

**Routledge Studies in European Communication Research
and Education**

Edited by Nico Carpentier, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium and Charles University, Czech Republic, François Heinderyckx, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium and Claudia Alvares, Lusofona University, Portugal.

Series Advisory Board: Denis McQuail, Robert Picard and Jan Servaes



<http://www.ecrea.eu>

Published in association with the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA), books in the series make a major contribution to the theory, research, practice and/or policy literature. They are European in scope and represent a diversity of perspectives. Book proposals are refereed.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 Audience Transformations
Shifting Audience Positions in
Late Modernity
<i>Edited by Nico Carpentier,
Kim Christian Schröder and
Lawrie Hallett</i></p> <p>2 Audience Research
Methodologies
Between Innovation and
Consolidation
<i>Edited by Geoffroy Patriarche,
Helena Bilandzic,
Jakob Linnaa Jensen and
Jelena Jurišić</i></p> | <p>3 Multiplayer
The Social Aspects of Digital
Gaming
<i>Edited by Thorsten Quandt and
Sonja Kröger</i></p> <p>4 Mapping Foreign
Correspondence in Europe
<i>Edited by Georgios Terzis</i></p> <p>5 Revitalising Audience Research
Innovations in European Audience
Research
<i>Edited by Frauke Zeller, Cristina
Ponte and Brian O'Neill</i></p> |
|--|--|

Revitalising Audience Research
Innovations in European Audience Research

**Edited by Frauke Zeller, Cristina Ponte
and Brian O'Neill**

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

 **cost**
EUROPEAN COOPERATION
IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
<http://www.cost.eu>

10 Using and Not Using Social Media What Triggers Young People's Practices on Social Network Sites?

*Christine W. Trültzsch-Wijnen, Sascha
Trültzsch-Wijnen and Andra Siibak*

INTRODUCTION

Current media developments offer various possibilities for communication, participation, self-presentation and acquisition of knowledge. Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) have become an integral part of the lives of young people in modern societies. More than 60 per cent of six- to sixteen-year-olds across Europe go online daily (and an extra 33 per cent are online once a week). In northern countries this rate is even higher (Livingstone, et al. 2011, p. 12). Because some 40 per cent of European youth use mobile devices to go online (*ibid.*), it is obvious that the Internet is omnipresent in the everyday lives of young people. In fact, findings from a recent Austrian study indicate that more and more younger people are starting to use the internet, compared to findings from earlier studies which identify age twelve and thirteen years as the age of first use (Trültzsch and Wijnen, 2012).

There is a large body of research on the ways young people use ICTs (boyd and Ellison, 2007; boyd, 2009; Peter, Valkenburg and Fluckiger, 2009; Baym, 2010; boyd and Marwick, 2011; Trültzsch and Wijnen, 2012), much of which focuses on the risks and opportunities related to ICTs and the well-being of young people (Livingstone, 2008; 2009; Kalmus, et al., 2009b; Livingstone, et al., 2011; Livingstone, Ólafsson and Staksrud, 2011; Kalmus, Siibak and Blinka, forthcoming). These studies suggest that differences in internet use practices among young people can be explained, to some extent, by socio-demographic factors, while others indicate that media literacy could have an important role to play in young people's new media usage practices and preferences (e.g. Schmidt, Paus-Hasebrink and Hasebrink, 2009; 2011).

Participating in social network sites (SNS) is one online activity that has become ubiquitous among millions of young people in Western societies encouraged by claims that if you are not on SNS then 'you don't exist', referring to the fact that usage of SNS has become the norm among modern youth. Research shows that these platforms are used mainly by young people to present themselves, to manage their relationships and to communicate with their peers (boyd, 2008; Ito, et al., 2008; Kalmus, et al., 2009a;

Peter, Valkenburg and Fluckiger, 2009; Schmidt, Paus-Hasebrink and Hasebrink, 2009; Siibak, 2009). Several scholars have claimed that social media, and SNS in particular, play an important part in the (media) socialisation and identity construction of contemporary youth (e.g. Siibak, 2009; 2011; Hernwall and Siibak, 2011; Krämer and Haferkamp, 2011). In this context, we would agree with Laura Portwood-Stacer's (2012, p. 7) argument that in today's "media-saturated consumer society, it is quite meaningful to be a person who says no to media consumption". However, very few researchers (Baker and White, 2011; Ryan and Xenos, 2011; Baumer, et al., 2013; Madden, et al., 2013; Rainie, Smith and Duggan, 2013) go beyond this and ask *why* some young people are *not* using social media and SNS in particular.

In this chapter, an overview is provided of some of the main reasons why millions of young people across the world decide to use SNS and analyses the reasons why some young people decide *not* to create SNS profiles. Because traditionally audience research focuses on exploring the use of different media, and recent research of online uses focuses mostly on different uses of the social web (in particular SNS usage), addressing the question of non-usage is a novelty in audience research.

We exploit several theoretical approaches to analyse the phenomenon of SNS usage by young people. Thereby, we consider approaches focusing on the individual and his or her motivations for using/not using SNS and leave out other theories such as systems theory and network theory. We begin by analysing several of the approaches used in media and communication studies that have been applied to explain the motives for young people's social media usage. We then provide a short overview of the various reasons given by young people for using and for not using social media especially SNS. Although the majority of the research so far focuses on young people's reasons and motivations for using SNS, we try to differentiate and discuss the reasons given for non-use or abandoning SNS by either deleting their profiles or just no longer visiting the sites. We discuss the state of the art in research on young people's SNS usage practices. We provide extracts from a recent qualitative study on Austria in order to support the findings (Trültzsch and Wijnen, 2012; Wijnen, 2013).

THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO THE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

Various theoretical approaches have been used to describe and explore the use of social media. Depending on the disciplinary background these approaches emphasise particular aspects of media usage such as motives, practices, outcomes and so on. We highlight four action theory approaches commonly used to study online communication. We acknowledge that this focus excludes other approaches, but the discussion that follows centres on the individual.

(1) Because self-representation is an integral part of social web usage it is closely linked to identity construction. For this reason, research in

the field of psychology, including impression management theories that go back to Goffman (see Krämer and Winter, 2008; Lewis, Kaufman and Christakis, 2008, pp. 82–83; Siibak, 2009) are especially relevant. These theories stress that by creating SNS profiles, users are able to reveal or conceal aspects of their personality in their online representations (Krämer and Winter, 2008, p. 106; see also system factors in this chapter). This strand of research is based on personality items, such as the ‘Big Five’ in modern psychology¹ proposed by Allport and Odbert (1936; see also Gerlitz and Schupp, 2005; Dehne and Schupp, 2007). Some items used to measure the influence of personal characteristics are openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism regarding one’s SNS profile (e.g. Tidwell-Collins and Walther, 2002; Back, et al., 2010; Correa, Hinsley and de Zuniga, 2010; for an overview see Weissensteiner and Leiner, 2011, pp. 529–530). The results in these studies show that almost all users tend to create profiles true to their ‘real’ identities, while the personality descriptions that are a result of the Big Five items have no influence on their behaviour regarding SNS-profiles. At the same time, extraversion (used more for relationship networking) and neuroticism (self-presentation in relation to social factors) correlate with the use of SNS (Weissensteiner and Leiner, 2011, p. 530). This implies that “extroverted persons with a broader offline network can accordingly communicate with a broader online network too” (ibid.)—which is the outcome we would expect. At the same time, the results of several studies that use these personality items are rather incoherent or even contradictory (ibid.).

