

# **Online friendships:**

What do adolescents feel, think, prefer and expect?

**Student Name: Annabel Draaijers**

**Student Number: 345470**

**Supervisor: Prof. Dr. J. Jansz**

**Second reader: Dr. E. Menchen-Trevino**

**Media, Culture & Society**

**Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication**

**Erasmus University Rotterdam**

**Master Thesis**

***June 20 2014***

## **Abstract**

The main purpose of this research was to establish what Dutch adolescents feel, think, prefer and expect when it concerns online communication in their friendships. In addition, this research wanted to determine factors that pattern these feelings, thoughts, preferences and expectations. A mixed method was used to provide not only significant details about the use and the evaluation of online communication by adolescents, but also to provide more insights on and anecdotes about what goes on in the minds of the adolescents when it concerns online communication. Seven adolescents were interviewed and 164 adolescents were surveyed. We found that on a daily basis most adolescents use Instant Messaging programs and social network sites very frequently. Most adolescents still prefer offline communication in comparison to online communication in their friendships, however; they do see advantages in online communication. Besides that, we found that a large part of the adolescents have certain online expectations of their friends. Finally, we found several gender and age differences in the use, the evaluation, the experience and expectations concerning online communication. The degree in activeness on social network sites and Instant Messaging programs was an influencing factor as well.

Key words: Online communication, Social network sites, Instant Messaging Programs, Adolescents, Friendship, Evaluation of online communication, Online friendship expectations, Gender and age differences

## **Acknowledgements**

Thank you, my sweet family. During the process of writing this thesis, you were 'mijn steun en toeverlaat', as we say it in Dutch.

Thank you, to all the people and especially Paul Kolbrink, who helped me with collecting the respondents.

However, above all, thank you Prof. Dr. Jansz for all your help, guidance, honesty enthusiasm and encouragement.

## Content

1. Introduction	p. 6
1.1. Opening	p. 6
1.2. Introducing the topic	p. 6
1.3. Research question and sub questions	p. 8
1.4. Outline	p. 9
2. Theoretical framework	p. 10
2.1. Adolescence & friendship	p. 10
2.2. The importance of friendship during adolescence	p. 12
2.3. Online communication & offline communication	p. 14
2.4. The domestication of online communication	p. 16
2.5. Social network sites & Instant Messaging programs	p. 17
2.6. The use of online communication	p. 18
2.7. Motivations for online communication	p. 19
2.8. Age, gender & the use of online communication	p. 21
2.9. Consequences of using online communication	p. 24
3. Research design	p. 27
3.1. Methodologies	p. 27
3.2. Interviews	p. 27
3.2.1. Data collection	p. 28
3.2.2. Interview goals	p. 28
3.2.3. Data analysis	p. 29
3.2.4. Validity and reliability	p. 29
3.3. Surveys	p. 30
3.3.1. Data collection	p. 30
3.3.2. Operationalisation	p. 30
3.3.3. Data analysis	p. 31
3.3.4. Validity and reliability	p. 32
4. Results	p. 33
4.1. Interviews	p. 33
4.1.1. The use of online communication	p. 33
4.1.2. The evaluation of online communication	p. 36
4.1.3. The effects of online communication	p. 38

4.1.4. The expectations on online communication	p. 40
4.2. Survey results	p. 43
4.2.1. The use of online communication	p. 43
4.2.2. The evaluation of online communication	p. 46
4.2.3. The effects of online communication	p. 50
4.2.4. The expectations on online communication	p. 56
5. Conclusion and discussion	p. 63
6. Literature	p. 69
7. Appendixes	p. 74
7.1. Overview respondents	p. 74
7.2. Topic list for semi-structured interviews	p. 75
7.3. Important quotes interviews	p. 77
7.4. Questionnaire	p. 92

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Opening

In the western world of today, there is a noticeable increase in people using social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. Main purposes of these sites and programs are 'bonding' or 'bridging' (Baym, 2010). Bridging refers to supporting relationships with 'weak ties' and with this, creating and maintaining a larger network (Ellison, Steinfeld & Lampe, 2007). One can speak of bonding when it concerns contact "between individuals in tightly-knit, emotionally close relationships, such as family and close friends" (Ellison et al., 2007, p. 1147). When using and examining these communication tools, friendship is a very important aspect. This notion also applies to this research, but also to my own use of these tools in my daily social life.

When I look around me, I see people who cannot imagine a world without their online and often mobile communication tools. They are continuously checking their Facebook, probably fearing they might miss something. Przybylski et al. (2013) call this phenomenon 'the fear of missing out', popularly referred to as FoMO. "FoMO is characterized by the desire to stay continually connected with what others are doing" (Przybylski et al., 2013, p. 1841). Nowadays, more and more people have the need to stay connected and updated when they are absent from each other (Przybylski et al., 2013). I still remember the days when I just occasionally send a friend a short SMS to meet up somewhere. Those days, however, are now the old days, almost completely part of the past.

Personally, I do not value social network sites as much as some other people do and because of this, I do not feel pressure to stay online. However, this does make me wonder if those people who are continuously checking their social network sites do feel pressure. In addition, I wonder how these people experience and evaluate these new communication tools and what they expect of it and what they expect of their friends online. Perhaps, people considered me as a bad friend if I had been from an even younger generation, because I am not that active online. In this research, I want to examine how online active adolescents experience and evaluate the online possibilities the Internet offers.

### 1.2. Introducing the topic

With the rise of the Internet, many new ways of interacting were developed. With the Internet limits of time and space can be crossed (Croteau, Hoynes & Milan, 2012). Physical distance is no longer of importance, when one communicates with others online. In particular, because of this, online communication is getting more and more important. One can argue that the Internet and its tools for interacting are becoming 'domesticated' (Baym, 2010). Domestication theory focuses on a particular technology becoming more and more ordinary.

Something that was once new and exiting gets normalized and is integrated in daily life (Silverstone, 1993). This has happened with the online communication tools as well, especially in most western countries. One has to take into account that some people are 'media rich' and others 'media poor' (Haddon, 2006, p. 198). This phenomenon is also known as the 'digital divide'. It highlights that not every individual has equal access to the Internet, which may result in social exclusion for some (Schulz, 2004).

In most western countries, online access is proliferated widely and available to most citizens. This online access includes access to the many online communication tools. The Internet offers a large online space where people can interact and work on their existing or new relationships. One example of this is the social network site Facebook where one can interact with others by sharing, chatting, posting, tagging, adding, poking, reacting and liking (Facebook, 2013). They are all online ways of interacting with friends, family and acquaintances. Baym (2010) calls these "new forms of personal connection" (p.1).

As social network sites and Instant Messaging programs enable new ways of interacting, they simultaneously offer new ways of showing affection. However, the online ways of interacting and showing affection still differ greatly from the traditional face-to-face interaction. Rice (1993) argues that there are three main characteristics in which face-to-face and online communication may differ. The first relates to crossing limits of time and space; the second evolves around the transmission of social, symbolic, and nonverbal cues; and the last the ability to convey unclear communication (Rice, 1993). There is a lot of discussion about these differences and if online communication is a positive or a negative development (Baym, 2010; Rice & Love, 1987; Walther, 1996). Nevertheless, people are using the online communication tools increasingly.

Especially among the younger generations who grew up with them, the online communication platforms have gained ground in maintaining relationships. Bighelaar and Akkermans (2013) stated that 93% of the Dutch adolescents between the age of twelve and eighteen used social media, including social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. As such, it should come as no surprise to learn that communicating with friends is one of the most commonly performed activities by the adolescents when they use the Internet (Duimel & de Haan, 2007). For these young adults, the Internet and its communication tools are becoming very normal to use in their daily social life (Selfhout, 2009). Selfhout (2009) states that the Internet and its new ways of communicating are becoming more and more important in offline friendships of adolescents.

An interesting development one should consider, when focusing on the role of online communication in friendships, is that with the development and the domestication of these technologies one can be reached anytime and anywhere (Baym, 2010). One can wonder if a person should be reachable every minute. What is expected? Being in friendship is

associated with expectations of how the other person in the relationship should behave (Reisman and Shorr, 1978). Perhaps, there are also online expectations. One can wonder what kind of impact online communication has on relationships, in particular on the relationships of young adults who grew up with these technologies.

Many questions come to mind that are not answered yet. One can wonder how adolescents experience these online technologies in their friendships, if they feel pressure to stay online and if they feel their friendships benefit from these online possibilities. These questions are scientifically and socially relevant, because as mentioned, online communication is increasingly of importance in friendships, especially in friendships of the younger generations. Subsequently, during the time adulthood is emerging maintaining friendships is crucial for children (Manago, Taylor & Greenfield, 2012). Friendships during this period are a source of support; “an increase in social support over the course of emerging adulthood show increases in psychological wellbeing, whereas low perceived social support among college students is related to depression and loneliness” (Manago et al., 2012, p. 2). The adolescents use the online communication tools primarily for maintaining their existing social relationships (Valkenburg & Peter, 2009). This demonstrates that one should further explore the combination of online communication, including social network sites and Instant Messaging programs, and friendships between adolescents.

In this thesis, the focus is on how young adults evaluate online possibilities in their offline friendships and on how they think about it. I chose a mixed method, including interviews and a survey, to learn more about the adolescents’ opinion on online communication. The interviews offered more details about the feelings and opinions of the adolescents. It contributed as well to the design of the quantitative study. With the second quantitative method, I could capture the views of a larger amount of adolescents. How adolescents evaluate online communication, specifically and more generally, is the core of this thesis.

### 1.3. Research question and sub questions

The aforementioned considerations regarding the possible importance of online communication for adolescent friendships have resulted in a set of questions guiding this research. This research examined the use of online communication tools by young adults with the following research question: How do Dutch adolescents evaluate online friendships in comparison to offline friendships?

In order to give an accurate and broad answer to the research question the following sub-questions were formed:

- In what ways do Dutch adolescents use social network sites and Instant Messaging programs?



- How do Dutch adolescents evaluate the rise of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs?

There is a lot written about possible positive and negative effects of online communication on adolescents and their social life (Baym, 2010; Bargh & McKenna, 2004; Kraut et al., 1989; Steinfield et al., 2008; Valkenburg & Peter, 2007; 2009). However, not much is written about how the adolescents experience these themselves. This research aims at giving a more detailed overview of how adolescents evaluate online communication. Therefore, this research also focuses on how the adolescents evaluate possible consequences of using online communication with the following sub questions:

- To what extent do the Dutch adolescents feel a need to interact and to stay online?
- To what extent do Dutch adolescents believe that their offline friendships benefit from their online friendships?

Friendship expectations accompany friendships; this also applies to online friendships. The online expectations of adolescents were examined based on the following sub question:

- What kind of online behavior do Dutch adolescents expect from a 'good' friend?

Lastly, previous research has demonstrated that gender and age have effect not only on the ways adolescents behave in their friendships, but also on their online behavior (Adams et al., 2000; Grubbs & Milne, 2010; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008). This emphasizes why these factors should be taken into account also when it concerns the evaluation of online communication in their friendships:

- To what extent does this evaluation differ by gender?
- To what extent does this evaluation differ by age?

#### 1.4. Outline

To answer the sub questions and therefore the research question, firstly a theoretical framework was established. Chapter two presents the theoretical framework based on theory and previous research that focuses on several relevant topics, including adolescence, the importance of friendship during adolescence, online communication and specifically, social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. Besides this, it focuses on the adolescents' use of online communication, their motivations for using, gender and age as influencing factors and lastly, possible consequences of the use of online communication. Chapter 3 addresses the research design, including the preparation for the interviews and surveys, by focusing on the methodologies, the research sample, the data collections and the data analyses. Then the results of the presented research will be discussed in chapter 4. This thesis will end with a conclusion in chapter five.

## 2. Theoretical framework

This framework firstly focuses on the importance of friendships between adolescents in general. Subsequently, it focuses on online versus offline friendship. Thirdly, the theoretical framework will explain how social network sites and Instant Messaging programs are becoming more important. Thereafter, I will discuss online communication in general and their characteristics, which could influence the evaluation by adolescents. After this, a discussion of studies that looked into the ways adolescents use social network sites, will follow. In the next section, I will discuss if and to what extent the use and in this way the evaluation is determined by age and gender. In the final section, I will discuss possible consequences of using online communication that may affect the evaluation of the social network sites by adolescents as well.

### 2.1. Adolescence & friendship

In the age period of adolescence, children become adults (Dolgin, 2011). One can consider adolescence as the bridge between childhood and adulthood. The exact ages that define the beginning and the end of adolescence are not agreed upon universally (Dolgin, 2011). Several people believe that adolescence is beginning when children are “hitting puberty” and is over when physical maturity is reached (Dolgin, 2011, p. 4). However, this process varies widely among adolescents. Others believe that adolescence ends when adolescents receive a full legal status, including the right to vote, drink/buy alcohol, etcetera (Dolgin, 2011). Only, the age when adolescents receive a full legal status differs greatly among countries and even within countries.

Dolgin (2011) defines and distinguishes early, middle and late adolescence. Early adolescence includes adolescents between the age of eleven and fourteen, middle adolescence refers to the age between fifteen and seventeen, and late adolescence refers to adolescents with the age between eighteen and twenty (Dolgin, 2011). During the early, middle, and late adolescence, children undergo several physical, sexual, and physiological changes (Dolgin, 2011). In these different periods, adolescents are exploring their own identities, personalities and preferences (Selfhout, 2009). Throughout this process of exploring their personal identities, friendship with peers is of great importance for adolescents in the process of exploring their personal identity (Selfhout, 2009). Dolgin (2011) explains that searching for your own identity includes “the adolescent’s search for goals, self-understanding and sense of unity” (p. 49).

The development of friendship and other social relations is one of the challenges adolescents face. Although, friendship is a common sense concept, it is not easy to define. Based on what children and adolescents say themselves, what parents and teachers report,

and what trained observers stated Bukowski, Newcomp and Hartup (1996) framed the concept of friendship. They claim that there need to be three conditions in a relationship between children or adolescents before one can call it a friendship, including reciprocities, liking, and affection. Reciprocities refer to having mutual regard and deriving benefits from the interaction with the other person (Bukowski et al., 1996). Liking can be considered as the desire to spend time with the other person in the relationship. Affection includes having fun with the other person, according to Bukowski et al. (1996).

Having a personal friendship is also associated with certain expectations of how the other person in the relationship should behave. Reisman and Shorr (1978) explain that friendship expectations change with age. At the beginning of their adolescence, children expect their friends to be amusing for example; a source of entertainment. However, this becomes less important as they mature (Reisman & Shorr, 1978). In addition to age, gender characterizes friendship expectations as well. Claes (1992, p. 39) states “girls expect more from their friends than boys and their level of attachment and intimacy with friends is greater”. Zabatany, Ghesquiere and Mohr (1993) state that friendship expectations can not be disconnected from the context. For instance, when it concerns an academic context, adolescents expect their friend to help them; they expect their friends to help them with homework. Zabatany et al. (1993) claim that when it concerns sports or games, adolescents expect their friends to offer ego reinforcement and to have preferential treatments. Lastly, when it concerns a noncompetitive context, relationship-enhancing expectations are applicable, including common interest and accepting one another.

Adolescence is also the time in our lives when children encounter our first romantic relationships. Both friendship and romantic relationships are important for the development of the adolescent (Dolgin, 2011). It is important to distinguish platonic friendships from romantic relationships. Connolly, Craig, Goldberg and Pepler (1999) examined how teens characterize both friendships and romantic relationships. While the authors found that both types of relationships are both characterized by intimacy, they differ in many other respects (Connolly et al., 1999). Intimacy refers to trust, self-disclosure and support. The study by Connolly et al. (1999) indicated that adolescents value affiliation in the other when it concerned friendships, while they put more emphasis on passion and commitment in romantic relationships. Passion referred to loving someone, being physically attracted to someone and having sex. Affiliation concerned liking the other in the relationship, thinking the other is a nice person, and being in a companionship. Commitment referred to being exclusively with someone for a longer period of time (Connolly et al., 1999). Friendships and romantic relationships are different and both quite complex, because of this the choice is made to focus on one type of relationship in this research.

For adolescents, friends are of great support or at least are expected to be of great

support. Either way, friendship is of great importance at this age. During adolescence individuals are exploring their own identities and personalities and in this period “increasingly more time is spent with friends and friendships are thought to have important functions in adolescent development” (Selfhout, 2009). This will be explained more extensively in the next section.

## 2.2. The importance of friendship during adolescence

Having friends during the adolescence period has a great impact on the psychological development of individuals (Berndt, 1982). For instance, it can contribute to the development of social skills and the social behavior of adolescents. Besides this, in the adolescence period, peers are commonly the primary and most favorite partners in interacting (Berndt, 1982). Moreover, Manago, Taylor and Greenfield (2012) highlight the importance of learning how to maintain close relationships during the age period of adolescence. They state “friendships grow as a source of companionship and support for self-esteem and as a source of instrumental support (tangible aid) in complement to familial social support” (Manago et al., 2012, p. 2). The authors also discuss the positive effects of having friends during this specific period; it increases the mental wellbeing of adolescents. In contrast, having no friends relates to depression and loneliness (Manago et al., 2012).

Delfos (2013) goes into detail about the different phases adolescents go through when growing up, in particular with respect to the role of friends. She emphasizes that during early adolescence, when children are between eleven and fourteen, having many friends and gaining popularity are very important aspects of the daily teen life. Similarly, Boneva, Quinn, Kraut, Kiesler and Shklovski (2006) also highlight the need of young adolescents for popularity and a larger amount of friends. The friendships in this age period are intense and sometimes even turbulent, which is why the friendships of early adolescents are unstable (Dolgin, 2011). At this age children still make, break, and restore friendships very easily (Delfos, 2013). This can be explained by the fact that in early adolescence individuals are often more egocentric and have more often unrealistic expectations of their friends especially concerning the support these friends should give (Dolgin, 2011). In their early teens, children are defining who they are and are trying to find their place in the world; it is a period that can be very insecure for adolescents. However, communication with peers can help adolescents to deal with their insecurities (Boneva et al., 2006).

At the age between thirteen and fifteen adolescents focus on gaining more independence, but peers still largely form the social environment of the adolescents (Delfos, 2013). Dolgin (2011) explains that especially girls in their mid-adolescence experience stress and concerns about their friends' loyalty. Yet, as teens grow older, they also get less egocentric and improve their management of their relationships (Dolgin, 2011). In the age-

period of sixteen and eighteen, there is an increase in intellectual capabilities of children and because of this, the relationships of older adolescents get more stable (Delfos, 2013; Dolgin, 2011). Nevertheless, they are still exploring their own identity (Delfos, 2013). Boneva et al. (2006, p. 614) explain that “communication with peers is a complementary process to private reflection for the adolescent; the social and the personal processes support one another in adolescent’s making sense of life experience and constructing viable relationships between self and society”.

Boneva et al. (2006) emphasize that one should make a division within the relationships adolescents have with their friends and with this, a division in what friendship can offer adolescents. This division relates to two types of communication namely communication in individual friendships and communication in peer groups. Boneva et al. (2006, p. 616) define these as “one-to-one” and “one-to-many” communication. For example, peer groups offer adolescents the feeling of belonging somewhere and this is important for their social identity formation (Boneva et al., 2006). Being a part of a clique or a crowd helps youngsters with developing their capability of social adjustment. Boneva et al. (2006) explain that “adolescent cliques have a clear central core and peripheral members, and acceptance rules are quite rigid, while crowds have more loose structure and function as reference groups for adolescents” (p. 618). ‘Hanging out’ with the group is the most important aspect of this type of friendship (Boneva et al., 2006).

Individual friendships offer adolescents the possibility to compare their own feelings and behaviors with others who are similar. This is of great importance for what Boneva et al. (2006) define as ‘self-identity formation’, which amounts to exploring their own personality and preferences. It offers them verification of their own feelings and behaviors (Boneva et al., 2006). As such, individual friendships provide adolescents emotional support, such as discussing problems the adolescents encounter, receiving, and giving advice about these problems, but also sharing interests. Therefore, it is not only about spending time together and sharing those interests, but also the opportunity to self-disclose (Boneva et al., 2006)

Other researchers also define self-disclosure as a key process in a friendship between two adolescents (Adams, Blieszner & de Vries, 2000; Berndt, 1983; Manago et al., 2012; Valkenburg & Peter, 2009; Valkenburg, Schouten & Peter, 2005). The sharing of personal thoughts, feelings and information is very important, because “intimate conversations with friends can contribute to adolescents’ self-esteem or, (...), to the validation of self-worth by showing adolescents that another person respects their ideas and wants their advice” (Berndt, 1982, p. 1450). Moreover, self-disclosure in friendships can offer adolescents the feelings of security and it is good for the development of their social skills (Berndt, 1982). Manago et al. (2012) highlight that before sharing intimate information there needs to be high level of trust and confidentiality in a relationship.

Not only Valkenburg and Peter (2010), but also Delfos (2013) and Boneva et al. (2006) emphasize how the communication possibilities on the Internet, including social network sites and Instant Messaging programs, can have a contributing role in the friendships of youngsters. Similarly, Valkenburg, Schouten & Peter (2005) suggest that the ability of adolescents to self-disclose on the Internet can become very important for friendship formation. The online communication tools are increasingly becoming more important in the social life of adolescents (Selfhout, 2009) and because of this it is interesting to examine how the adolescents evaluate these tools in their social life themselves.

### 2.3. Online communication & offline communication

Communication is a very important aspect of friendship and today one can communicate with friends in varying ways, offline and online. This section will explain more about online communication by focusing on several differences between online and offline communication. Since, the central topic in this thesis is how adolescents use and evaluate online communication in their friendship compared to offline communication.

Rice (1993) proposes to compare online and offline communication based on two concepts, namely social presence and media richness. Social presence relates to the extent a type of communication can convey “the presence of the communicating participants”, this does not only concern conveying the words of the participants, but also the nonverbal and verbal cues (Rice, 1993, p. 452). Media richness is the extent a type of communication can bridge different frames or references, can reduce ambiguities, or can offer the opportunity to learn while communicating. Rice (1993) defines three characteristics in which face-to-face and online communication may differ in; “the extent to which they a) can overcome various communication constraints of time, location, permanence, distribution, and distance; b) transmit the social, symbolic, and nonverbal cues of human communication; and c) convey equivocal information (p.452)”.

Social network sites and Instant Messaging programs have certain characteristics that make them different from face-to-face communication for instance, but also make them an attractive communication tool for youngsters to use. Ishii (2006) discusses one of those characteristics related to the first defined characteristic of Rice (1993); namely, mobility. Ishii (2006) explains that there are three dimensions in the concept of mobility, including, spatial, temporal, and contextual mobility, which make the online communication tools attractive to use (Ishii, 2006). Spatial mobility highlights the possibility to travel with the mobile communication tools. Temporal mobility highlights the possibilities to save time and to speed up the communication. Lastly, the contextual mobility focuses on the social contexts, like youngsters reframing their interactions with their peers in the presence of family members (Ishii, 2006). The family context is a very important area to focus on when studying

adolescents. Often, adolescents use the mobile devices to maintain their social networks outside of parental surveillance, as it offers adolescents more spatial, temporal and contextual freedom (Ishii, 2006).

Boneva et al. (2006) highlight other possibilities the Internet, and specifically instant messaging (IM), offer to adolescents that relate to Ishii's (2006) concepts spatial, temporal and contextual freedom. Because every time adolescents need a friend to talk to they can find them online, there are no big time- and space limits. Boneva et al. (2006, p. 653) explain: "IM connects adolescents to peers and extends their opportunities to communicate". Delfos (2013) highlights that social network sites "meet the need of children to become popular and make friends" (Delfos, 2013, p. 118). With social network sites adolescents can add easily hundreds of friends (Delfos, 2013) and can also easily communicate with multiple friends at the same time (Boneva et al., 2006). It can contribute both to the individual friendships of adolescents, but also to the need for belonging to groups (Boneva et al., 2006). On social network sites they are part of the crowd and with Instant Messaging programs, including Whatsapp, adolescents can create online cliques.

Online communication tools, such as social network sites and Instant Messaging programs, have attractive characteristics. However, some believe that mediated conversations cannot provide the social cues that can lift a conversation to the next level (Short, Williams & Christie, 1976). Short et al. (1976) proposed the social presence theory, which stated that mediated communication could not transmit interpersonal impressions and warmth. This relates to the second characteristic Rice (1996) defines, including the ability of a type of communication to transmit the social, symbolic, and nonverbal cues. Rice and Love (1987) explain that many assume that mediated communication transmits a lower amount of 'natural richness' that face-to-face interaction does transmit. This assumption includes mediated communication considered as less personal and more task-orientated (Rice & Love, 1987).

By contrast, the researchers found in their own research that one can exchange socio-emotional content through mediated communication (Rice & Love, 1987). Walther (1996) continues and says that mediated communication can in fact even be hyperpersonal. He argues that computer-mediated communication can increase expression and personal conversation. Computer mediated communication can be "more stereotypically desirable in achieving their goals and transmit messages free of the noise that otherwise comes with unintended appearance or behavior features" than face-to-face communication (Walther, 1996, p. 29). Besides this, users are less under pressure in mediated communication than in face-to-face communication, because there is for example no time pressure (Walther, 1996). Rice and Love (1987) highlight as well that mediated communicated text can be reflected, organized and can be of high quality. These researchers also emphasize that experienced

users, such as adolescents, can develop ways to express the missing social cues nevertheless in mediated communication (Rice & Love, 1987).

In the present project, these insights about the characteristics of online communication versus face-to-face communication were used to set up the study. For instance, the hyperpersonal feature of mediated communication offers the adolescents the possibility to transmit their message the way they planned and intend it more easily. The characteristics of online communication could be aspects adolescents consider in their evaluation.

#### 2.4. The domestication of online communication

Online communication is becoming more and more important in our daily lives, in friendships of adolescents as well (Boneva et al., 2006; Delfos, 2013; Valkenburg & Peter, 2010). As such, it can even be said that these online communication tools are becoming domesticated. Domestication theory focuses on the usage and adoption of a technology by individuals; it focuses on individuals using a technology within the restrictions of social contexts, such as the household (Haddon, 2006). In the process of domestication, new technologies and services that initially were unfamiliar and exiting become in a way controllable by the users (Silverstone, 1993). "They are bought or subscribed to, understood or misunderstood, used or rejected; but in their ownership and in their appropriation into the culture of family or household and into the routines of everyday life, they are at the same time cultivated" (Silverstone, 1993, 227). In other words, these technologies are accepted, but at the same time changed and developed by this acceptance.

The processes of domestication consist of different dimensions (Haddon, 2006). Firstly, one can speak of dimensions of space and time. When using a technology, users have time constraints, for example considering the amount of time that they can spend on using a technology. Secondly, the dimension of space concerns the location of the technology; where does the technology belong in the household for instance (Haddon, 2006)? Social network services on smartphones and tablets make it possible for people to connect anytime and anywhere (Baym, 2010). However, which type of use is acceptable in the household? One can imagine that young adults are not allowed to chat with their friends at the dinner table. Thirdly, the process of domestication includes symbolic dimensions, which highlight the constraints of people desiring a certain image that influence the use of a technology (Haddon, 2006). One can imagine that parents do not want their children to make use of their smartphones when they have guests over, because it could give the 'wrong' impression.

In addition, domestication theory assumes that technologies and users both shape each other. "People shape the place and use of technology in their lives, but technology can



in turn influence their experiences” (Haddon, 2006, p. 198). An example of this is users getting more and more dependent on a technology. When a technology integrates so deeply in daily life, people cannot imagine returning to the time without that technology (Haddon, 2006). The same can be said for social network sites, Instant Messaging programs and young adults. The Internet and its communication tools are used more and more and are getting adapted to the daily social life of especially adolescents (Selfhout, 2009). When technologies, such as social network sites, are domesticated, they influence the experiences of the users in their daily life (Haddon, 2006).

## 2.5. Social network sites and Instant Messaging programs

There are several types of online communication, but in this thesis will focus specifically of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. Before discussing the role or the influence of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs in friendships and the daily social life of adolescents, this theoretical framework should explain and define these two tools specifically. boyd and Ellison (2008) describe social network sites as web-based services that offer individuals; the possibility to create an public or semi-public profile within a specific system, the access to the profiles of other users with whom they are connected, and the possibility to view the connections of their connections. While others call these types of websites, social networking sites, boyd and Ellison (2008) do not find this term suitable. They believe networking concerns relationships between strangers. Meeting strangers is a possibility on social network sites, but it is not the primary purpose (boyd & Ellison, 2008). “Participants are not necessarily ‘networking’ or looking to meet new people; instead, they are primarily communicating with people who are already a part of their extended social network” (boyd & Ellison, 2008, p. 211).

With social network sites users can interact and work on their existing or new relationships. For instance, on the social network site Facebook one can share, chat, post, tag, add, poke, react and like (Facebook, 2013). Facebook is a certain ‘personal website’, within a defined community (Yang, 2012). In this community, users can locate another and can communicate with each other. On Facebook people can share information, can show others which things they like, they can share photo’s, but can also share their feelings. They can write private messages to friends, post messages on their friends’ ‘personal websites’ or tag friends in photo’s (Yang, 2012).

