digital natives” (2001: 2). This view of generation forming is not far from defining technology as some kind of technological praxis, which determines subjects. It is opposed by the scholars who acknowledge the centrality of social (not technological) processes. For Pierre Bourdieu, generations are social constructs emerging through conflicts over available economical, social and cultural resources (1993: 100). Similarly, Leena Alanen interprets the constitution of generations as generational structuring or “generationing” by which different generations (e.g. children and adults) interdependently construct each other by purifying their distinctive sets of practices (2001: 129).

The cultural conception of media generations makes a bridge between two extreme positions: demographic absolutism on one hand and technological absolutism on the other. We can picture these two absolutisms as prioritization of one of the two possible time axes: the demographic axis, which represents the successive generations of people being alive at the same time from newborns to the very old; or the technological axis, which represents the successive generations of media technologies from the print to social networks. If demographic absolutism were correct in claiming age to be the only relevant factor in media generationing, then there would be total correlation between technological diets and age; all young people would be using new media and all elderly people would read print newspapers. If technological absolutism were correct in putting the only emphasis on technology, then there would be zero correlation between the use of media technologies and age; the dominant technology would be equally penetrating all generations. Of course, neither of these absurd extremes reflects the reality of generational use of media technologies in everyday life. In day to day life there is much less regularity and predictability; it is neither purely age nor purely technology which explains generational use of media. The key question is how people *experience* age and technology through their cultural environments, which include habits, influences of peer groups, memories of formative or traumatic events and many other culturally grounded variables. Naturally, the statistics show that new media are more frequently used by younger generations. However, in our model of cultural media generation, age should be understood as a cultural, not biological category. This correlation cannot be explained by the biological age of the users of new media. It is rooted in the nuanced and fragile

processes of interpretation and understanding of what it means to be young and the value of technology in a particular age group or, more precisely, an “age culture”.

In media generation scholarship, there is a strong bias towards the media profile of the contemporary young generation and the way it articulates itself in and by new media, mainly the internet. Nonetheless, the concept of media generations has a longer history. Some literary groups (e.g. the Beat Generation or Romanticist literary movements in the 19<sup>th</sup> century) defined themselves as generations on metonymical principle – they claimed to represent the *Zeitgeist* of their generation with such fidelity that they thought of themselves as of its essence.

The phenomenon of media generations as a systematic and coherent response to some significant innovation in media technology appeared with the establishment of electronic media, particularly television in the 1950s in the U.S. Occasionally the radio generation is also taken into account, as the people who were born in the early 1920s (Maass & Gonzalez 2005). The assumed constitutive effect of the technologies of typography and print media was hardly captured in periods so short as generations, not even by trueborn technological determinists. Harold Innis spoke of “empires” (1950), Marshall McLuhan of “galaxies” (1962), and Neil Postman of “ages” (1985). The shift from large monoliths of typographic time to more swiftly passing electronic generations indicates the change of pace in the modernization process and technological innovation. The compression of time which reduced media epochs to media generations was also reinforced by escalating commodification. Marketing started to target generations as naturally emerging markets, whose tastes and lifestyles are often specified by a combination of branding and media technologies, e.g. the Playstation Generation (Cordiner, 2001), or the Google Generation (Gunter, Rowlands & Nicholas 2009).

Television experience had a special relevance in forming the identity of the Vietnam War Generation, an age subgroup within the Baby Boomers. The Vietnam War was the first televised war conflict. “War coverage demonstrated power of pictures, often close-up, searing images of death and destruction” (Barkin, 2003: 39). It was the suggestive character of the television image, the level of its detail and the unprecedented nature of this experience that made television war scenes rip into the collective memory of an entire generation. The Vietnam War as experienced and remembered by those who followed it from a distance is inseparable from its television rendition. For that matter, Michael J. Arlene has famously labeled the Vietnam War “the living-room war” (1997). Defining the Vietnam War generation as a television generation, and the Vietnam War itself as a historical event shaped by television, seems to be exactly a case of technological determinism leaking into the notion of cultural generations in spite of all attempts to avoid it. However, we are still presenting it as an example of cultural media generation that is not fully and passively produced by television, but one where its members share an identity, of which particular experience with television is an inseparable part. Technological determinism reverses causes and consequences – it explains media technologies as determining causes, while from other perspectives they are consequences of broader social and political transformations and developments behind them, together with phenomena which they

supposedly determine. Television thus has not determined the mentality of the Vietnam War generation; rather, sensitivity to the television image together with pacifism and many other characteristics of life in the 1960s were the consequences of more general social movements contesting expansion of *petit bourgeois* society after World War II.