(2) Research based on social capital in Bourdieu’s (1979) sense, focuses on the positive effects of social capital for users. While the concept of social capital has different sources in sociology, (see Portes, 1998) and was developed further by Putnam (1995; 2000), Bourdieu’s (1986) central point is to distinguish four kinds of capital, namely economic capital (“directly convertible into money [...] institutionalized in the form of property rights”; Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47), cultural capital (knowledge based, institutionalised via formal degrees and diplomas) symbolic capital (i.e. reputation of a person; Bourdieu, 1986, p. 56) and social capital (“made up of social obligations (‘connections’)”; Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47). More precisely, “[s]ocial capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 51). With regard to SNS, Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe (2007, p. 1146) state that especially bridging (i.e. building up new connections) social capital “can take the form of useful information, personal relationships, or the capacity to organize groups” (see informational, recipient and relationship factors in this chapter). In addition to ‘strong ties’, such as relationships with family and friends (bonding social capital), connecting with so-called weak ties—such as neighbours, friends of friends and so on—can also be considered (bridging) social capital (Granovetter, 1982). SNS can increase the circle of ‘weak ties’ since it facilitates the maintenance

and tracking of such loose contacts (Putnam, 2000; Donath and Boyd, 2004; Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe, 2007). Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe (2011, p. 5) argue that, in addition, SNS include “latent ties”, which might become weak ties. For example the students in a class might see from Facebook that they live in the same town; they make friends on Facebook and chat in their subsequent classes about their common background (ibid.). Thus, although the majority of young SNS users do not use SNS to meet and connect with strangers (e.g. Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe, 2007; Subrahmanyam, et al. 2008), they have the potential to establish new weak ties and thereby gain (or increase) social capital. Accordingly, not using SNS means losing networking opportunities and accompanying resources and benefits.

(3) Another approach that is also related to Bourdieu’s work is Silverstone’s (2006) concept of the moral economy of the household, which developed as a result of his and his colleagues’ work on domestication of the media (Silverstone, Hirsch and Morley, 1992; Silverstone and Haddon, 1996). According to this concept, technology serves as a tool to reproduce and distinguish one’s social position in the realm of symbolic and cultural forms (Aroldi and Vittadini, 2010; Trültzsch, Kōuts-Klemm and Aroldi, 2014, p. 204). The integration of technologies into everyday lives (of families) builds on the moral economy of the family and balances “public, formal, *zweckrational*” and “private, informal, *wertrational* economy”² (Aroldi and Vittadini, 2010, p. 3). Because “different families draw on different cultural resources, based on religious beliefs, personal biography, or the culture of a network of family and friends” (Silverstone, Hirsch and Morley, 1992, p. 19), the integration of technology and therefore its usage follow different patterns. The moral economy of the household includes regulations for and restrictions on young people’s media use and also their “cultural capital, social capital (in terms of offline relations) and free-time capital (as a kind of scarce resource) emerged as key factor in the prediction of different styles of social networking on Social Networking Sites” (Trültzsch, Kōuts-Klemm and Aroldi, 2014, p. 204). Related to this approach, relationships, social, system and recipient factors are of particular importance.

(4) Other research is based on variations of the uses and gratification approach (Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch, 1973; McQuail, 2010, pp. 423–430), according to which users decide about their media choices on the basis of needs, motives and more especially expected gratification (Leung, 2009, pp. 1329–1330; Thaddicken and Jers, 2011, pp. 149–150). Sought and achieved gratification can vary from “information and education, guidance and advice, social contact [...] value reinforcement, emotional release” to “identity formation and confirmation [or] lifestyle expression” (McQuail, 2010, p. 427; see relationship, social, information and recipient factors in this chapter). With regard to social media use, Leung (2009, pp. 1336–1337) examines four “gratifications” resulting from creating online content: cognitive needs (broader knowledge, being informed about society), entertainment needs, recognition needs (establish personality, gain respect

and support), and social needs (express feelings, communicate with family and friends). Recognition and social needs are significant motivations for creating online content, while the other two are categorised as non-significant in Leung's (2009, p. 1337) sample. Thaddicken and Jers (2011, pp. 150–151) refer to them as social and individual integration needs in their discussion of the motives for online disclosure of personal information. With regard to privacy issues and the so-called privacy paradox (Barnes, 2006; Utz and Krämer 2009; Joinson, et al., 2011), Thaddicken and Jers (2011, p. 143) ask whether users trade “loss of privacy for social web gratifications”. Research differentiates between the user's general attitude to not disclosing private information, and his/her actual online privacy behaviour, highlighting the paradox (Barnes, 2006; Utz and Krämer, 2009; Joinson, et al., 2011). To benefit from SNS use, it is necessary to reveal personal information similar to what occurs in offline communication within friendship groups. A study by Lampe, Ellison and Steinfield (2007, cited in Thaddicken and Jers, 2001, p. 144) confirms that the more personal information the SNS user reveals, the higher the level of networking activity: “Evidently the disclosure of private information is rewarded with social gratifications” (Thaddicken and Jers, 2001, p. 144), especially social and individual integration, but also including transformation of latent into weak ties or maintenance of weak tie networks.

The four concepts discussed earlier are among the most common approaches to describing and understanding current social media usage. In what follows, we reflect on the state of the art in research on young people's social media usage according to sociality, information, system and recipient relationship factors.

YOUNG PEOPLE AND SNS

Although for many young people SNS have become “integrated into the daily lives” (Pempek, Yermolayeva and Calvert, 2009, p. 236; Livingstone, Ólafsson and Staksrud, 2011), there are various socio-demographic and context-specific factors that influence the decision about whether to engage in social networking or not. In this section we draw on the findings from various international studies, and provide a short overview of the main socio-demographic and context-specific factors influencing SNS use. We also introduce five additional factors suggested by Agosto, Abbas and Naughton (2012) that have an impact on how young people choose SNS and other platforms for personal communication.

Reasons for Using SNS

Previous studies suggest many different socio-demographic factors have an impact on young people's SNS usage practices. For instance, studies carried out in the US (Lenhart, et al., 2007; Hargittai, 2008; Hampton 2011), Australia and many European countries (Joinson, 2008; Kalmus, Runnel

and Siibak, 2009; Trültzsch and Wijnen, 2012) indicate that young women are more active than young males in using SNS. Also, the motives for engaging in SNS and prevalent SNS practices differ (Lenhart and Madden, 2007; Kalmus, et al., 2009a; Pujazon-Zazik and Park, 2010; Davidson and Martellozzo, 2012; Trültzsch, 2012).

Age has an impact on SNS usage. According to the findings from the EU Kids Online study (Livingstone, et al., 2011, p. 13), 59 per cent of nine- to twelve-year-olds are non-users of SNS compared to only 21 per cent of non-users amongst thirteen- to sixteen-year-olds. A study conducted in Austria reveals similar trends—the highest rate of non-users (44.5 per cent) belongs to the ten-to-eleven-year-old age group, while the number of non-users amongst twelve- to thirteen-year-olds is 25.8 percent (Trültzsch and Wijnen, 2012).³ For young people aged older than twenty-four years, the rate of non-users of SNS increases again—probably because this is a typical age for people to be focusing on their careers or raising children (ibid).