Another important online communication tool for adolescents are Instant Messaging programs. These programs offer users software that gives them the possibility to “have real-time private textbased conversations on the Internet” (Boneva et al., 2006, p. 614). They allow users to see if their friends or contacts are online and gives them the possibility to send them messages. These friends or contacts are a defined groups of others (Boneva et

al.,2006). At this moment Whatsapp Messenger is a very popular Instant Messaging program (Van Hoek, June 21 2013). Whatsapp describes itself as a cross-platform mobile messaging app. It offers users the ability to share messages, but also pictures, video's, and audio. Users can also create group chats besides personal chats (Whatsapp, 2014). It allows users to sustain interaction with multiple people in groups and at the same (Baym, 2011).

## 2.6. The use of online communication by adolescents

Especially, affluent western adolescents increasingly use social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. These young adults not only spend more time on the Internet than adults do, they also spend their time on the Internet more on communicating with others than adults do (Valkenburg & Peter, 2009). Bighelaar and Akkermans reported in 2013 for CBS that specifically 93% of the Dutch adolescents between the age of twelve and eighteen used social media, which included both social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. CBS also reported that 75% of the Dutch adolescent has Internet on their mobile phones or Smartphone's and that for 90% of these adolescents social networking was an important purpose for using the Internet (CBS Webmagazine, May 27 2014). The organization also stated that the average use of social media in the Netherlands is the highest compared to the average use in other European countries (Bighelaar & Akkermans, 2013). Livingstone, Lobe, Olafsson and Vodeb (2011) compared the Internet use of children between the ages of nine and sixteen originating from twenty-five European countries, including the Netherlands. They made use of the data conducted by EU Kids Online. They reported that specifically Dutch kids spend approximately around 94 minutes of their time on the Internet daily.

More recent and specific research into the use of online communication by Dutch adolescents is limited. This is why less recent research is used to get a broader view about the use of the Internet, social network sites and Instant Messaging programs by adolescents. In 2007, Duimel and De Haan released an extensive rapport about the computer and Internet use of Dutch adolescents between the age of thirteen and eighteen. They found that in 2005 94% of the adolescents had access to the Internet in their home. Communicating with friends was one of the most commonly performed activities on the Internet by adolescents (Duimel & de Haan, 2007). Subsequently, 95% of the Dutch youngsters used MSN, an Instant Messaging communication program on the Internet. Around two thirds of the adolescents used this program one or multiple times a day and most of them used it longer than an hour each time (Duimel & de Haan, 2007). Duimel and de Haan (2007) explain that in 2005 websites with personalized profiles, like social network sites, were upcoming and they found that 36% of the adolescents had an own profile on such websites.

In 2006 Valkenburg, Schouten en Peter found that on average Dutch adolescents who had a profile, visited social network sites three days a week. On average, they spend

half an hour on these sites when visiting. One can imagine that over the years this use is increased. Raacke and Bonds-Raacke (2008) gave more specific details about the online communication between users in the USA. They surveyed hundred American students and found that averagely the students spend daily 1.46 hour on their own social network account and approximately 1.10 hour on the accounts of others. On average, the social network users logged in 4.19 times in one day and the students had an average of 235.5 friends in their online social network (Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008). Manago et al. (2012), who surveyed American students as well, found that students had averagely 440 friends in their social network.

However, Raacke & Bonds-Raacke (2008) and Manago et al. (2012) focus on the social network use of students. One can wonder if this use is similar to the use of younger generations like adolescents. Yang (2012) highlights that in the United States more than 80% of the adolescents use social network sites. Espinoza and Juvonen (2011) focused specifically on early adolescents, children between the age of twelve and thirteen, and found that at an average school day 45% of the adolescents devoted thirty minutes or less of their time using social network sites. 34% of the young adolescents used the social network sites for thirty minutes to one hour a day and 21% of the adolescents said they used social network sites over one hour per day (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011). The researchers also noted that 57% of the adolescents reported to visit social network sites only once a day or not at all. 31% of the adolescents visited these sites approximately two to four times a day and only 12% visited the sites more than five times daily (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011).

While providing valuable information about the usage of social networking sites, these studies mainly focus on American adolescents. Yet, Valkenburg and Peter (2007) state that the online communication habits of Dutch adolescents are very similar to the habits of American adolescents. It would be useful to provide more updated and more specific information about the online communication habits of specifically Dutch adolescents.

## 2.7. Motivations for using online communication

Now that we have seen that adolescents are enthusiastic users, the subsequent question is why do they use online communication increasingly (Schouten, 2007; Valkenburg & Peter, 2007)? As such, it is interesting to examine the reasons and motivations of adolescents to use the online communication tools. Why do they find them so attractive to use? Raacke and Bonds-Raacke (2008) looked into the reasons why American students use social network sites. They found that keeping in touch with old friends and keeping in touch with current friends were the two main reasons for using these sites. Other, less mentioned, reasons were to make new friends and to look and share pictures.

Yang (2012) states that young people from the U.S. use social network sites to find

new friends, to work on existing friendships and to stay updated about social activities in their network. According to Espinoza and Juvonen (2011) the main activity for young adolescents when visiting the social network sites was checking and responding to comments written to them (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011). Other significant reasons for the young adolescents to visit these sites were editing their profile page and wanting to view photos of others (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011). However, also in the case of the young adolescents the one main reason for using social network sites was staying connected with friends they already knew (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011). Instant Messaging programs are also used predominantly “for the maintenance of existing social relationships” (Valkenburg & Peter, 2009, p. 79).

Valkenburg and Peter (2010) examined why adolescents find online communication so attractive to use and found that the controllability of self-presentation and self-disclosure was the main reason. Self-disclosure is a key process in friendship between adolescents (Adams, Blieszner & de Vries, 2000; Berndt, 1983; Manago et al., 2012; Valkenburg & Peter, 2009; Valkenburg, Schouten & Peter, 2005). Self-presentation is key process in adolescents’ social development (Schouten, 2007). Schouten (2007, p. 10) explains that: “self-presentation refers to adolescents’ control of how they are perceived by others by selectively presenting aspects of their selves”. As such, the processes of self-disclosure and self-presentation are connected. Nevertheless, self-disclosure relates more to the development of relationships between adolescents, such as friendships, and self-presentation relates more to the general social development of adolescents (Schouten, 2007).

Online communication, including social network sites and Instant Messaging programs, offer adolescents more control in the processes of self-presentation and self-disclosure (Schouten, 2007). With this increased controllability, adolescents get the opportunity to overcome certain social barriers (Valkenburg & Peter, 2010). Communication through the Internet has three characteristics that enhance the controllability of self-presentation and self-disclosure, including its anonymity, asynchronization and its accessibility (Valkenburg & Peter, 2010). It is easy to assume that when having a personalized profile on a social network you are not anonymous. Yet, communication through these sites is still more anonymous than face-to-face communication. Online communication also include less nonverbal cues and also offers adolescents more control over the time and pace of the interaction (Schouten, 2007). According to Schouten (2007), these characteristics positively influence the self-disclosure. Valkenburg and Peter (2009) explain that because of the reduced cues in mediated communication “interactants become less concerned about how others perceive them and thus they feel fewer inhibitions in disclosing themselves” (p. 82).

These websites are also benefitting the self-presentation of adolescents, because

they have control over the information they want to share; they have control over if they want to share visual, audio or only verbal information (Valkenburg & Peter, 2010). Besides this, Valkenburg and Peter (2010) explain that “most online communication is asynchronous, that is, it allows adolescents to change and reflect on what they write before they send their messages” (p. 122). The adolescents feel more secure about their statements and make more easily statements because of this. Social network sites provide adolescents the possibility to structure their self-presentation and to have more control over the image they represent (Schouten, 2007). In addition, social network sites offer youngsters the possibility to experiment with their identities; they have the opportunity to present themselves in varying ways (Schouten, 2007).

This increased control is a factor that can have an influence on the possible positive evaluation of online communication tools by adolescents. Therefore, one should consider these insights. In this thesis, these insights were also incorporated when setting up the interviews and secondly, the survey.

## 2.8. Age, gender and the use of online communication

Research showed that gender and age have effect not only on the ways adolescents behave in their friendships, but also on their behavior when using online communication (Adams et al., 2000; Grubbs & Milne, 2010; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008). Gender and age differences should be taken into account when looking at the behaviors and views of adolescents, in this case specifically on online communication. This section will explain more about gender and age as influencing factors.

Dolgin (2011) emphasizes the importance of gender as well, especially in the period of adolescence. She explains that when adolescents hit puberty, they are often behaving more gender-stereotypical. Adolescents are searching for their own identity and are trying to fit in the stereotypical gender norms (Dolgin, 2011). Boys are expected to be confident, logical, and not emotional. In contrast, girls are supposed to be lovingly, gentle, sentimental and emotional (Dolgin, 2011). One can imagine that this also influences the way girls and boys behave online. For example, Adams et al. (2000) mention that online there is “the tendency of women to share emotional experiences and men to share activities” (p. 199). This online behavior of males and females corresponds with their offline behavior.

Raacke & Bonds-Raacke (2008) also found differences. For instance, women, when using social network sites, change more often their profile pictures than men. In addition, women are more carefully with the privacy issues; they are generally more concerned about their privacy being invaded (Grubbs & Milne, 2010). Schouten (2007, p. 25) adds; “whereas males seem to emphasize their status and competence, women tend to present themselves as nice and attractive” on profile websites. Barker (2009) highlights that women use social

network sites for working on their relationships more often than men do.

Additionally, females also feel more connected with their friends than males. Moreover, Barker (2009) emphasizes that girls focus more on the relational aspects of social network sites, whereas boys focus more on the entertainment that social network sites can offer. Espinoza and Juvonen (2011) explain that in America social network sites are more central to the social lives of girls than it is for boys. The researchers add that because of this it is not strange that girls spend more time on social network sites, while social network sites mainly evolve around maintaining friendships (Espinoza & Juvonen, 2011). It could be interesting to research if this is also case for the Dutch boys and girls. This is why this thesis takes gender as a focus point when looking at the use and evaluation of online communication by adolescents.

Schouten (2007) states that there are no big differences in the Internet use of female and male adolescents. However, they do differ in the type of use they perform and prefer the most. Male adolescents like to play games and watch video clips for example, while female adolescents prefer to communicate through e-mail, chat or IM (Schouten, 2007). Livingstone et al. (2011) reports similar results about the use of the Internet by European girls and boys. The scholars state that the actual amount of Internet use lie close together; boys use the Internet approximately 91 minutes a day and girls use the Internet daily approximately 85 minutes (Livingstone et al., 2011). However, boys perform more content-based activities on the Internet than girls, including playing Internet games, watching video clips, reading the news and downloading music and films. Girls use the Internet more for their schoolwork than boys and besides this, are in general more active in contact/communication-based activities and peer-participation activities, such as IM, visiting social network sites, e-mailing, chatting, posting content and writing blogs (Livingstone et al., 2011). This emphasizes again that gender is a social factor that should take into account when looking at the preferences, behaviors and evaluations of adolescents.

Age is another social factor that should be taken into account. Delfos (2013) highlights during in their adolescence, children go through different age phases that are associated with different behavior in their friendships. Dolgin (2011) explains that early adolescents want many friends and want to be popular, but when adolescent get older they seek fewer but better friendships. These different phases could possibly lead to different use of the Internet and it communication tools and could possibly lead to varying views about these communication tools.

Livingstone et al. (2011) demonstrate that there are differences in the use of the Internet by European adolescents of different ages. They report that mid-adolescents use the Internet increasingly more than early adolescents do. Children of eleven and twelve spend averagely 74 minutes on the Internet daily, children of thirteen and fourteen approximately

spend 97 minutes on the Internet and children of fifteen and sixteen spend about 118 on the Internet (Livingstone et al., 2011). The researchers have observed an increase. Similar to the gender differences, one can also find age differences in the type of Internet activities the adolescents perform and prefer the most. Especially, when focusing on the contact/communication-based activities one can determine quite an increase (Livingstone et al., 2011). Around 40% of the boys and girls between the age of nine and twelve years used IM, social network sites and send e-mails. While approximately 80% of the adolescents between the age of thirteen and sixteen carry out these activities (Livingstone et al., 2011).

One should also consider the already mentioned difference between young adolescents and students. Raacke and Bonds-Raacke (2008) found that students averagely spend daily about three hours on their own social network sites and logged in about 4.19 times in one day. While Espinoza and Juvonen (2011) found that only 21% of the early adolescents, around the age of twelve and thirteen, used social network sites over hour per day and 57% of the youngsters reported to visit social network sites only once a day or not at all. One can determine quite a difference between the use of social network sites by the early adolescents and the students.

The scholars all show that gender and age are social factors that need to be taken into account, since they can affect the ways adolescents behave online and this could also have an influence on the way they value the online possibilities in their friendships.

## 2.9. Consequences of using online communication

With the increasing use of the Internet and its communication tools over the years (Raacke and Bonds-Raacke, 2008; Schouten, 2007; Valkenburg & Peter, 2007); the research into the consequences of this use has expanded as well. In the nineties, several researchers believed that Internet use would reduce “adolescents’ social connectedness and well-being” (Peter & Valkenburg, 2009, p. 1). The extent of social connectedness relates to the relationships a youngster has with his environment, such as family and friends. Kraut et al. (1998) believed and established that the online relationships adolescents had, were a substitute for their offline relationships. These researchers, who called their research: *The Internet Paradox: A Social Technology That Reduces Social Involvement and Psychological Well-Being?*, showed that greater use of the Internet was accompanied with fewer conversations with family members. People were afraid mediated interaction would replace face to face interaction, that people would prioritize being online, put face to face communication on the backburner and get more isolated (Baym, 2010).

However, in 2001 Kraut et al. ‘revisited’ their previous research. When repeating the research they found different results. They concluded that using the communication possibilities of the Internet had positive effects on adolescents. “Our follow-up of participants

remaining in the sample in 1998 showed that most of negative outcomes initially associated with use of the Internet dissipated, except for its association with increased stress” (Kraut et al., 2001, p. 21). The participants had increasing local and distant social networks, more face-to-face communication, were increasingly involved with the community and had more trust in people within their network (Kraut et al., 2001).

Nevertheless, Kraut et al. (2001) do add that one can speak of the ‘rich get richer’ hypothesis. Joinson (2004, p. 473) explains: “extraverts gain increased social capital and mental well-being through Internet use, a pattern reversed for introverts”. This means that users who have more social resources benefit more from using the Internet (Kraut et al., 2001). Steinfield et al. (2008) define social capital as benefits one receives from being in a relation. Ellison et al. (2007) state that social capital includes “the resources accumulated through the relationships among people” (p. 1145).

Peter and Valkenburg (2009) explain the possible differences between the Internet effects of the nineties and the Internet effects in recent years. They highlight that there are differences concerning the Internet compared to the nineties that one should consider. For instance, in the present much more people have access to the Internet in western countries compared to the nineties; “adolescents have more opportunities to maintain their social network through this medium” (Peter and Valkenburg, 2009, p. 1). Additionally, social network sites emerged that rather stimulate communication with existing friends (Peter & Valkenburg, 2009).

Several researchers demonstrated that the Internet could have positive effects on adolescents (Steinfield et al., 2008; Valkenburg & Peter, 2007). Steinfield et al. (2008) argue for example that the use of social network sites can help to build social capital between users, especially of users with a low self-esteem. Steinfield et al. (2008) add; “those with lower self-esteem gained more from their use of Facebook in terms of bridging social capital than higher self-esteem participants”. Valkenburg and Peter (2007) highlight as well that users who were more socially anxious experienced the use as more beneficial in this case focusing on increasing self-disclosure. They explained socially anxious adolescents are more convinced that that online communication is “effective for developing breadth and depth of communication” (Valkenburg & Peter, 2007, p. 276). In addition, the researchers state that, adolescents who communicated online more intensively felt more close to their existing friends. Those adolescents also thought online communication, such as social network sites, is more useful when focusing on self-disclosure (Valkenburg & Peter, 2007).

Bargh and McKenna (2000; 2004) see online communication as a positive development as well. They say that it can have a positive impact on not only individuals themselves, but also on their interaction with others and their relationships. The scholars define four aspects that are related to the three already mentioned features of Valkenburg



and Peter (2010), which can have positive impact, including anonymity, the reduced importance of physical appearance, but also the reduced importance of physical distance, and having more control over the interaction (Bargh and McKenna, 2000). Bargh and McKenna (2000; 2004) explain that one can speak of a reduced importance of physical appearance when communicating online and because of this, physical attractiveness is also of less importance. Liking someone, feeling attracted to them, and forming a friendship is on the Internet based on different grounds, for example more on similarity in values and interests (Bargh & McKenna, 2000).

The scholars explain that this stimulates friends to reach a deeper level in their friendships (Bargh & McKenna, 2004). With having more control over the interaction when communicating online individuals are more successfully in presenting themselves (Bargh & McKenna, 2000). As already explained earlier, individuals have more control over the image they present (Schouten, 2007). Bargh and McKenna (2004) highlight that the increased control stimulates self-expression as well. The scholars add also that “this higher degree of control, coupled with anonymity, seems to contribute to individuals taking greater risks and chances with making self-disclosures to those with whom they talk on the Internet compared to real life” (McKenna & Bargh, 2004, p. 67). Additionally, the reduced importance of physical distance stimulated communication and closer ties between friends and family members, even more for the individuals not living close to another. Bargh and McKenna (2000) believe that online communication has a lot of positive impacts and they explain that they believe that “the Internet does not, (...), have by itself the power or ability to control people, to turn them into addicted zombies, or make them dispositionally sad or lonely (or, for that matter, happy or popular)” (p. 72).

However, by other researchers online communication is associated with negative impacts, stress for example (Kraut et al., 2001; Thomee, Eklof, Gustafsson, Nilsson & Hagberg, 2007). Kraut et al. (2001) found in their research that a more intensive use of the Internet relates with an increase of the perceived stress in the daily life of respondents. The researchers explain this increase in stress by highlighting the increased use of the Internet. Because of the increased use, there is less time for other activities and because of this users can experience more stress (Kraut et al., 2001). Thomee et al. (2007) found also a correlation between the increasing use of the communication tools on the Internet and an increasing amount of perceived stress.

One can also say that peer pressure can make the adolescents feel more stressed as well. Clasen and Brown (1985) describe peer pressure as following: “pressure to think or behave along certain peer-prescribed guidelines” (p. 452). With peer pressure, the group norms are transmitted and the loyalty of the group members is determined. Group membership or the feeling of belonging to the group is essential for the social development of

adolescents. Clasen and Brown (1985) state that experiencing peer pressure is the price an adolescent has to pay for his group membership. One can imagine that there are also group norms online. For example, one can imagine that an adolescent feels pressure to respond immediately when a group member sends a message, because that is the way one should act in the group.

Another phenomenon that should be taken into account is what Przybylski et al. (2013) call the 'the fear of missing out'. Social network sites and Instant Messaging programs make it very easy for adolescents to stay in contact with their friends and be updated about what their friends are doing. Przybylski et al. (2013) explain that this is positive and negative development: "On the upside, these social resources provide a multitude of opportunities for interaction; on the downside, they often broadcast more options than can be pursued, given practical restrictions and limited time" (p. 1841). This can result in a need to stay connected and updated when an adolescent is absent from his friends or in a fear of missing out (Przybylski et al. 2013).

These insights about the Internet and its ways of communicating are relevant, because they highlight how the Internet can have positive, but also negative influence on adolescents and their friendships. These possible consequences are of importance when examining the ways adolescents experience and evaluate the social network sites. One can wonder if the adolescents believe that these tools benefit them and their friendships.

In sum, previous research has shown that a study about online friendships between adolescents should take into account that friendships during adolescence is of great importance. Secondly, that self-disclosure is a key aspect in these friendships and that online communication can stimulate this self-disclosure. Online communication tools become more and more important in friendships between adolescents and besides that, it has characteristics that make these tools more attractive to use, including for example the mobility of online communication and the control users have over their self-presentation while using it. One should also take into account that the interaction through the Internet has positive and negative consequences and that there are social factors, gender and age, that could have an influence. In this project, these aspects are taken into account when examining the evaluation of online friendships. The next chapter discusses the preparation of the actual examination of the evaluation of online communication by adolescents.

### 3. Research design

This part of the thesis presents the preparation for the quantitative and qualitative research, including the details of the methodologies, units of analysis, data collection and the data analysis.

#### 3.1. Methodologies

In this thesis, a mixed method was used. This research combined qualitative and a quantitative method to give the most complete answer as possible to the research question: How do Dutch adolescents evaluate online friendships in comparison to offline friendships? Qualitative research, such as interviews, is a good starting point for a quantitative research method like surveys; it offers insights that can be essential for setting up the survey question. Qualitative research also provides extensive information about how adolescents use and evaluate online communication; it gives the adolescents the opportunity to explain their views and at the same time, it gives the study more profoundness. The quantitative research provides the possibility to examine a larger group of people and to establish correlations. The next paragraphs explain the decisions concerning the two different methodologies.

#### 3.2. Interviews

The first method was qualitative, that is, interviewing. Interviews are an adequate instrument that can provide insights about how the adolescents use and evaluate online communication (Baarda, De Goede & Kalmijn, 2010). These insights were used for setting up the design of the survey; the results of the interviews provided high quality input for developing the survey questions. As Bryman (2012) explains qualitative interviews can help with developing the quantitative research instrument; in-depth knowledge can be used for setting up survey questions. The interviews also provide the opportunity to delve deeper into answers of the respondents (Baarda, De Goede & van der Meer-Middelburg, 2007). It contributes to the content and the extensiveness of this thesis. It makes the research more profound by supplementing the survey results with interesting anecdotes.

The interviews were semi-structured, because it offers the opportunity to explore the attitudes of the respondents towards social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. Semi-structured interviews also suit with the used analysis method, which is the Constant Comparative Method (Boeije, 2002). Semi-structured interviews were most applicable in this research, because it can facilitate comparability, for example because one can ensure that every respondent answers the same questions (Barriball & While, 1994).

### 3.2.1. Data collection

The research units are Dutch adolescents, because adolescents spend more time on the Internet than adults spend and besides this, spend their time on the Internet more on communicating with others than adults do (Valkenburg & Peter, 2009). Adolescents are an interesting research group, when one examines the impact of online possibilities in relationships. The units of analysis are Dutch adolescents, because the Netherlands is a wealthy developed country and the major part of the Dutch population uses the Internet (Wereldbank, 2013). Valkenburg, Peter & Schouten (2006) define adolescents as people between the age of 10 and 19. In this study, the participants are between the age of 12 and 19. This choice is made, because this specific age range is reachable for the secondary school teachers that helped with collecting the respondents.

To find right amount of interviewees a purposive sampling method was used. I was specifically searching for respondents of varying ages and of different gender, to receive diversity in the sample. I chose for a purposive sampling method, because this sampling method ensures you receive different perspectives on an issue in this case on online communication (Cresswell, Hanson, Clark Plano & Morales, 2007). I found the sample through contact with secondary school teachers.

In total five interviews were conducted with seven adolescents. I interviewed five female participants and two male participants. One female participant was fourteen, three female participants were fifteen, the oldest female participant was sixteen, one male participant was sixteen and the oldest male participant was eighteen. Six interviews were individually, but there was one exception, including the last interview. The last interview was with three female respondents at the same time, because the respondent felt more comfortable when her friends joined the interview. The interviews lasted approximately 40 minutes. I recorded the interviews on audio with consent and transcribed them in Dutch. Therefore, the quotes used in the results chapter were originally in Dutch and were translated into English by me. Before carrying out the interviews, I have asked for parental consent and received this. In the case, of the group interview one parent gave permission for all the three girls.

### 3.2.2. Interview goals

The interviews had two goals; the primary purpose was contributing to the development of the quantitative research instrument and the secondary purpose included providing more in depth information about the attitudes of adolescents towards their online friendships. In the result chapter, the interviews will be firstly discussed and here interesting and important statements of the adolescents will be covered. The interviews gave more in depth answers to the research question and sub-questions. To answer the first five sub-questions the

interviews had specific focus points in the topic list. The interview questions focused on the use, the evaluation and the effects of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs, but also on the reasons for using them and the expectations concerning friends when using them. The last two sub-questions concerning the differences by gender and age in the use of, the evaluation of and the attitude towards online communication were also researched with the interviews through the selection of respondents. Age and gender are social factors that one should take into account (Delfos, 2013; Dolgin, 2011).

### 3.2.3. Data analysis

With analyzing the interviews, I used an inductive analysis method. With this method one searches for recurring and relevant themes in a text, in this case interviews (Boeije, 't Hart & Hox, 2009). Specifically, I chose the Constant Comparative Method when analyzing the qualitative content. Comparison is a key concept in this method (Boeije, 2002). "Comparative thinking contributes to the development of criteria to distinguish categories of data, to the conceptualization of the field under study and to the patterning of the data that ultimately provides an answer to the research questions that are examined in a particular study" (Boeije, 2002, p. 408). This analysis method is most suitable. This because this research does not only want to examine the use and evaluation of online communication by Dutch adolescents, but also more specifically the age and gender differences within this specific research group.

In the process of analyzing, I first highlighted every quote that deemed relevant to this research. Secondly, I grouped the quotes in categories related to the focus points in this research. Thirdly, I compared the different quotes in the different categories. When using the Constant Comparative Method one compares in multiple stages, as I did as well. I followed the steps Boeije (2002) mentions in her article. First, I made a comparison within every single interview. Secondly, I made comparisons between interviews within the same age and gender groups. Lastly, I made comparisons between interviews from different age and gender groups.

### 3.2.4. Validity and reliability

For strengthening the validity and reliability of this research, I chose to do semi-structured interviews. With more structure, the interviews will be easier to repeat in other studies. According to Barribal and White (1994, p. 330) when choosing for semi-structured interviews the validity and reliability "depend, not upon the repeated use of the same words in each question, but upon conveying equivalence of meaning". Because of the time limits of this research, only five interviews could be carried out. However, the main goals of the interviews

were not to generalize the results to a larger population, but to use the results to strengthen the quantitative research and to provide illustrative content to this thesis.

### 3.3. Surveys

The second method in this study was a quantitative one, including an online survey. Surveys are generally used to provide a general overview of people's attitudes, opinions and behavior intentions concerning specific topics (Baarda et al., 2010). The survey aims at gathering information about adolescents' opinions and evaluations regarding social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. A survey is structural way of collecting data, which can capture the views of a large amount of adolescents (Baarda et al., 2010).

#### 3.3.1. Data collection

For the survey, the target population included Dutch adolescents between the age of 12 and 19 as well. I approached the adolescents in two ways, online and offline. The first approach included the distribution of the survey on Facebook on several pages of institutions associated with adolescents, such as schools and sport clubs. In addition, I posted the link on Twitter and these posts were retweeted by sport clubs, including V.O.C. en HCRotterdam. However, the gathering of respondents through the Internet did not go as fast as anticipated. That is why I initiated the second offline approach. At the Gemini College in Rotterdam the survey was distributed on paper. Adolescents were approached at the soccer club V.O.C. in Rotterdam as well. With filling in the survey, online or offline, the adolescents could win a gift card of thirty Euros twice. A hundred-and-thirty-one adolescents, between the ages of twelve and nineteen, have filled in the survey completely. Thirty-three adolescents completed the survey almost; they missed one or two questions. In total 164 adolescents filled in the survey. 52.4% of the adolescents were female and 47.6% male. I inserted the data from paper and pencil survey into the SPSS dataset.

#### 3.3.2. Operationalisation

The concepts from theory needed to be translated into variables that could be measured, including the use by, the evaluation by, the reasons of and expectations of Dutch adolescents, but also the positive and negative effects adolescents experience. These concepts were made measurable by the use of varying survey questions. To measure the concepts in the best way possible the formulation of the survey questions were tested during the interviews.

The use of social network sites and Instant messaging programs was operationalized by asking the adolescents firstly about the regularity they use specific social network sites and Instant messaging programs. Secondly, I asked them about their average use of social

network sites and Instant Messaging programs in general. The questionnaire also contained questions about the devices that the adolescents use and questions on a Likert-type five-point scale (1 = very unimportant; 5 = very important) about the importance of several activities while communicating online. Lastly, I asked the adolescents to express whether they found certain reasons for using the online communication tools important with a Likert-type five-point scale (1 = very unimportant; 5 = very important). The phrasing of these reasons was based on the interview content.

When it concerned the evaluation of social network sites and Instant Messaging the participants were given 13 scaled questions and were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with them on a Likert-type five-point scale (1 = disagree totally; 5 = agree totally). I based the assembly of the statements on the interviews and relevant theory (Adams et al., 2000; Baym, 2010; Berndt, 1983; Manago et al., 2012; Rice & Love, 1987; Short et al., 1976; Valkenburg & Peter, 2009; Valkenburg, Schouten & Peter, 2005; Walther, 1996). The statements focused on online versus offline communication and on the benefits and the downsides of online communication.

The negative and positive effects were measured by asking the adolescents about their feelings when having no access to these types of communication, the reasons for these feelings, the occurrence of missing out on other activities because of using online communication. Besides this, I asked them as well whether they value many people responding to their communication on a Likert-type five-point scale (1 = very unimportant; 5 = very important). Lastly, the survey included questions about the expectations concerning good friends through online communication. I asked the adolescents whether they found it important to receive reactions and fast reactions on a Likert-type five-point scale (1 = very unimportant; 5 = very important). To be more specific, I asked the adolescent in which time range they expect their friends to react.