The next generation that is putatively taking shape in response to the rupture in technological repertoire and the coming of new “media grammars” (Gumpert & Cathcart, 1985) and “generational semantics” (Colombo, 2011) is the contemporary young generation, i.e. people born after 1977. The generations of people who have grown up amidst new media technologies since their early years are often supposed to have specific intra-generational homogeneity stemming from very easy and intimate contact with digital technologies. The intra-generational homogeneity is translated into the names that these generations are given, including the “electronic generation” (Buckingham, 2000), “Nintendo generation” (Green, Reid, Bigum, 1998), “Playstation generation” (Cordiner, 2001), “net generation” (Tapscott, 1998), “wired generation” (Jacobsen & Forste, 2011), “Google generation” (Gunter, Rowlands, Nicholas, 2009), “Obama generation” (Sideridis & Patrikakis, 2009), “cyberkids” (Holloway & Valentine, 2003), “cyborg babies” (Davis-Floyd & Dumit, 1998) and of course “digital natives” (Prensky, 2001).

By now, there is a substantial amount of research exploring the various dimensions of generational differences in online practices and the search for digital specificities of the young generation – or claims that the digital rupture dividing the young ones from the other generations should not be overstated. The key type of research in this field is aimed at mapping the young generation’s uses of new media and has an exploratory character. Sonia Livingstone and her team’s project “EU Kids Online” provides an authoritative and complex picture of activities that children perform online (in terms of access, time spent, inequalities, education, communication, participation, risks and regulation) (Livingstone & Bober, 2005). Other topics addressed within the field encompass online safety or cyber-bullying (Livingstone & Haddon 2009; Kowalski, Limber & Agatston, 2012), internet addiction (Johnson, 2009), the generation gap and self-socialization of children and teens (Ribak, 2001; Clark, 2009; Helsper, 2010).

Nonetheless, the most blatant polemic in media generations scholarship – either packaged as specialized articles or cutting across other topics – concerns the tenability of Don Tapscott’s concept of the “net generation” (1998), later rephrased as “digital natives” by Marc Prensky (2001). From this perspective, technology in general has an epistemological quality. Digital technology hence grows a new type of mind and intelligence, especially with those who were born into it. This argument opens with the assumption that young people armed with new media “think and process information fundamentally differently from their predecessors” (Prensky, 2001: 1). Tapscott, Prensky and their disciples emphasize that ‘digital natives’ are fully immersed in the digital environment, taking it as their second nature. Multitasking or “multiprocessing” (Brown, 2000) is claimed to be their preferred style of work. In the intellectual area, the net generation is described as creative, interactive,

collaborative and inclined to inductive thinking. Cyberkids also learn things differently; they privilege game and discovery-based learning over the obsolete didactic approach (Holloway & Valentine, 2003). This part of the net generation theory made an intervention in education studies; a serious backlash came from this field and disapproved mainly Prensky's statement that children socialized with new media develop new form of creativity and intelligence (Bennet, Maton & Kervin, 2008).

When the scholars started to examine young people's online practices with focused empirical research, the rhetoric of net generation theory entered the phase of deconstruction in many other respects as well. The provocative speculation was translated into a set of indicators for empirical assessment of the level on which young people master new technologies, such as: use of emerging technologies, producing activities in Web 2.0 style (Bruns, 2007), collaborative nature of use, diversity of types of use, etc. As a result, scholars started to report that: the use of the Internet is very heterogeneous and Mannheim's old idea of fracturing generation into smaller units could be useful (Holmes, 2011); it is not only age but a synergy of other factors such as gender, socio-economic status and type of school that leads to differences in young people's use of new media (Lee, 2005), or that "the use of collaborative and self-publishing 'Web 2.0' technologies that have often been associated with this generation is quite low" (Kennedy et al., 2007).

Technological determinism is usually disentangled as an analytical standpoint of net generation theory, which is a troublesome framework for many critics. There is no doubt that the search for generational differences in new media use is a legitimate goal. The empirical literature, however, underlines that it is not merely digital technology that produces the mentality and mindset of the young people. The construction of technological endowment as part of their generational identity is closely related to social meanings ascribed to new technologies in broader social and economical contexts. Lisa Lee therefore revives the concept of "co-construction" (Oudshoorn & Pinch, 2003), which captures the reciprocal process in which technologies and users mutually construct each other (Lee, 2005: 317). She evokes it to tame fundamentalist technological determinism, while maintaining the relevance of new media as one of the entry points into the process of generational identity construction. David Buckingham also proposes a sophisticated critique of the new wave of technological determinism. He criticizes Tapscott and the others for assuming that current technological modus is a random result of genial human intelligence which has emerged from nowhere and has no social and political preconditions. In Buckingham's perspective, technological determinations are seriously shaped by social and political affordances of the preceding social order and "interplay of complex social, economic, and political forces" (Buckingham, 2006: 9).