Several studies refer to engagement in a particular SNS being dependent on ethnicity. According to Hargittai (2008), for instance, Hispanic students in the US are less likely to use Facebook than white students, while Asians/Asian Americans are significantly less likely to use MySpace and more likely to use Xanga than Hispanics or whites (ibid).

The preceding would suggest that an individual's offline network influences the use of (a particular) SNS or not. As suggested by Agosto, Abbas and Naughton (2012), relationship factors are an important factor in the choice of which SNS to use.

Relationship Factors

Studies conducted in different cultural contexts (e.g. the US, Australia, Europe, Asia, etc.) suggest that young people use SNS primarily to connect and re-connect with existing contacts, and much less to find new ones (e.g. Lenhart, et al. 2007, Kalmus, Runnel and Siibak, 2009; Pempek, Yermolayeva and Calvert, 2009). In other words, SNS are readily available, easy-to-use platforms that facilitate ‘keeping in touch’ with both close (strong ties) and more distant ‘friends’ (weak ties). The latter opportunity, however, may be associated with building social capital and gratification—engagement in SNS allows users to invest in accumulation of bridging and bonding social capital. Research indicates that engaging in social networking helps to increase social capital and thus “could have strong payoffs in terms of jobs, internships, and other opportunities” (Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe, 2007, p. 1164; see also Peter, Valkenburg and Fluckiger, 2009; Rienties, et al., 2012).

Social Factors

Peers have a major influence on young people's intrinsic motivations for using the Internet (Zhao, et al., 2010). According to Baker and White (2011, p. 15), young people's “intentions to engage in frequent SNS use are likely

to be greater when they perceive the behaviour to be normative among their friendship group”.

Empirical work suggests that peers and close friends are most often viewed as reference points (Siibak, 2009); their preferences and practices are noted when selecting the “markers of cool” (Liu, 2007) worthy of inclusion in one’s profile. Hence, it appears that the impression management strategies young people use on SNS build largely on the collective peer culture (Corsaro, 1997), whose values and norms help to frame the self-presentation process (Siibak, 2009).

Self-Protection Factors

To benefit from SNS it is necessary to disclose at least a minimum of personal data to be recognised by both friends (strong and weak ties) and people with similar interests (latent ties).

Young users seem to have awareness of what information they reveal and to whom. They decide what personal information to include in their profile, and who is allowed to access it according to the results in Trültzsch (2012) and those from other studies of online communication (for an overview see Weissensteiner and Leiner, 2011, 530–536). The profiles of most young Austrian SNS users (79.3 per cent) include full names, and 80.7 per cent include a recognizable profile image (Trültzsch, 2012; see also Debatin, et al., 2009; Autenrieth, 2010). The findings based on the Austrian sample reveal also that those who do not use the Internet daily are less likely to upload a good likeness (a good photograph) for their profile image and that those who use the Internet less often are more likely try to be anonymous.

Information/Communication Factors

Recent research (Agosto, Abbas and Naughton, 2012; Vitak and Ellison, 2012) indicates that many young SNS users claim that they have benefited from access to a diverse network of contacts enabled by SNS. One such benefit is to obtain advice or information, or to receive support from a friend (ibid). Empirical research on three-generation families in Estonia reveals that although public postings on Facebook are not used much for communication within the family, the opportunity to exchange private Facebook messages and to use Facebook chat options are popular for parent–child interactions (Siibak and Tamme, 2013).

Systems Factors

Several studies suggest that the adoption of SNS is dependent on the users “confidence in their ability to successfully understand, navigate, and evaluate content online” (Daugherty, Eastin and Gangadharbatla, 2005, p. 71), or their Internet self-efficacy (e.g. Gangadharbatla, 2008). In other words,

the greater the individual’s facility to navigate on the site and perform the necessary tasks online, the greater will be their ability to join and engage in the service (ibid). Interviews with Facebook non-users for example suggest that non-users often “position themselves with respect to the discourse of technophobia, either admitting or denying that they were averse to new technology in general” (Portwood-Stacer, 2012, p. 13).

Recipient Factors

Some studies suggest that schools and higher education institutions are making more and more use of SNS for education-related reasons. According to Madge, et al. (2009), Facebook has become an important social tool or the ‘social glue’ required to help freshmen college students settle into the university system, feel part of the community and access important information (e.g. about social events).

Reasons for Not Using or Dropping Out of SNS Use

There is a lack of research on the reasons why some young people decide not to use SNS. So far only a few empirical studies have investigated non-use of SNS and even fewer analyse the phenomenon of dropout, that is the phenomenon of one-time users of SNS either deleting their profiles or no longer using the site. More research is needed on these aspects. However, the findings from the few studies that have been done so far provide us with a first glimpse of the lifestyle practice, which Portwood-Stacer (2012, p. 2) refers to as “media refusal”. We can illustrate these findings using qualitative data from Austria. The study referred to by Trültzsch and Wijnen (2012) formed the basis for further qualitative research on forty-six young people aged between twelve and seventeen years (interviews and think-aloud technique), in the period November 2012 to February 2013 (Wijnen, 2013). The focus was on the relation between young people’s SNS usage, media literacy and the habitus (Bourdieu, 1979). Although the majority were SNS users there were also some non-users. Their reasons for avoiding SNS are described in the following together with the findings from other studies on the topic.

Time Management and Media Use Preferences

There are various personal reasons for not using SNS, especially Facebook. For instance, several studies suggest that non-users of SNS “position themselves as above the ‘time-wasting’, ‘artificiality’ and ‘narcissism’ that they see as characterising Facebook use” (Portwood-Stacer, 2012, p. 11). Eleven- to eighteen-year-old Estonian non-users of the national language-based SNS, Rate, made similar references to it, stating that Rate SNS “is pointless”, “sucks” or is just boring (Kalmus, Runnel and Siibak, 2009). In other words, the dominant reason for not adopting SNS among young

non-users—regardless of the cultural context (e.g. the US, Saudi Arabia, Estonia, Australia), is a general lack of interest in the site (Kalmus, Runnel and Siibak, 2009; Baker and White, 2011; Aljasir, Woodcock and Harrison, 2012; Lampe, Vitak and Ellison, 2013).

Because non-users of SNS are more familiar with using the Internet for practical reasons—banking, research, shopping and so on—rather than expressive reasons, for example entertainment, they are not inclined to look looking around “just for fun”, which is a normal activity on SNS (Tufecki, 2008). This applies to non-users in the Austrian sample. Most were not intensive media users and were very conscious of different media uses for different reasons; computers and the Internet are mostly classified as tools for research and doing homework but not for fun (e.g. using SNS; Wijnen, 2013).

D: [I]nternet? Well, I'm using it for homework because we have to.

I: And what about using it for private interests—for fun?

D: No, computer is not so much for fun.

I: And Facebook and something like that?

D: I don't need that.

I: But your friends are using it?

D: Yes, but I don't need that. I use my computer for work.