### 3.3.2. Data analysis

The statistical analyses were targeted at establishing an overview about the use and the evaluation of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs by Dutch adolescents, therefore the following analyses were carried out 1) descriptive analyses 2) means and variance analyses 3) a factor analysis 4) relation and regression analyses. The descriptive analyses were used to say something about the use of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs by adolescents, the reasons for using them and their expectations. The factor analysis was used when it concerns the questions with statements, which are focused on the evaluation of the online communication tools by youngsters. I executed the means and variance analyses to determine if the social factors, gender and age, characterize adolescents' behavior concerning and opinion towards social network sites and Instant

Messaging programs. Lastly, I executed the regressions analyses and the measures of association to establish if there were significant relationships between the different factors, including for example gender, age and the use of the online communication tools.

#### 3.3.4. Validity and reliability

Daymon and Holloway (2011, p. 78) state: "in quantitative research, reliability is the extent to which a research instrument such as a questionnaire, when used more than once, will reproduce the same results or answer". They also highlights that validity in quantitative research is checked by looking if the research instrument, in this case the questionnaire, accurately approaches the phenomena that the researcher is examining (Daymon an Holloway, 2011). To reassure the reliability and validity in this research the interviews were the basis for the survey. Based on the interview conversations the questions and answer categories of the survey were formulated.

After completing the survey, I conducted a pretest with three adolescents within my personal network. Because of this, it became clear that two questions needed to be reformulated and more adjusted to the younger respondents. For instance, I asked the adolescents firstly whether there emerged negative feelings when they did not have access to the communication tools. I changed this into a question whether they felt bad about having no access; this seemed more suitable. After conducting the survey and looking at the answers, I assume that the adolescents were a bit confused about the question about the social network site Google+. I believe that several adolescents did not know about the social network site Google+. I think that because of this, the adolescents believed that the question concerned the search engine Google instead of the social network site. This should have been more clear in the questionnaire. Lastly, to determine if the scale-questions are reliable, I executed multiple Cronbach's Alpha's.

This chapter focused on the key elements that should be determined before carrying out a research. The following step was carrying out the actual research that leads to answering the research question and sub questions. The next chapter will present the results of interviews and survey that were executed.



## 4. Results

To give an answer to the research question and the sub questions this study involved five interviews with seven respondents and a survey distributed among 164 respondents. Firstly, this chapter discusses the interviews and secondly, the results of the survey.

### 4.1. Interviews

The interviews were a preparation for the survey firstly and secondly, they provided extensive information about how the adolescents use and evaluate online communication. The interviews also generated interesting anecdotes related to the core of this thesis. I distinguished four categories within the interviews: the use of online communication, the evaluation of online communication, the effects of online communication, and the expectations concerning friends when using online communication. The following paragraphs discuss the interviews according to each of these categories. The interviews were originally in Dutch, therefore; the used quotes are translated.

#### 4.1.1. The use of online communication

Respondent 3: *Well, everyone has Whatsapp, so then it is handy that you also have Whatsapp, because if...*

Interviewer: *Yes?*

Respondent 3: *If you have something else, no one will respond, because they do not have it.* (Respondent 3, male, 16 years)

The first sub question asked in what ways Dutch adolescents use social network sites. Therefore, the interviews began with questions about the use of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. Specifically, the adolescents received questions about which online communication tools they used, how often they used them, on which moments they used them, how they used them and why they used them. All the interviewees used both Whatsapp and Facebook. For the six girls Instagram was also an important social network site. A sixteen-year-old female respondent gave the following typical answer to the question about the online communication tools she used besides Facebook: "Uhm, Whatsapp and also Instagram, actually no others. I did register for Twitter. Besides that, there was also for a moment Pal. However, I never, never really used them" (Respondent 1, female, 16 years).

The interviewees were asked how often they used social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. The first female respondent of fifteen said the following: "Actually, I am on Facebook the whole day" (Respondent 5, female, 15 years). In contrast, the boy of eighteen said: "Uhm, I think on Facebook, on a weekend day, one or two times and on a

weekday one time or something” (Respondent 2, male, 18 years). All the respondents made clear they used Instant Messaging programs, in this case specifically Whatsapp, far more frequently than social media network sites. For example, the same boy of eighteen said he used: “Whatsapp quite a bit more; I think about a dozen times a day. The other boy said made some illustrative statements as well: “Yes, yes, I use that very often” and “on Whatsapp, I am online eighty times every day” (Respondent 3, male, 16 years). The girls of fifteen also highlighted that they used Whatsapp more often than Facebook as shown in the following part of the interview:

Interviewer: *And do you use Whatsapp, for example?*

Respondent 5: *Yes, yes, yes, I use that more.*

Respondent 6: *You use that rather than Facebook. You do not, you do not chat often through Facebookchat. I use Whatsapp throughout the whole day [laughs].*

(Group interview, respondent 5 and 6, female, 15 years)

The second fifteen-year-old adds the following about her use of Whatsapp: “If I have time, so if I am not busy with something, then I definitely look every ten minutes to see if someone has send something nice” (Respondent 6, female, 15 years). I also asked the adolescents whether the adolescents had specific moments they used the two online communication tools. They gave some interesting answers, for example the sixteen-year-old girl:

*When I come home, I usually eat and do nothing for an hour, and when no one is home I use my laptop. Additionally, before I go to sleep I look (...) Previously, I read a book, but now...now I look at Facebook actually [laughs]* (Respondent 1, female, 16 years).

In addition, the adolescents mention repeatedly that they use social network sites on the moments they are bored. As one respondent (Respondent 2, male, 18 years) explains: “Uhm, usually on the kind of death moments, when I have nothing to do [laughs]. Yes, mainly then actually”.

From the interviews, it seemed clear that for all the respondents just looking at Facebook was the main activity when using social network sites. The sixteen-year-old boy stated for example the following: “I use it mainly for looking and once in a while for sharing”. In their conversation, the three girls discussed this activity as well. They said the following:

Respondent 7: *Well, I actually never use Facebook. I look at it ones in a while, but...*

Respondent 6: *Well, you do not do much yourself on Facebook.*

Respondent 7: *No.*

Respondent 6: *I never write something on Facebook myself either.*

Respondent 5: *Yes, but you do look at it all the time.*

Respondent 6: *Yes, that is true, yes.*

(Group interview, respondent 5, 6 and 7, female, 15 years)

Some of the adolescents gave reasons for not posting much themselves. The boys said that this was, because they did not feel like it. The youngest girl said: “Yes, sometimes then, (...), it is none of their business” (Respondent 4, female, 14 years). Other mentioned activities were searching for people and searching for events. All the girls were more enthusiastic about sharing photos on Instagram. The fifteen-years-old girls gave some reasons why they preferred to share on this social network site. One of the girls for example said about Instagram, that it is used “mainly for just nice pictures and if you have been to a nice party; you post that quicker on Instagram than on Facebook” (Respondent 5, female, 15 years). Her friend added: “Yes, because on Facebook I do not only have friends. On Instagram you almost only have your own friends, of your own age, and not so much parents, etcetera” (Respondent 6, female, 15 years).

Lastly, I also asked the adolescents about their reasons for using social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. The male respondent of sixteen mentions the following reason: “Facebook I just use for entertainment, so to speak” and the other male respondent says: “I think it is always funny to see what uhm...what most people, sometimes news messages or photos, post” (Respondent 2, male, 18 years). The girls of fifteen and sixteen experience Facebook more as something necessary, as the following reactions highlight: “I do feel like if I’m missing something if I do not look at it the whole day” (Respondent 1, female, 16 years) and “In this time, yes, you do everything with it” (Respondent 5, female, 15 years).

Some of the adolescents mention that they use Facebook partly as well, because all their friends have it. The fourteen-year-old female respondent said the following: “Facebook, just because there are a lot of friends”. The first female respondent of sixteen years gives a more extensive explanation: “I think because everyone has it, that you, that you miss something when you do not have it. Moreover, with friends...then there is a party for example and then you are invited through Facebook. And yes, actually...that happens quite a lot”.

For using Instant Messaging programs, the adolescents have different reasons. The first main reason is communicating with friends; all respondents mention this. The youngest female respondent of fourteen years says she uses Whatsapp, because she wants “just to talk to people”. The youngest male respondent of sixteen years says he uses the communication tool “just to stay in touch with everyone; that is actually, my way to communicate”. Another reason for a significant number of respondents is, the same as with Facebook; “everyone has it”. A respondent explains this even more extensively:

*Because all my friends are on there. You had for example Telegram or something (...). Then I had that and it was actually really fast and fun. However, I had only one friend who had that too and after a while I thought; we can stay here talking with the two of us, but...In the end you go back to Whatsapp, simply, because everyone has it. It is probably not the fastest, but*

*all your friends are on there. You are not going to be one who says to everyone; if you want to send me a message you have to download this and that*  
(Respondent 1, female, 16 years).

The adolescents also mention that they use Whatsapp, because it is just a handy communication tool; “you can ask things very quickly” (Respondent 6, female, 15 years).

#### 4.1.2. The evaluation of online communication

*On the other hand, if you really imagine standing in front of someone and you let that person wait a minute for your answer; then that would be strange. However, with that you can also retain, uhm, so to speak, insults and that sort of stuff, which you would initially blur out. Therefore, it has a bit pros and cons* (Respondent 2, male, 18 years).

Subsequently, the interviews focused on the differences between online and offline communication adolescents experience, on their opinion about these types of communication, their preferences and how much they value social network sites and Instant Messaging programs in their friendships.

As demonstrated with the quote that introduces this paragraph the interviewed adolescents are not surefooted in their evaluation of online communication versus offline communication. All respondents view online communication as something with, on one hand, advantages and on the other hand, disadvantages. A typical statement about the inability to see someone’s expressions through online communication is “Sometimes I find it really stupid, because then, (...), then things can come through quite differently, on Whatsapp, while you actually do not mean it angry at all” (Respondent 1, female, 16 years). The fourteen-year-old female respondent said something similar: “Face-to-face is easier and is actually nicer, because some people can misunderstand you if you do it via, yes, via Whatsapp”. The sixteen-year-old male respondent thinks it does not matter that one cannot see another’s faces. He says: “You know that you are talking to a specific person, so it does not matter”. However, he is not completely sure if not seeing the person is a positive aspect or negative aspect of online communication, as illustrated by the following quote:

Respondent 3: *Uhm, well, face-to-face people can be of course...it is different, and then it can be tenser, so to speak, than on Whatsapp. (...). Because someone can get mad there, but they are just letters.*

Interviewer: Yes.

Respondent 3: *But if you stand face-to-face, it can be more embarrassing, or more awkward, or just nicer.*

(Respondent 3, male, 16 years).

One of the girls of fifteen also mentions that through online communication: “someone can

pose himself differently than what he truly thinks” (Respondent 7, female, 15 years). The adolescents also mention positive characteristics. The sixteen-year-old female respondent explains that when you are in a situation where you do not know how to react; it is good you have time to think about it when you use online communication. The fifteen-year-old girls made similar statements, for example they said: “if you do not know what to say, yes, then you often ask someone else, through Facebook or something. Then you ask; what do I need to say to this?” (Respondent 7, female, 15 years).

A significant number of the adolescents mention smileys as a good solution for the missing facial expressions. The girl of sixteen says the following about smileys: “It is very difficult to notice with only hello if someone is happy or not, this is possible with smileys” (Respondent 1, female, 16 years). A girl of fifteen highlights this as well: “Even if you do not see each other, you still get a little bit of an attitude from someone” (Respondent 7, female, 15 years). The adolescents also identify some other positive aspects of online communication. The female respondents of the age of fifteen mention different advantages of online communication in the following part of their conversation:

*Respondent 5: Well, I think that it goes much easier online above all. Uhm, yes, I dare much more to say online (...).*

*Respondent 7: You start the conversation much easier.*

*Respondent 5: Yes, you start the conversation much easier. Yes, yes [laughs], you do not do that quickly in real life, I think. I think that is a big difference, yes, and besides that, you reach much more people at once.*

*(Group interview, respondent 5 and 7, female, 15 years)*

In the end all the adolescents prefer to communicate face-to-face if they had to choose between online and offline communication. The girl of fourteen explains: “Face-to-face is more fun, but it is handy of course that you can always talk with each other on Whatsapp” (Respondent 4, female, 14 years).

The overall opinion of the adolescents is quite positive about online communication, especially about Instant Messaging programs as Whatsapp. Above all, they find Whatsapp very handy. The boy of eighteen says that with Whatsapp: “you can ask things very quickly and you get your sought information very fast, so to speak” (Respondent 2, male, 18 years). The oldest girl confirms this as well, she thinks Whatsapp “is very handy when you are not together” (Respondent 1, female, 16 years). The male respondent of sixteen explains it even more extensively:

*Respondent 3: One friend of mine lives in Prinsenland, my best female friend lives in Hillegersberg, my two other friends live in Hoogvliet and Nesselande, so that is then...*

*Interviewer: Far apart?*

*Respondent 3: Yes, that is why, they do not live in the same street as me or something;*

*otherwise I would just visit them. However, that is why Whatsapp is so handy.*

Wherever the adolescents are, they can be in contact with their friends; this is also illustrated by the following example: “Whatsapp I always find just fun, cozy talking. You always have someone to talk to, yes; many are online the whole day of course” (Respondent 4, female, 14 years).

Some respondents more explicitly said that they believe the online possibilities are benefitting or contributing to their friendships. The following part of the conversation of the fifteen-year-old girls illustrates this:

Respondent 6: *Very handy, very important.*

Respondent 5: *Very important.*

Respondent 7: *Yes, because if you always have to go to someone to tell something, then...*

Respondent 6: *Yes, or need to call or something, then you are busy for three hours every day. And if it is quick through Whatsapp, that is handy, right?*

Respondent 5: *Yes, and it is also, that we know from another what we are doing and that is fun to know, right? I think.*

Respondent 7: *Yes.*

(Group interview, respondent 5, 6 and 7, female, 15 years)

The fifth respondent elaborates on this a bit more and adds the following: “If you are not, yes, if you are not together, yes, especially with the people you often hang out with and you are used to discuss everything with, then when you are just at home and not close to someone; you still can continue your conversation and your habits”. With the online communication tools limits of time and space can be crossed (Croteau, Hoynes & Milan, 2012) and mainly because of that the interviewed adolescents believe that the tools contribute to their friendships.

#### 4.1.3. The effects of online communication

*Recently I had...I recently added a picture...and usually, I always get from people, who are constantly on Instagram and who like in two seconds...and now there was nothing after five minutes and then I thought...I thought I was very stupid, but I removed the picture...(Respondent 1, female, 16 years).*

All the interviewed adolescents said that they felt need to stay online to a certain extent. The sixteen-year-old female respondent said the following about Facebook: “it is kind of addictive actually. Sometimes I watch nothing for half an hour and then I think: what did I actually do?” (Respondent 1, female, 16 years). The eighteen-year-old boy also had sometimes the feeling that he has to look at Facebook, but he does not experience that as truly negative: “I always find it fun to watch as much news messages or photos or that sort stuff as possible”.

However, with Whatsapp he does feel a type of pressure: “sometimes when I come back from field hockey or something, when you do not have Internet for while and then you get a whole load, then there really are thirty people and you have to answer them all (Respondent 2, male, 18 years). The girls of fifteen also experience more pressure to keep an eye on Whatsapp than on Facebook:

Interviewer: *Do you sometimes have the feeling that you really have to look on Facebook, for example because you are afraid to miss something?*

Respondent 7: *Well, that not necessary actually. I do have it on my Whatsapp, but that is because you receive so much messages.*

Respondent 6: *Because you can not keep up with that.*

Respondent 5: *If there is something really nice on Facebook, then that would pass by on Whatsapp or...*

Respondent 7: *With Whatsapp it is far more important that you keep it up.*  
(Respondent 5, 6 and 7, female, 16 years)

In the interviews, the adolescents also received questions about their perceived stress or pressure about combining online communication with other activities. From the interviews seemed clear that the adolescents do experience negative feelings when procrastinating other activities by focusing too much on their online communication. The sixteen-year-old girl describes this: “I have it especially with homework, then my laptop is on and I get caught up in someone’s pictures, then I just watch that. And then, at one point, I think: what am I doing?” (Respondent 1, female, 16 years). She adds that she thinks it is “stupid and a waste, but I do it every time” (Respondent 1, female, 16 years).

Especially, when it concerns schoolwork the adolescents have too little time. The sixteen-year-old boy experiences this as well: “yeah, sometimes, because then I am very busy with whatsapping with everybody, then I think: o shit, I still have to do that, well I have to do that tomorrow then” (Respondent 3, male, 16 years). The oldest boy experiences this as well, normalizes it: “if I then, uhm, visit Facebook for half an hour or something, then yes, I think; this is at the expense of my learning. However, it is not so significant that my grades go down” (Respondent 2, male, 18 years). The fifteen-year-old girls feel less good about it:

Respondent 5: *But I think especially with your homework very much, and that you go to sleep very late of course. When you are in the middle of a conversation, you finish that first, and then, you continue with someone else. Yes, it is very easy to talk to someone and then a little longer and then you go to sleep late and did nothing about your homework.*

Respondent 6: *Yes, that is not so smart.*

Interviewer: *And do you sometimes feel bad about your homework...?*

Respondent 6: *Well especially stupid.*

Respondent 5: *Afterwards, you think, we will do that less and I will turn of my phone for an hour, but then I see my telephone there...and then I think: yes, I have to look.*

(Group interview, respondent 5 and 6, female, 15 years)

The interviewed adolescents, especially the female respondents of the age of fifteen and sixteen, also stated that they got quite insecure about their online self-presentation. The girls said that they got especially insecure when they do not get any likes or reactions on their posts on social network sites. The sixteen-year-old female respondent for example said the following:

*There are people who are on it constantly and they say then: can you like my photo? Then I think well...that is not really me. I'm not going cry or something [laughs], because I always have my friends who like my pictures (...) but sometimes I also have that my sisters say for example: that picture is nice, you should choose that one as your profile picture...and then I pick that one and then I think: o god, everyone is going to think; what is this? And then you get a lot of likes, then you think: o, maybe it is a nice picture after all.*

She even adds: "it is more like, that if I look and then I think; o this picture has little likes...and then I look at that picture and I think; well, perhaps this is an ugly picture or something" (Respondent 1, female, 16 years). She adds that she sometimes thinks the following when she does not get enough response: "does everyone suddenly thinks I am unkind or is their some gossip about me?" (Respondent 1, female, 16 years).

The male respondents in the contrary say that they do not care much about getting reactions or likes on their Facebook posts. The eighteen-year-old male for example said that he thinks it is just nice, because then he knows that it is "read by people and that people think about it". The sixteen-year-old male respondent said that he just thinks that it is "boring" when no one reacts or likes. The youngest female respondent does not mind either when no one responds to her posts, she even says: "it is only something on Facebook, it is not something for real or something really important". The fifteen-year-old girls value many likes and/or reactions more. One of the girls said: "if you have a really nice picture and nobody likes it, I do think surely: hmm, perhaps I should remove it" (Respondent 5, female, 15 years).

#### 4.1.4. Expectations on online communication

"Basically, when you go through my pictures and you look at the reactions, you really do see who my friends are" (Respondent 1, female, 16 years).

Lastly, the interview focused on to what extent the adolescents expect from their friends to receive a reaction or answer to different type of messages. There is a big difference for the adolescents between not receiving reactions on personal messages and not receiving reactions on Facebookposts. The youngest respondent says for example that she does not mind if people do not react to her posts on Facebook, because; "you can not be on Facebook all the time. Whatsapp is different however" (Respondent 4, female, 14 years). She adds that



not many of her friends have Facebook on their phones. The youngest male respondent does not really mind as well, he says the following: 'It is not necessary. It is, a bit, your own choice if you want to do that. I do not expect much really, but I do think it is stupid when there are zero reactions or zero likes or something' (Respondent 3, male, 16 years). However, he does add that he expects some likes from his friends on the things he posts on social network sites, because 'liking' is an easy and frequently executed action.

As demonstrated in the previous paragraph the interviewed girls of sixteen and fifteen consider likes and reactions to their posts on social network sites as more crucial. Because of this, they expect also more of their friends; the following part of the conversation with the sixteen-year-old girl illustrates this:

*Respondent 1: If I, even though only my best friends like, I find that already, I find that enough. It is of course nice if many people like it.*

*Interviewer: But it is good enough if you good friends do it?*

*Respondent 1: Yes, if they do not do it, then you know definitely that there is something wrong with it (Respondent 1, female, 16 years).*

The respondent continues her story and says: "it is quite common that your best friends usually like". The sixteen-year-old female respondent also adds that she also does that: "Sometimes I like something of my best friends or good friends, while I do not actually at all... a picture that I do not think is pretty at all, but still...". She still likes the posts of her good friends, because that is 'what you do as a friend' according to sixteen-year-old. In addition, the fifteen-year-old respondents highlight this as well, as demonstrated in the following part of their conversation:

*Respondent 5: We, as friends, you do like always. You always have ten likes of solid friends, I think, yes, I think that.*

*Respondent 6 and 7: Yes.*

*Respondent 5: Of which you are certain they will like always. It depends a bit, but as solid friends you do that generally.*

*(Group interview, respondent 5, 6 and 7, female, 15 years)*

The fifth respondent adds that they can be certain, because "we know from each other, that we do not like it to have zero likes". Also with personal messages through Instant Messaging programs and social network sites, the girls of fifteen and sixteen find reactions quite important. The female respondent of sixteen thinks it is "stupid" when someone does not respond and she thinks it seems like someone is thinking: "I do not feel like responding to you and you may know that". However, the respondent does add that when it concerns a good friend it would be very stupid if they do not respond or the friend has a very good reason for not responding. The fifteen-year-old female respondents also find it important, as

demonstrated in the next part of the interview:

Respondent 5: *Well, I think especially, that we always are on our phone, so we respond very quickly.*

Interviewer: *Yes.*

Respondent 6: *But when you do not respond, there is really a reason, so to speak, that is not for no reason.*

Respondent 5: *Yes.*

Respondent 6: *Then you do that with a kind of intention behind it.*

Respondent 5: *Then it is clear that there is something going on.*

Respondent 6: *Yes.*

Interviewer: *Yes.*

Respondent 7: *Otherwise you would make some time to answer.*

(Group interview, respondent 5, 6 and 7, female, 15 years)

The oldest male respondent said the following about friends not responding to a personal message: "Usually I find it a pity, but it also depends a bit if it is about an appointment or something, then I would think: yes, what a jerk that he does not respond" (Respondent 2, male, 18 years). The male respondent of sixteen adds that when he sends a personal message and he does not receive a reaction then "after half an hour, then I send something again, because (...) before that I think it is okay, because then you can be busy or something..." (Respondent 3, male, 16 years). However, he also adds that he does not really mind when his friends do not respond and he does not talk to them, because he sees them everyday "on school, and after school, and in the weekend I also always see them, so yes...I do not find it super important, because it is usually about homework..." (Respondent 3, male, 16 years).

In sum, the interviews brought several issues to light that one should take into account when making a questionnaire about this topic. Above all, I learned from the interviews that I should make a distinction between the use of social network sites and the use of Instant Messaging programs. It became clear during the interviews that the adolescents use and value these two tools differently and that they expect different things from their friends when using these tools. Besides this, the adolescents mentioned several reasons for using online communication, which I incorporated in the survey, for example the reason 'everyone has it'. Interesting to incorporate as well were the insecurities about receiving too little response. How important do the adolescent find it to receive many reactions and likes? Something that also became evident in the interviews was that one should make a distinction between reactions and likes as well. The interviewees considered the likes as more common than reactions. I also learned that the survey should include and examine the degree of activeness as a characterizing factor. It is a logical thought that the opinion of someone about a product or service is formed by the degree using this product or

service; this also became apparent in the interviews. In addition, the interviews provided illustrative and extensive examples of how the adolescents evaluate online communication. The next paragraphs discuss the results of the survey research.

#### 4.2. Survey results

In total 164 adolescents, between the ages of twelve and nineteen, have filled in the survey. Thirty-three adolescents missed one or two questions, but they were kept in the sample because their answers were almost complete. The average age of the participants was 14.6 years ( $SD= 2.089$ ). The male and female respondents were almost equivalent in this sample, with 52.4% female adolescents and 47.6% male adolescents. Most adolescents were younger than 15 years (50%) and the adolescents of eighteen and older were less represented (11%). The main research results will be discussed according to the following four categories as well: the use of online communication, the evaluation of online communication, the effects of online communication and the expectations concerning friends when using online communication.

##### 4.2.1. The use of online communication

The first sub question of this research was in what ways do Dutch adolescents use social network sites and Instant Messaging programs? To answer this question we carried out several descriptive analyses. In the survey, we started with questions about the use of online communication. With these questions the adolescents could choose from eight ascending categories, including 'less than once a week', 'once a week', 'once in a couple of days', 'once a day', '2 to 5 times a day', '6 to 10 times a day', '11 to 15 times a day' and 'all the time'. We differentiated between usage of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. To be more clear we divided the adolescents into three groups based on their use of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs, notably: less active users (less than once a day), active users (1 to 5 times a day) and very active users (6 times a day to practically always). Only 4.3% of the adolescents reported to be less active on Instant Messaging programs, this was 9.8% when it concerned social network sites. The very active users were most dominant in the sample, when it concerned Instant Messaging programs (77.4%) and social network sites (57.3%).

To get a more detailed overview about the use of online communication tools by adolescents we asked the adolescents how often they used specific sites and programs. One can see these results in Table 1 and Table 2. The social network sites that are used by most adolescents sometimes, often or always are Facebook, Instagram and Twitter.

Table 1: Percentages of the sample of Dutch adolescents concerning using different SNS

	Facebook	Twitter	Instagram	Tumblr	Pinterest	Habbo	Google+
% of the sample that uses this SNS (N= 164)	72%	36%	74.4%	13.4%	4.9%	1.85%	33.7%

The Instant Messaging programs that are used by the most adolescents sometimes, often or always are WhatsApp, Snapchat and Skype as shown in table two.

Table 2: Percentages of the sample of Dutch adolescents concerning using different IM

	Whatsapp	Skype	Snapchat	Telegram	IChat	Google Hangouts	MSN
% of the sample that uses this SNS (N= 164)	95.7%	48.7%	45.7%	18.9%	2.5%	4.9%	3.7%

We also asked the adolescents about the importance of certain activities while using social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. The largest number of adolescents (59.3%) considers looking at profiles on social network sites an (very) important activity. Posting messages, pictures or videos was the second most valued activity (55.5%). Activities the adolescents considered not as important were sending private messaging to strangers, only 4.9% found this important to very important, and the alerting (in Dutch know as 'porren'), only 5% of the adolescents found this important to very important. With using Instant Messaging programs, most adolescents considered private messaging as (very) important (90.9%). Chatting in groups was important for 78% of the adolescents. Only 27.6% of the adolescents found video chatting important to very important.

Next, the adolescents were asked about the importance of certain reasons for using social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. 'Communicating with friends' is an important reason for most adolescents (96.3%) when they use Instant Messaging programs. This is the same when it concerns social network sites (81.7%). The reason 'it is easy and quickly' is the second most valued reason, by 75% of the adolescents when it concerns social network sites and by 84.8% of the adolescents when it concerns Instant Messaging programs. Other important reasons for the adolescents were 'staying updated about friends', 'keeping friends updated' and 'sharing with friends. 74.4% of the adolescents considered the reason 'all my friends have it' importance or very important when using Instant Messaging programs, however; this is only 59.8% of the adolescents when it concerns social network sites. The reason that is valued the least is 'staying updated about events'.

We also wanted to determine the influence of gender and age on using Instant Messaging programs and social network sites. We conducted a series of Independent T-

tests to investigate whether male and female participants differed in their average use and whether younger and older adolescents differed in their use. The girls and boys differed from each other significantly when it concerned the average use of social network sites. The average of female adolescents ( $M = 6.93, SD = 1.25$ ) was higher than the average of the male adolescents ( $M = 6.49, SD = 1.57$ ) ( $t(162) = -2.55, p < 0.05$ ). The differences concerning the average use of Instant Messaging programs were not significant. Regarding age, we found that the younger (12-15 years) and older adolescents (16-19 years) differed from each other when it concerned the average use of Instant Messaging programs. The average use of Instant Messaging by older adolescents ( $M = 7.27, SD = 1.9$ ) was significantly higher than the average from younger adolescents ( $M = 6.41, SD = 1.69$ ). This difference was significant ( $t(162) = 1.19, p < 0.05$ ). The differences between age groups concerning the average use of social network sites were not significant.

To determine if gender and age are really influencing the adolescents' use of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs we carried out correlation and regression analyses. A linear regression model enables to determine the effects on a dependent of a changing independent variable. However, before carrying out this type of analyses the variable gender needs some adjustment. It should be a dummy variable; only one value or characteristic of the variable can be measured. We chose female as the main value, because this characteristic was the most dominant in the data sample. Table 3 shows that the correlations are under 0.75, this means there is enough variation. One can see that the correlation between female gender and the use of Instant Messaging programs is not significant. The correlation between the age of the adolescents and the use of social network sites is not significant as well.