## **2. Generations and media audiences**

On the basis of the debate on generations and media we can state that contemporary audiences are composed by people belonging to different generations. This evidence is particularly relevant

observing generations from the point of view of audience studies and according to what Alasuutari (1999) calls the third phase of audiences studies. Alasuutari describes this phase as characterized by a specific focus on the cultural dimension of audiences and on the fact that being part of an audience is relevant for the process of identity construction (at the individual and the collective level). Although media use (especially television) has been described as aimed at foster social integration i.e. identification with others and the realisation of a sense of belonging, the connection between audience behaviour and identity construction emerges when Abercrombie and Longhurst describe the contemporary “diffused audiences” experience. “The essential feature of this audience-experience is that, in contemporary society, everyone becomes an audience all the time. Being a member of an audience [...] is constitutive of everyday life” (1998: 261) Being part of an audience, according to the authors, is constitutive of the personal identity and, at the same time, allows people to perceive themselves as part of an imagined community of people sharing experiences (mediated or not); cultural and material consumptions and lifestyles. The diffusion of technologies allowing mediated relations, according to the definition of “networked publics” (2008), increases the opportunities to share discourses and social exchanges about media consumption that promotes the construction of imagined communities of audience.

According to this third phase of audience studies generational belonging is part of the individual identity of the members of the audience and is one of the constituents of the audience as imagined community. At the same time the process of “generationing” (Alanen 2001) implies also the sharing of audience practices. Often these audience practices are diffused and consolidated through mediated discourses and narrations produced top down (by media institutions) or bottom up (by audience members).

Thus, on the basis of empirical studies, we can identify two levels at which generational belonging affects media audiences practices.

The first level is related to the fact that each generation (in its formative years) grows up with a specific style of media usage and culture (responding to the available mediascape), which helps to differentiate audience practices of a generation from previous ones (Schäffer 2003; Colombo 2011).

According to the Pew Internet Research Project on generations, for example, in 2010 six consecutive generations were currently online in the US: Millennials (ages 18-33), Generation X (ages 34-45), Younger Boomers (ages 46-55), Older Boomers (ages 56-64), the Silent Generation (ages 65-73) and the G. I. Generation (age 74+) (Zickuhr 2010) and each generation domesticates the digital environment according to different and typical media consumption habits.

Various empirical studies have been focused on the differences between generations in media repertoires (Hasebrink & Propp 2006) and, in recent years, on media technologies repertoires.

For example the Pew Research Center report on “generation’s digital gadgets” describes how Millennials privileges mobile phones, laptop and Ipad or Mp3 player; while Generation X uses desktop and games consoles, and Younger Boomers use more desktop and e-book readers.

Besides media repertoires, different researches highlighted the fact that, the collective responses produced to the availability of particular mediapaces that contribute to the generational identity tend to diffuse among people belonging to the same generation a kind of style of media use. For example a style of media use focused on specific contents and time-consuming opposed to a flow, time-spending and snack consumption.

For example a Finnish study (Lugano & Peltonen 2012) on generation-based differences highlights some differences between generations in terms of values. For younger generations the speed of the answer in computer mediated communication is a value indicating attention and concentration on the conversation opposed to slowness that, for example for boomers, is valuable as a sign of a more meditated answer. Differences are also visible in linguistic and narrative habits: short and dialogical communication in contrast to long and narrative descriptions.

Similarly younger generation privilege ephemeral cultural objects to be consumed but not owned, in contrast to tangible, ownable and physical objects.

In the “beta world of web 2.0” where, according with O’Reilly “the product is developed in the open [through] real time monitoring of user behavior” (2005: 6) these different values affect, particularly, both the way in which generations define the success of an application and the way in which they privilege some affordances rather than others.

Other studies are focused on the differences on the online activities. For instance, studies in the U.S. suggest that the members of the Generation X are the most likely group to bank, shop and to look for health information online (Jones & Fox 2009). Findings of a representative survey carried out in Estonia indicate similar trends (“Me. The World. The Media., unpublished data). This analysis indicates that the 65-74 year old social media users (15.45) (together with the 20-29 year olds 13.3%) are one of the most active groups in posting information and links about politics and politicians, or commenting upon different political themes on social media. In comparison to the younger Estonians (15-29 year olds), the older age groups also appear to be more active in giving feedback to public institutions through social media.

The second level is related to the fact that each generation share (through media and digital technologies) narratives and discourses that contribute to stabilise consumption habits also in the consolidation phase of the generational identity, following the formative years. According to Edmunds and Turner we can say that media affect the social making of generational cohorts as cultural identities also offering an inventory of spaces where people can share “the collection of practices through which generational experiences are manifest” (Edmunds & Turner 2002, p. 16). Being part of an audience (and in particular of a diffused, networked and performative audience) is, thus, a constituent of the generational belonging.

Different researches focused on the Millennials can offer a significant description of this kind of connection between generation and audiences. Millennials audience practices are characterized by a wide inventory of media resources and by an attitude to act as space-based audiences (in contrast to



place-based, locally situated, audiences), able to share symbolic contents all over the world and using these contents to build a common cultural identity (Aroldi 2011: 60). Again, the development of web 2.0 provide them a new space with a wide range of discursive resources where self-narrations can be told and self-representations can be acted (Boccia Artieri 2011), increasing reflexivity on “generational belonging” as well as on audience status.

An Italian study (included in the research program Media and Generations 2007-2009 funded by the Italian Ministry) has shown how blogs and YouTube are places where generational discourses emerge, where people produce stories and look for stories of people who share the same “we sense”. Furthermore, cultural products are used in those stories as a mnemonic anchor to remember the common “mood of time”, assuming that everybody is familiar with them (Boccia Artieri 2011).