(girl, aged thirteen)

The preceding examples suggest that SNS may simply not fit with the specific media needs and preferences of non-users (e.g. Aljasir, Woodcock and Harrison's 2012 study of Facebook non-users in a group of Saudi Arabian students). In addition to engaging in more practical and task-oriented online activities, young non-users of SNS also tend to prefer to devote spare time to offline interests and commitments. For instance, many Australian teen non-users of Facebook stated that they had other interests (e.g. reading, watching TV series, etc.) or commitments (e.g. sports) which they preferred to spending time on SNS; they considered SNS use to be “too time-consuming or detracted from the time they could be spending on alternate activities” (Baker and White, 2011, p. 397).

In fact, according to Rainie, Smith and Duggan (2013, p. 4), 42 per cent eighteen- to twenty-nine-year-old Facebook users in the US who had taken a break from using the site in the past (N = 316), reported decreasing Facebook usage in the previous year, and 38 per cent of the sample expected to spend less time on the site in 2013. One of the main self-reported reasons for a ‘Facebook vacation’ was the need to deal with other life demands and not having time to spend on the site (21 per cent), followed by general lack of interest in the site (10 per cent) and the absence of compelling content (9 per cent). This last reason (lack of compelling content) is in line with

the findings from a study by Pew Internet Research, which suggests that young Facebook users have started “to migrate their activity and attention to other sites” (Madden, et al., 2013, 7), such as Twitter or Instagram, mainly because these sites appear to be freer of negative social interactions (less ‘drama’ and fewer adults) and focused more on personal content creation than self-presentation.

Social Factors

Non-users of SNS are less interested in those activities referred to as social grooming (Portwood-Stacer, 2012). Hence, non-users of SNS are not only less interested in keeping in touch with their friends, especially friends from the past; they also are less curious about other people in general than SNS users (ibid). Ljepava, et al. (2013) show that non-users of Facebook may also be less committed to intimate friendships compared to frequent users of the site.

On the other hand, Portwood-Stacer (2012, p. 14) argues that only individuals whose “social standing will endure without” a SNS such as Facebook, can actually afford what has been described as the “cost of opting out” (Marwick, 2011). That these costs can be very high is shown by the example of a twelve-year-old boy and a thirteen-year-old girl in the Austrian sample (Wijnen, 2013) who do not use Facebook because their parents forbid it. (Baker and White [2011] refer to this as one of the reasons for teens in Australia not using Facebook). Both children suffered because their school-mates were intensive Facebook users. Both were unable to participate in quick chat communications, missed out on invitations for leisure time activities and were unable to keep up to date with what their friends were doing and talking about (Wijnen, 2013). These results are confirmed by Madden, et al. (2013, p. 26), who suggest that although many teens have “widespread negative feelings about the interactions on Facebook”, they still feel the need to stay on the site so as not to “miss out” (ibid, p. 7). Hence, although there is some evidence of attrition we are currently witnessing “lagging resistance”, that is “a sense of wanting to quit but not doing so just yet” (Baumer, et al. 2013, p. 8) among young Facebook users in particular, the fear of being isolated and excluded from various social events is maintaining SNS use.

Privacy and Self-Disclosure Factors

In several studies, privacy concerns are cited as one of the aspects playing a role in non-users' decisions (Baumer, et al. 2013; Lampe, Vitak and Ellison, 2013; Madden, et al., 2013). Although the students in Tufecki's (2008) sample did not regard SNS as dangerous platforms, they were concerned about their privacy in general. Recent studies refer to the fact that many non-users are concerned about the need to share private information on a platform they consider to be public, regardless of the opportunity to use

privacy settings (Lampe, Vitak and Ellison 2013; Madden, et al., p. 2013). Furthermore, comparisons between Facebook non-users and frequent users reveal that non-users are less interested in sharing personal information (Ljepava, et al., 2013). For instance, some of the non-users in Baumer, et al.'s (2013, p. 3) sample (N = 410) stressed that they not only did "not want to be on display or live 'life in a global aquarium', but also cited their concerns about privacy violations in professional relationships e.g. with employers, and were concerned about the (mis)use of personal data by Facebook itself."

Young non-users of SNS in the US (Tufekci, 2008; Madden, et al., 2013) also did not like the idea of using SNS for self-presentation reasons; that is they often believed people were "only fishing for affirmation" (Tufekci, 2008, 559) by including the names of their favourite movies and bands on their profiles either to impress or match the expectations of their online peer group. Similar dislike of the importance of self-presentation on Facebook was expressed by young non-users in Australia (Baker and White, 2011).

Although the above demonstrates that non-users of SNS are generally against the idea of using SNS as a self-presentation tool, several scholars argue that, regardless of non-users being conscious of the fact or not, such "performances of resistance" (Portwood-Stacer, 2012, 9) can also be regarded as "an alternative form of self-expression" (Kalmus, et al., 2009a, p. 1269). Portwood-Stacer's (2012, p. 3) interviews with non-users of Facebook indicate that their decision not to use the site can often be interpreted as a "wish to demonstrate one's superiority to the abstract 'mainstream', or even one's superiority to the friends one leaves behind in the Facebook network." Similarly, analysis of open-ended responses from non-users of SNS Rate suggest that non-users often revel in their difference from the mainstream, for instance by stating that SNS such as Rate represent "mass hypnosis and idiot culture" (Kalmus, et al., 2009a, p. 1269). Because non-users appear to be consciously critical of SNS, and open about their stance, they can be described as engaging in 'conspicuous non-consumption', that is "they make their refuser status visible through performance of non-consumption which [is] also on display" (Portwood-Stacer, 2012, p. 7).

This alternative self-expression is exemplified by a seventeen-year-old boy in the Austrian sample who had a Facebook profile but rarely used it because he believed himself superior to his class mates and peer group whose members he considered 'mainstream'. He aspired to being like his idol, Albert Einstein, and used his Facebook profile only to position himself as an intellectual non-user who does not need SNS. He never communicated with others and only sometimes posted "something intellectual" as his status update, in order to show off. However, despite his protestations that he wanted to be regarded as a non-user, he secretly and carefully watched others' reactions to his postings (Wijnen, 2013).

Ideological and Outside Factors

In addition to the previously mentioned personal reasons for not adopting SNS, some non-users gave ideological reasons for their decision. These were usually connected to "dissatisfaction with Facebook's corporate practices, and more broadly, voice[d] an overall ideology tinged with anti-capitalist sentiment" (Portwood-Stacer, 2012, p. 7) and to positioning "themselves with respect to the discourse of technophobia, either admitting or denying that they were averse to new technology in general" (ibid., p. 13).

Alongside these value-related reasons, lack of regular computer access was identified as one of the factors contributing to non-use of SNS among college students in the US and in Saudi Arabia (Ajasir, Woodstock and Harrison, 2012). Economic reasons (47 per cent) were also mentioned by non-users (only 3 per cent in this sample) in Italy (ISFOL, 2011; see Trültzsch, Kouts-Klemm and Aroldi, 2014, pp. 201–202). In addition, lack of computer skills and knowledge about Facebook (Ajasir, Woodstock and Harrison, 2012), or lack of interest in the Internet and ICTs in particular, and lack of curiosity related to culture may have an impact on the decision not to adopt to SNS (ISFOL, 2011, p. 106).