Table 3: Spearman's rho analyses gender, age and use of SNS and IM

	Use SNS Spearman's rho	Use IM Spearman's rho
Female gender	0,183*	0.085
Age	-0.014	0.334*

\* $p < 0.05$

In Table 4, one can find the characteristics of the two regressions models. Direct logistic regressions were performed to assess the impact of gender and age on the activeness on social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. The variables activeness on social network sites and Instant messaging programs needed some adjustment as well. The variables needed to be dichotomous; we chose very active as the main value. Model one is not significant. Model two explained between 13% (Cox and Snell R square) and 19.8%

(Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in the very active use of Instant Messaging programs by the adolescents. Although the explained variance is low, the data suggest that we can determine that age is a factor that significantly contributes to the very active use of Instant Messaging programs.

Table 4: Logistic regression analyses for the effects of gender and age on very active users of SNS and IM

	Model 1 Very active use SNS	Model 2 Very active use IM
Female gender (B coefficients)	0.579	0.650
Age (B coefficients)	-0.054	0.470*
Cox & Snell R Square	0.023	0.13
Nagelkerke R Square	0.030	0.198

\* $p < 0.05$

#### 4.2.2. The evaluation of online communication

The second and the third question of this thesis included ‘how do Dutch adolescents evaluate the rise of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs?’ and ‘to what extent do Dutch adolescents believe that their offline friendships benefit from their online friendships?’. To measure how the adolescents evaluate online communication they received 13 scaled statements and were asked to express whether they agreed or disagreed with them on a Likert-type 5-point scale (1 = disagree totally; 5 = agree totally), as explained in the method section. The statements intended to measure 1) the evaluation of certain characteristics of online communication 2) the evaluation of online communication versus offline communication and 3) the evaluation of the possible benefits online communication offers.

We asked the adolescents if they agreed with the statement ‘It is annoying that you can not see someone’s expressions when you communicate online’. 61.8% of the adolescents agree or totally agree with this statement. On the other hand, 81.1% of the adolescents agree with the statement ‘It is nice that you can take the time to respond to a message when you communicate online’. Only 20.1% of the adolescents agree or totally agree with the statement ‘I find online communication nicer than offline communication’. Lastly, to measure the adolescents’ evaluation of the possible benefits online communication offers we asked the adolescents for instance if they agreed with the statement: ‘Through

social network sites (Facebook) I stay updated about a larger amount of people'. 66.3% of the adolescents agree or strongly agree with this statement.

In order to calculate with the 13 statements about the evaluation, the statements were subjected to a factor analysis. Firstly, we needed to determine the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity before continuing with the analysis. It became clear that the analysis met the criteria for a factor analysis (KMO .76; Bartlett .000; Pallant, 2007) Two statements were removed for further analysis ('Online communication is less personal than offline communication' and 'I think it is annoying that you cannot see someone expressions when you communicate online'). These variables provided inconsistencies; they provided double loads with multiple components. Based on the criteria of an Eigenvalue greater than 1, the factor analysis resulted in three components (see Table 5). These three components explained separately 33.78%, 12.65% and 10.57% and in total 57% of the variance.

Table 5: Evaluation components concerning online communication: item loadings on a three factor principal components solution

	Components		
	1: Benefitting friendships	2: Extending social network	3. Good characteristics
Because of online communication with my friends our friendships became better	0.831		
Because of online communication with my friends our friendships became stronger	0.811		
I find online communication is nicer than offline communication	0.789		
Through online communication I dare to tell my friends more	0.730		
It is handy that you do not see someone's face while communicating online	0.508		
Through of social network sites I stay updated about a larger amount of people		0.859	
Because of social network sites I have more relatives		0.831	
Because of social network sites I have more friends		0.772	
It is nice that you can take the time to respond to a message when you communicate online			0.772
Online communication through video chat is the same as offline communication			0.698
With smileys you can make online communication more personal			0.571

A reliability analysis revealed that Cronbach's alpha was satisfactory for only two scales ('Online communication benefits my friendships', 0.81; 'Online communication extends my social network', 0.67). One item ('It is handy that you do not see someone's face while communicating online'), in the first scale, was removed for further analysis, because it resulted in a higher alpha. The alpha = .67 for the scale 'online communication extends my social network' was low, but is considered acceptable in an exploratory study according to

Pallant (2007). The third scale 'Online communication is similar to offline communication' had a very low Alpha 0.56, based on these scaling results we chose to proceed with only two scales. We created two new variables that were used in subsequent analyses:

1. Benefitting friendships; online communication benefits my friendships (four items)
2. Extending social network; online communication extends my social network' (three items)

We wanted to determine if gender and age are influencing determining factors when it concerns the evaluation of the online communication. We conducted a series of Independent T-tests to investigate whether male and female participants differed in their evaluation, and to investigate whether younger and older adolescents differed in their evaluation. These results were not significant.

The interviews revealed that it would be interesting to examine as well if the degree of activeness also attributes to the evaluation. With two ANOVA's we examined if the evaluation of online communication by adolescents could be distinguished by their degree of activeness. We found there was a statistically significant difference between the three groups, less active users, active users and very active users, when it concerned the extent the adolescents believed that online communication is benefitting their friendships ( $F(2) = 8.523, p < 0.05$ ). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of the very active users ( $M = 2.9, SD = 0.87$ ) were significantly higher than the mean scores of the less active users ( $M = 2.03, SD = 0.95$ ) and the active users ( $M = 2.4, SD = 0.85$ ). The very active users differed significantly from the other two groups.

We also found that there was a statistically significant difference between the three groups when it concerned the extent the adolescents believed that online communication extends their social network ( $F(2) = 11.164, p < 0.05$ ). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of the less active users ( $M = 1.95, SD = 0.77$ ) were significantly lower than the mean scores of the active users ( $M = 2.95, SD = 0.85$ ) and the very active users ( $M = 2.9, SD = 0.83$ ).

To determine if gender, age and the extent of activeness are influencing the adolescents' evaluation of online communication we carried out correlation and regression analyses. In Table 6, one can see that all the correlations again are under 0.75. One can see that the correlation between gender and the evaluation of online communication is not significant. The other correlations are significant.

In Table 7, one can find the characteristics of the two multiple regressions models concerning the influence of the female gender, age and being very active on the extent the adolescents agree that online communication benefits their friendships and on the extent they believe it enlarges their social network. Model three shows being very active on social network sites and Instant Messaging programs are significant stimulants for the extent the



adolescents believe these tools benefit their friendship. Age has a significant negative influence. This model explains 17.4% of the variance in the evaluation of the friendship benefits online communication can offer. Model 4 explains 8.7% of the extent the adolescents believe online communication can extend an adolescent's social network. Although the explained variance is low, the data suggest that we can determine that age is a factor that significantly contributes to the extent the adolescents believe online communication extends their network.

Table 6: Pearson's correlation analyses gender, age, activeness and evaluations of online communication

	Benefitting friendships Pearson's corr.	Extending social network Pearson's corr.
Female gender	0,014	0.115
Age	0.180*	0.189*
Very active on SNS	0.332*	0.197*
Very active on IM	0.256*	0.213*

\* $p < 0.05$

Table 7: Multiple regression analyses for the effects of gender, age and activeness on evaluation online communication

	Model 3 Benefitting friendships	Model 4 Extending social network
Female gender (B coefficients)	-0.89	0.135
Age (B coefficients)	-0.109*	0.072*
Very active on SNS (B coefficients)	0.384*	0.283
Very active on IM (B coefficients)	0.535*	0.122
R-Square	0.174	0.087

\* $p < 0.05$

#### 4.2.3. The effects of online communication

The third sub-question of this thesis focused on the extent the Dutch adolescents felt the need to interact and to stay online. Several effects of online communication were focus

points in the survey. Firstly, the survey focused on the adolescents feeling the need to stay online, secondly, on the adolescents having less time for other activities because using online communication and thirdly, on the adolescents having the need for confirmation through responses.

Regarding the first focus point, we wanted to determine if the adolescents felt the need to stay online. We asked them to what extent they found it unpleasant when they did not have access to social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. The adolescents differed in the extent they had negative feelings about having no access to these two communication tools. This reflects in the percentages of frequencies; only 42.1% of the adolescents find it (highly) unpleasant when they do not have access to social network sites while this is 81.7% of the adolescents when it concerns Instant Messaging programs. We asked the adolescents as well why they had negative feelings when they did not have access to their online communication tools. 'Missing a personal message' (73.8%), 'not being available' (72.6%) and 'not being in contact with friends' (58.8%) were reasons for most adolescents to feel annoyed when having no access to their online communication tools.

Regarding the second focus point, we asked the adolescents about how often their use of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs resulted in having less time for other activities, for example schoolwork. 42.7% of the adolescents say that happens rarely or never when using social network sites. 37.8% says having no time for other things is never or rarely the case when using Instant Messaging programs. 32.9% of the adolescents say that he or she sometimes has less time for other things while using social network sites. This is 28.7% when it concerns Instant Messaging. Lastly, 24.3% of the adolescents report that they often or always have less time for other activities, because he or she is using social network sites and 33.5% report this when it concerns Instant Messaging programs. More than half of the adolescents experience sometimes, often or always they have less time for other activities, including schoolwork, due to their use of online communication.

From the interviews, it became clear that the adolescents and especially the female adolescents felt insecure whenever they did not receive any reactions or likes to their posts on social network sites or to their messages in group chats. This is why this was the third focus point in the survey. We asked the adolescents with Liker-type 5-point scale questions (1 = very unimportant, 5 = very important) about how much value they attach to receiving many reactions to different type of messages and to receiving many likes when posting a message on social network sites. There are more adolescents (42.1%) who value or highly value many likes than that there are adolescents who value many reactions (33.5%). Reactions to messages in group chats is (highly) valued by the most adolescents (50.6%).

We also examined if there was a significant difference between boys and girls when it concerned these focus points. Regarding the extent of feeling the need to stay online, the

means scores revealed that the girls felt worse when they did not have access to social network sites ( $M = 3.4$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ) than the boys ( $M = 2.9$ ,  $SD = 1.27$ ), this result is significant ( $t(144.25) = -2.8$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Similar results were established concerning Instant Messaging programs. The girls scored higher ( $M = 4.4$ ,  $SD = 0.74$ ) than the boys ( $M = 3.9$ ,  $SD = 1.16$ ) and the t-test revealed that this difference was significant ( $t(128.66) = -3.25$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). We also compared the extent the boys and girls find it important to receive many reactions or many likes to different types of messages. The girls find it significantly more important ( $M = 2.47$ ,  $SD = 1.04$ ) than boys ( $M = 2.05$ ,  $SD = 0.9$ ) to receive many reactions to a message they posted on social network sites ( $t(161.6) = -2.741$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The average of female adolescents ( $M = 2.7$ ,  $SD = 1.1$ ) was as well significantly higher than the average the male adolescents ( $M = 2.28$ ,  $SD = 1.14$ ) when it concerned the importance of receiving many likes to a posted message on social network sites ( $t(162) = -2.48$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

We as well examined if there were significant differences between the younger and older adolescents when it concerned the extent of feeling the need to stay online. The means scores revealed that the younger adolescents felt more annoyed when they do not have access to social network sites ( $M = 3.3$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ) than the older adolescents did ( $M = 2.92$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ), this result was significant ( $t(162) = 2.06$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). There was as well a statistically significant difference between the three groups, less active users, active users and very active users, when it concerned the extent the adolescents felt bad about having no access to social network sites ( $F(2) = 27.22$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores for the less active users ( $M = 1.81$ ,  $SD = 1.11$ ) for the active users ( $M = 2.8$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ) and the very active users of social network ( $M = 3.6$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ) did differ significantly from each other.

In addition, we performed variance analysis, but now to explore if the degree of activeness on Instant Messaging programs characterizes the extent the adolescent felt bad about having no access to the programs. There was a significant difference between the three groups; however, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated. However, the violation of this assumption is tolerated, because the research sample is big enough (Pallant, 2011). Therefore, we looked at the Robust Test of Equality Means and specifically at the Welch test ( $df2(2) = 14.04$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Again, the post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores for the less active users ( $M = 2.57$ ,  $SD = 1.18$ ) for the active users ( $M = 3.57$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ) and the very active users of social network ( $M = 4.39$ ,  $SD = 0.79$ ) did differ significantly from each other.

Following this, we also looked if the different users on social network sites differed in the way they value many responses to their messages on social network sites. We determined a significant difference between the three groups when it concerned the extent the adolescents found it important to receive many reactions to a posted message on social

network sites ( $F(2) = 8.6, p < 0.05$ ). The very active users scored the highest ( $M = 2.44, SD = 1.02$ ) and differed significantly from the less active users ( $M = 1.38, SD = 0.62$ ). The active users ( $M = 2.24, SD = 0.89$ ) also differed significantly from the less active users. The difference between the very active users and the active users was not significant.

We as well examined if the different users on social network sites varied from each other when it concerned the importance of many likes to a posted message on social network sites. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was again violated, but also here this violation is tolerated. The difference was significant ( $df(2) = 53.42, p < 0.05$ ). The difference between the very active users ( $M = 2.74, SD = 1.15$ ) and the active users ( $M = 2.39, SD = 1.02$ ) was once again not significant. However, apparent from the Tukey HSD test the less active users ( $M = 1.44, SD = 0.63$ ) differed significantly from the other two groups. The differences concerning Instant Messaging programs were not significant.

To determine if gender, age, the extent of activeness, but also the evaluation, influence the adolescents' experience of several effects we performed several correlation and regression analyses. In Table 8 one can see that all the correlations are again under 0,75. One can see that many correlations between age and the possible effects of online communication are not significant.

In Table 9, one can find the characteristics of the seven regressions models. Direct logistic regressions were performed to assess the impact of gender, age, the activeness on SNS and IM, and the evaluation by the adolescents on the adolescents feeling bad about having no access to their online communication tools and on the extent adolescents have less time for other activities because of using these tools. Model five explained between 37.1% (Cox and Snell R square) and 49.9% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in the extent the adolescents felt bad having no access to social network sites. Although the explained variance is moderate, the data suggest that the evaluation factors significantly contribute to the extent the adolescents feel negative about having no access to social network sites. This also applies to model six; however, in this model the female gender is also a significant stimulant.

Model seven explained between 38.5% (Cox and Snell R square) and 42.1% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in the extent the adolescents have less time for other activities as a result of using social network sites. In this model age and the extent the adolescents believe online communication benefits their friends and extends their social network significant stimulants. Model eight explained between 36.6% (Cox and Snell R square) and 33.7% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in the extent the adolescents have less time for other activities as a result of using Instant Messaging. In this model, age is again a significant stimulant. The extent the adolescent believe online communication benefits their friendships is a significant stimulant in this model as well.

Multiple regressions were performed to assess the impact of gender, age, the activeness on SNS and IM, and the evaluation by the adolescents on the extent they value many responses to different type of messages. Model nine (*R-square* = 0.128) shows us that the female gender has a significant influence on the extent the adolescents find it important to receive many reactions to a message on social network sites. Besides that, being a very active user is also a significant influence and the extent the adolescent believes social network sites benefits their friendships as well. For model ten (*R-square* = 0.215) the evaluations factors are the only two significant stimulants. Model eleven is not significant.

Table 8: Pearson's correlation and Spearman's rho analyses gender, age, activeness, evaluation and experience effects of online communication

	Negative feelings no access SNS Spearman's rho	Negative feelings no access IM Spearman's rho	Less time SNS Pearson's corr.	Less time IM Pearson's corr.	Importance many people react with message SNS Pearson's corr.	Importance many people like with message SNS Pearson's corr.	Importance many people react with group message IM Pearson's corr.
Female gender	0.209*	0.219*	0.140	0.070	0.209*	0.184*	0.057
Age	-0.067	-0.017	0.189*	0.179*	-.037	-0.056	-.087
Very active on SNS	0.444*	0.329*	0.299*	0.253*	0.197*	0.088	0.251*
Very active on IM	0.309*	0.395*	0.256*	0.321*	0.087	0.103	0.239*
Extent believing OC benefits friendships	0.461*	0.304*	0.385*	0.366*	0.259*	0.354*	0.212*
Extent believing OC extends social network	0.491*	0.202*	0.421*	0.377*	0.190*	0.329*	0.277*

\* $p < 0.05$

Table 9: Logistic (Model 5-8) and multiple (Model 9-11) regression analyses for the effects of gender, age, activeness and evaluation on the experience of effects with online communication

	Model 5 Feeling negative no access SNS	Model 6 Feeling negative no access IM	Model 7 Less time SNS	Model 8 Less time IM	Model 9 Importance many people react with message SNS	Model 10 Importance many people like with message SNS	Model 11 Importance many people react with group message IM
Female gender	0.493	1.035*	0.339	0.016	0.377*	0.293	0.081
Age	-0.149	-.086	0.242*	0.224*	-.007	0.013	0.050
Very active on SNS	0.757	0.384	0.826	0.488	0.209	0.188	0.031
Very active on IM	1.287	1.712*	-0.412	0.451	-0.119	0.207	-0.53
Extent believing OC benefits friendships	0.752*	0.600*	0.894*	0.911*	0.219*	0.293*	0.202
Extent believing OC extends social network	1.474*	-0.060	0.753*	0.452	0.102	0.259*	0.154
R-Square					0.128	0.215	0.075
Cox & Snell R Square	0.371	0.195	0.274	0.247			
Nagelkerke R Square	0.499	0.315	0.368	0.337			

\* $p < 0.05$

#### 4.2.4. Expectations of online communication

The fifth research question focused on the online behavior adolescents expect from their friends. Therefore, in addition, we asked the adolescents about their expectations concerning good friends on social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. They answered questions about how much value they attach to receiving reactions and likes from good friends. We can conclude that a higher percentage of adolescents attach value to receiving reactions to messages send by them with Instant Messaging programs. The percentage of adolescents that attach value to receiving reactions to messages posted or send by them on social network sites is lower. More adolescents find it important to very important to receive a reaction to a personal message on Instant Messaging programs (73.8%) than to receive a reaction to a personal message on social network sites (51.2%). 44.8% of the adolescents value or highly value that good friends like their posts on social network sites. This is a larger percentage than the percentage of adolescents that (highly) value their good friends to react to their posts on social network sites (39%).

The survey also asked if the adolescents found it important to receive a fast reaction to different types of messages on social network sites and Instant messaging programs from their good friends. The group that found it important to receive a fast reaction is substantial, but not large: 19% of the participants said they considered it important to very important that their friends react fast to a message they have posted on social network sites. However, this picture changes when it concerns a more private or person-to-person type of communication; 47.6% of the adolescents reported that they found it important to receive a fast reaction when it concerned a private message on social network sites and 68.9% reported this when it concerned a private message with Instant Messaging programs. So, speed in responding seems to be less important than actual responding. The percentages about fast responding are lower than when it concerns just responding in general and because of this one can conclude that fast responding is valued less than responding in general.

To be more specific, we also wanted to determine with which speed the adolescents expect their friends to respond, this is why the adolescents were asked in what range of time they expect their friends to react. When posting a message on a social network site only 6.7% of the adolescents expect their good friends to 'like' or respond right a way. 23.8% of the adolescents expect this within half an hour and 31.7% within a view hours. 17.1% of the adolescents expect that their friends respond by liking or reacting within a day, 3.7% within a few days and 1.2% expect this within a week. 15.2% of the adolescents do not expect their friends to respond at all. With the use of Instant Messaging programs, more adolescents have higher expectations of their good friends. When sending a personal message with an Instant Messaging program 21.3% of the adolescents expect that their good friends react directly. 47% expect this within half an hour and 23.8% within a few hours. Only 4.9% expect



that their friends respond within a day and 2.4% expect this within a few days. When it concerns Instant Messaging programs, only 0.6% of the adolescents do not expect a reaction of their good friends at all.

Next, we wanted to determine if the female adolescents had higher expectations from their friends than male adolescents did. Claes (1992) concluded that girls expect more from their friends than boys do. The results of this research seem to support this observation. On average girls found it more important ( $M = 2.5$ ,  $SD = 0.99$ ) to receive a reaction from a good friend to a post on social network sites than boys ( $M = 2.0$ ,  $SD = 0.9$ ). This difference was significant ( $t(162) = -3.28$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The girls valued 'likes' of good friends also significantly more ( $M = 2.8$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ ) than the boys did ( $M = 2.2$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ),  $t(152) = -3.51$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . The female adolescents also scored highest when it concerned the importance of friends responding to a personal message on Instant Messaging programs ( $M = 3.45$ ,  $SD = 1.2$ ). The difference from the male respondents ( $M = 2.97$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ ) was again significant ( $t(162) = -2.55$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The mean differences concerning the importance of friends responding to a message in a group chat with using Instant Messaging programs were not significant.

Regarding age, we also investigated the differences when it concerns the extent they value many responses and responses of good friends. Unfortunately, these results were not significant. We also examined if the different type of users concerning activeness differed in their expectations of good friends. When it concerns the importance of receiving likes of good friends on social network sites we could determine a significant difference ( $F(2) = 11.95$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The less active users ( $M = 1.43$ ,  $SD = 0.51$ ), the active users ( $M = 2.35$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ) and very active users on social network sites ( $M = 2.8$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ) differed from each other significantly, according to the Tukey HSD test.

In addition, there was a significant difference when it concerns the importance of receiving reactions from good friends on a posted message on social network sites ( $F(2) = 8.84$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and on a private message on social network sites ( $F(2) = 8.23$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The very active users ( $M = 2.44$ ,  $SD = 0.95$ ) differed significantly from the less active users ( $M = 1.38$ ,  $SD = 0.62$ ) when it concerned the importance of receiving reactions from good friends on a posted messages. This also was the case when it concerned the very active users ( $M = 2.89$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ), the less active users ( $M = 1.75$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ) and the importance of receiving reactions to a private message on social network sites. There were no significant differences observed between the active users and the very active users.

We also focused on the users of Instant messaging programs and the way they value responses to reactions of their good friends to personal messages and messages in group chats. We found significant differences between the three groups when it concerned a personal message ( $F(2) = 4.51$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and with a message in a group chat ( $F(2) = 3.07$ ,

$p < 0.05$ ). The Turkey HSD test showed that the difference between the less active users ( $M = 2.14$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ) and the very active users ( $M = 3.35$ ,  $SD = 1.22$ ) when it concerns the importance of reactions to a personal message was significant. The others were not significant.

To determine if gender, age, the extent of activeness, the evaluation and the extent adolescents find it important to receive many responses influence the adolescents' expectations concerning friends we again performed several correlation and regression analyses. In Table 11 one can see that all the correlations again are under 0,75, except the correlation between the importance of many people liking a message on social network sites and the importance of good friends doing that. One can see that many correlations between age and the importance of friends responding are not significant. The others correlations are for the largest part significant.

In Table 12, one can find the characteristics of the out multiple regression analyses. One can determine that the female gender is a significant influencing factor when it concerns the importance of friends responding in most of the models. This is not the case when it concerns the importance of good friends reacting to a group message using Instant Messaging programs. One can see as well that the extent the adolescents value many responses to a certain message influences the extent the adolescents value responses of their good friends as well.

Table 11: Pearson's correlation analyses gender, age, activeness, evaluation, importance many people reacting and expectations concerning friends when using online communication

	Importance good friends react with message on SNS Pearson's corr.	Importance good friends react with private message on SNS Pearson's corr.	Importance good friends react with message in group chat IM Pearson's corr.	Importance good friends react with private message IM Pearson's corr.	Importance many people like with message SNS Pearson's corr.
Female gender	0.249*	0.255*	0.137	0.197*	0.274*
Age	-0.017	0.159*	0.065	0.185*	-.058
Very active on SNS	0.199*	0.231*	0.185*	0.160*	0.293*
Very active on IM	0.193*	0.194*	0.188*	0.196*	0.220*
Extent believing OC benefits friendships	0.421*	0.134	0.238*	0.092	0.469*
Extent believing OC extends social network	0.339*	0.281*	0.301*	0.174*	0.335*
Importance many people react with message SNS	0.621*	0.401*	0.303*	0.193*	0.621*
Importance many people like with message SNS	0.553*	0.455*	0.442*	0.313*	0.796*
Importance many people react with groupmessage IM	0.439*	0.477*	0.704*	0.520*	0.408*

Table 12: Logistic regression analyses for the effects of gender, age, activeness and evaluation and the importance many people reacting on the expectations concerning friends when using online communication

	Model 12 Importance good friends react with message on SNS	Model 13 Importance good friends react with private message on SNS	Model 14 Importance good friends react with group message chat IM	Model 15 Importance good friends react with private message IM	Model 16 Importance many people like with message SNS
Female gender	0.260*	0.373*	0.163	0.421*	0.309*
Age	0.023	0.042	-0.020	0.059	-.026
Very active on SNS	-0.151	0.276	0.126	0.194	0.080
Very active on IM	0.205	0.008	0.103	0.138	0.013
Extent believing OC benefits friendships	0.227*	-.094	0.004	-0.043	0.209*
Extent believing OC extends social network	0.136	0.133	0.115	-0.022	0.036
Importance many people react with message SNS	0.375*	0.053	-0.200*	-0.259*	0.131
Importance many people like with message SNS	0.076	0.187*	0.174*	0.169	0.522*
Importance many people react with groupmessage IM	0.138*	0.358*	0.655*	0.603*	0.053
<i>R-Square</i>	0.517	0.365	0.547	0.347	0.664

\* $p < 0.05$

In sum, this study showed us that adolescents use Instant Messaging programs and social network sites a lot; 91.5% of the adolescents reported that they use Instant messaging programs multiple times a day; this was 85.5% of the adolescents when it concerned social network sites. The main reasons for the adolescents to use these tools were 'to communicate with friends' and 'it is quick and easy'. We also examined if gender and age of the adolescents influences their use. We found that female adolescents significantly use social network sites more than male adolescents. The older adolescents also used instant messaging programs significantly more than the younger adolescents did. Logistic regression analyses were conducted in order to determine the impact of gender and age of the activeness on social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. These analyses showed that age is a significant positive stimulant for adolescents' use of Instant Messaging programs.

To measure the evaluation of online communication by the adolescents they received several statements and were asked to express whether they agreed or disagreed. 81.1% of the adolescents agree with the statement 'It is nice that you can take time to respond to a message when you communicate online'. However, only 20.1% of the adolescents think online communication is nicer than offline communication. A factor analysis was executed in order to reduce the statements into variables which could be used for subsequent analyses. Regarding the evaluation by the adolescents, we found a positive relation between activeness and the extent the adolescents believed online communication benefits their friendship and extends their network. Very active users on average were more positive about online communication. We also found that being very active on social network sites and Instant Messaging programs had a positive influence on the extent adolescents believed online communication benefits their friendships.

Regarding the possible effects of online communication adolescents experience, we found that many adolescents found it annoying to very annoying to have no access to Instant Messaging programs, when it concerns social network sites this number of adolescents was lower. The most frequently mentioned reasons by the adolescents for feeling annoyed are 'missing a personal message' and 'not being reachable'. Secondly, we found that more than half of the adolescents reported that they sometimes, often or always have less time for other activities as a consequence of using social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. Lastly, we also asked how the adolescents value many different types of responses to their messages on social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. The adolescents valued getting many 'likes' to a message more than getting reactions to a message.

Regarding groups differences, female adolescents found it more annoying to have no access to the online communication tools and find it more important to receive many reactions on social network sites. The younger adolescents found it as well more annoying to

have no access to the online communication tools than the older adolescents did. As expected, also the very active users found it significantly more annoying to have no access to the communication tools and found it more important to receive many responses on social network sites.

Multiple and logistic regression analyses were conducted in order to determine the impact of gender, age, activeness and the extent adolescents believe online communication benefits their friendships and extends their network on the extent the adolescents experience these several effects. The analyses showed that the evaluation factors are significant positive stimulants for the extent the adolescents feel negative about having no access to social network sites and that the evaluation factors and the female gender are significant stimulants when it concerns the extent the adolescents feel negative about having no access to Instant Messaging programs. These analyses showed that age and the evaluation factors have a significant impact on the extent the adolescents have less time for other activities because of using social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. The extent the adolescents found it important to receive many responses was significantly influenced by their gender and their degree of activeness.

Lastly, we asked the adolescents questions about their expectations concerning their good friends online. 73.8% of the adolescents find it important to very important to receive a response from friends when they send a message through Instant Messaging programs. Fewer adolescents find it important when it concerns a message through social network sites. The adolescents value responding in general more than specifically fast responding. However, 68.3% of the adolescent do report that they expect their friends to respond right away or within half an hour when they have sent a message through Instant Messaging programs. Only 30.5% of the adolescents expect this in the case of a message via social network sites. In general, the female adolescents also expected significantly more from their friends than the male adolescents. Besides this, the very active users valued reactions from their friends online significantly more than the less active users. Generally, the expectations from the adolescents concerning friends were significantly influenced by gender and the extent adolescents find it important to receive many responses.

## 5. Conclusion and discussion

### 5.1. Conclusion

The main purpose of this research was to establish how Dutch adolescents use and evaluate online communication in general and specifically in their friendships. Nowadays one can consider social network sites and Instant Messaging programs as domesticated, especially among adolescents (Baym, 2010). It is of great importance for the daily social life of adolescents (Selfhout, 2009) and that is why it is interesting to examine how these active users are evaluating and using these communication tools. The main question of this thesis was therefore: how do Dutch adolescents evaluate online friendship in comparison to offline friendship? To give an answer to this in main question this thesis focused on several sub-questions. A theoretical framework was built and an extensive mixed method research was carried out, which both revolved around giving the most complete answer as possible to these sub-questions.