In an empirical study McMillan and colleagues (2006) show how the production of “we sense” through internet mediated discourses is relevant. A respondent in this study said “since they [friends] too are part of my generation we have all shared in similar experiences ...we have all been in college to see the almost overnight change from card catalogue files, to online card catalogue” (87).

As Edmunds and Turner (2002) highlight, global and social media are increasing and speeding up the sedimentation of the generational “we sense”, offering the opportunity to accede, re-mediate, share and socialize cultural products. Furthermore, according with Hartmann (2003) the relations between the generational identities of millennials (and youger generations) and technologies has a specificity. Younger generations, in fact, tend to perceive some kind of duty (mediated by social and media discourses) to use technology and to build their generational identity around the devices that they use perceiving that the specificity of the self-definition of their generation is technology use.

### **3. The role of peer culture**

Peer networks are crucial in helping to form this generational “we sense”, especially in the case of young generations. In this respect, some authors suggest that we can draw parallels with “doing gender” and “doing generation”. For instance, according to McDaniel (2007, p. 4) „generation is a process in a similar way to gender as process, where generation is done by performance, in social relation to others“.

Hence, as also noted by Buckingham (2006, p.2), the process of defining a generation is a cultural issue as “it is a matter of how the potential members of a generation constitute themselves as having a shared identity“. For instance, despite the popular “web generation discourse” (Hartman 2003, p. 10) which is used to refer to the preferences and supposed common characteristics of the present day youth, the latter have taken quite a critical stand against such labelling (Siibak, 2010). Jason Sternberg’s (1998) studies among the young people in Australia also indicate similar almost despicable reactions among the supposed members of the Generation X towards the concept.

Thus, in addition to being a crucial component in forming the generational consciousness, peer culture plays an important role in helping to create the public image of a generation. For instance in the context of the digital generation, studies suggest that peers not only have a significant impact on young people's intrinsic motivation for making use of the internet (Zhao et al., 2011) but peers also have "a positive effect on increasing children's digital skills and the range of their online activities" (Kalmus, von Feilitzen & Siibak 2012, p. 252). Furthermore, they are often considered to be the largest influence on taking up the opportunity of creative online activities like creating a SNS profile or keeping a blog (Kalmus, Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, Runnel & Siibak 2009). At the same time, this positive influence of friends should not be seen as the same as ordinary peer pressure, which has often been named as the most frequent reason for taking up some creative and interactive uses of the new media (Grinter and Palen, 2002; boyd, 2008; Siibak, 2009). Thus, the false assumptions about the intra-generational homogeneity that the present day young people supposedly share may also be triggered by phrases like "If you're not in Facebook you do not exist!" that illustrate the taken-for-grantedness of the need to engage in and experience similar online activities.

Empirical studies also indicate that peers and close friends are also most often viewed upon as sources for reference (Siibak, 2009) on whom one's own online behavior and usage practices may be modelled. For instance, studies suggest that the preferences and practices of one's friends are noted when selecting the 'markers of cool' (Liu, 2007) worthy to be put on one's SNS profile. In fact, such "markers" are also often used for illustrating or improving one's status in a group of peers (Peter, Valkenburg & Fluckinger, 2009). In other words, the impression management strategies young people use, for instance on SNS, are not only dependent on the affordances of the particular technological interface, but are also largely built on the collective peer culture (Corsaro, 1997), whose values and norms help to frame the self-presentation process (Siibak, 2009).

In fact, according to Sonia Livingstone, young people's online identities are expressed "not as a free-floating, individual activity but as embedded in and shaped by specific social and technological conditions" (2009, p. 117). In other words, the findings of various empirical studies about young people's online practices clearly refer to the reciprocal processes of co-construction taking place between users and technologies that we touched upon earlier in the chapter. Those so-called space-based generations are therefore able to share their self-definition among peers and by doing so to reinforce generational communicative habits through discursive practices carried on in social networks.

#### **4. CMC and inter-generational relations**

Susan Herring (2008: 78) stated that the label "digital generation" which is presently commonly used both in the academic and public discourse when referring to the present day youth is actually "an exonym - a name used to refer to a group by outsiders (in this case, adults)" and not chosen by the

young people to represent themselves. Such an exotic label was meant to illustrate the age-based differences in technology skill and use.

In recent years, however, the previous technology-knowledge gap between the present day youth and the members of previous generations has been diminishing. Older adults, in particular, have become more and more motivated to learn basic skills of web-based communication and, by doing so, have become more aware of the opportunities to access their children's online worlds and mediate their Internet use (Livingstone & Haddon, 2009). Having a chance to follow the lives of their grandchildren is usually seen as the one of main motivating factors for the grandparents to start learning and using web-based communication environments (Gonzalez, Jomhari, & Kurniawan, 2012). In fact, various studies (Smith, 2011; Taylor, Funk, Craighill & Kennedy, 2006) indicate that older members of the families have acknowledged that new media technologies may offer them an opportunity to reach out to the young, who otherwise seem to be out of reach. In other words, ICTs have become key elements in bringing different generations together and helping to promote strengthened family ties and experiences (Taske & Plude 2011) and hence also helping to facilitate family relations (Mesch 2006).