CONCLUSION

In this chapter four of the most common approaches used to describe current social media usage have been discussed. However, are these theories applicable also to non-usage of SNS? Impression management-based theories that focus on personality items, such as the Big Five, have been shown not to be coherent in relation to SNS use (Weissensteiner and Leiner, 2011, p. 530). They suggest that extraverts behave in more extraverted ways online in personal networking and self-presentation. This might imply that introversion is a reason for not using SNS because introverts have no need for intensive communication—either online or offline. However, in light of the motives for and factors related to non-usage identified by the studies referred to in this chapter, this would seem to be a less than convincing explanation.

More promising seems the focus on social capital in the sense of Bourdieu (1979). Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe (2011, p. 5) and others argue that SNS can be used to build social capital. This is in line with recipient and relationship factors highlighted by many studies of SNS use. According to this research, young people use SNS mainly to connect, to reconnect and communicate with others, to stay in contact with geographically distant friends and family, to get settled into new environments (e.g. university), for education-related collaborations and so on. However, this does not explain why some people decide not to use SNS despite these advantages.

One factor in non-usage is the habitus of an individual whose other behaviour is also linked to media usage (Biermann, 2009; Bourdieu, 1979; Kommer, 2010). In this sense, an individual's values and behaviour provide a means of differentiation from others. This may explain why some young people do not need SNS either because these platforms do not fit with their individual media needs and preferences or because non-usage is part of an alternative form of differentiation from the mainstream. Silverstone's (2006) concept of the moral economy of the household is in line with this explanation. As the integration of technologies into everyday life follows the moral economy of the family, it also involves media education including regulations and restrictions on SNS use by young people.

The uses and gratifications approach (Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch, 1973) may also be useful to explain non-usage. The decision not to use SNS may be the result of weighing up gratifications such as entertainment and social needs, against potential risks such as privacy concerns or time constraints. For these reasons perhaps young people decide not to 'waste' their time on SNS and to use the Internet instead for homework or engaging in something they see as more valuable.

More research is needed to provide a more detailed insight into young people's decisions not to follow their peers onto SNS and to enable a better theoretical discussion of non-usage. There is no clear theoretical explanation, in part because of the focus in existing research on users, but also the implicit assumption that the level of competences and skills is connected to use and that non-use is related to an absence of these skills. This explanation builds on the earlier digital divide discussion. It seems clear that non-usage is not simply the result of lack of access or a lack of digital skills and poor media literacy. However, not using SNS should be seen as a well-thought-out decision based on rational choices and weighing the benefits and risks of disclosure of private information. With regard to communicative competence and media literacy, this choice can be considered as indicative of both because opting out and going against the peer group requires more justification, discussion and explanation than does using SNS according to group norms.

The literature review in this chapter shows that information on non-users is incidental to research on SNS usage. The small amount of data available is mostly the result of quantitative studies that do not investigate in depth reasons for and types of non-usage. We need more quantitative studies to identify a certain population of non-users and more qualitative research to enable an in-depth examination of the individual reasons for such behaviour. At the theoretical level, we need to consider and discuss the reasons for not using certain media—not just SNS but media in general (e.g. TV, newspapers) as well. This will involve questioning and retesting traditional theories from this new perspective because an active audience, central to modern audience research, means people who make active and conscious decisions about their usage as well as non-usage of media.

NOTES

1. The Big Five personality traits are dimensions to describe individuals personality, regarding *openness*, *conscientiousness*, *extraversion*, *agreeableness* and *neuroticism*. For a survey these are typically operationalised with questions such as "I am open to new experiences" (*openness*), "I am spontaneous" (*conscientiousness*) and so on. The Big Five address in detail *openness*: appreciation for new experiences, art and so on; *conscientiousness*: tendency to planned or spontaneous behaviour, self-discipline; *extraversion*: positive emotions, seeking the company of others or prefer to stay alone; *agreeableness*: being cooperative towards other or be suspicious and antagonistic; and *neuroticism*: the tendency to negative emotions like anger or stable and vulnerable.
2. The terms refer to Max Weber's typology of social action; *zweckrational* actions are goal oriented and more instrumental and *wertrational* are ones based on specific values.
3. These data refer to an online survey of social media usage (N = 2,492; age: 10–30 years) conducted in Austria during December 2011 and February 2012 (Trültzsch and Wijnen, 2012). The results were used as the basis for further analysis on privacy issues and the publication of photos on SNS (Trültzsch, 2012) and media literacy, SNS usage and its relation to the habitus of young people (Wijnen, 2012).

REFERENCES

- Agosto, D.E., Abbas, J. and Naughton, R., 2012: Relationships and social rules: teens' social network and other ICT selection practices. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 63(6), pp. 1108–1124.
- Aljasir Abdulrahman, S., Woodcock, A. and Harrison, S., 2012. Facebook non-users in Saudi Arabia: why do some Saudi college students not use Facebook? In: *International Conference on Management, Applied and Social Sciences*, Dubai, 24–25 March. Available at: <<http://psrcentre.org/images/extraimages/312713.pdf>>
- Allport, G.W. and Odbert, H.S., 1936. Trait-names: a psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs* 47(1), p. 211.
- Aroldi, P. and Vittadini, N., 2010. Transnational digital audiences? 'Moral economy of the households' and digital television. In: *Ecrea Conference 2010*, Hamburg, 12–15 October.
- Autenrieth, U.P., 2010: MySelf. MyFriends. MyLife. MyWorld: Fotoalben auf Social Network Sites und ihre kommunikativen Funktionen für Jugendliche und junge Erwachsene. In: K. Neumann-Braun and U. Autenrieth, eds. 2010. *Freundschaft und Gemeinschaft im Social Web. Bildbezogenes Handeln und Peergroup-Kommunikation auf Facebook und Co.* Baden-Baden: Nomos. pp. 123–161.
- Back, M.D., Stopfer, J.M., Vazire, S., Gaddis, S., Schmukle, S.C., Egloff, B. and Gosling, S.D., 2010. Facebook profiles reflect actual personality, not self-idealization. *Psychological Science* 21(3), pp. 372–374.
- Baker, R. and White K.M., 2011. In their own words: why teenagers don't use social networking sites. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking* 14(6), pp. 395–398.
- Barnes, S.B., 2006. A privacy paradox: social networking in the United States. *First Monday* [e-journal] 11(9). Available at: <<http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/1394>>.
- Baumer, E.P.S., Adams, P., Khovanskaya, V.D., Liao, T.C., Smith, M.E., Sosik, V.S. and Williams, K. 2013. Limiting, leaving, and (re)lapsing: an exploration