The first sub-question that we asked, included 'In what ways do Dutch adolescents use social network sites and Instant Messaging programs?'. Because of this, this thesis provided more up to date details about the use of online communication by adolescents. We found that 91.5% of the Dutch adolescents use Instant Messaging programs multiple times a day, of which 77.4% use the programs 6 times a day to all the time. 85.5% of the adolescents reported that they use social network sites multiple times a day, of which 57.3% use the programs 6 times a day to all the time. In 2007 Duimel and de Haan stated that 66% of the Dutch adolescents in their study used the Instant Messaging program MSN multiple times a day and in 2006 Valkenburg et al. reported that the adolescents in their study visited social network sites on average three times a week. If one compares the results of the presented research with the previous research, one can assume there has been a huge increase in the average use of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs over the years. Illustrative examples of how the adolescents talk and think about their use of online communication themselves were provided by the conducted interviews. A respondent said for example the following about his use of Instant Messaging programs: "Yes, yes, I use that very often. (...) On Whatsapp I am online eighty times every day" (Respondent 3, male, 16 years).

The second and fourth sub question revolved around the adolescents' evaluation of online communication. The second question included 'How do Dutch adolescents evaluate the rise of social network sites and Instant Messaging programs?' and the fourth included 'To what extent do Dutch adolescents believe that their offline friendships benefit from their online friendships?'. There is much literature about the characteristics of online communication (Ishii, 2006; Rice, 1993; Short et al., 1976; Walther, 1996); however, not

much is written about how active users, including the adolescents, evaluate these tools themselves. We can say that in general only 20.1% of the adolescents think online communication is nicer than offline communication.

More specifically, we can say that 61.8% of the adolescents agree with the statement 'It is annoying that you can not see someone's expressions when you communicate online', while 81.1% of the adolescents agree with the statement 'It is nice that you can take the time to respond to a message when you communicate online'. This corresponds with what Walther (1996) and Rice and Love (1987) explain; the adolescents are less under pressure when communicating online; there is less time pressure and because of this, the adolescents can check their text before sending. 66.3% of the adolescents reported as well that they believe that through social network sites they stay updated about a larger amount of people. Online communication gives the adolescents the possibility to travel and be apart from each other, but still be in contact with another at the same time (Ishii, 2006). An illustrative quote from an interviewed adolescent highlights this positive aspect as well: "I think that it can bring people closer to each other, because you know...you can talk with people over larger distances" (Respondent 3, male, 16 years).

The third sub-question of the conducted research aimed at determining whether the adolescents felt a need to stay online: 'To what extent do the Dutch adolescents feel a need to interact and to stay online?' We found that 81.7% of the adolescents feel annoyed to very annoyed when having no access to Instant Messaging programs, this was only 42.1% when it concerned social network sites. Another phenomenon associated with the use of online communication is stress. Kraut et al. (2001) explain that with more intensive use of the Internet there is less time for other activities and this relates to an increase in the perceived stress of users. We found that more than half of adolescents reported that they sometimes, often or always have less time for other activities due to using social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. A typical example of how the interviewed adolescents thought about having less time for other activities is demonstrated in the following quote: "I have it especially with homework, then my laptop is on and I get caught up in someone's pictures, then I just watch that. And then, at one point, I think; what am I doing?" (Respondent 1, female, 16 years).

The fifth sub-question was 'What kind of online behavior do Dutch adolescents expect from a "good" friend?'. To answer this question this research provided insights on a research topic that has not been researched yet, namely; online friendship expectations. Being in a friendship is associated with expectations of how the other person in the relationship should act and behave (Reisman and Shorr, 1978). We wanted to determine if there are also certain expectations when it concerns online friendship. We found that 73.8% of the adolescents find it important to very important to receive a response of friends when they send a message



through Instant Messaging programs. Fewer adolescents find it important to receive a response of friends when it concerns a message through social network sites. Next, we found that the adolescents value responding in general more than fast responding. However, when we asked the adolescents how fast they expect their friends to react, 68.3% of the adolescents said they expected their good friends to respond right away or within half an hour when it concerned a message on Instant Messaging programs. 30.5% of the adolescents said this when it concerned a message on social network sites.

Finally, the last two questions included 'To what extent does this evaluation differ by gender?' and 'To what extent does this evaluation differ by age?'. This research aimed at establishing factors that could influence the use, the evaluation, the experience by and the expectations of adolescents when it concerns online communication. We wanted to provide insights on the patterns that could be found in the adolescents' behavior and opinion. Corresponding with previous research, we found that female adolescents significantly use online communication, in this case Instant messaging programs, more than male adolescents (Livingstone et al., 2011; Schouten, 2007). Espinoza and Juvonen (2011) explain that online communication is more central to the social lives of girls than it is for boys.

In this research, the female adolescents found it more annoying to have no access to their online communication tools and found it more important to receive many reactions on social network sites. Both gender and the degree of activeness of adolescents were a significant positive influence on the extent adolescents found it important to receive many responses. In general, the female adolescents also expected significantly more from their friends than the male adolescents. This relates with what Claes (1992) said, namely that girls expect more from their friends than boys do. We found as well that the expectations of the adolescents concerning friends were indeed influenced by gender. The extent adolescents find it important to receive many responses was a significant stimulant also. The extent adolescents value many reactions has an impact on the extent adolescents value reactions of their friends.

Regarding age patterns, we found that with the use of online communication one can determine quite an increase when adolescents are aging. This corresponds with previous literature (Livingstone et al., 2011). In addition, we found that the age is indeed a significant positive stimulant for adolescents' use of Instant Messaging programs. The extent adolescents had less time because of using their online communication tools was positively related to their age. Interesting to add is that the extent the adolescents believed online communication benefits their friendships and extends their social network was a significant stimulant as well. Therefore, when the adolescents get older or when they evaluate online communication more positively the more likely they have less time for other activities.

This research also offered more insights on other possible factors that could have an influence, including the degree of activeness on social network sites and Instant Messaging programs. We found that very active users found it significantly more annoying to have no access to the communication tools. They valued many reactions and reactions of their friends also significantly more. The degree in activeness influences the evaluation positively as well; very active users were on average more positive about online communication. Being very active on social network sites and Instant Messaging programs had a significant positive impact on the extent adolescents believed online communication benefits their friendships.

This research provided a broad overview on what adolescents feel, think, prefer and expect when it concerns online communication and on which factors pattern these feelings, thoughts, preferences and expectations. By combining the two research methods, this thesis provided not only significant details about the use and the evaluation of online communication by adolescents, but also provided more insights and anecdotes about what goes on in the minds of the adolescents. An appropriate ending of this conclusion is therefore an illustrative example of how the adolescents talk about online communication:

Respondent 6: It is just handy.

Respondent 5: Very important.

Respondent 6: We can not go without.

Respondent 5: No, I think we made that clear.

(Group interview, respondent 5 and 6, female, 15 years)

## 5.2. Discussion

Even though this research provided an extensive overview about the use and evaluation of online communication by adolescents there are some limitations to this research. Firstly, this study focused on Dutch adolescents, which is an interesting research group. However, one has to take into account that the Netherlands is 'media rich' country (Haddon, 2006, p. 198). The Dutch belong to the top in terms of internet use (Wereldbank, 2013) and because of this, we cannot generalize the results this study to a larger population or more specifically to populations in which the Internet use is much lower. One can also imagine that the found results could even differ in different parts of the Netherlands. Now, the survey was spread in Rotterdam, one of the largest cities in the Netherlands. However; one can imagine that in a more rural environment, adolescents perhaps think differently about online communication.

Secondly, I chose a specific time period for collecting the respondents and this had its consequences; I chose May and in this month several students who are in the fourth, the fifth and sixth school years were busy with their final exams. When the survey was spread around the students at the Gemini College in Rotterdam, the older adolescents were less present

and because of this, the older respondents (17-19 years) were less represented in the research sample; this led to an unequal distribution.

Thirdly, when focusing on the results, this research has its limits as well, especially when it concerned the measurement of the evaluation of online communication by the adolescents. The statements that were used to measure the evaluation were subjected to a factor analysis; this resulted in one good component with a high Alpha (0.81) percentage. However, the Alpha's of the other components were low; one was satisfactory (0.67) and the other one was really on the borderline (0.56). As a result, this research could not expand on this topic. In addition, I based many results of this research on variance and regression analyses, which can determine correlations. With these types of analyses, we have found interesting patterns in the use and evaluation of online communication by adolescents. However, this is just the beginning. To make any further claims about influencing factors on the use and evaluation of online communication by adolescents a longitudinal study should be conducted. In addition, this research should be expanded with a larger and more diverse sample.

Another reason for expanding this research is that it covered a topic that was not researched until now. In the research field of adolescents and online communication, this study took a new turn by examining online friendship expectations. Online friendship expectations are quite a new research focus. However, again, this research was just the beginning. It would be very interesting to expand the research into these online expectations. Can one define other online friendship norms for example? Are there different norms when it concerns different situations?

One can also wonder what the role of peer pressure is; do the adolescents feel pressure to behave in a certain way online, because their friends expect this? One can imagine that an adolescent feels pressure to respond immediately when a group member sends a message, because that is the way one should act in the group. The interviews revealed this possible factor as well. Several respondent talked about 'what is normal' in their group of friends. The sixteen-year-old male respondent said for example the following: "In my group of friends no one is really, so to speak, super social-media-like". The sixteen-year-old female respondent explicitly said that she believes her friends influence her with the extent they are active or not. She said the following: "I think that you also adjust a bit, when your best friends add a thousand pictures, then you would think: o, o, maybe I should do that as well" (Respondent 1, female, 16 years). The sixteen-year-old also adds that she really experiences pressure from the people around her to have a social network account. She continues and says the following: "If someone does not have Facebook from my class, then it is like; who is that? Why do you do not have that? So strange" (Respondent 1, female, 16 years).

It would make sense that an adolescent values a product or service as more important when his or her group of friends values it as important. This would be an interesting point of view to examine. Writing this thesis started with the thought that I would perhaps be considered as a bad friend if I was from an even younger generation. I would not meet the online friendship standards. The results of this research underscore that offline and online friendships are merging, especially among the younger generations. If I would be fifteen again today, I can imagine that I would be tired of constantly having to be online and having to be reachable to friends. However, perhaps, I would just get accustomed to it. Perhaps, I would just think about these online communication tools the same way as the fifteen-year-old girls in the interviews did:

Respondent 5: Yes, very important, especially now, in this time, we can not go without.

Respondent 6: Well yes, especially since it has always been like this.

Respondent 5: We are accustomed to it

(Group interview, respondent 5 and 6, female, 15 years)

## 6. Literature

Adams, R.G., Blieszner, R. & de Vries, B. (2000). Definitions of Friendship in the Third Age: Age, Gender, and Study Location Effects. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 14, 117-133.

Baym, N.K. (2010). *Personal Connections in the Digital Age*. Oxford: Polity.

Baarda, D.B., Goede, de M.P.M. & Kalmijn, M. (2010). *Basisboek Enquêteeren*. Groningen/Houten: Noordhoff Uitgevers.

Baarda, D.B., Goede, de M.P.M. & Meer-Middelburg, van der A.G.E. (2007). *Basisboek Interviewen: Handleiding voor het voorbereiden en afnemen van interviews*. Groningen/Houten: Noordhoff Uitgevers.

Barriball, K.L. & While, A. (1994). Collecting data using a semi-structured interview: a discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19, 328-335.

Barker, V. (2009). Older Adolescents' Motivations for Social Network Site Use: The Influence of Gender, Group Identity, and Collective Self-Esteem. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 12, 209-213.

Berndt, T.J. (1982). The Features and Effects of Friendship in Early Adolescence. *Child Development*, 53, 1447-1460.

Bighelaar, van den S. & Akkermans, M. (2013). CBS Bevolkingstrends 2013: Gebruik en gebruikers van sociale media. October 2013.

Boeije, H. (2002). A Purposeful Approach to the Constant Comparative Method in the Analysis of Qualitative Interviews. *Quality & Quantity*, 36, 391-409.

Boeije, H., 't Hart, H. & Hox, J. (2009). *Onderzoeksmethoden*. Amsterdam: Boomonderwijs.

Boneva, B. S., Quinn, A., Kraut, R. E., Kiesler, S., & Shklovski, I. (2006). Teenage communication in the instant messaging era. In R. Kraut, M. Brynin & S. Kiesler (Eds.), *Computers, phones, and the Internet: Domesticating information technology* (pp. 201-218). New York: Oxford University Press

Boyd, D.M. & Ellison, N.B. (2008). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship

Bryman. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 13, 210-230.

Connolly, J., Craig, W., Goldberg, A. & Pepler, D. (1999). Conceptions of Cross-Sex Friendships and Romantic Relationships in Early Adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 28, 481-494.

Bukowski, W.M., Newcomb, A.F. & Hartup, W.W. (1996). *The Company They Keep, Friendship in Childhood and Adolescence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CBS Webmagazine (2014). At CBS. Consulted at the 26<sup>th</sup> May 2014, on <http://www.cbs.nl/nlNL/menu/themas/dossiers/jongeren/publicaties/artikelen/archief/2014/2014-4-4079-wm.htm>.

Claes, M.E. (1992). Friendship and personal adjustment during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 15, 39-55.

Creswell, J.W., Hanson, W.E., Clark Plano, V.L. & Moreales, A. (2007). Qualitative Research Designs: Selection and Implementation. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35, 236-265.

Croteau, D., Hoynes, W. & Milan, S. (2012). *Media Society: Industries, Images and Audiences*. Sage Publications Inc., California

Daymon, C. and Holloway, I. (2011). *Qualitative Research Methods in Public Relations And Marketing Communications*. Routledge, Oxon.

Delfos, M. (2013). The virtual environment from a developmental perspective. In: *Improving the Quality of Childhood in Europe 2012*, 3, 102-157. European Council for Steiner Waldorf Education. <http://www.ecswe.org/downloads/publications/QOC-V4/QOC13-Chapter4-Delfos.pdf>.

Dolgin, K.G. (2011). *The adolescent: development, relationships, and culture*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Duimel, M. & de Haan, J. (2007). *Nieuwe links in het gezin: De digitale leefwereld van tieners en de rol van hun ouders* (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, maart 2007). Consulted at [www.scp.nl/dsresource?objectid=19477&type=org](http://www.scp.nl/dsresource?objectid=19477&type=org).

Ellison, N.B., Steinfeld, C. & Lampe, C. (2007). The Benefits of Facebook "Friends:" Social Capital and College Students' Use of Online Social Network Sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12, 1143-1168.

Espinoza, G. & Juvonen, J. (2011). The Pervasiveness, Connectedness, and Intrusiveness of Social Network Site Use Among Young Adolescents. *Cyber psychology, Behavior & Social Networking*, 0, 1-5.

Facebook. (n.d.). At *Facebook*. Consulted at 27<sup>th</sup> of December 2013, on <https://www.facebook.com/policies/?ref=pf>.

Guo, R.M. (2008). Stranger Danger and the Online Social Network. *The Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 23, 617-644.

Grubbs, M. & Milne, G. (2010). Gender Differences in Privacy-related Measures for Young Adult Facebook Users. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 10, 28-45.

Hoek, van C. (2012, 21 Aug.). Whatsapp heeft kwart miljard actieve gebruikers. Consulted at <http://www.nu.nl/tech/3506473/whatsapp-heeft-kwart-miljard-actieve-gebruikers.html>.

- Haddon, L. (2004). The Contribution of Domestication Research to In-Home Computing and Media Consumption. *The Information Society*, 22, 195-203.
- Ishii, K. (2006). Implications of Mobility: The Uses of Personal Communication Media in Everyday Life. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 346–365.
- Joinson, A.D. (2004). Self-Esteem, Interpersonal Risk, and Preference for E-Mail to Face-To-Face Communication. *Cyber psychology & Behavior*, 7, 472-478.
- Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T. & Sherlis, W. (1998). Internet Paradox: A Social Technology That Reduces Social Involvement and Psychological Well-Being?. *American Psychologist*, 53, 1017-1031.
- Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J. & Helgeson, V. (2001). Internet Paradox Revisited. *Human-Computer Interaction Institute*. Paper 101. Consulted at <http://repository.cmu.edu/hcii/101>.
- Livingstone, S., Lobe, B. and Ólafsson, K. & Vodeb, H. (2011). *Cross-national comparison of risks and safety on the internet: initial analysis from the EU Kids Online survey of European children*. EU Kids Online Network, London, UK.
- Manago, A.M., Taylor, T. & Greenfield, P. (2012). Me and My 400 Friends: The Anatomy of College Students' Facebook Networks, Their Communication Patterns, and Well-Being. *Developmental Psychology*, Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0026338.
- McKenna, K.Y.A. & Bargh, J.A. (2000). Plan 9 From Cyberspace: The Implications of the Internet for Personality and Social Psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 57-75.
- McKenna, K.Y.A. & Bargh, J.A. (2004). The Internet and Social Life. *Annual Review Psychology*, 55, 573-90.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. Allen & Unwin, Australia.
- Przybylski, A.K., Murayama, K., de Haan, C.R. & Gladwell, V. (2013). Motivational, emotional, and behavioral correlates of fear of missing out. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, 1841-1848.
- Raacke, J. & Bonds-Raacke, J. (2008). MySpace and Facebook: Applying the Uses and Gratifications Theory to Exploring Friend-Networking Sites. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 11, 169-178.
- Reisman, J.M. & Shorr, S.I. (1978). Friendship Claims and Expectations among Children and Adults. *Child Development*, 49, 913-916.
- Rice, R.E. (1993). Media Appropriateness Using Social Presence Theory to Compare Traditional and New Organizational Media. *Human Communication Research*, 19, 451-484.
- Rice, R.E. & Love, G. (1987). Electronic Emotion: Socioemotional Content in a Computer-Mediated Communication Network. *Communication Research*, 14, 85- 108.

Short, J., Williams, E., & Christie, B. (1976). *The social psychology of telecommunication*. London: John Wiley.

Schouten, A.P. (2007). Adolescents' online self-disclosure and self-presentation (PhD thesis). UvA, Amsterdam.

Schulz, W. (2004). Reconstructing mediatization as an analytical concept. *European Journal of Communication*, 19, 87-101.

Selfhout, M. (2009). Me, Myself, and You: Friendships in Adolescence (PhD thesis). Universiteit Utrecht, Utrecht.

Silverstone, R. (1993). Domesticating the revolution: information and communication technologies and everyday life. *Aslib Proceedings*, 45, 227-233.

Steinfeld, C., Ellison, N.B. & Lampe, C. (2008). Social capital, self-esteem, and use of online social network sites: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 29, 434-445.

Thomee, S., Eklof, M., Gustafsson, E., Nilsson, R. & Hagberg, M. (2007). Prevalence of perceived stress, symptoms of depression and sleep disturbances in relation to information and communication technology (ICT) use among young adults – an explorative prospective study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23, 1300-1321.

Valkenburg, P.M. & Peter, J. (2007). Preadolescents' and Adolescents' Online Communication and Their Closeness to Friends. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 267-277.

Valkenburg, P.M. & Peter, J. (2009). The Effects of Instant Messaging on the Quality of Adolescents' Existing Friendships: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Communication*, 59, 79-97.

Valkenburg, P.M. & Peter, J. (2010). Online Communication Among Adolescents: An Integrated Model of Its Attraction, Opportunities, and Risks. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 48, 121-127.

Valkenburg, P.M., Schouten, A.P. & Peter, J. (2005). Developing a Model of Adolescent Friendship Formation on the Internet. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 8, 423-430.

Valkenburg, P.M., Peter, J. & Schouten, A.P. (2006). Friend Networking Sites and Their Relationship to Adolescents' Well-Being and Social Self-Esteem. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*, 9, 584-590.

Walther, J.B. (1996). Computer-Mediated Communication: Impersonal, Interpersonal, and Hyperpersonal Interaction. *Communication Research*, 23, 3-43.

Wereldbank. (2012). Internetgebruikers in procenten van de bevolking [Data file]. Consulted at

[https://www.google.nl/publicdata/explore?ds=d5bncppjof8f9 &met\\_y=it\\_net\\_user\\_p2&idim=country:NLD&dl=nl&hl=nl&q=internetgebruik%20nederland](https://www.google.nl/publicdata/explore?ds=d5bncppjof8f9 &met_y=it_net_user_p2&idim=country:NLD&dl=nl&hl=nl&q=internetgebruik%20nederland).

Whatsapp Messenger. (n.d.). At *Whatsapp*. Consulted at 26<sup>th</sup> of May 2014, on



<http://www.whatsapp.com>.

Yang C. & Bradford Brown, B. (2013). Motives for Using Facebook, Patterns of Facebook Activities, and Late Adolescents' Social Adjustment to College. *Youth Adolescence*, 42, 403-416.

Zarbatany, L., Ghesquiere, K. & Mohr, K. (1992). A Context Perspective on Early Adolescents' Friendship Expectations. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 12, 111-126.

## 7. Appendixes

### 7.1. Overview anonymous respondents

- Respondent 1, female, 16 years, student Montessori Lyceum Rotterdam, interview was conducted on 28<sup>th</sup> of March 2014
- Respondent 2, male, 18 years, student Rudolf Steiner College Rotterdam, interview was conducted at 31<sup>st</sup> of March 2014
- Respondent 3, male, 16 years, student Rudolf Steiner College Rotterdam. Interview was conducted at 2<sup>nd</sup> of April 2014
- Respondent 4, female, 14 years, student Rudolf Steiner College Rotterdam, Interview was conducted at 10<sup>th</sup> of April 2014
- Respondents 5, 6 and 7, 15 years, students Montessori Lyceum Rotterdam, Group interview was conducted at 11<sup>th</sup> of April 2014

## 7.2. Topic list for semi-structured interviews

Hoe belangrijk is Facebook voor jou? En Whatsapp?

Gebruik van social network sites, IM, texting (In what ways do Dutch adolescents use social network sites?)

- Welke social network sites gebruik je? (zoals Facebook, Whatsapp, Twitter, Instagram, Pinterest etc.)
- Hoe vaak heb je gister gekeken op social network sites?  
En op welke websites zat je dan?  
Hoe vaak gebruik je deze websites gemiddeld?  
In de weekenden meer dan op schooldagen?
- Op welke manier gebruik je deze websites?  
Op je computer, laptop, mobiel, tablet?  
Wat heeft je voorkeur? Waarom?
- Op wat voor momenten kijk je op social network sites?  
Na school? Tijdens School? Met vrienden?  
En wanneer kijk je er juist niet op?
- Waarvoor gebruik je ze deze websites? (Voor het delen van foto's of voor vrienden opzoeken, chatten, posten etc.)  
Kan je misschien voorbeelden geven?  
Heb je ze deze week nog bezocht?  
Kan je me meer vertellen over dat moment?  
Wat heb je toen allemaal gedaan?

Redenen voor gebruik social network sites (In what ways do Dutch adolescents use social network sites?)

- Waarom gebruik je social network sites?  
Wil je in contact blijven met vrienden?  
Met welke vrienden; nieuwe vrienden, schoolvrienden of oud-klasgenoten?  
Waarom vind je dit (on)belangrijk?  
Wil je op de hoogte blijven over je vrienden en evenementen?  
Kan je mij vertellen waarom?  
Vind je het belangrijk om dingen te delen met je 'Facebookvrienden'?  
Kan je mij vertellen waarom je dit vindt?
- Waarom kies je op deze manier contact te houden met kennissen?  
Is het een handige manier of juist niet?

Evaluatie social network sites (How do Dutch adolescents evaluate the rise of social network sites?)

- Vind je het fijn om online met je vrienden te praten of dingen te delen? (Dus via de computer of mobiel)  
Kan je me hier meer over vertellen?
- Denk je dat je meer aan je vrienden durft te vertellen via online communicatie?  
Hoe denk je dat dit komt?
- Vind je het vervelend of juist fijn dat je iemand gezicht niet ziet als je met iemand praat online?  
Vind je het erg dat je de uitdrukkingen niet ziet van iemand waarmee je praat?  
Waarom vind je dit?
- Wat vind je prettiger met iemand online of gewoon face-to-face praten?  
Waarom vind je dit?  
En wat vind je van Skype of FaceTime?
- Wat zijn voor jou verschillen tussen online and offline?  
Noem er eens twee?
- Wat vind je ervan dat je zelf kan bepalen wanneer je reageert op een bericht? (Dus niet als in een face-to-face gesprek, waar je eigen meteen moet reageren)  
Wat vind je ervan dat je de tijd kan nemen op te reageren op een bericht?  
Of dat je goed kan nadenken voor dat je een bericht of post verstuurd?  
Waarom vind je dit?
- Wat vind je ervan dat je zelf je foto's uit kan kiezen voor je profiel?  
Wat vind je van het persoonlijk maken van je profielpagina?

Vind je het fijn dat je zelf bepaalt welke gegevens je deelt? (zoals je geboortedatum, je school, je relatiestatus).

Waarom vind je dit fijn of niet fijn?

Postieve en negatieve effecten van social network sites (To what extent do the Dutch adolescents feel pressure to interact and to stay online?)

- Heb je voor je gevoel meer vrienden door social network sites?  
Hoe denk je dat dit komt?
- Hoe voel je als veel mensen hebben gereageerd op een post van jou?  
Hoe voel je als er weinig mensen reageren op een post van jou?  
Hoe voel je als iemand niet reageert op een persoonlijk bericht van jou?  
Of in een groepschat?  
Vind je dit vervelend?
- Wat gebeurt er als jij niet reageert op een bericht van een vriend of vriendin?  
Zijn ze daar door gekwetst?  
Voel je druk om altijd meteen te reageren?
- Heb je wel eens het gevoel dat je echt moet kijken op social network sites, omdat je anders dingen mist?  
Voel je daar weleens vervelend over?  
Hoezo, denk je dat je, je zo voelt?
- Denk je dat het bezoeken van social network sites er voor zorgt dat je minder tijd hebt voor andere dingen?  
Voel je daar dan vervelend over?

Verwachtingen van vrienden op social network sites (What kind of online behavior do Dutch adolescents expect from a 'good' friend?)

- Wat vind je ervan als vrienden niet reageren op een bericht dat jij hebt geplaatst?  
Als je een post hebt gedaan of een foto hebt geplaatst, verwacht je dan dat je goede vrienden daar altijd op reageren?  
Reageren jouw goede vrienden op je posts?
- Wat vind je ervan als een vriend of vriendin niet reageert op een persoonlijk bericht wat je hem of haar hebt gestuurd?  
Vind je het erg als ze daar niet op reageren?  
Waarom?  
Hoe snel moeten mensen reageren op een bericht?  
Wat vind je ervan als het langer dan een dag duurt?
- Reageer jij altijd op de posts of persoonlijke berichten van je goede vrienden?  
Wanneer wel en wanneer niet?  
Binnen welke tijd?
- Hoe belangrijk vind je het dat je vrienden contact met je onderhouden online?  
Foto's met je delen?  
Waarom wel/niet?