At the same time, research reveals that young people are not as willing to interact with their parents via social media as their parents are to interact with them (Siibak & Murumaa 2011). In fact, it has been argued (cf. Siibak & Murumaa 2011) that parents are usually often perceived as a disturbing factor on such sites, i.e. “nightmare readers” (Marwick & boyd 2010) whose presence on the environment may cause young adults and children to readjust their privacy settings and disclosure practices. For instance, recent empirical studies (Siibak & Murumaa 2011) indicate that young people are making active use of the privacy tactic named social steganography (boyd 2010), which is essentially a strategy where information is hidden in plain sight. Decoding such posts can be extremely difficult for the audience members without the appropriate “interpretative lens”, and hence such posts are targeted and understood only by the members of the “ideal audience” (Marwick & boyd 2010), i.e. their closest friends and online peers who are usually the representatives of the same generation and thus share similar reference points.

## **5. Implications for research**

In this chapter, we demonstrated how using the concept of “generation” as a stratification of users and audiences may reveal valuable insights. The category proved to be useful for explaining differences in media repertoires, media habits, and uses of media as status symbols. There is also evidence for some limitations. We know that generations are not homogenous units, not with respect to the shared experiences and events prevalent at a specific epoch, and not with respect to media use. By now, older age groups have started to be avid users of social media, comparable with young users.. This phenomenon implies that the group of social media users may not be defined along shared experiences

in a common epoch, but by similar life circumstances, such as time resources and thematic interest. On the other hand, it seems that the latest Generation Y (or Millennials) considers the use of technologies as key defining element of their generation. Thus, the crucial question is how a cohort may be integrated over a period of time and perceive itself, and be perceived as a generation.

One option to answer this question is to look at self-definitions more closely. The internet has often been discussed as a forum where the individual can arrange, articulate and form their own identity, where self-narrations can find their place as well as attention from others (Aroldi 2011). So far the focus has been on individual identities. While these are often defined in terms of the individual's interpretations and perceptions of the world, it seems that the generational identity is only loosely connected to subjective constructions of the groups themselves. So one possible research field is to look at how much the formal definitions of generations also coincides with the understanding that the *generations* have about *themselves*. Possible approaches are, of course, to ask for statements about the sense of "generation" from the users themselves and ask them for an interpretation of the generation's scope and characteristics. The starting point for such a study may be to begin collecting information from people who grew up during the establishment of a particular *media* generation and then work backwards to the fringes of the age cohort. Theoretical sampling of other age cohorts should produce differences in self-definition. Another source of such information may be found in self-narrations on the web disseminated by members of the generations themselves.

On a related note, generations are not only constituted by their actual social practice, but also by reflections on it – of course, scientific reflections, but also reflections in public discourse. A number of books make the Generations X and Y (or Millennials) accessible to a wide (non-scientific) audience. An even larger share of the public is reached by products of popular culture – specifically, sitcoms targeting young viewers (up to Young Baby Boomers) show the lives, habits and views of the 20 or 30-somethings. In some of these tremendously popular series, we can observe the practices of young people involving ICT or mobile media. We can also observe what these technologies *mean*. An example of this is an episode of "*How I Met Your Mother*" (USA, 2005), where the protagonists watch another character at a party send text messages on his phone and form the unanimous suspicion that he is in a relationship. Other series go beyond merely *showing* the practices concerning new technologies and give *reflective* if not *critical* accounts. An example of this is an episode of "*IT Crowd*" (GB, 2006) where one of the protagonists first gets involved in a SNS called "Friendface"; the episode shows the steady decline of the protagonists' social life, and increasing addiction to the site as well as the pressure to react swiftly, thus reducing time for everything else. Other portraits are on the verge of being stereotypes ridiculed by the humorous format: for example, new communication technologies are pervasive and probably one of the leitmotifs in "*The Big Bang Theory*" (USA, 2007). When one of the characters needed to set up a lie, he created a Facebook account for the person he was feigning to be with to support his lie – mirroring the motto "If you don't have a Facebook page, you don't exist". Another instance, indicative of reflections on contemporary life executed by the same series is the

instance where one of the characters of “*The Big Bang Theory*” had been out of his job for three months and no one had noticed. In answer to the question of what he had done all the time, one item on his list was “update my Facebook account”. These few examples demonstrate how rich the fictional television world is with references to the Generations X and Y (or Millennials) and their respective characteristics. In a way, these mass media portrayals co-create a society’s view on the generations. Yet, a systematic analysis of popular formats with regard to generational implications is still lacking. Moreover, as these series are viewed by an audience of millions worldwide, the portrayal and stereotypes transported there might be used by the audience to construct an image of a particular generation one does not belong to, or create a standard or norm for those who belong to the generation.