- of Facebook non-use practices and experiences. In: CHI '13, *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Paris, 27 April–2 May. pp. 3257–3266
- Baym, N., 2010. *Personal connections in the digital age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Biermann, R., 2009. *Der Mediale Habitus von Lehramtsstudierenden: Eine quantitative Studie zum Medienhandeln angehender Lehrpersonen*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.
- Bourdieu, P., 1979. *La distinction: critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Éds. de Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P., 1986. The forms of capital. In: J. E. Richardson, ed., 1986. *Handbook of social research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press. pp. 46–58.
- boyd, d., 2008. *Taken out of context: American teen sociality in networked publics*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California-Berkeley, School of Information.
- boyd, d., 2009. Friendship. In: M. Ito, S. Baumer, M. Bittanti, d. boyd, R. Cody, B. Herr-Stephenson, H. A. Horst, P. G. Lange, D. Mahendran, K. Z. Martínez, C. J. Pascoe, D. Perkel, L. Robinson, S. Sims and L. Tripp, eds. 2009. *Hanging out, messing around, and geeking out. Kids living and learning with new media*. Cambridge: MIT Press. pp. 79–115.
- boyd, d. and Ellison, N.B., 2007. Social network sites. Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13(1), pp. 210–230.
- boyd, d. and Marwick, A., 2011. Social privacy in networked publics. Teens' attitudes, practices, and strategies. In: Oxford Internet Institute and *Information, Communication and Society, A decade in internet time: Symposium on the dynamics of the internet and society*, Oxford Internet Institute, Oxford, UK, 22 September. Available at: <<http://www.danah.org/papers/2011/SocialPrivacy-PLSC-Draft.pdf>>.
- Correa, T., Hinsley, A. W. and de Zuniga, H.G., 2010. Who interacts on the web? The intersection of user's personality and social media use. *Computers in Human Behavior* 26(2), pp. 247–253.
- Corsaro, W., 1997. *The sociology of childhood*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Daugherty, T., Eastin, M. and Gangadharbatla, H., 2005. e-CRM: Understanding Internet confidence and implications for customer relationship management. In: I. Clark III and T. Flaherty, eds. 2005. *Advances in electronic marketing*. Harrisonburg: James Madison University, Idea Group Publishing, Inc. pp. 67–82.
- Davidson, J. and Martellozzo, E., 2012. Exploring young people's use of social networking sites and digital media in the Internet safety context: A comparison of the UK and Bahrain. *Information, Communication and Society* 16(9), pp. 1456–1476.
- Debatin, B., Lovejoy, J.P., Horn, A. and Hughes, B.N., 2009. Facebook and online privacy: Attitudes, behaviors, and unintended consequences. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 15, pp. 83–108.
- Dehne, M. and Schupp, J., 2007. *Persönlichkeitsmerkmale im Sozio-oekonomischen Panel (SOEP)—Konzept, Umsetzung und empirische Eigenschaften* [online]. DIW Research Notes 26. Berlin: DIW Berlin. Available at: <http://www.diw.de/documents/publikationen/73/diw_01.c.76533.de/rn26.pdf>.
- Donath, J. and boyd, d., 2004. Public displays of connection. *BT Technology Journal* 22(4), p. 71.
- Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C. and Lampe, C., 2007. The benefits of Facebook 'friends': exploring the relationship between college students' use of online social networks and social capital. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12, pp. 1143–1168.
- Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C. and Lampe, C., 2011. Communication practices, connection strategies: social capital implications of Facebook-enabled. *New Media & Society* 13(6), pp. 873–892.

- Gangadharbatla, H., 2008. Facebook me: collective self-esteem, need to belong, and internet self-efficacy as predictors of the iGeneration's attitudes toward social networking sites. *Journal of Interactive Advertising* 8(2), pp. 5–15.
- Gerlitz, J. and Schupp, J., 2005. Zur Erhebung der Big-Five basierten Persönlichkeitsmerkmale. In: *SOEP, DIW Research Notes 2005–4*. Berlin: DIW Berlin. pp. 36.
- Granovetter, M.S., 1982. The strength of weak ties: a network theory revisited. In: P. V. Marsden and N. Lin, eds. 1982. *Social structure and network analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 105–130.
- Hampton, K.N., 2011. Comparing bonding and bridging ties for democratic engagement. Everyday use of communication technologies within social networks for civic and civil behaviours. *Information, Communication & Society* 14(4), pp. 510–528.
- Hargittai, E., 2008. The role of expertise in navigating links of influence [online]. In: J. Turow and L. Tsui, eds. 2008. *The hyperlinked society*. Available at: <<http://www.eszter.com/research/hyperlinksociety.html>>
- Hernwall, P. and Siibak, A., 2011. Writing identity. Gendered values and user content creation in SNS interaction among Estonian and Swedish tweens. *Global Studies of Childhood*, 1(4), pp. 365–376.
- ISFOL. 2011. *Il divario digitale nel mondo giovanile. Il rapporto dei giovani italiani con le ICT*. Roma: ISFOL.
- Ito, M., Horst, H., Bittanti, M., boyd, d., Herr-Stephenson, B., Lange, P. G., Pascoe, C. J., Robinson, L., 2008. *Living and learning with new media: summary of findings from the digital youth project* [online]. Berkeley: University of Southern California and University of California, Berkeley. Available at: <<http://www.macfound.org>>
- Joinson, A. N., Houghton, D. J., Vasalou, A. and Marder, B. L., 2011. Digital crowding: privacy, self-disclosure and technology. In: S. Trepte and L. Reinecke, eds. 2011. *Privacy online: perspectives on privacy and self-disclosure in the social web*. Heidelberg: Springer. pp. 33–46.
- Joinson, N. A., 2008. 'Looking at', 'looking up' or 'keeping up with' people? Motives and uses of Facebook. In: CHI '08, *CHI 2008 Proceedings*, Florence, 5–10 April. ACM, New York. pp. 1027–1036.
- Kalmus, V., Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, P., Runnel, P. and Siibak, A., 2009a. Mapping the terrain of "Generation C": places and practices of online content creation among Estonian teenagers. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 14(4), pp. 1257–1282.
- Kalmus, V., Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, P., Runnel, P. and Siibak, A., 2009b. Online content creation. Practices of Estonian schoolchildren in comparative perspective. *Journal of Children and Media* 3(4), pp. 331–348.
- Kalmus, V., Runnel, P. and Siibak, A., 2009. Opportunities and benefits online. In: S. Livingstone and L. Haddon, eds. 2009. *Children online: opportunities and risks for children*. London: Policy Press. pp. 71–82.
- Kalmus, V., Siibak, A. and Blinka, L. (2014). The Internet and child well-being. In: A. Ben-Arieh, I. Frones, F. Casas and J.E. Korbin, eds. *Handbook of child well-being*. Delhi: Springer. pp. 2093–2133.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J.G. and Gurevitch, M., 1973. Uses and gratifications research. *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 37(4), pp. 509–523.
- Kommer, S., 2010. *Kompetenter Medienumgang? Eine qualitative Untersuchung zum medialen Habitus und zur Medienkompetenz von SchülerInnen und Lehramtsstudierenden*. Opladen: Budrich UniPress.
- Krämer, N. C. and Haferkamp, N., 2011. Online self-presentation: balancing privacy concerns and impression construction on SNS. In: S. Trepte and L. Reinecke, eds. 2011. *Privacy online: perspectives on privacy and self-disclosure in the social web*. New York and Heidelberg: Springer. pp. 127–142.