Achtergrondinformatie

- Naam
- Geslacht
- Geboorteplaats
- Leeftijd
- Naam school

### 7.3. Important quotes interviews

<b>Use of online communication Respondent 1</b>
Ik heb toch het gevoel dat ik iets mis als ik er de hele dag niet op kijk. Dat, dat, bijvoorbeeld op school dat zegt iedereen: oo, heb dat grappige filmpje gezien? Dat je, dat je dat dan eigenlijk allemaal mist, heb ik dan eigenlijk het idee. Daardoor krijg ik wel alle informatie eigenlijk een beetje binnen.
RS1: Uhm, Whatsapp en ook Instagram. Verder eigenlijk niet. Ik heb wel, ik heb wel Twitter aangemaakt. En Pal was op een gegeven moment ook wel, van zulke dingen. Interviewer: Die ken ik niet [lacht] RS1: Maar daar heb ik nooit echt, nooit echt, dat ik dat echt ging gebruiken
Best wel vaak, ook als ik me verveel vooral. Ik denk wel iets van zes keer per dag dat ik het open op mijn telefoon of dat ik aan het leren op laptop, dan staat het ook meestal wel open.
Maar thuis, als ik thuiskom, dan ga ik meestal een uurtje eten en niks doen, en als er niemand thuis is dan ga ik dat uur achter de laptop zitten. En meestal voordat ik ga slapen kijk ik nog even, voordat ik ga slapen. Vroeger las ik altijd een boek, maar nu...nu kijk ik eigenlijk op Facebook [lacht].
Meestal, uhm, soms als mijn telefoon leeg is stuur ik dan altijd via mijn Facebook berichtjes, dan via mijn laptop. En...ik ga er meestal op om te kijken, ook te kijken naar al die filmpjes. Die vind ik eigenlijk wel gewoon grappig. En, bijvoorbeeld laatst op school, dan is er iets gebeurd. Er was een meisje en die had, die had van alles gestolen. Bij ons op school met en jongen, die hadden helemaal geheime organisatie met z'n tweeën. En toen is de één gevluht naar Jakarta. En dan gaat natuurlijk iedereen diegene opzoeken op Facebook, gewoon omdat je wilt zien wie het is.
En toen dacht ik dat ga ik onthouden en toen ging ook wel even in de pauze kijken wie dat was, gewoon zo een beetje iemand opzoeken. Maar niet echt om iemand uit te lachen of zo, maar gewoon kijken wie het is. Gewoon nieuwsgierig
RS1: Ja, ja, meestal als ik op de laptop zit en dan zie ik iemand waarmee ik wil praten, die online is dan wel gewoon via Facebook. Dat gaat wel makkelijk. Interviewer: En, anders gebruik je de Whatsapp? RS1: Ja. Eigenlijk wel vaker. Maar eigenlijk alleen als ik op mijn laptop zit en mijn telefoon ligt ergens anders en dan denk ik, ik doe het maar zo.
Ik denk omdat iedereen het heeft, dat je, dat je toch iets mist als je het niet hebt en met vriendinnen...dan is er bijvoorbeeld een feestje en dan word je uitgenodigd via Facebook. En ja...eigenlijk...er gebeurt best wel veel. En dan is het toch wel een beetje dat je dan niet mee kan praten.
Omdat daar al mijn vrienden opzitten. Nu had je bijvoorbeeld Telegram, of zo, dat was. Toen had ik dat en dat was eigenlijk heel snel en wel leuk. Alleen ik had één vriend die dat ook had en op een gegeven moment denk je dan; we kunnen we steeds met z'n tweeën hier op zitten praten. Maar uiteindelijk ga je toch wel terug naar Whatsapp, gewoon, omdat iedereen dat heeft. Het is waarschijnlijk niet eens het snelste, maar als al je vrienden daar op zitten, dan ga je ook niet als enige tegen iedereen zeggen; als je een bericht wilt sturen dan moet je maar dit en dat downloaden. Dus, eigenlijk meer.
Ja, gewoon eigenlijk omdat iedereen het heeft. Verder, dat Telegram vond ik veel sneller en fijner, maar ja, je kan natuurlijk niet, als, als enige zeggen van; nou ik zit daar op. Dus, daarom, denk ik.
Maar ja...ik gebruik het niet echt...om nieuwe banden te leggen of iemand die ik niet echt ken, om die te leren kennen. Dat vind ik een beetje raar, dat je dan iets stuurt van; heey [lacht]. Nee, dat doe ik eigenlijk alleen met mijn beste vriendinnen, praat ik erop.
<b>Respondent 2</b>
Uhm, ik denk op Facebook een weekenddag een keer of twee denk ik, en doordeweeks denk ik 1 keer of zo. En Whatsapp wel ene stuk vaker Ik denk een stuk of tien keer wel...op een dag
Uhm, meestal op een beetje dooie momentjes, als ik niks hebt te doen of zo [lacht]. Ja, dan eigenlijk vooral.
RS2: [Lacht]. Ik vind het altijd wel grappig om te zien wat uhm...wat de meeste mensen voor, soms nieuwsberichtjes of foto's plaatsen. Vind ik altijd wel leuk om te zien. Ik post zelf ook niet zo veel. Uhm, ja, dus ik vind het eigenlijk wel leuk om andere mensen te kijken qua foto's en filmpjes en eh ja... Interviewer: Ja. En jij gaat niet bijvoorbeeld via Facebook chatten, dat doe je niet? RS2: Uhm, nee bijna nooit, tenzij dus ik bijvoorbeeld iemands Whatsapp niet heb

Ik heb gewoon niet heel veel behoefte om dingen te delen..nja ik weet niet waarom dat eigenlijk is.
<b>Respondent 3</b>
RS3: Uhm, ja, ik check wel af en toe mijn tijdlijn, maar ik post niet zo veel. Interviewer: En kan je dan meer vertellen over gister, hoe je dan, hoe vaak je het hebt gebruikt en...
RS3: Nou, uhm, ja dan open ik het, en dan zit er een halfuurtje op ofzo, dan kijk ik alles wat er in die tijdlijn verschijnt. Meestal zijn dat filmpjes of zo, dat iedereen Best Vines
Uhm, nou, inderdaad wel na school, tijdens school eigenlijk niet. En meestal als ik in bed lig, voordat ik ga slapen check ik alles.
Ik gebruik het vooral om te kijken en af en toe wat te delen
RS3: Eh...nou Whatsapp gewoon om in contact te blijven met iedereen, dat is soort eigenlijk, mijn manier om te communiceren, en eh...ik gebruik ook sms niet. Whatsapp, voor mij is het smsen. Interviewer: Ja.
RS3: En eh...Facebook kijk ik gewoon als vermaak zeg maar.
RS3: Nou, nja iedereen heeft Whatsapp, dus daarom is het wel handig als jij ook Whatsapp hebt, want dan ja, Interviewer: Ja.
RS3: Dan kan je wel iets anders hebben, maar dan reageren ze toch niet want ze hebben het niet. Ja, eigenlijk is het ook een makkelijke manier om te communiceren, en daarom ook nog steeds
<b>Respondent 4</b>
Uhm, dat verschilt nogal, soms doe ik het echt een dag niet
Ja, maar soms zit ik er gewoon niet achter en doe ik andere dingetjes. En als...het verschilt gewoon heel erg.
RS4: Maar ik zit soms ook wel, gewoon in de pauzes erop. Interviewer: Ja.
RS4: Ja, en als ik wifi heb. En meestal gewoon thuis. Interviewer: Ja.
RS4: Maar als ik op visite ben, dan niet, of heel soms.
Interviewer: Oké, en je doet ook dat je eh, persoonlijke berichten sturen, dat je de Facebookchat gebruikt?
RS4: Toch wel heel soms, want dan heb ik niet, dan whatsapp ik niet met diegene.
RS4: Nou, Instagram voor het kijken van foto's, doe ik gewoon heel vaak, of plaatsen doe ik weleens. Interviewer: Ja.
RS\$: En Facebook, gewoon omdat er veel vrienden en zo...en ook soms foto's. En Whatsapp om gewoon te praten met mensen
L: Ja, soms dan, gaan mensen, gaat het niet echt aan...
<b>Respondent 5,6 and 7</b>
RS 5: Uhm, nou ik vind Facebook wel heel erg belangrijk. Nu zeker deze tijd. In deze tijd, ja, je doet er eigenlijk alles mee. Ik zit eigenlijk wel heel de dag op Facebook. RS 7: Nou ik zit eigenlijk heel weinig op Facebook. Ik kijk af en toe, maar... RS 6: Nou, je doet zelf niet zo veel op Facebook. RS 7: Nee. RS 6: Ik schrijf zelf bijna nooit iets op Facebook. RS 5: Ja, maar je kijkt wel altijd. RS 6: Ja, dat is waar, ja
Interviewer: En bijvoorbeeld een Whatsapp, gebruiken jullie die ook?
RS5: Ja, ja, ja, dat gebruik ik meer. RS6: Dat gebruik je eerder dan Facebook. Je gaat niet, je chat meestal niet via Facebookchat. Ik whatsapp heel de dag door [lacht]
RS6: Als je tijd hebt, dus als je niet ergens mee bezig bent, dan zit ik wel echt iedere tien minuten of iemand wat leuks heeft gestuurd.
RS5: Nah, nou, ja Whatsapp heel de week door ja inderdaad, maar Facebook vooral in het weekend, denk ik, want dan heb je gewoon de tijd, gewoon rustig op je computer alles en doordeweeks op je telefoon is toch wel wat moeilijker. RS7: Ja, en ook niet in alle lessen mag je op je telefoons. RS5: Je mag volgens mij nooit op je telefoon [lacht]
RS5: Ik wel veel na school. RS6: Ja, Facebook na school meestal, ja, in de avond, dan heb je gewoon alle tijd. RS5: Ja, tijdens school, heb je er gewoon niet zo veel tijd voor, om alles rustig te lezen, om alle leuke foto's te kijken, ja...ja.

<p>Interviewer: En eh, zijn er ook momenten dat je denkt; dan kijk ik echt niet? Bijvoorbeeld dat er visite is...</p> <p>RS5: Nee, ik kijk altijd, ja.</p> <p>RS6: Ja, nou toetsweek.</p> <p>RS5: Ja, toetsweek, maar ik kijk altijd wel eigenlijk. Ja, het is heel asociaal, maar ook als er, uit eten dan kijk ik, ja, ik heb toch altijd mijn telefoon naast mij liggen, dus dan, als je iets binnenkrijgt dan kijk je wel meteen.</p>
<p>RS6: Nja, vooral als je iemands nummer nodig hebt en je hebt hem zeg maar op Facebook, kan je via Facebookchat iemands nummer vragen. Dat is best handig, want je hebt bijna wel iedereen op Facebook en ik heb niet iedereen nummer</p>
<p>RS5: Ja, evenementen wel.</p> <p>RS7: Ja, je krijgt ook vaak een uitnodiging van feestjes.</p> <p>RS6: Ja, nu de laatste tijd iedereen doet, organiseert zijn feest via Facebook, dus dat is best handig. En ook andere grote evenementen.</p> <p>RS5: Ja, vooral bij verjaardagen dan, nu bij al die zestienjarigen, zijn allemaal grote feesten en dan is het makkelijk gewoon om in één keer een grote uitnodiging te maken.</p>
<p>RS7: Gewoon, eens in de zo veel weken eigenlijk, op Facebook niet eens echt.</p> <p>Interviewer: En waarom kiezen jullie dan voor Facebook, om contacten te houden met mensen van de basisschool?</p> <p>RS5: Uhm, nou het lijkt me, ik vind het altijd leuk om eh, gewoon te kijken wat voor vrienden ze hebben, ja, ik weet niet.</p> <p>RS6: Waar iedereen mee bezig is.</p>
<p>RS7: Ja, ik denk toch het meest via Whatsapp, dat je eigenlijk even snel dingen wil vragen dus dan whatsapp je het even.</p> <p>RS5: Ik denk vooral Whatsapp met de mensen die je heel goed kent en...</p> <p>RS7: Waar je het dichtbij staat.</p> <p>RS5: Ja, en Facebook, vooral met de mensen, die je eigenlijk ja...</p> <p>RS6: Die je eigenlijk af en toe hoort te Whatsappen.</p>
<p><b>Evaluation of online communication</b> <b>Respondent 1</b></p>
<p>Ja, bij verjaardagen. Dan doe ik dat wel, altijd dan zie ik rechtsboven en dan denk ik: o ja, snel een berichtje sturen. Dat gaat nu wel heel makkelijk, dat klik je er gewoon op en dan kan je zo en dan klik je op enter en dan...</p>
<p>Die ken ik van hockeykamp of zo. Dat is dan ook wel weer grappig, dat je ziet, wel, dat jouw netwerk ook bij andere ziet.</p>
<p>Dan, we waren laatst, in de kerstvakantie naar Nieuw-Zeeland gegaan en dat deed ik gewoon...wat in Snapchat kunnen alleen, zeg maar, goede vrienden het zien. En dat vind ik wel fijn, want eigenlijk ben ik niet zo van het foto's overal opzetten. Want eigenlijk, vind ik, hoeft niet iedereen dat allemaal te zien. Maar bijvoorbeeld in Nieuw-Zeeland gebeurde er best wel veel en ik had niet zo'n zin om na de vakantie iedereen hetzelfde verhaal te vertellen, dus dan zette ik soms een foto op Story en dan kan iedereen dat zien. Dus dat is dan wel handig, want dan houd je iedereen in één keer op de hoogte. Dus dat is dan wel...praktisch eigenlijk. Want anders, zit je, moet je tegen iedereen vertellen ik was toen daar en daar en eigenlijk weten ze het dan al een beetje.</p>
<p>Dan kan je zelf selecteren wie het dan wel kunnen zien. Op Facebook klik je toch niet zo snel aan; alleen deze vrienden mogen dit bekijken. Want dat kunnen zij dan ook zien.</p>
<p>Nou, als er echt iets is, dan doe ik dat wel liever in het echt. Maar, ja, ik weet het eigenlijk niet. Het is meer, bijvoorbeeld op vakantie en ik zie iemand heel lang niet, mijn vrienden, dan doe ik het wel via Whatsapp of bellen eigenlijk.</p>
<p>Want Whatsapp is ook, ik vind het soms heel stom, want dan kan je, weet niet, dan kunnen dingen heel anders overkomen, op Whatsapp. Terwijl je ze eigenlijk helemaal niet boos bedoelt. Dan denkt diegene meteen; oo, die is helemaal boos. Terwijl je het eigenlijk gewoon misschien een beetje chagrijnig bedoelt, maar niet boos. Er kan dan meteen een hele, hele ruzie ontstaan. Niet dat ik dat echt heb, maar andere hebben dat volgens mij wel dan.</p>
<p>Hele ruzie, terwijl er dan helemaal niks aan de hand is. En dat vind ik wel het stomme aan Whatsapp, eigenlijk. Liever in het echt, want dan kan je niet hele mistopvattingen krijgen over, over wat er eigenlijk is...of wat een verhaal wat je typt is ook iets onduidelijker.</p>
<p>Ja, daarom is gezicht...face to face wel handiger en dat vind ik wel gewoon fijner. Maar soms is het wel lastig. Bijvoorbeeld, als ik, moest voorlof vragen, niet dat, dat iets met vrienden te maken heeft, maar met mijn coördinator, mail ik dat toch liever dan dat ik naar hem toe moet. Of als er iets met een vriendinnetje is, wat je eigenlijk niet heel leuk vindt, dan durf je daar in het echt niet echt op te</p>

reageren, van oo leuk. Maar op Whatapp, kan je dan wel zeggen van oo, leuk..zeg maar [lacht], omdat je dan toch, toch, in het echt kan je dan niet opeens wegrennen en op Whatsapp wel
Alleen Whatsapp is dan wel handig als je niet bij elkaar bent. Alleen, als ik, zeg maar, in hetzelfde gebouw ben en je moet iets vertellen...dan ga ik gewoon daar naar toe, dan ga ik niet whatsappen.
Gewoon, ik denk dat het een stuk minder persoonlijk overkomt als je whatsapppt. Bijvoorbeeld als iemands opa dood gaat en je gaat beterschap, beterschap, sterkte..dat komt toch een stuk. Dat had ik toen mijn oma dood ging, toen kreeg ik heel van sterkte..en dan..dan denk ik van ja..ja bedankt..maar dat komt niet echt aan. Als iemand dat in het echt zegt, is dat toch net iets anders. Dan komt het wel echt aan. Dingen op Whatsapp komen...weet niet...echt belangrijke dingen...weet niet...komen niet heel erg. Ik zou het liever gewoon in het gezicht zeggen. In het gezicht zeggen [lacht]...in het echt zeggen.
je zegt wel dingen sneller dan in het echt en ik denk dat het handiger is als je in het echt praat. Dat je goed nadenkt over dingen en niet zegt wat je niet meent.
Maar met Whatsapp kan je nog een smoesje bedenken. En bij vriendinnen is dat eigenlijk ook een beetje zo, want met afspreken, soms heb je gewoon niet zo'n zin of ben je moe, moe. En dan kan je zeggen van; oo nee, ik..moet met mijn moeder mee. Maar als ze bellen of in het echt vragen eigenlijk, dan, dan eh...ja dan, dan, kan je niet zo snel liegen. Ik kan ook helemaal niet liegen [lacht], dus dat is helemaal niet handig.
Ja, ik vind dat zelf eigenlijk best wel vervelend. Mijn moeder bijvoorbeeld, neem dan lekker haar tijd om te antwoorden of ik...of ik ergens heen mag of zo. En, soms vind ik het wel fijn. Met vriendinnen ben ik eigenlijk gewoon meer van meteen antwoorden, maar dat wordt ook best wel beperkt door het 'laatst gezien' en 'aan het typen' en 'online,
En dan lijkt het steeds dan meer op het echt. Want een smsje kon je vier dagen lang negeren. Maar eigenlijk kan dat bij whatsappen al. Ja, ja, ik vind het niet leuk als je dan iets vraagt en dan blijft er nog heel lang online staan en dan denk je; oke, dan niet [lacht].
Gewoon stil gaan staan en dan weglopen...maar dat kan wel op Whatsapp, eigenlijk kan je dat gewoon doen. Maar in het echt zou je dat bijna nooit doen, dat je gewoon wegloopt als iemand wat vraagt [lacht], wat vraagt
Maar...dat vind ik wel veel fijner dan aan het echt, want soms weet ik niet precies hoe je ergens op moet reageren of...of dan wil je toch een afwegenlinkje..o dat wil ik helemaal niet zeggen. Iemand vraagt of je iets kan doen en dan zeg je eerst ja, maar dan halverwege zeg je dan; toch niet. Maar ik ben meestal wel gewoon van het sturen en dan stuur ik weer wat nieuws...en dan stuur ik; o nee, sorry. Maar dat is wel heel handig, vind ik, dat kan in het echt natuurlijk niet. Maar toch, vind ik het in het echt wel gewoon handiger...ja...maar ja, dat weghalen is wel heel handig. Maar dat doe ik vooral ook als ik met, niet met mijn beste vriendinnen praat...want daar, daar kan ik net zo goed sturen wat ik wilde sturen en daarna wat ik eigenlijk wilde sturen. Maar als er echt iets serieus is...dan...dan is dat wel heel handig, omdat je dan natuurlijk niet al meteen weet wat je moet zeggen eigenlijk.
Ja dat vind ik wel handig, dat doe ik ook heel vaak. Soms dan ben ik heel blij en dan stuur ik iets met allemaal vrolijke smileys en dan weet die, dan weet diegene dat ook. Want anders is het, is het wel heel moeilijk om zeg maar bij hoi alleen al te merken dat iemand heel blij is of juist niet. Dat kan wel met smileys.
Maar daardoor lijkt Whatsapp wel steeds meer op echt praten, omdat je dan, ja, omdat je dan, weet niet, gewoon toch een beetje kan laten zien hoe je gezicht er soort van uit zou zien.
Facebookchat is eigenlijk meer vervanger voor Whatsapp als die even uit is. En ehm, ja, ik whatsapp vooral met vriendinnen best wel snel. En Snapchat vind ik vooral gewoon handig om met foto's, want ik vind niet dat iedereen al mijn foto's hoeft te zien. Gewoon als je een foto maakt dan, dan is dat wel handig omdat alleen naar die mensen te sturen.
RS1: Ik laat eigenlijk niet heel veel zien aan mensen op Facebook, maar van kleine dingen, dat ik zeg; oo ik ga nu Duinrell [lacht]. Leuke voorbeelden heb ik vandaag. Naar Duinrell, dat zet ik er niet op. Alleen misschien wel op Snapchat voor mijn beste vriendinnen, dat je daar dan ook over kan praten, maar niet voor iedereen. Interviewer: Ja. Je wilt hun op de hoogte houden RS5: Ja, en dat je dan de volgende dag zegt; ik zag dat je naar Duinrell was, hoe was het? Zo, maar niet, maar niet voor de hele wereld.
<b>Respondent 2</b>
RS2: Uhm, nee, niet belangrijk. Ik, eh, kijk er wel vaak door, maar het is niet dat ik het bijvoorbeeld mis op vakantie of zo, helemaal niet, dus. Nee. Interviewer: En bijvoorbeeld een Whatsapp? RS2: Uhm, nou dat vind ik wel...belangrijker in ieder geval. Omdat uhm ja dan...dan kan je eigenlijk



lekker snel dingen aan mensen vragen en kom je snel aan je informatie zeg maar. Dus dat is wel belangrijker.
Interviewer: En wil je ook in contact blijven met vrienden, daardoor, dus dat je... RS2: Nou, niet dat het uhm, dat het zeg maar het real life contact vervangt. Interviewer: Nee. RS2: Dat eh, zou ik niet willen. Maar...ja, soort extraatje, dat is op zich wel leuk vind ik.
Want je kan het zelf heel makkelijk uit- en aanzetten zeg maar, dus dan vind ik het juist wel een pre.
RS2: Nou, ik zoek het niet op, maar soms dan, dan ja rolt zo'n gesprek op die manier er in en dan kap ik het niet af als van; dat kunnen we een keer real-life bespreken zeg maar... Interviewer: Nee. RS2: Dat niet, maar ik zoek het beslist niet op nee.
Interviewer: Nee, en vind je het dat een prettig aspect van Whatsapp bijvoorbeeld dat je iemands gezicht niet ziet? Of vind je dat juist, of maakt het je niet zo veel uit? RS2: Uhm, nou het kan wel fijn zijn, vind ik, want dan, anders ehm zit je iemand aan te kijken en dan heb je natuurlijk ook veel non-verbale communicatie enzo [lacht].
Uhm, nou eigenlijk, meer iets negatiefs, bijvoorbeeld een grapje of zo...dat gaat veel minder makkelijk meestal via Whatsapp of zo...dan in het echt, omdat je dan, zeg maar, dan heb je ook je non-verbale communicatie die dan voor de grap kan helpen.
Aan de andere kant als je, je echt voorstelt dat je tegenover iemand staat en je laat diegene gewoon een minuut wachten op je antwoord dan is dat wel vreemd. Maar je kan ook daarmee ook, ehm, zeg maar, beledigen of dat soort dingen, die je in eerste instantie er zo uit zo flappen, kan je daarmee wel tegenhouden. Dus het heeft ook wel een beetje voor- en nadelen.
Interviewer: Ja, en wat vind je ervan dat je inderdaad echt de tijd kan nemen om te bedenken wat ga ik nu zeggen, hoe ga ik reageren? RS2: Uhm, nou aan de ene kant goed, omdat je dus wel soort van het antwoord krijgt wat je het liefst zou willen zeggen, na nagedacht er over te hebben. Interviewer: Ja. RS2: Aan de andere kant, is het soms niet het antwoord die je zou zeggen in face-to-face. Dus dan ben je eigenlijk soort van iemand anders als het ware.
RS2: Maar, dat over die gegevens zie ik eigenlijk ook wel echt als een voordeel, dat je echt kan kiezen, dat je niet in een gesprek zo'n vraag krijgt en maar gewoon impulsief antwoord met bepaalde gegevens. Interviewer: Ja. RS2: Dat is op zich wel een voordeel er aan. Je kan er echt ehm over nadenken en dan tot de beste beslissing komen.
<b>Respondent 3</b>
Oo, ja, voor mij is het niet zo heel erg belangrijk, voor andere kinderen weet ik wel, die zetten er alles op enzo, maar ik vind het helemaal niet zo belangrijk
Ja, ik vind zelf, mijn mening is meer dat het een beetje is van; kijk wat ik doe, en dat iedereen zegt van; kijk wat ik doe, kijk wat ik doe. Voor mij is het gewoon, dat niet iedereen hoeft te weten wat ik doe, ik zet er iets op als ik daar zin in heb.
RS3: Uhm, ja niet super belangrijk, want meestal ben ik daar wel redelijk laat mee...pas een week later. Terwijl andere het meteen doen als ze terug zijn, maar ik wil dan gewoon, ja, liever mijn vrienden erover vertellen en dat soort dingen. Interviewer: Ja, het is niet de manier om mensen te laten weten hoe je vakantie was? RS3: Nee, het is gewoon, ja het is wel heel handig natuurlijk, maar niet iedereen boeit mijn vakantie ook
RS3: Ja, ja, ja natuurlijk. Als ik bijvoorbeeld dan eh, één vriend van mij die woont in Prinsenland, mijn beste vriendin woont in Hillegersberg, mijn andere twee vrienden wonen in Hoogvliet en in eh Nesselande. Dus, ja dan... Interviewer: Is wel ver uit elkaar. RS3: Ja, dus daarom, ze wonen niet bij mij in de straat ofzo, dan zou ik even bij ze langsgaan. Maar daarom is Whatsapp ook handig...
Uhm, nou dat vind ik niet zo erg. Want ik weet dat ik met die persoon aan het praten ben, dus dat maakt niet zo veel uit.
RS3: Uhm, nou ik heb er eigenlijk geen voorkeur aan, maar het is meer waar de rest op dat moment aan het doen is. Interviewer: Ja. RS3: Als ik bij ze in de buurt ben dan face-to-face en anders gewoon Whatsapp.
Interviewer: Er is geen verschil voor jou?

RS3: Nou eigenlijk niet, nou het is wel zo bij andere mensen zo, dat weet ik, maar bij mij is dat niet zo. Ja, het is natuurlijk wel een betere uitweg, maar...ja, ja dat is inderdaad wel zo. Maar toch zeg ik liever dingen gewoon tegen iemand in plaats van over Whatsapp.
RS3: Uhm, nou face-to-face kunnen mensen natuurlijk wel...is het anders, dan kan je meer gespannen zijn, zeg maar, dan, dan op Whatsapp. Want daar kan iemand dan wel boos worden, maar ja, dan zijn het toch maar lettertjes. Interviewer: Ja.
RS3: Maar als je face-to-face staat, kan dat natuurlijk veel gênanter zijn, of ongemakkelijker of juist fijner...
Nja, soms is het wel gewoon fijn om, om iets over Whatsapp te zeggen, gewoon lekker snel
Interviewer: Ja. En, uhm, wat vind je ervan dat als iemand jou een whatsappje stuurt of een Facebookbericht, dat je zelf kan bepalen wanneer je reageert? Dat je dus ook eerst [cross-talk]. RS3: Ja dat vind ik wel fijn, ja want dan, soms is het gewoon zo, ja dan ben je even bezig of heb je gewoon geen zin, en dan leg je het even weg.
Interviewer: Maar is het denk je een eh...een belangrijk onderdeel van je vriendschap of...? RS3: Uhm, ja ja, ik zou het niet kunnen missen. Interviewer: En hoe denk je dat het komt? Gewoon... RS3: Ja, puur uit, uit gewenning. Gewoon als het dan weg is, dan ja, dan zou ik het heel vervelend vinden.
RS3: Ja, ik vind wel heel handig en ik vind ook wel dat het mensen dichterbij elkaar brengt, want je weet...je kan gewoon over afstanden met iemand praten enzo. En het is af en toe ook gewoon makkelijk, Whatsapp, in het gebruik. Interviewer: Ja. RS3: Ja, want je kan niet de hele dag met iemand zijn, elke dag, ja.
<b>Respondent 4</b>
Hm, niet heel erg. Ik zit er weleens achter, maar eigenlijk doe ik niet echt van...nja ik doe...ik zet niet alles erop. Gewoon echt alleen maar dingetjes die ik leuk vind, maar waarvan ik denk dat mensen niet er raar op gaan reageren. Ik kijk er wel echt naar wat ik erop zet.
Interviewer: Vind je bijvoorbeeld Whatsapp ook fijner, omdat het dan eigenlijk persoonlijker is, dat je dan ook... RS4: Ja, want dan kan je gewoon praten over wat je aan het doen bent en dan hoeft je het niet op Facebook te plaatsen.
RS4: Nou, wel met familie of vrienden die geen Whatsapp hebben, geen telefoons of zo, dan wel. Interviewer: Ja. RS4: Maar voor de rest, voor de mensen die wel Whatsapp hebben, vind ik dat gewoon fijner, makkelijker.
Face-to-face is wel makkelijker en is eigenlijk ook fijner, wat sommige mensen kunnen je ook verkeerd gaan begrijpen als je het via, ja, via Whatsapp doet en dat soort dingen. Maar soms ik het ook wel makkelijker om dingen te zeggen
Soms is het fijn, maar soms is het ook wel echt, dat je het liever wel gewoon...dat mensen je echt recht aankijkt.
Uhm, ik vind face-to-face wel...het is wel fijner en ja, via social media...is het, ja...dan kunnen dingen verkeerd aankomen, dat is natuurlijk niet fijn. Dus dan zou ik liever, face-to-face is leuker. Maar het is natuurlijk wel gewoon handig met whatsappen, zo, dat je altijd met elkaar kan praten.
Eh, dat vind ik, soms denk je te veel en dan ga je het toch weer helemaal anders doen [onduidelijk], maar het is ook dat je dan soms even kan nadenken. Dat is ook wel fijn, soms zeggen mensen iets voordat ze er bij na hebben gedacht. Dan kan natuurlijk ook verkeerd aankomen soms.
Ja, want het is wel handig, want je kan wel veel mensen opzoeken, want heel veel mensen hebben natuurlijk Facebook.
RS4: Uhm, nou via Facebook vind ik een beetje onhandig meestal. Interviewer: Ja. RS4: Maar Whatsapp vind ik altijd wel gewoon leuk, gezellig, praten. Je hebt altijd wel iemand om mee te praten. Ja, heel veel zijn natuurlijk gewoon de hele dag online. Interviewer: Ja. RS4: In die groepsgesprekken is er meestal heel veel aan het praten, dus ja, ik vind het wel gezellig, ook als je niks te doen hebt of zo. Dan kan je gewoon heel even praten met diegene.
Interviewer: Maar denk je dat je nog zonder Whatsapp bijvoorbeeld kunnen leven, klinkt een beetje dramatisch maar [lachen]. RS4: Ja, ik denk het wel, maar het is wel leuk om er bij te hebben. Als ik op vakantie ben geweest... Interviewer: Ja.