The third option is to look at modes of reception rather than usage itself (i.e., what, how long, where, etc.). If generations are really held together by the conditions, events, and affordances of growing up and living in a certain time, that should create practices connected to certain styles of use and gratifications rather than specific technologies. For example, growing up in a time and place where it was crucial to be informed about politics every day, should make a person grow accustomed to being oriented about political events – whether through traditional or new media hardly matters. Thus, generations may be defined by the motives and gratifications one expects from media, rather than the technology available to fulfil them. In a similar vein, reception styles trained in one environment may persist even when reading the same content in another. For example, someone who is socialized in the traditional linear reading of a newspaper, will tend to read linearly and sequentially even in multimedia, highly linked news portals on the web. Conversely, young users trained in non-linear styles by the hyperlinked structure of the internet will continue to browse and scan in traditional environments such as television and newspapers as well (see Schweiger’s (2006) concept of “transmedia use styles”). Another option may be that intensive use of social media cultivates the urge for expressing instant reactions, which is not satisfied when using traditional mass media.

## **Conclusion**

The potential applications are promising. The concept of “generations” offers a wide range of valuable heuristics to explore the meaning and use of media in people’s lives, and may help us explore the complex interrelations between audiences, technologies and cultural settings. It is utterly clear that a simple age-generation-equation will not be useful for understanding contemporary media usage, but that theoretically meaningful application of the generations concept requires viewing generations as a multifaceted phenomenon. It covers several dimension, objective (for example, shared experiences) as well as subjective (for example, self-definitions) components. While it seems important to explore the nature of each of the components, a comprehensive model of media generations taking into account the specifics of media is urgently needed and will represent an important task for future research on media use.

**Acknowledgments**

Andra Siibak is grateful for the support of the target financed project SF0180017s07 and research grant no. 8527 by the Estonian Science Foundation.

## References

- Abercrombie, N., & Longhurst, B. 1998. *Audiences: a Sociological Theory of Performance and Imagination*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Alanen, L. 2001. Childhood as Generational Condition: Children's Daily Lives in Central Finland Town. pp. 129–143 in L. Alanen, B. Mayal (eds.), *Conceptualizing Child-Adult Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Alasuutari, P. 1999. *Rethinking media audiences*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Arlene, M.J. 1997. *Living-Room War*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Aroldi, P. 2011. Generational Belonging Between Media Audiences and ICT Users. In Colombo, F and Fortunati L. (eds.) *Broadband Society and Generational Changes*, Berlin: Peter Lang pp. 51-68
- Barkin, S.M. 2003. *American Television News*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.
- Baughman, J.L. 2007. *Same Time, Same Station*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Benckendorff, P., Moscardo, G., Pendergast, D. 2010. *Tourism and Generation Y*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Bennet, S., Maton, K., Kervin, L. 2008. "The 'Digital Natives' Debate: A Critical Review of the Evidence." *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5): 775–786.
- Boccia Artieri G. 2011 Generational «We Sense» in the Networked Space. User Generated Representation of the Youngest Generation. pp.109-120 in Colombo, F., Fortunati, L. *Broadband Society and Generational Changes*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Bolin, G., Westlund, O. 2009. "Mobile Generations: The Role of Mobile Technology in the Shaping of Swedish Media Generations". *International Journal of Communication* 3: 108-124.
- Bourdieu, P. 1993. *Sociology in Question*. London: Sage.
- boyd, d. 2008. Why youth heart social network sites: The role of networked publics in teenage social life. pp 119-142 in D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth, identity, and digital media*. London: The MIT Press.
- boyd, d. 2010. *Social Steganography: Learning to Hide in Plain Sight*. Retrieved from <http://www.zephorio.org/thoughts/archives/2010/08/23/social-steganography-learning-to-hide-in-plain-sight.html>
- Brown, J. S. 2000. Growing Up Digital: How the Web Changes Work, Education, and the Ways People Learn. *Change*, (March/April): 10–20.
- Bruns, A. (2007) *Producersage, Generation C, and Their Effects on the Democratic Process. Media in Transitions 5: Creativity, Ownership, and Collaboration in the Digital Age*. Cambridge: MIT Press
- Buckingham, D. 2000. *After the Death of Childhood: Growing up in the Age of Electronic Media*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Buckingham, D. 2006. Is There a Digital Generation? In Buckingham, D. & Willett, R. (eds.). *Digital Generations. Children, Young People, and New Media* (pp.1-13). NY, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Buckingham, D., Willett, R. 2006. *Digital Generations. Children, Young People, and New Media*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Clark, L.S. 2009. "Digital Media and the Generation Gap. Qualitative Research on US Teens and their Parents". *Information, Communication & Society*, 12(3): 388–407.
- Colombo, F. 2011. The Long Wave of Generations. pp. 19–36 in Colombo, F., Fortunati, L. (eds.), *Broadband Society and Generational Changes*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Cordiner, R. 2001. "Generation Y: Tricky for sports". *Sports Marketing* 77, 8.
- Corsaro, W. 1997. *The sociology of childhood*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Corsten, M. 1999. The time of generations. *Time & Society* 8(2): 249-272
- Davis-Floyd, R., Dumit, J. 1998. *Cyborg Babies: from Techno Sex to Techno Tots*. London: Routledge.
- Edmunds, J., Turner, B.S. 2002 *Generations, culture and society*. Philadelphia: Open University Press
- Eyerman, R., Turner, B.S. 1998. "Outline of a Theory of Generations". *European Journal of Social Theory*, 1: 91–106.
- Gonzalez, V. M., Jomhari, N., Kurniawan, S. H. 2012. "Photo-based narratives as communication mediators between grandparents and their children and grandchildren living abroad". *Universal Access in the Information Society* 11(1): 67-84.
- Green, B., Reid, J., Bigum, C. 1998. Teaching the Nintendo generation? Children, Computer Culture, and Popular Technologies. pp. 19–41 in Howard, S. (ed.), *Young People and the Electronic Media*. London: UCL.
- Grinter, R. E. and Palen, L. 2002. "Instant messaging in teen life" Pp 21-30, in *Proceedings of the 2002 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New Orleans, USA*. Retrieved from <http://www.cs.colorado.edu/~palen/Papers/grinter-pDBLP>.
- Gumpert, G. , Cathcart, R. 1985. "Media Grammars, Generations, and Media Gaps". *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2: 23–35.
- Gunter, B., Rowlands, I., Nicholas, D. 2009. *The Google Generation*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.
- Haddon, L. (2003). Domestication and Mobile Telephony. in J. E. Katz, (Ed.) *Machines that become us The social context of personal communication technology*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ, pp. 43–56.
- Hartley, J. 1999. *The Uses of Television*. London: Routledge.
- Hartmann, M. 2003. *The Web Generation ? Users , Morals and Consumption Everyday Life Network , 2000-2003. Technology, 2000-2003*. Brussels: EMTEL.
- Hasebrink, U., Popp, J. 2006. Media repertoires as a result of selective media use. A conceptual approach to the analysis of patterns of exposure, *Communication* 31 pp. 369-387