- Krämer, N.C. and Winter, S., 2008. Impression management 2.0: the relationship of self-esteem, extraversion, self-efficacy and self-presentation within social networking sites. *Journal of Media Psychology* 20(3), pp. 106–116.
- Lampe, C., Ellison, N. and Steinfield, C., 2007. A familiar Face(book): profile elements as signals in an online social network. In: CHI '07, *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, San Jose, CA, 28 April–3 May. ACM, New York. pp. 435–444.
- Lampe, C., Vitak, J. and Ellison, N., 2013. Users and nonusers: Interactions between levels of adoption and social capital. In: CSCW '13, *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on Computer supported cooperative work (CSCW '13)*, San Antonio, TX, 23–27 February. New York: ACM. pp. 809–820.
- Lenhart, A., Madden, M., Macgill, A.R. and Smith, A., 2007. *Teens and social media* [online]. PEW: Internet & American Life Project Report. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Available at: <http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Teens_Social_Media_Final.pdf>.
- Lenhart, M. and Madden, M., 2007. *Teens, privacy and online social networks. How teens manage their online identities and personal information in the age of MySpace* [online]. Pew Internet & American Life Project Report. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Available at: <http://www.pewinternet.org/~/media/Files/Reports/2009/PIP_Adult_social_networking_data_memo_FINAL.pdf>.
- Leung, L., 2009. User-generated content on the Internet: An examination of gratifications, civic engagement and psychological empowerment. *New Media & Society* 11(8), pp. 1327–1347.
- Lewis, K., Kaufman, J. and Christakis, N., 2008. The taste for privacy: an analysis of college student privacy settings in an online social network. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 14, pp. 79–100.
- Liu, H., 2007. Social network profiles as taste performances. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13(1), pp. 252–275.
- Livingstone, S., 2008. Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: teenagers' use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and self-expression. *New Media & Society* 10(3), pp. 393–411.
- Livingstone, S., 2009. *Children and the Internet*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A. and Ólafsson, K., 2011. *Risks and safety on the Internet. The perspective of European children: full findings* [online]. London: EU Kids Online, LSE. Available at: <<http://www.eukidsonline.net>>.
- Livingstone, S., Ólafsson, K. and Staksrud, E., 2011. *Social networking, age and privacy*. London: EU Kids Online Network.
- Ljepava, N., Orr, R.R., Locke S. and Ross, C., 2013. Personality and social characteristics of Facebook non-users and frequent users. *Computers in Human Behaviour* 29(4), pp. 1602–1607.
- Madden, M., Lenhart, A., Cortesi, S., Gasser, U., Duggan, M., Smith, A. and Beaton, M., 2013. *Teens, social media, and privacy. Full report* [online]. Pew Institute Center and the Berkman Center for internet & Society at Harvard University. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Available at: <http://www.pewinternet.org/~/media/Files/Reports/2013/PIP_TeensSocialMediaandPrivacy_FINAL.pdf>.
- Madge, C., Meek, J., Wellens, J. and Hooley, T., 2009. Facebook, social integration and informal learning at university: it is more for socialising and talking to friends about work than for actually doing work. *Learning, Media and Technology* 34(2), pp. 141–155.
- Marwick, A., 2011. 'If you don't like it, don't use it. It's that simple.' ORLY? [online]. Available at: <<http://socialmediacollective.org/2011/08/11/if-you-dont-like-it-dont-use-it-its-that-simple-orly/>>.
- McQuail, D., 2010. *McQuail's mass communication theory*. 6th ed. London: Sage.

- Pempek, P.A., Yermolayeva, Y.A. and Calvert S.L., 2009. College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 30(3), pp. 227–238.
- Peter, J., Valkenburg, P.M. and Fluckiger, C., 2009. Adolescents and social network sites: Identity, friendship and privacy. In: S. Livingstone and L. Haddon, eds. 2009. *Kids online: opportunities and risks for children*. Bristol: Policy Press. pp. 83–94.
- Portes, A., 1998. Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24(1), pp. 1–24.
- Portwood-Stacer, L., 2012. Media refusal and conspicuous non-consumption: the performative and political dimensions of Facebook abstention. *New Media & Society* 10(1), pp. 1041–1057.
- Pujazon-Zazik, M. and Park, J., 2010. To tweet or not to tweet: gender differences and potential positive and negative health outcomes of adolescents' social internet use. *American Journal of Men's Health* 4(1), pp. 77–85.
- Putnam, R.D., 1995. Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6(1), pp. 65–78.
- Putnam, R.D., 2000. *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rainie, L., Smith, A. and Duggan, M., 2013. *Coming and going on Facebook* [online]. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project. Available at: <http://www.pewinternet.org/~/media/Files/Reports/2013/PIP_Coming_and_going_on_facebook.pdf>.
- Rienties, B., Beausaert, S., Grohnert, T., Niemantsverdriet, S. and Kommers, P., 2012. Understanding academic performance of international students: the role of ethnicity, academic and social integration. *Higher Education* 63(6), pp. 685–700.
- Ryan, T. and Xenos, S., 2011. Who uses Facebook? An investigation into the relationship between the Big Five shyness, narcissism, loneliness, and Facebook usage. *Computers in Human Behavior* 27(5), pp. 1658–1664.
- Schmidt, J., Paus-Hasebrink, I. and Hasebrink, U., 2011. *Heranwachsen mit dem Social Web: Zur Rolle von Web 2.0—Angeboten im Alltag von Jugendlichen und jungen Erwachsenen*. Münster: Vistas.
- Süibak, A., 2009. *Self-presentation of the 'digital generation' in Estonia*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Süibak, A., 2011. Online peer culture and interpretive reproduction on the social networking site profiles of the tweens. In: F. Colombo and L. Fortunati, eds. 2011. *Broadband society and generational changes*. Berlin: Peter Lang, pp. 121–132.
- Süibak, A. and Tamme, V., 2013. Who introduced granny to Facebook?: an exploration of everyday family interaction in web-based communication environments. *Northern Lights* 11, pp. 71–89.
- Silverstone, R., 2006. Domesticating domestication: reflections on the life of a concept. In: T. Berker, M. Hartmann and Y.W. Punje, eds. 2006. *Domestication of media and technologies*. Maidenhead: Open University Press. pp. 229–248.
- Silverstone, R. and Haddon, L., 1996. *Television, cable and AB households. A report for Telewest*. Falmer: Sussex University.
- Silverstone, R., Hirsch, E. and Morley, D., 1992. Information and communication technologies and the moral economy of the household. In: R. Silverstone and E. Hirsch, eds. 1992. *Consuming technologies: media and information in domestic spaces*. London: Routledge. pp. 15–31.
- Subrahmanyam, K., Reich, S.M., Waechter, N. and Espinoza, G., 2008. Online and offline social networks: use of social networking sites by emerging adults. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 29, pp. 420–433.
- Thaddicken, M. and Jers, C., 2011. The uses of privacy online: trading a loss of privacy for social web gratifications? In: L. Reinecke and S. Trepte, eds., 2011.