RS4: Kijk ik kan het wel zonder hoor. Ik ga soms een week of twee weken op vakantie en dan kan ik echt zonder, maar soms vind ik het wel weer leuk om, ja, heel even te zeggen wat je hebt gedaan om even te praten met elkaar. Ja, als je alleen maar bent met je broertje of zo, of een andere vriendin maakt, het is toch wel anders dan gewoon je echte vriendinnen van thuis.
<b>Respondent 5,6 en 7</b>
RS5: Uhm, nou ik vind Facebook wel heel erg belangrijk. Nu zeker deze tijd. In deze tijd, ja, je doet er eigenlijk alles mee. Ik zit eigenlijk wel heel de dag op Facebook.
Interviewer: En vinden jullie het dan een handige manier? RS7: Ja, echt heel handig. Ik zou ook niet weer weten, kunnen voorstellen... RS6: Heel je sociale leven is bijna... RS5: Ja, als je een week niet op je telefoon hebt gekeken, op Facebook of iets, dan heb je al bijna heel veel gemist. Interviewer: Ja, en uhm vinden jullie het fijn om via Whatsapp, maar ook via Facebook dingen te delen met vrienden? RS5: Uhm, nou bijvoorbeeld, zo'n uitnodiging is wel gewoon makkelijk, dat iedereen het in één keer ziet, maar het is niet dat ik eh, ja, ik weet niet hoe je dat zegt. Ja, ik zet niet zo heel veel op Facebook, maar foto's vind ik altijd wel leuk, dan zijn mensen weer op de hoogte over hoe het was. Het geeft altijd wel een leuke indruk.
RS5: Uhm, ja, nou uhm, ja, ik whatsapp liever. Interviewer: Ja. RS5: Maar Facebook is wel een heel goed alternatief
RS6: Als je voor iemand staat, is dat toch wel even anders RS5: Vooral met relaties is het. Als je een ruzie hebt, en iets heel erg moet, ja ik weet het niet. Als je erg ruzie hebt, zou je veel sneller, heel erg onaardig doen via Facebook of zo dan, dan dat je dat in het echt doet zeg maar.
RS5: Ja, op sommige momenten is het heel fijn. Ik denk, ja, ja sommige dingen in een relatie denk ik wel. Het gaat toch makkelijker, als je net een jongen hebt ontmoet. Dan, als je elkaar nog niet zo goed kent, dan kan via whatsapp gewoon leuk. Als je nou eerste date in het echt over rare dingen, ja, dat is toch [crosstalk]
RS6: Nou meer als het je eerste date is, dan heb je via Whatsapp al over een aantal dingen gepraat. RS5: Dat ook ja. RS6: Dat vooral. Dan weet je al wat meer van diegene, want anders moet je echt zo van; haai. [lachen].
RS6: Ja, dat vind ik soms ook wel weer onhandig. RS5: Ja, mensen vatten dingen anders op. RS7: Ja, of mensen kunnen zich anders opstellen dan dat ze eigenlijk ook denken. Interviewer: Ja. RS6: Dat iemand iets zegt wat sarcastisch is bedoeld en dan is het totaal niet sarcastisch bedoeld, voor jou zeg maar. Dus dan zorgt voor verwarring. Dat soort dingen.
Interviewer: En wat vinden jullie bijvoorbeeld van Skype en Facetime? RS5: Ja, dat vind ik ook wel heel handig. Zeker als je op vakantie bent dan, dan is het toch even of je elkaar ziet of je hebt heel veel te vertellen. Ja, vaak als je heel veel hebt te vertellen, dan is het ook fijner om eh, iemands gezicht te zien, zeg maar.
Interviewer: Oké, en uhm, wat zijn voor jullie nou grote verschillen tussen online en offline communicatie? RS5: Uhm, nou ik denk dat het vooral gewoon veel makkelijker gaat online. Uhm, ja, ik durf veel meer te zeggen online en dan hoeft niet perse... RS6: Je gaat veel makkelijker het gesprek aan.
RS5: Ja, je gaat veel makkelijker het gesprek aan. Ja, ja [lacht], dat doe je niet zo snel in het echt, denk ik. Dat vind ik wel een groot verschil ja, en verder... en je bereikt gewoon veel meer mensen in één keer. Dat is ook wel, als je dan een grote groep, dan ja,
RS5: Ja, ik wacht nog even met reageren, ik ga hier even over nadenken en dan reageer ik pas?
RS6: Heel handig [lachen]. RS5: Heel handig, ja, dat is wel. RS6: Ja in sommige gevallen is dat wel... RS7: Ja, als je niet weet wat je moet zeggen, ja. Dan ga je vaak ook aan iemand anders vragen, via Facebook of zo, dan vraag je; wat moet ik hierop zeggen? Ofzo. RS5: Vaak met vriendjes, is dat altijd het geval [lacht]. Dan is gewoon heel het gesprek, als één van ons dan, bijvoorbeeld een gesprek met een jongen heeft, dan heeft hij een gesprek met ons allen drie. Want omdat wij alleen maar elkaar helpen dan.

RS5: Ja, zeker bij hele serieuze dingen is het wel handig als je. Je zegt natuurlijk wel heel makkelijk iets, je doet meteen heel erg boos.
RS7: Zonder dat je er over nadenkt RS5: Maar dat is soms dan ook wel weer een beetje een nadeel, dat je iets zegt...dat je het veel sneller doet. RS7: Je kan ook niet meer zeggen; ik wil nu dit zeggen. In een gesprek kan je het nog wel... RS6: Ja, in het echt. RS7: Goed praten, ja... RS5: Maar op Whatsapp kan je het screenshots en je hebt eh...je kan het teruglezen.
RS5: Ja. Wanneer ben je jarig is ook leuk om te weten van iemand. Dan is trouwens ook echt een voordeel aan Facebook, dat je iedereen kan feliciteren.
Interviewer: En, uhm, hoe belangrijk vinden jullie het om met je goeie vrienden, ja, contact te hebben via Whatsapp? RS6: Heel handig, heel belangrijk. RS5: Heel belangrijk. RS7: Ja, want als je steeds naar iemand toe moet gaan om iets te zeggen, dan... RS6: Ja, of bellen of zo, dat ben je elke dag echt drie uur bezig of zo en als je dan even snel via Whatsapp, dat is toch handig. RS5: Ja, en het is ook wel, wij weten gewoon heel de dag van elkaar wat we aan het doen zijn en dat is toch leuk om te weten, denk ik, toch? RS7: Ja. RS5: Als je een date met ene jongen hebt, dat je dan even tussendoor kan zeggen hoe het is, dat is leuk [lacht]
RS5: Ja, heel belangrijk, zeker nu, in deze tijd, kunnen wij niet zonder. RS6: Nja, ook vooral omdat het zo altijd geweest is. RS5: Omdat we het gewend zijn
RS6: Via sms ging je niet zo heel snel alles vertellen, dan stuurde je meestal iets wat heel belangrijk was en dan verder niet zo veel via sms zeg maar. RS5: Nee. RS6: Via Whatsapp stuur je echt gewoon wat jou helemaal niks kan boeien, maar waarvan ik denk ja leuk.. RS5: Ja, van; ik zit op de wc [lachen] Interviewer: Whatsapp is gewoon ook meer als echt een gesprek maar dan via de telefoon? RS5: Ja, als je niet, ja, als je niet meer bij elkaar bent dan, ja vooral met de mensen met wie je heel vaak bent en gewend ben om alles te bespreken, dan als je gewoon even thuis bent en niet vlakbij iemand bent, dan kan je toch gewoon door gaan met je gesprek en gewoontes.
Interviewer: Ja, en wat vinden jullie dan van smileys? RS5: Die vind ik geinig. RS6: Ja, leuk. RS7: Het kan ook wel uitdrukken hoe je ergens over denkt. RS6: Maar soms reageer je alleen met smiley, niet eens met o ik heb een heel verhaal te vertellen. RS7: Maar ook hoe je het over wilt laten komen zeg maar, als je elkaar toch niet ziet, dat je toch wel een beetje een houding krijgt van iemand. Interviewer: Ja. Jullie denken ook wel dat smileys er echt voor kunnen zorgen, dat je, dat het echt op een gesprek lijkt? RS5: Ja, ja, vooral op de manier hoe je het bedoelt. Dus als je het heel sarcastisch bedoelt dan, dan heb je ook wel een soort sarcastische eh, eh, smiley. Weet je wel? Die doe je er altijd bij, bij elk gesprek horen heel veel smileys.
RS6: Gewoon dat het handig is. RS5: Heel belangrijk. RS6: We kunnen niet zonder. RS5: Nee, dat is wel duidelijk denk ik
<b>Effects of online communication Respondent 1</b>
Het is toch een beetje verslavend ofzo. Soms zit ik een halfuur naar niks te kijken en dan denk ik: wat heb ik eigenlijk gedaan? Eigenlijk helemaal niks.
Maar...nee, maar geen nieuwe vrienden. Maar misschien wel mensen die ik op school niet echt heel veel spreek, maar die je dan toch wel toevoegt..op eh. Ik heb ook meisjes op mijn school die ik eigenlijk nooit heb gesproken, maar dan herken je elkaars gezicht...en eh, die voeg, voeg je dan toe en dan ken je ze je eigenlijk net toch eigenlijk net of je ze meer van hun weet, terwijl als dat niet

bestond, je geen idee zou hebben hoe ze überhaupt heet.
Ja, ik denk wel als je 1 keer iemand hebt gesproken en die voeg je dan toe, dan denk je wel van; oo, dan...dan blijf je zeg maar in zijn, in zijn leven kijken, omdat dat steeds langskomt waardoor je diegene een stuk beter kent. Als je bijvoorbeeld 1 keer op een feestje, diegene was tegenkomen, en dan nooit meer had gezien, dan weet je op eens wat die doet en wat...ja.
Nou, ik heb wel, dan...dan...ja er zijn mensen en die zitten er constant maar op en die zeggen dan; kan je mijn foto liken? Dan denk ik nou...daar ben ik niet echt van.
ik ga meestal niet huilen of zo [lacht] want ik heb wel gewoon mijn vriendinnen die altijd mijn foto liken...enne en zeggen van...maar soms dan heb ik ook, dan zei bijvoorbeeld mijn zus van; die foto is leuk die moet doen je als profielfoto...en dan doe je dat en dan denk je; o god, iedereen gaat nu denken van wie is dat nou weer...en dan krijg je heel veel likes, dan denk je toch wel van; o misschien is het toch wel een leuke foto. Het geeft wel een beetje zelfvertrouwen...
Het is meer dat ik dan kijk en dan denk; oo deze foto heeft weinig likes. En dan kijk ik naar die foto en dan denk ik; nou, daar zal ik wel lelijk opstaan of zo. Je denkt toch met hoeveel likes je hebt dat, dat dan ligt aan hoe leuk mensen je of mooi vinden op die foto. En, dat is meestal wel een beetje als je een bijzondere foto hebt, dat meer mensen het liken. Soms, soms heb je ook wel een beetje een nietsnut foto. Maar dan vooral op Instagram, op Facebook zet ik eigenlijk niet heel veel onzin, maar op Instagram zet ik soms wel grappige foto's. En, dat krijgt dan ook minder likes, maar dat vind ik eigenlijk ook wel gewoon prima. Dat doet me eigenlijk niet heel veel, alleen als je er natuurlijk heel veel krijgt. Het is meer dat ik het leuk vind als het positief is, maar als het heel negatief is, dan...nou ik hebt nooit gehad dat ik echt nul likes heb...dat ik zit van...
Interviewer: Dat je bang bent dat je iets mist bijvoorbeeld? RS1: Ik denk dat ik dat stiekem toch wel heb, ook al zeg altijd wel van niet. Maar ik denk dat bijna wel de meeste mensen bij mij op school dat wel hebben, omdat ik dat, maar best wel, nog...daar best wel mee geboren ben met al die...nou niet geboren met Facebook, maar... Interviewer: Mee opgeroeid bent? RS1: Ja, dat het voor mij heel normaal is, en bijvoorbeeld voor mijn zussen, die denken bij mij waarschijnlijk ook van; nou die zit alleen maar op Facebook. Maar, ik ben dan nog niet, zo iets jongere kinderen, uit de eerste...die gewoon echt, alles erop zetten, en in de les foto's maken en de erop zetten. Dat is dan niet, dat is nog wel een beetje van na mij. Alleen ik, ik heb toch wel een beetje een drang omdat iedereen het doet.
Ja, wel met huiswerk. Als ik gewoon echt geen zin heb om iets te leren of als ik zo veel moet doen, dan weet ik niet waar ik moet beginnen...en dan open ik Facebook en dan is het opeens een halfuur later en dank denk ik; o nee. Het is gewoon zo nutteloos eigenlijk. Want het is niet dat je dat echt moet doen. Ik heb het vooral met huiswerk, dan staat het open op mijn laptop en dan raak ik helemaal verzeild in iemands foto's, dat ik dat gewoon ga kijken. En dan op een gegeven moment, denk ik; waar ben ik eigenlijk mee bezig? Maar het is niet met, dat ik een avond op Facebook zit, terwijl ik eigenlijk naar vriendinnen zou gaan. Zo belangrijk vind ik het ook weer niet, meer als ik mij verveel.
En ik heb nu ook een Facebook-blocker. [lacht]. Op mijn telefoon, op mijn laptop en dan kan je het uitschakelen voor vijf uur en dan kan je op geen een manier kan je erop komen.
RS1: Omdat, je schiet er helemaal niks mee op en het is ook niet dat je nou zo veel geleerd hebt nadat je op Facebook gekeken. Van oo nu ben ik heel wat wijzer. Ik krijg vaak grappige filmpjes en dan kijk ik vaak alles drie keer, omdat ik dan niet, niet huiswerk wil maken. Interviewer: Ja. RS1: En dat vind ik eigenlijk wel heel stom en zonde ook, maar toch doe ik het elke keer weer. Gewoon een beetje een automatisme.
Ja, ik heb wel laatst...ik heb wel laatst een foto had ik erop gezet...en normaal krijg ik altijd wel van die mensen die constant op Instagram zitten en die liken het dan binnen twee seconden...en nu was het na vijf minuten nog niks en toen dacht ik...ik vond dat heel stom van mezelf, maar toen heb ik het eraf gehaald...want ik dacht misschien is er wel helemaal iets omis met die foto, terwijl het volgens mij gewoon een prima foto was. Alleen toen heb ik het eraf gehaald, want toen dacht ik; nou het zal wel aan mij liggen dat ik het helemaal niet zo vreselijk vond. Dat voelt dan, dan ook wel stom, maar eigenlijk komt dat bijna nooit voor...
<b>Respondent 2</b>
RS2: Ja, dat bijvoorbeeld wel. Ik denk niet ehm, meer vrienden zeg maar in aantallen of zo...maar meer uhm, mensen die je anders nooit meer zou spreken, die je dan wel spreekt zeg maar. Interviewer: Ja. RS2: Dat, dan onderhoud je je netwerk wel beter zeg maar. [lacht]. Ik vind het meestal wel leuk, want dan merk je toch dat het dan gelezen wordt en dat mensen er dan

overnadenken
Interviewer: Ja, en eh...en als er bijvoorbeeld heel weinig reageren, mensen, als er weinig mensen reageren, doet dat je iets of...? RS2: Nee, eigenlijk niet. Nee, maakt me eigenlijk niet zo veel uit.
En dan vindt kennelijk niemand anders het grappig of zo, en dan denk ik altijd; ligt het aan mij?
Interviewer: Nee. En voel je dan bijvoorbeeld druk om meteen te reageren als iemand met je een afspraak wil maken, bijvoorbeeld via Whatsapp? RS2: Uhm, ja, soms wel. Want soms als ik van de hockey kom of zo, dan heb ik ff geen internet, en dan komt er soms zo'n hele lading. En dan zijn het ook echt dertig mensen en dan moet je ze allemaal beantwoorden.
Interviewer: Ja, heb je weleens het gevoel dat je echt moet kijken op Facebook, omdat je anders iets mist? RS2: Uhm, ja soms wel, soms wel. Ja, ik vind het wel altijd leuk om zo veel mogelijk van dat soort nieuwsberichtjes of foto's of dat soort dingen te zien.
RS2: En als ik dan eh, een half uur of zo op Facebook zit, dan ja, dan denk ik wel van; het gaat ten koste van leren, maar ook niet zo significant dat mijn cijfers naar beneden gaan. Interviewer: Nee, maar voel je daar dan vervelend over achteraf, dat je dan op Facebook hebt gezeten in plaats van hebt geleerd? RS2: Uhm, soms wel, dan denk ik, ja, dan moet ik of heel laat naar bed of ik heb mijn huiswerk niet af. Dan denk ik wel dat is echt onzin eigenlijk.
<b>Respondent 3</b>
Ik krijg er niet echt extra vrienden door of zo.
Het ligt eraan wat voor post het was, want toen ik eh had gepost dat ik een halfjaar met mijn vriendin had, toen was het; o cute, cute, cute. En dat was dan wel irritant, omdat er tachtigduizend keer cute stond
RS3: Maar meestal krijg ik niet zo heel veel reacties, maar heel veel likes, twintig of zo. Ja. Interviewer: Ja. En wat zou je ervan vinden als je helemaal geen reacties of... RS3: Nja, dat vind ik altijd wel saai. Interviewer: Ja. RS3: Tenminste wel één reactie, want anders zou ik het ook niet doen.
Uhm, nou, uiteindelijk reageert iedereen altijd wel [background noise]. Maar ik zit niet als er na vijf minuten nog niemand reageert, dat ik denk; argh ze reageren niet.
Uhm, ja soms wel, omdat ik dan heel druk bezig ben met whatsappen met iedereen, dan denk ik; oo shit, ik moet dat nog doen, nou dan doe ik dat morgen maar.
RS3: Ja, dat was eigenlijk mijn voorbeeld. Het heeft meestal wel met school te maken, maar dan heb ik er ook geen zin in, dus dat soort dingen zijn ook een uitweg zeg maar. Interviewer: Ja, dus als het niet Whatsapp was geweest, dan was er wel iets anders geweest denk je? RS3: Ja.
<b>Respondent 4</b>
Nee, dat niet echt. Ik heb wel mensen van school of zo, maar het is niet echt dat ik daarmee praat.
Interviewer: Ja, en uhm, als je bijvoorbeeld een post doet of Facebook en er reageren heel veel mensen, hoe voel je dan? RS4: Ik vind het wel leuk, maar het is niet alsof ik dan denk; ik heb heel veel vrienden of zo. Interviewer: Oké, en uhm als er bijvoorbeeld heel weinig mensen reageren, vind je dat erg? RS4: Nee, dat boeit me eigenlijk niet zo veel.
RS4: Ik vind het wel leuk als mensen het leuk vinden of reageren, maar ja, het is niet alsof ik het heel erg jammer vind als ze niet reageren. Het is maar iets op Facebook, het is niet iets in het echt, of het is niet iets heel belangrijks of zo. Interviewer: Ja, en eh voel je druk om altijd meteen te reageren? RS4: Uhm, nee, soms zie ik wel iets en dan wil ik gelijk reageren, maar soms doe ik ook wel van; ik heb geen zin om te reageren, dat doe ik later wel.
Interviewer: Heb je weleens dat Facebook er voor zorgt dat je minder tijd hebt voor dingen, of dat je bijvoorbeeld door Whatsapp minder tijd hebt voor dingen? Dat het veel tijd in beslag neemt? RS4: Nee, soms Whatsapp wel, maar Facebook niet.
<b>Respondent 5,6 en 7</b>
RS5: Uhm, nja, echt vrienden wil ik het, nja je hebt heel veel vrienden op Facebook en die kan je natuurlijk eigenlijk niet allemaal je vriend noemen, maar het is wel, uhm, zeker... RS6: Je houdt meer vrienden, denk ik.

<p>RS5: Ja, dat zeker en het is ook wel dat vaak, dan zie je iemand vaak op school lopen en dan weet je wel wat van, maar via Facebook weet je er toch net iets meer van, en dan is het ook wel makkelijker om dan hoi te zeggen of om even een praatje te maken. Dan weet je net toevallig dat diegene op vakantie is geweest, is toch makkelijker dan, als dat er allemaal niet was. Dan zou je diegene waarschijnlijk helemaal niet aanspreken.</p>
<p>Interviewer: Ja, en uhm, stel je voor je doet nou een Facebookpost en er reageert helemaal niemand, vinden jullie dat vervelend?  RS5: [lacht], ja, als het een hele leuke foto is en niemand liked, dan denk ik wel van; hm, misschien moet ik er hem maar afhalen.  RS6: Misschien is het toch niet zo'n goed idee.</p>
<p>RS7: Dan is het wel zo van; iedereen vind die foto ook leuk, zoals ik hem leuk vind.</p>
<p>Interviewer: En, hebben jullie weleens het gevoel dat jullie echt moeten kijken op Facebook, bijvoorbeeld omdat je bang bent dat je anders iets mist?  RS7: Nou, dat niet echt eigenlijk. Wel op mijn Whatsapp, nja, dat alleen omdat je dan zo veel berichten binnen krijgt.</p>
<p>RS6: Want dat haal je niet bij.  RS5: Als er nou echt iets heel leuks zou zijn langs gekomen, dan zou dat wel langs zijn gekomen op Whatsapp of...  RS7: Whatsapp is wel belangrijker dat je dat bijhoudt.  RS5: Zeker, want anders als je geen wifi hebt of zo, moet je alles weer bijwerken en op iedereen reageren.</p>
<p>Interviewer: En heb je ook weleens, hebben jullie weleens, dat je door Facebook en Whatsapp, dat je dan minder tijd hebt voor andere dingen?  RS 5,6,7: Ja [lacht]  RS7: Voornamelijk met schoolwerk.  [lachen]  RS6: Ja, dat is wel moeilijk, maar eigenlijk alleen school.</p>
<p>RS5: Maar ik denk vooral dat je schoolwerk er heel erg, en dat je natuurlijk heel laat gaat slapen als je midden in het gesprek zit, dan maak je het toch af. En dan, ga je weer met iemand anders. Ja, het is heel makkelijk om met iemand te praten dan nog even en dan ga je laat slapen en doe je niks aan je huiswerk.  RS6: Ja, dat iets niet zo slim.  Interviewer: En voelen jullie daar weleens vervelend over dat het huiswerk dan helemaal eh...  RS6: Nou vooral dom.  RS5: Achteraf denk je van, dat doen we minder en ik zet mijn telefoon nu een uur uit, maar dan zie ik toch mijn telefoon daar...en dan denk ik; ja, ik moet nog even kijken. En dan heb je waarschijnlijk allemaal whatsappjes die je moet reageren en dan ga je weer reageren en dan ben je weer een halfuur verder.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Expectations on online communication Respondent 1</b></p>
<p>Interviewer: En wanneer kijk je dan gewoon echt niet? Bijvoorbeeld op school?  RS1: Uhm, meestal eigenlijk niet, gewoon omdat het te langzaam gaat [lacht]. Op school heb ik hele slechte verbinding. En als ik met vrienden ben, kijk ik er ook niet op. En op vakantie..nou op vakantie misschien wel. Gewoon niet als ik met mensen ben.  Interviewer: Ja.  RS1: Dat vind ik altijd zo stom.</p>
<p>RS1: Ja, wel met praten en soms dan ga ik ze porren of zo. Maar verder, niet, het is niet dat ik met mensen die niet echt heel goed ken, dat ik daar contact mee zoek via Facebook. Maar mijn beste vrienden, die stuur ik wel berichtjes via privé en dan kan je dan, als je er een foto op zet, taggen enzo en dat is dan, dan wel zo. Maar verder, maar verder niet heel erg denk ik. Onder foto's reageer ik dan ook wel.  Interviewer: Ja.  RS1: In principe zie je wel, als je door mij foto's heen gaat en je kijkt bij de reacties, zie je eigenlijk wel wie mijn vrienden echt zijn.</p>
<p>Want eigenlijk vind ik het nu wel dat vriendinnen het niet kunnen maken om, dat je iets gestuurd hebt en om dan nog heel lang online te blijven en dan niet reageren.</p>
<p>Interviewer: Maar kwetst dat je bij vriendinnen, als zij er heel lang over doen?  RS1: Ja, ik voel me dan wel een beetje; nou dan niet, sorry dat ik het vroeg. Maar dat gebeurt gelukkig niet zo vaak. Maar als je bijvoorbeeld iets vraagt aan iemand, zo iets, van; ga jij het werkstuk afmaken? En dan krijg je heel lang online, en dan...offline. Oke, dan doe ik het wel. Het voelt dan wel</p>

<p>een beetje of als diegene achter zijn telefoon zit; nou daar is Leo weer, nou laat maar.</p>
<p>Toen heb ik daar niet op geantwoord, ook een beetje om...je kan ook niet antwoorden om...om een beetje te doen, ja ik vind dit echt niet leuk eigenlijk. Dan zien ze toch wel dat je het hebt gelezen. Dus bij mij komt dat meer over van; ik heb niet zo'n zin om op je te antwoorden en dat mag je ook best weten.</p>
<p>Zoals mijn moeder en sommige vriendinnen ook wel...en bij die mensen weet ik het ook wel, bij die mensen weet ik dat ze het niet kwaad bedoelen. Maar als ik het doe bij iemand, dan denk je waarschijnlijk meteen van; hoow wat is er aan de hand? [Lacht].</p>
<p>Interviewer: Ja, en wat gebeurt er als jij niet reageert op een bericht van iemand?  RS1: Het ligt een beetje aan, hele goeie vriendinnen sturen gewoon nog dertig vraagtekens, zo van; hee leo, hoezo reageer je niet? Doe is normaal. Maar iets minder goeie vriendinnen, die...ik weet het niet...dan zeggen op school van, dan vragen ze het nog eens wat ze vroegen. Maar soms bijvoorbeeld dan vraagt iemand van; kan je, ik ben mijn boek vergeten, kan je foto's maken? En dan denk ik van; ahh, daar heb ik echt geen zin in. Ik ben dan niet iemand die dan niet reageert, maar als ik dat dan niet zou doen dan zijn er of mensen die zeggen gewoon niks meer en die vragen het aan iemand anders, die doen de volgende dag misschien een beetje op school van; nou dan niet. Maar beste vriendinnen die zeggen dan van; kom op Leo, alsjeblieft, doe even. En dat is wel een verschil. En er zijn waarschijnlijk, ik heb ook wel vriendinnetje en die zich denk ik heel erg gedist voelen. Het ligt er ook een beetje aan wat voor vraag het is. Is het iets van wil je met mij mee op vakantie in de zomer en daar reageer je niet op, is dat natuurlijk erger dan als iemand vraagt van; mag ik je tipp-ex lenen. [lacht]</p>
<p>RS1: Dat, dat ik echt, als ik, ook al zijn het alleen maar mijn beste vriendinnen liken, vind ik dat al, vind ik dat gewoon genoeg. Het is natuurlijk leuk als heel veel mensen het liken.  Interviewer: Maar het is goed genoeg als je goede vrienden het doen?  RS1: Ja, als die het ook niet doen dan weet je toch wel zeker dat er iets, iets niet goed aan is.</p>
<p>RS1: Ze zetten het er toch wel onder. Ik vind dat eigenlijk helemaal niet erg fijn als, als iemand altijd onder je foto leuk zet.  Interviewer: Ja.  RS1: Of super mooi. Maar ik vind het ook wel leuk om van iemand anders, zeg maar niet uit mijn beste vriendinnengroep, gewoon van; hee leuke foto...een meisje uit, van mijn klas.  Interviewer: Ja.  RS1: Dat is weer iets anders, dat voelt dan wat echter of zo...want ze zijn niet verplicht, nou niet verplicht, maar niet zo standaard...</p>
<p>Interviewer: Uhm, als je bijvoorbeeld dan echt een persoonlijk bericht stuurt op Facebook...  RS1: Ja.  Interviewer: En dan, reageert er, dan reageert iemand niet...[crosstalk]  RS1: Ja, dat vind ik stom.  Interviewer: Ja.  RS1: Vooral omdat je heel duidelijk hebt 'gezien', dan denk ik nou; dan niet.  Interviewer: Ja.  Interviewer: Ik vind dat best wel stom. Ik, het ligt er ook een beetje aan, als het echt een goede vriendin is dan denk ik; of ze heeft een hele goede reden of het is gewoon echt...heel stom, maar...  Ja, ik ben gewoon gewend dat mijn vriendinnen wel heel erg, altijd wel bereikbaar zijn</p>
<p>Heel kort...doe ik erover. Soms, soms bij meisjes die ik niet heel goed ken, laat ik het express even liggen, dan reageer ik zo...anders lijkt het alsof ik geen leven heb [lacht].</p>
<p>RS1: Maar soms dan like iets van mijn beste vriendinnen of goeie vriendinnen, terwijl ik het eigenlijk helemaal niet...of een foto die ik eigenlijk helemaal niet mooi vind, maar toch. Toch denk ik wel van nou, ja...  Interviewer: Dat is wel wat je doet als vriendin?  RS1: Ja [lacht], toch wel leuk.</p>
<p>RS1: Nou, ja, via, via Facebook, Whatsapp of Instagram. Ook gewoon door, door andere mensen, als je dat...dat het gewoon normaal is dat je bij beste vriendinnen wel gewoon liked...dat, dat zie je bij andere vriendengroepen ook, dat meisjes reageren op beste vriendinnen. Vaak, vaak reageren en ook grappig reageren en doe je ook niet zo snel bij iemand die je niet goed kent.  Interviewer: Ja.  RS1: En berichtjes sturen. En iemand, eigenlijk iemand die ik niet heel goed ken en toch een berichtje wil sturen, dan doe ik dat sneller via Facebook, omdat het natuurlijk een beetje raar is als je een nummer hebt via Whatsapp, terwijl je ze eigenlijk echt niet heel goed kent.</p>
<p><b>Respondent 2</b></p>
<p>Interviewer: Ja, en uhm...bijvoorbeeld van je betere vrienden verwacht je wel meer van hun? Dat zij</p>