- Helsper, E.J. 2010. "Gendered Internet use Across Generations and Life Stages". *Communication Research*, 37(3): 352–374.
- Herring, S. C. (2008). Questioning the Generational Divide: Technological Exoticism and Adult Construction of Online Youth Identity. In D. Buckingham (ed.), *Youth, identity, and digital media* (pp. 71-94). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Retrieved from: <http://ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/macarthur.pdf>
- Holloway, S.L., Valentine, G. 2003. *Cyberkids: Children in the Information Age*. London: Routledge.
- Holmes, J. 2011. "Cyberkids or Divided Generations? Characterizing Young People's Internet Use in the UK with Generic, Continuum or Typological Models". *New Media & Society*, 13(7): 1104–1122.
- Innis, H. 1950. *Empire and Communications*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobsen, W.C., Forste, R. 2011. "The Wired Generation: Academic and Social Outcomes of Electronic Media Use Among University Students". *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 14(5): 275-280
- Johnson, N.F. 2009. *The Multiplicities of Internet Addiction*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Jones, S., Fox S. 2009. *Generations Online in 2009*. Report Pew Internet Research Project retrieved at <http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2009/Generations-Online-in-2009.aspx>
- Kalmus, V. 2007. "Estonian adolescents' expertise in the Internet in comparative perspective" *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 1 (1). Retrieved from <http://www.cyberpsychology.eu/view.php?cisloclanku=2007070702>
- Kalmus, V.; Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, P.; Runnel, P.; Siibak, A. 2009. "Mapping the terrain of "Generation C": Places and practices of online content creation among Estonian teenagers". *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(4): 1257-1282.
- Kalmus, V.; von Feilitzen, C.; Siibak, A. 2012. Effectiveness of teachers and peers' mediation in supporting opportunities and reducing risks online. In Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A. (eds.) *Children, Risk and Safety on the Internet. Research and policy challenges in comparative perspective*. Bristol : Policy Press, pp. 243-254.
- Kennedy, G. et al. 2007. *The Net Generation are not Big Users of Web 2.0 Technologies: Preliminary Findings*. Proceedings ascilite Singapore 2007.
- Kowalski, R.M., Limber, S.P., Agatston, P.W. 2012. *Cyberbullying: Bullying in the Digital Age*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lee, L. 2005. "Young People and the Internet: From Theory to Practice". *Young*, 13: 315
- Liu, H. 2007. "Social network profiles as taste performances". *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1). Retrieved from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol13/issue1/liu.html>
- Livingstone, S. 2009. *Children and the internet: Great expectations, challenging realities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Livingstone, S. – Bober, M. 2005. *EU Kids Go Online Final Report of Key Project Findings*. Economic and Social Research Council.