- Privacy online: perspectives on privacy and self-disclosure in the social web.* Heidelberg: Springer. pp. 143–156.
- Tidwell-Collins, L. and Walther, J. B., 2002. Computer-mediated communication effects on disclosure, impressions, and interpersonal evaluations: getting to know one another a bit at a time. *Human Communication Research* 28(3), pp. 317–348.
- Trültzsch, S., 2012. *Privacy, photographs and SNS.* Unpublished research paper.
- Trültzsch, S., Kōuts-Klemm, R. and Aroldi, P., 2014. Digital divide in transformation: From first to second level digital divide: missing links and perspectives to overcome them. In: N. Carpentier, K. C. Schröder and L. Hallett, eds. 2014. *Audience Transformations.* New York: Routledge. pp. 191–209.
- Trültzsch, S. and Wijnen, C. W., 2012. *Social web use of children, youth and young adults in Austria.* Unpublished research.
- Tufecki, Z., 2008. Can you see me now? Audience and disclosure regulation in online social network sites. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society* 28, pp. 20–35.
- Utz, S. and Krämer, N. C., 2009. The privacy paradox on social network sites revisited: the role of individual characteristics and group norms. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace* [e-journal], 3(2). Available at: <<http://www.cyberpsychology.eu/view.php?cisloclanku=2009111001&article=2>>.
- Vitak, J. and Ellison, N. B., 2012. ‘There is a network out there you might as well tap’: exploring the benefits of and barriers to exchanging informational support-based resources on Facebook. *New Media & Society* 15, pp. 243–259.
- Weissensteiner, E. and Leiner, D., 2011. Facebook in der Wissenschaft: Forschung zu sozialen Onlinenetzwerken. *Medien- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* 59(4), pp. 526–544.
- Wijnen, C. W., 2012. Media literacy, participation and citizenship in the social web. In: ECREA, *ECC 2012*, Istanbul, 24–27 October.
- Wijnen, C. W., 2013. *SNS use, media literacy and the habitus of young people.* Unpublished research paper.
- 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), pp. 346–356.

11 Audiences as Socio-Technical Actors The ‘Styles’ of Social Network Site Users

Piermarco Aroldi and Nicoletta Vittadini

INTRODUCTION

During recent decades a number of different studies have highlighted the characteristics of contemporary audiences. People act as audiences in their everyday life through both traditional media consumption (i.e. watching television) and by producing, commenting, sharing and using media content in their communication activities. Moreover, the inhabitants of the connected socio-technical environment provided by social media act as a networked audience, group and public (Livingstone, 2005; Varnelis, 2008).

In this chapter we discuss the need to broach the subject of the differentiation of digital audiences and especially of users of social networking sites (SNS) as a consequence of their agency. The relevance of this topic lies in our attempt to distance ourselves from two divergent kinds of reductionism: on one hand, the design of interfaces and affordances of SNS platforms are seen as instrumental guides that lead users to act in a—more or less—predictable manner, whereas on the other, the users’ social position (age, gender, class, education, ethnicity and so on) is interpreted as the key factor in the production of their online behaviour. In this chapter we try to avoid this kind of polarisation by introducing the concept of ‘style’ as a form of personal agency that mediates between the constraints of technological affordances and the structure of opportunity in which the actor is rooted and which in turn directs and restricts his/her action. The validity of the concept of style is also discussed in terms of the results of a qualitative research project titled ‘Online Social Relations and Identity: Italian Experience in Social Network Sites’,¹ which was carried out in Italy in 2012 and 2013.

The constantly changing, fast-paced evolution of the digital environment suggests that we need to understand the (new) ways in which agency is implicated in both face-to-face and mediated relations, and to what extent the users’ identity is intertwined with their both offline and online performances, against the (new) possibility to act in—and be controlled by—social networks. Indeed, this may not appear to be a dramatic innovation in terms

at the University of Georgia, US. Dr. Nimrod studies psychological and sociological aspects of leisure and media use among populations with special needs such as older adults and people with disabilities. Within this area, she focuses on several subjects, including leisure and later life transitions (such as retirement, widowhood and health decline), innovation in leisure and new media as leisure activity and their functions for individuals and various social groups.

Brian O'Neill is Head of the School of Media at Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland. His research interests include media literacy research, policymaking and public interest issues in media and communications. He has written widely on media technologies and media literacy for academic journals as well as for organisations such as UNICEF and the Broadcasting Commission of Ireland. He is a member of the Management Committee of COST Action IS0906 ("Transforming Audiences, Transforming Societies") and is Chair of the Audience Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research (IAMCR). Brian O'Neill is also a member of the Management Group of EU Kids Online and leads the work package on "Policy and Recommendations".

Cristina Ponte, Ph.D. and Habilitation on Media and Journalism Studies, Associate Professor at the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences (FCSH) / NOVA, New University of Lisbon, Portugal. Her research examines media, journalism and society; children, youth and media; media and generations, with a focus on the family; digital inclusion. Coordinating the Portuguese team in the EU Kids Online Project since 2006, she has a wide experience on leading international and large teams of researchers, including the Working Group on Social Integration in the COST Action "Transforming Audiences, Transforming Societies" (2010–2014), and the funded projects "Digital Inclusion and Participation" (2009–2011), and "Children and Young People in the News" (2005–2007). The author of ten books and several articles in Portuguese and English, and a former vice-chair of the Audience and Reception Section of ECREA (2008–2012), she is currently vice-chair of the European Communication Research and Education Association Temporary Working Group on Children, Youth and Media.

Seija Ridell works as a professor in the School of Communication, Media and Theatre at the University of Tampere, Finland. Her areas of expertise include news narratology, social semiotic theory of genre, cultural audience research, web studies and theories of publicness. Ridell's most recent research revolves around medium theory and technology-mediated modes of (inter)action in diverse public and semi-public spatial contexts.

Kim Christian Schröder is Professor of Communication at the Department of Communication, Business and Information Technologies at Roskilde

University, Denmark. His co-authored and co-edited books in English include *Audience Transformations: Shifting Audience Positions in Late Modernity* (2014), *Museum Communication and Social Media: The Connected Museum* (2013), *Digital Content Creation* (2010), *Researching Audiences* (2003), *Media Cultures* (1992) and *The Language of Advertising* (1985). His interests comprise the theoretical, methodological and analytical aspects of audience uses and experiences of media in everyday life, with particular reference to the challenges of methodological pluralism. His recent work explores different methods for mapping news consumption.

Andra Siibak, Ph.D., is Senior Research Fellow of Media Studies at the Institute of Social Sciences at the University of Tartu, Estonia. Her present research interests include young people's social media use, people's perceptions conceptualisations of privacy in networked publics and inter-generational relations in new media. She is principal investigator of the research project "Conceptualisations and Experiences with Public and Private in Technologically Saturated Society" financed by the Estonian Research Council and engaged in the project "Generations and Inter-generational Relations in the Emerging Information Society". In COST IS0906 "Transforming Audiences, Transforming Societies", she is a task force leader within working group three and co-leader of the cross-working group initiative "Generations and Media".

Christine W. Trültzsch-Wijnen is Professor for Media Education and E-learning at the University of Education Salzburg, Austria. She studied media and communication as well as music and holds a Ph.D. in communication from the University of Salzburg. From 2010 to 2014 she was post-doctoral research assistant at the Department of Education at the University of Vienna. Her work focuses on audience research, young people and the internet, media socialisation, media literacy, international comparisons of media education as well as methods and methodologies of qualitative research. She is member of the advisory board of Saferin-ternet.at, chair of the section media education of the Austrian Association of Research and Development in Education, vice chair of the section media education of the German Association of Journalism and Communication Research and Austrian Country Representative of the Young Scholars Network of European Communication Research and Education Association.

Sascha Trültzsch-Wijnen received his Magister Artium (Master of Arts) in Sociology and Media and Communication Studies after studying at Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany. As a research assistant, from 2004 to 2007, he worked in the Project Programme of East-German Television—The Family Series founded by the German Research Foundation and completed his doctoral thesis: "Contextualised Media Analysis—A Discourse-analytical Method Sensitive to Ideological Components in