<p>dan vaker reageren?</p> <p>RS2: Uhm, ja als ik bijvoorbeeld in de klas over een bepaald filmpje of zo heb verteld, dat het heel leuk was, en ik post dat filmpje, dan verwacht ik min of meer dat zij wel iets reageren of liken of zo.</p>
<p>Interviewer: Ja, en uhm...en bijvoorbeeld echt een persoonlijk bericht via de Whatsapp, maar ook via Facebook uhm, als dan een goeie vriend van je niet reageert, wat vind je daar dan van?</p> <p>RS2: Uhm, ja, meestal wel jammer, omdat je het natuurlijk echt in een privé chat, uhm, dat is toch met eh, met de bedoeling om een reactie zeg maar.</p>
<p>Uhm, dat vind ik meestal wel jammer, maar het hangt ook een beetje af of het echt zo'n afspraak of zo is, dan denk ik; ja wat een eikel want hij reageert niet.</p>
<p>RS2: En dan een keer na het eten in ieder geval, dat ik dan wel verwacht, dat ze ooit een keer [lacht] op hun telefoon gaan kijken en kunnen reageren.</p> <p>Interviewer: Ja, en wat als het dan langer duurt dan, dan aan het einde van de dag?</p> <p>RS2: Ja, dan begin ik me meestal af te vragen waarom dat is.</p> <p>Interviewer: Ja.</p> <p>RS2: En, dan eh zeg ik meestal van; hallo, reageer ofzo [lacht].</p>
<p>Interviewer: Je probeert het wel? En als iemand bijvoorbeeld, je betere vrienden, een post doen op Facebook, reageer je daar ook altijd op?</p> <p>RS2: Nee, niet altijd, zeker niet. Omdat sommige van mijn vrienden ook van die dingen posten [lacht] echt eh; nu douchen of zo. Ja, en dan denk ik ook echt van, ja, oké, doe!</p>
<p>RS2: Uhm, ja, wel als iets heel concreets vraag zoals een datum of, of diegene wel of niet kan of wil, dan wel.</p> <p>Interviewer: Ja.</p> <p>RS2: Maar anders, als het zo'n onzinding is dan eigenlijk niet.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Respondent 3</b></p>
<p>RS3: Maar het is ook, in mijn vriendengroep is niet iedereen zo zeg maar super social media-achtig.</p> <p>Interviewer: Ja.</p> <p>RS3: Daar is het gewoon als we wat leuks hebben gedaan dan, zetten ze dat op internet en dat is het eigenlijk wel.</p>
<p>Uhm, nou ja, het ligt er aan, als het een belangrijk iets is, dan moet ik natuurlijk wel snel reageren</p>
<p>Ik heb nooit echt drang om, eh, om op Facebook te gaan, soms wil ook gewoon even offline zijn, even helemaal niks.</p>
<p>Maar ik ben wel sowieso elke dag, op Whatsapp ben ik elke dag wel 80 keer online.</p>
<p>RS3: Uhm, nou ja, ik vind het niet zo heel erg. Maar het is meer dan op Facebook ga ik het niet nog een keer posten...</p> <p>Interviewer: Nee.</p> <p>RS3: Dan is het gewoon zo. Maar op Whatsapp zeg ik nog wel een keer dit en dat.</p> <p>Interviewer: Ja, en als je dan bijvoorbeeld een post doet op Facebook verwacht je dan eigenlijk dat je goeie vrienden wel altijd reageren? Of verwacht je meer van hun?</p> <p>RS3: Nja, het hoeft niet. Het is een beetje, je eigen keuze of je dat wilt doen. Ik verwacht eigenlijk niet zo veel, maar ik het wel stom als er nul reacties staat of nul likes ofzo...</p>
<p>Nja, vooral nul likes, want nul reacties dat is...er wordt niet zo veel op gereageerd, maar likes is dat iedereen denkt; oo oke, like...o like. Dat gaat zo een beetje langs.</p>
<p>En uhm, dan vind ik het gewoon jammer als iemand niet reageert, dus dat meer.</p>
<p>Nja ik vind wel bij een halfuur later, dan vraag ik opnieuw iets, want anders, daarvoor vind ik het oke, dan kan je bezig zijn ofzo...</p>
<p>RS3: Nja, ik vind het altijd vervelend als je niet kan zien of iemand online is geweest, want dan stuur ik bijvoorbeeld dingen en...</p> <p>Interviewer: Ja.</p> <p>RS3: Dan wil ik dat iemand reageert en dat kan je dan niet zien, en dat is wel vervelend.</p>
<p>RS3: Dan is het ook vervelender, als iemand online is.</p> <p>Interviewer: Ja. En hoe denk je dat het komt dat, dat verschil?</p> <p>RS3: Nou, omdat je dan denkt; waarschijnlijk heeft ie het gelezen, maar heeft hij geen zin om te reageren</p>
<p>RS3: Maar, ik vind het ook wel vervelend als mensen, gewoon, het niet hebben staan zeg maar.</p> <p>Interviewer: Ja.</p> <p>RS3: Dan weet je, je weet gewoon niks op dat moment.</p> <p>Interviewer: Ja.</p> <p>RS3: Terwijl je normaal, altijd alles van elkaar weet.</p>
<p>Interviewer: Oké, en uhm...reageer jij altijd binnen een halfuur op eh?</p> <p>RS3: Ik reageer bij altijd heel snel ja.</p>

<p>Interviewer: Ja? En reageer jij ook vaak op post die je vrienden hebben gedaan? RS3: Nou, ik ben meer een 'liker' zeg maar.</p>
<p>RS3: Ik vind het niet zo heel erg als ik niet met ze praat, want ik zie ze toch elke dag. Interviewer: Ja. RS3: Op school, en na school, en in het weekend zie ik ze sowieso altijd, dus ja...Ik vind het ook niet super belangrijk, maar het is meestal dan gaat het over huiswerk...</p>
<p>Uhm, nja, ik weet het een beetje onsociaal om maar zo te zeggen, om als je met mensen zit, dan ga je niet de hele tijd op je telefoon zitten, dat vind ik gewoon...Nja, als je met z'n tweeën bent bijvoorbeeld dan praat je gewoon met elkaar, maar als je met z'n drieën of vieren bent, dan kan je wel gewoon af en toe op je telefoon zitten...</p>
<p><b>Respondent 4</b></p>
<p>RS4: Nee, het is natuurlijk dat iedereen door elkaar heen gaat praten, dus dan maakt het eigenlijk ook niet zo veel uit. Maar als het dan een 1 op 1 gesprek is en je reageert dan niet, dan zou dat wel jammer zijn. Interviewer: Ja, en uhm, hoe denk je dat, waarom dat verschil is? RS4: Omdat je dan echt tegen diegene praat. Ja, echt tegen diegene.</p>
<p>Nja, eigenlijk niet, sommige hebben ook geen Facebook en ik reageer ook nooit zo veel op anderen, omdat ik er nooit echt achter zit.</p>
<p>Uhm, ligt er ook een beetje aan wat de vraag is. Als het belangrijk zou zijn dan zou het wel erg zijn, en als het niet zo belangrijk zou zijn, zou het niet zo heel erg zijn. Wel jammer, maar niet heel erg.</p>
<p>RS4: Nee, je kan natuurlijk niet altijd op Facebook zijn. Whatsapp is wat anders. Interviewer: Ja, maar wat maakt Whatsapp dan anders? RS4: Hm, de meeste hebben niet echt Facebook of hebben het niet op hun telefoon of zo.</p>
<p>Interviewer: En als je een persoonlijk bericht hebt gestuurd naar een goeie vriend, via Whatsapp, hoe lang mag iemand er eigenlijk overdoen voordat je begint te twijfelen van eh, dat je denkt, dit duurt echt te lang? RS4: Hm, dat maakt niet zo veel uit. Interviewer: Er is niet een eh... RS4: Misschien een dag of zo.</p>
<p>RS4: Facebook maakt me niet zo veel uit. Whatsapp vind ik wel leuk als ze dingen delen, maar daar heb je ook groepsgesprekken voor. Interviewer: Ja. RS4: Ja, want daar praten ze echt over alles en nog wat, ook over die niet belangrijke dingen, dus eigenlijk kom je wel heel veel te weten.</p>
<p><b>Respondent 5,6 en 7</b></p>
<p>Interviewer: En, stel je voor, je eh, stuurt een persoonlijk bericht naar iemand via Whatsapp en iemand reageert dan niet. Vind je dat ook vervelend? RS7: Nou, soms heb je wel dan, dat ze online gaan en dan niet reageren, dan denk ik wel; nou dan wacht ik nog wel. Maar als ze echt na twee weken niet hebben gereageerd, dan denk ik echt van; oké, wat is hier aan de hand. RS6: Dan ga je daarna ook niet zo heel snel meer iets zeggen. RS5: Nee. RS6: Als zij je ook niet meer aanspreekt. RS5: Nee, dat is moeilijk. RS6: Dan denk je misschien van; oo die is boos, dan ga je meteen allemaal dingen bedenken. RS5: Wij vinden dat waarschijnlijk heel gênant, vooral [lacht] ja.</p>
<p>Interviewer: Ja, en bijvoorbeeld als je in een groepswatsapp, die hebben jullie wel? RS5: Uhu. Interviewer: Als je daar dan iets ingooit en niemand reageert, hoe vinden jullie dat? RS7: Dat is eigenlijk nog veel vervelender. RS6: Ja, het ligt er aan, soms denk ik ook van, ja, dit was meer dat iedereen dit moest weten en dat was het. Het is niet, bij sommige dingen heb je ook niet zo veel om op te reageren.</p>
<p>RS5: Soms is de vraag persoonlijk. Soms heb ik ook weleens, dat ik het zo gênant vind, dat niemand er op reageert, dat ik wel gewoon, dat ik een vriendin whatsapp van; reageer er even op [lacht]. RS6: Dat is serieus, doe ik serieus ook.</p>
<p>RS5: Uhm, nou ik denk vooral, dat wij alle drie gewoon heel veel op onze telefoon zitten, dus dat wij heel snel reageren. Interviewer: Ja. RS6: Maar als je niet reageert, dan is daar wel echt een reden, zeg maar, dat is niet zomaar. RS5: Ja.</p>

<p>RS6: Dan doe je dat wel met een soort bedoeling er achter.  RS5: Dan is het duidelijk dat er iets aan de hand is.  RS6: Ja.  Interviewer: Ja.  RS7: Anders antwoord je nog wel even snel.  RS5: Vooral met mensen die je heel goed kent, uhm, nou ja, wij praten wel 24 uur per dag met elkaar, dan zou het heel raar zijn als, als we niet zouden reageren...</p>
<p>RS5: Of die heeft gelezen of is er iets aan de hand...of is die gewoon, dan ga ik er heel veel over nadenken, misschien niet zo goed.  RS7: Terwijl iemand ook gewoon aan het eten kan zijn.  Interviewer: Ja.  RS5: Maar dat komt vooral, omdat wij heel veel op onze telefoon zitten en heel snel reageren, en als iemand anders dat dan niet doet, dan is het meteen van; dan ga je allemaal rare dingen bedenken.</p>
<p>Interviewer: En, bijvoorbeeld, weer even terug naar, als je een post plaatst, verwacht je dat je goeie vrienden daar wel altijd op reageren of dat ze het liken?  RS7: Nou wel dat ze het liken, maar dat doen ze ook meestal altijd wel [lacht]. En soms zie je het ook, op Facebook zie je alles van iedereen, dus dan...ik heb weleens dat iemand zegt; like mijn post heel even [lachen] terwijl ik die foto nog helemaal niet voorbij had zien komen.  Interviewer: Ja.  RS5: Ja, maar wij, als vriendinnen like je altijd wel, je hebt altijd wel tien likes van vaste vriendinnen, dat denk ik, ja dat denk ik  RS 6,7: Ja  RS5: Waarvan je zeker weet, dat ze die wel liken. Het verschilt altijd wel een beetje, maar als vaste vriendin doe je dat meestal wel.</p>
<p>RS5: Ook omdat we van elkaar weten, dat we het niet zo leuk vinden als we nul likes hebben. Ja, dat staat toch een beetje stom.  Interviewer: Het is gewoon fijn als andere dat...  RS5: Ja  RS7: Ja, eerst even aan een vriendin; is deze foto leuk? [lacht]  RS5: Ja.  RS7: En dan van zo; ja, zet hem er maar op, dan like ik hem of zo is het.</p>
<p>RS5: Het ligt er aan hoe serieus het is. Als iets over school gaat dan maakt het...dan...  RS6: Maar stel je zou zeggen; ik heb echt een top vakantie gehad, en jij reageert daar niet op, dan zou ik niet heel erg hebben van eh  RS5: Nee, dat is niet heel raar, vervelend  RS7: Maar als ik zeg ik heb ruzie met mijn ouders, ik het dit en ik kom er niet uit of zo, dan zou ik het wel fijn vinden als je reageert...  RS5: Ja, dan is het heel raar om niet te reageren.  Interviewer: En hoe snel moet een vriendin eigenlijk reageren op een persoonlijk bericht?  RS7: Uhm, nou als die online is, eigenlijk...  RS5: Als die het heeft gelezen, dan, dan meteen denk ik</p>
<p>RS7: Maar het is vervelend als iemand gewoon online is en dan niet reageert.</p>
<p>Interviewer: Hoe snel jullie reageren, binnen welke tijd?  RS5: Ja, gewoon gelijk, als je het leest dan...  RS7: Dan wel gelijk.  RS6: Meestal binnen een paar minuten, maar als je, als iemand echt druk bezig is dan kan het ook na een uur zijn.  RS5: Maar dan weten we ook meestal van elkaar dat we druk bezig zijn.</p>

## 7.4. Questionnaire

### **Enquête over social media: hoe gebruiken adolescenten het, wat vinden ze ervan en wat verwachten ze?**

#### **Introductie**

Dankjewel voor het invullen van deze enquête!

Ik volg de Master Media, Culture & Society aan de Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam. De resultaten van deze enquête zullen gebruikt worden voor mijn scriptie over jongeren en social media. Met mijn scriptie onderzoek ik hoe jongeren social media gebruiken, wat zij ervan vinden en wat zij verwachten van hun vrienden via social media.

De antwoorden die je invult blijven volledig anoniem en worden alleen gebruikt voor mijn scriptie. Weet ook dat je vrij bent om te stoppen met de enquête op elk moment.

Het invullen van deze enquête duurt ongeveer 10 minuten. Als je aan het einde van de enquête jouw e-mailadres invult, maak je kans op één van de twee H&M of Bol cadeaubonnen van € 30! Je e-mailadres wordt alleen gebruikt om contact met je op te nemen als je één van de bonnen hebt gewonnen, voor de rest wordt je e-mailadres niet gebruikt!

Heb je vragen? Stuur dan een mailtje naar [annabel.543@hotmail.com](mailto:annabel.543@hotmail.com).

#### **Toestemming**

Voordat je begint aan deze enquête heb ik jouw toestemming nodig om jouw antwoorden te kunnen gebruiken voor mijn scriptie. Jouw antwoorden en gegevens blijven volledig anoniem. Geef jij mij toestemming om jouw antwoorden te gebruiken voor mijn scriptie?

- Ja
- Nee

### Gebruik social network sites en IM

De volgende vragen gaan over jouw gebruik van social media. Social media is hier onderverdeeld in social network sites en Instant Messaging (IM) programma's/apps. Bij social network sites kan je denken aan websites als Facebook, Twitter en Instagram. Bij Instant Messaging programma's/apps kan je denken aan chatprogramma's/apps als WhatsApp, Telegram, Snapchat.

1. Hoe vaak gebruik je de volgende social network sites? (Kruis bij elke site een antwoord aan)

	Nooit	Zelden	Soms	Vaak	Altijd
Facebook					
Twitter					
Instagram					
Pinterest					
Tumblr					
Flickr					
Myspace					
Google+					
Habbo					

2. Hoe vaak gebruik je de volgende Instant Messaging (chat) programma's/apps? (Kruis bij elk programma een antwoord aan)

	Nooit	Zelden	Soms	Vaak	Altijd
WhatsApp					
Telegram					
Messenger					
Snapchat					
Facebook Messenger					
iChat					
Blackberry Messenger					
Skype					
MSN					
Google Hangouts					

3. Op welke apparaten gebruik je social network sites, zoals Facebook? (Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)
- Computer
  - Laptop
  - Smartphone
  - Mobiele telefoon
  - Tablet
4. Hoe vaak kijk je gemiddeld op de social network sites, die je het meest gebruikt?
- Minder dan 1 keer per week
  - 1 keer per week
  - 1 keer in de paar dagen
  - 1 keer per dag
  - 2 à 5 keer per dag
  - 6 à 10 keer per dag
  - 11 à 15 keer per dag
  - Bijna altijd
5. Hoe vaak kijk je gemiddeld op de Instant Messaging programma's/apps, die je het meest gebruikt?
- Minder dan 1 keer per week
  - 1 keer per week
  - 1 keer in de paar dagen
  - 1 keer per dag
  - 2 à 5 keer per dag

- 6 à 10 keer per dag
- 11 à 15 keer per dag
- Bijna altijd

6. Hoe belangrijk zijn de volgende activiteiten voor jou bij het gebruiken van social network sites, zoals Facebook, Instagram en Twitter? (Kruis bij elke activiteit een antwoord aan)

	Heel onbelangrijk	Enigszins belangrijk	Belangrijk	Tamelijk belangrijk	Heel belangrijk
Profiel aanpassen					
Nieuwe vrienden toevoegen					
Privébericht sturen naar vrienden					
Privébericht sturen naar vreemden					
Posten van foto's, video's en berichten					
Foto's toevoegen aan album					
Taggen					
Reageren op posts					
Liken van posts					
Porren					
Opzoeken van evenementen					
Kijken naar het nieuwsoverzicht					
Kijken naar profielen					
Kijken naar pagina's (bijv. van sterren of Best Vines)					

7. Hoe belangrijk zijn de volgende activiteiten voor jou bij het gebruiken van Instant Messaging programma's/apps, zoals Whatsapp? (Kruis bij elke activiteit een antwoord aan)

	Heel onbelangrijk	Enigszins belangrijk	Belangrijk	Tamelijk belangrijk	Heel belangrijk
Profiel aanpassen					
Persoonlijk chatten					
Chatten in groepen (Groepswhatsapp)					
Videochatten					
Foto's uitwisselen					
Filmpjes uitwisselen					
Geluidsoptname uitwisselen					

### Redenen voor gebruik social network sites en IM

De volgende vragen gaan over welke redenen belangrijk zijn voor jou bij het gebruiken van social network sites en Instant Messaging programma's/apps.

8. Hoe belangrijk zijn de volgende redenen voor jou bij het gebruiken van social network sites, zoals Facebook? (Kruis bij elke reden een antwoord aan)

	Heel onbelangrijk	Enigszins belangrijk	Belangrijk	Tamelijk belangrijk	Heel belangrijk
Met vrienden communiceren					
Met vrienden dingen delen, zoals foto's					
Vrienden op de hoogte houden					
Over vrienden op de hoogte blijven					
Over evenementen op de hoogte blijven					
Verveling tegen gaan					
Het is afleiding					
Het is vermakelijk					
Het is makkelijk en snel					
Al mijn vrienden hebben het					

9. Hoe belangrijk zijn de volgende redenen voor jou bij het gebruiken van Instant Messaging programma's, zoals Whatsapp? (Kruis bij elke reden een antwoord aan)

	Heel onbelangrijk	Enigszins belangrijk	Belangrijk	Tamelijk belangrijk	Heel belangrijk
Met vrienden communiceren					
Met vrienden dingen delen, zoals foto's					
Vrienden op de hoogte houden					
Over vrienden op de hoogte blijven					
Over evenementen op de hoogte blijven					
Verveling tegen gaan					
Het is afleiding					
Het is vermakelijk					
Het is makkelijk en snel					
Al mijn vrienden hebben het					

### Evaluatie van social network sites en IM

Bij dit onderdeel zie je verschillende stellingen over online communicatie (via Facebook, WhatsApp, etc.) en offline communicatie (face-to-face). Bij deze vragen moet je aankruisen of je het er mee eens bent of niet.

10. Ben je het eens met de volgende stellingen over online communicatie en offline communicatie? (Kruis bij elke stelling een antwoord aan)

	Helemaal mee oneens	Oneens	Noch eens, noch oneens	Mee eens	Helemaal mee eens
Het is handig dat je iemands gezicht niet ziet wanneer je online communiceert.					
Het is vervelend dat je iemands uitdrukkingen niet ziet wanneer je online communiceert.					
Het is fijn dat je de tijd kan nemen om te reageren op een bericht wanneer je online communiceert.					
Via online communicatie durf ik mijn vrienden meer te vertellen.					
Ik vind online communiceren fijner dan offline communiceren.					
Online communicatie is minder persoonlijk dan offline communicatie					
Met smileys maak je online communicatie meer persoonlijk					
Online communiceren via video-chatten (Skype, Facetime) is hetzelfde als offline communiceren					
Door social network sites (Facebook) heb ik meer vrienden.					
Door social network sites (Facebook) heb ik meer kennissen.					
Door social network sites (Facebook) blijf ik op de hoogte over een groter aantal mensen.					
Door online communicatie met mijn vrienden zijn onze vriendschappen sterker geworden.					
Door online communicatie met mijn vrienden zijn onze vriendschappen beter geworden.					



## Positieve en negatieve effecten van social network sites en IM

De volgende vragen gaan over de mogelijke positieve en negatieve effecten van social network sites en of jij deze ervaart.

11. In hoeverre vind je het vervelend als jij geen toegang hebt tot social network sites, zoals Facebook?
- Helemaal niet vervelend
  - Niet vervelend
  - Neutraal
  - Vervelend
  - Heel vervelend
12. Waarom vind je het onder andere vervelend als je geen toegang zou hebben tot social network sites, zoals Facebook? (Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)
- Het missen van een post (foto, bericht) bij het nieuwsoverzicht
  - Het missen van een post (foto, bericht) op jouw profiel
  - Het missen een persoonlijk bericht
  - Niet op de hoogte te zijn over vrienden/kennissen
  - Niet met je vrienden in contact te zijn
  - Het niet bereikbaar zijn.
  - Het missen van grote gebeurtenissen
  - Het missen van afleiding
  - Het missen van vermaak
  - Het missen van het makkelijke en snelle communiceren
  - Er komen geen negatieve gevoelens bij mij op als ik geen toegang zou hebben tot social network sites.
13. In hoeverre vind je het vervelend als je geen toegang hebt tot Instant Messaging programma's/apps, zoals Whatsapp?
- Helemaal niet vervelend
  - Niet vervelend
  - Neutraal
  - Vervelend
  - Heel vervelend
14. Waarom vind je het onder andere vervelend als je geen toegang zou hebben tot Instant Messaging programma's/apps, zoals Whatsapp? (Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)
- Het missen van een groepschatbericht
  - Het missen van een persoonlijk chatbericht
  - Niet op de hoogte te zijn over vrienden/kennissen
  - Niet met je vrienden in contact te zijn
  - Het niet bereikbaar zijn.
  - Het missen van grote gebeurtenissen
  - Het missen van afleiding
  - Het missen van vermaak
  - Het missen van het makkelijke en snelle communiceren
  - Er komen geen negatieve gevoelens bij mij op als ik geen toegang zou hebben tot Instant Messaging programma's.
15. Hoe vaak komt het voor dat je door het bezoeken van social network sites, zoals Facebook, minder tijd hebt voor andere dingen (bijv. schoolwerk)? (Omcirkel je antwoord)
- Nooit   Zelden   Soms   Vaak   Altijd
16. Hoe vaak komt het voor dat je door het gebruiken van Instant Messaging programma's/apps, zoals Whatsapp, minder tijd hebt voor andere dingen (bijv. schoolwerk)? (Omcirkel je antwoord)
- Nooit   Zelden   Soms   Vaak   Altijd

17. Hoe belangrijk is het voor jou dat er veel mensen bij de volgende types van communicatie reageren? (Kruis bij elk type een antwoord aan)

	Heel onbelangrijk	Enigszins belangrijk	Belangrijk	Tamelijk belangrijk	Heel belangrijk
Een door jou geplaatst bericht/foto/video op social network sites					
Een door jou geplaatst bericht in een groepschat met Instant Messaging programma's/apps					

18. Hoe belangrijk is het voor jou dat er veel mensen liken bij een door jou geplaatst bericht/foto/video op social network sites? (Omcirkel je antwoord)  
 Heel onbelangrijk   Enigszins belangrijk   Belangrijk   Tamelijk belangrijk   Heel belangrijk

### Verwachtingen van vrienden op social network sites en IM

De volgende vragen gaan over wat jij verwacht van je goede of beste vrienden via online communicatie. Neem bij deze vragen dan ook jouw beste vriend(en) in gedachten.

19. Hoe belangrijk is het voor jou dat je goede vrienden bij de volgende types van communicatie reageren? (Kruis bij elk type een antwoord aan)

	Heel onbelangrijk	Enigszins belangrijk	Belangrijk	Tamelijk belangrijk	Heel belangrijk
Een door jou geplaatst bericht/foto/video op social network sites					
Een door jou geplaatst bericht/foto in een privégesprek op social network sites					
Een door jou geplaatst bericht in een groepschat met Instant Messaging programma's/apps					
Een door jou geplaatst bericht in een persoonlijke chat met Instant Messaging programma's/apps					

20. Hoe belangrijk is het voor jou dat je goede vrienden liken bij een door jou geplaatst bericht/foto/video op social network sites? (Omcirkel je antwoord)  
 Heel onbelangrijk   Enigszins belangrijk   Belangrijk   Tamelijk belangrijk   Heel belangrijk

21. Hoe belangrijk is het voor jou dat je goede vrienden bij de volgende types van communicatie snel reageren? (Kruis bij elk type een antwoord aan)

	Heel onbelangrijk	Enigszins belangrijk	Belangrijk	Tamelijk belangrijk	Heel belangrijk
Een door jou geplaatst bericht/foto/video op social network sites					
Een door jou geplaatst bericht/foto in een privégesprek op social network sites					
Een door jou geplaatst bericht in een groepschat met Instant Messaging programma's/apps					
Een door jou geplaatst bericht in een persoonlijke chat met Instant Messaging programma's/apps					

22. Na hoeveel uren verwacht jij dat een goede vriend zal reageren of liken bij een post (bericht, foto) van jou op social network sites, zoals Facebook, Instagram?
- Direct

- Binnen een halfuur
  - Binnen een paar uur
  - Binnen een dag
  - Binnen een paar dagen
  - Binnen een week
  - Ik verwacht niet dat zij reageren of liken.
- 23.** Na hoeveel uren verwacht jij dat een goede vriend reageert op een persoonlijk bericht via Instant Messaging programma's/apps, zoals Whatsapp?
- Direct
  - Binnen een halfuur
  - Binnen een paar uur
  - Binnen een dag
  - Binnen een paar dagen
  - Binnen een week
  - Ik verwacht niet zij reageren op mijn persoonlijke berichten.
- 24.** Na hoeveel uren reageer of like jij gemiddeld een post van een goede vriend op social network sites, zoals Facebook, Instagram?
- Direct
  - Binnen een halfuur
  - Binnen een paar uur
  - Binnen een dag
  - Binnen een paar dagen
  - Binnen een week
  - Ik reageer/like niet op meestal niet bij de posts van mijn vrienden.
- 25.** Na hoeveel uren reageer jij gemiddeld op een persoonlijk bericht van een goede vriend via Instant Messaging programma's/apps, zoals Whatsapp?
- Direct
  - Binnen een halfuur
  - Binnen een paar uur
  - Binnen een dag
  - Binnen een paar dagen
  - Binnen een week
  - Ik reageer niet of meestal niet op persoonlijke berichten van mijn vrienden.

### **Afsluiting**

Dit is het laatste onderdeel van de enquête. Bij dit onderdeel wordt er naar jouw persoonlijke gegevens gevraagd. Ook kan je bij dit onderdeel jouw e-mailadres invullen als je kans wilt maken op één van de twee cadeaubonnen van € 30. Jouw gegevens blijven volledig anoniem.

**26.** Ik ben een...

- Jongen
- Meisje

**27.** Mijn leeftijd is ... (Graag in cijfers vermelden)

**28.** Met welke opleiding ben je bezig?

- Universitaire opleiding
- hbo-opleiding
- mbo-opleiding
- vwo-opleiding
- havo-opleiding
- vmbo-opleiding
- Ik ben niet bezig met een opleiding.

**29.** Heb je nog een vraag of een suggestie? Vul die dan hieronder in.

**30.** Wil je kans maken op één van de twee H&M of Bol cadeaubonnen van € 30? Vul dan hieronder je e-mailadres in.

Je e-mailadres wordt alleen gebruikt om contact met je op te nemen als je één van de bonnen hebt gewonnen, voor de rest niet!

**Dankjewel voor het invullen van deze enquête!**