- Livingstone, S. – Haddon, L. 2009. *Kids Online: Opportunities and Risks for Children*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., & Ólafsson, K. 2011. *EU Kids Online: Final Report*. London: LSE, EU Kids Online.
- Lugano, G. Peltonen, P. 2012 . Building intergenerational Bridges Between digital natives and digital immigrants: attitudes, Motivations and appreciation for old and new Media. pp. 151-170 in Loos, Haddon & Mante-Meijer (Eds) *Generational use of new media*. Aldershot: Ashgate Me. The World. The Media (2011). Unpublished data set. University of Tartu, Institute of Journalism and Communication.
- Maass, M., Gonzalez, J.A. 2005. “Technology, Global Flows and Local Memories: Media Generations in ‘global’ Mexico”. *Global Media and Communication*, 1(2): 167–184.
- Mannheim, K. 1964. The Problem of Generations. *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Marwick A. E., boyd, d. m. 2010. “I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience”. *New Media & Society*, 13 (1) Retrieved from: <http://nms.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/06/22/1461444810365313>
- Matthews, D. (2003) “Media Memories: The First Cable/VCR Generation Recalls their Childhood and Adolescent Media Viewing”, *Mass Communication & Society* 6(3): 219–41.
- McDaniel, S. A. (2007). Why Generation(s) Matter(s): to Policy. Retrieved from: <http://cdm6gs.lib.utah.edu/utis/getfile/collection/uspace/id/46/filename/40.pdf>
- McLuhan, M. 1962. *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mcmillan, S. J. 2006. “Coming of age with the internet: A qualitative exploration of how the internet has become an integral part of young people’s lives.” *New Media & Society* 8(1):73-95.
- Mesch, G. S. 2006. “Family Relations and the Internet: Exploring a Family Boundaries Approach”. *The Journal of Family Communication* 6(2): 119-138.
- O’Reilly T. 2005 *What Is Web 2.0. Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software*. Retrieved from <http://oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html>
- Oudshoorn, N., Pinch, T. 2003. *How Users Matter: The Co-Construction of Users and Technology*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Peter, J.,; Valkenburg, P.; Fluckinger, C. 2009. Adolescents and Social Network Sites: Identity, Friendships and Privacy. In Livingstone, S. and Haddon, L. (eds). *Kids Online*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 83-94.
- Postman, N. 1985. *Amusing Ourselves to Death*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Prensky, M. 2001. “Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants”. *On the Horizon*, 9(5): 1–6.
- Ribak, R. 2001. “Like Immigrants”. *New Media & Society*, 2(3): 220–238.
- Schäffer, B. 2003. *Generationen – Medien – Bildung. Medienpraxiskulturen im Generationenvergleich*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

- Schweiger, W. 2006. Transmedialer Nutzungsstil und Rezipientenpersönlichkeit. Theoretische Überlegungen und empirische Hinweise. *Publizistik*, 51: 290-312.
- Sideridis, A.B., Patrikakis, CH.Z. 2009. *Next Generation Society*. Berlin: Springer.
- Siibak, A. 2009. *Self-Presentation of the "Digital Generation" in Estonia*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Siibak, A. 2010. The new media and peer culture. In Lauristin, M. (ed.) *Estonian Human Development Report 2009*. Tallinn: AS Eesti Ajalehed, 127-131.
- Siibak, A., Murumaa, M. 2011. Exploring the "Nothing to Hide" Paradox: Estonian Teens' Experiences and Perceptions about Privacy Online. Paper presented at the Oxford Internet Institute's "A Decade in Internet Time: Symposium on the Dynamics of the Internet and Society". Retrieved from: [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1928498](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1928498)
- Silverstone, R. 1994. *Television and Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, A. 2011. Why Americans Use Social Media? Retrieved from: <http://pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2011/Why%20Americans%20Use%20Social%20Media.pdf>
- Sternberg, J. (1998). Rating youth: statistical review of young Australians' new media use. *Australian Studies in Journalism*, 7, 84-136.
- Tapscott, D. 1998. *Growing up Digital. The Rise of the Net Generation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tapscott, D. 2009. *Grown Up Digital. How the Net Generation is Changing Your World*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Taske, C., Plude, F. F. 2011. "Experiencing social media across generations". *Media Development*, 58(1): 38-41.
- Taylor, P., Funk, C., Craighill, P., Kennedy, C. 2006. Families drawn together by communication revolution. Retrieved from: <http://pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/FamilyBonds.pdf>
- Varnelis, K. (ed.) 2008. *Networked publics*. Cambridge The MIT Press.
- Vittadini, N. 2010. Aprire le porte, marcare i confini: reti sociali e performance identitarie nella comunicazione mediata dei giovani pp. 37-56 in Giaccardi, C. (ed) *Abitanti della rete*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Wyatt, D. 1993. *Out of Sixties: Storytelling and the Vietnam Generation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zhao, L., Lu, Y., Wang, B. and Huang, W. 2011. "What makes them happy and curious online? An empirical study on high school students' internet use from a self-determination theory perspective". *Computers & Education* 56(2): 346-56.
- Zickuhr, K. (2010). Generations 2010. Pew Internet and American Life Project. Retrieved from: [http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2010/PIP\\_Generations\\_and\\_Tech10\\_final.pdf](http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2010/PIP_Generations_and_Tech10_final.pdf)