

Social norms concerning online communication;

Dutch users assessing norm violations regarding online behavior

Abstract

There are concerns in academic circles, but also in Dutch society about the increasing use of online communication. Worries are expressed that people will lose their offline connections with each other. This article aimed at informing that discussion by researching the norms people uphold concerning their daily online behavior. A large sample of 495 respondents (12-30 years) participated in the research project. A survey incorporating vignette assignments was used to explore what kind of norms the respondents upheld. The results revealed that many respondents view specific norm violations as unacceptable, including scoffing on SNS or posting something that might reflect negatively on a friend. Another norm upheld by half of the respondents included that one should respond to an important personal message of friend. In contrast, responding to a post of a friend on SNS is clearly not considered a norm by almost all respondents. Noteworthy is that a large amount of respondents found using one's mobile technologies while you are in a serious conversation not OK. Besides this a large percentage of the respondents indicated that they find offline communication more important than online communication. This demonstrates in a way that many respondents still valued face-to-face conversation. In line with previous research, this research also established that gender, age and peers were significant determinants in how respondents evaluate the norm violations.

Key words: Online communication; social norms; norm violations; gender and age differences; peer influence

Word Count: 9998

Student Name: Annabel Draaijers

Student Number: 345470

E-mail: 345470ad@student.eur.nl

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. J. Jansz

Second reader: -

Research Master Media Studies – Sociology of Culture, Media and the Arts

Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master Thesis

June 17 2016

Introduction

Online communication provides the possibility to communicate anywhere and anytime; it makes constant contact possible. For a large part of the population mobile connection has become essential in maintaining relationships (Selfhout, 2009). Consequently, these relationships develop in both online and offline environments. Hall and Baym (2011) emphasize that “the use of new media in maintaining friendship has become increasingly common” (p. 320). The increasing use of online communication has led to concerns in society and in academics.

In her TED-talk Sherry Turkle (2012, February), a famous academic in communication sciences, addresses this worry and even goes as far as saying that “people distance themselves from one another by overusing social media”. In short, Turkle argues that increasingly connecting online can harm people’s ability to being connected offline. Related to this worry, Hall, Baym and Miltner (2014) highlight the concerns in American society about the increasing use of smartphones. Hall et al. (2014) perceive these concerns as an upcoming moral panic and refer to news articles that warn that constant use of social media can ‘ruin’ relationships.

Similar worries are expressed in the Netherlands. In Table 1, one can see some illustrations of how Dutch news articles warn about the use of online communication. Some journalists warn that overusing online communication is damaging for your relationship. (Dagblad van de Limburger, 2013; Rovers, 2014). Another expressed worry concerns the fear that people and especially youngsters will lose the skills to hold a face-to-face conversation (AD/Haagsche Courant 2016; Steenhuis, 20016). On the other hand, other journalists emphasize that the worries about the use of online communication are not grounded (SeeTable 2). For example in Trouw, a journalist states that children of today grow up with social media and are very capable to cope with issues online and offline (Ahlers, 2016).

Table 1. Worries concerning online communication expressed in Dutch newspapers

Newspaper	Quote
<i>De Limburger</i> (2013)	Couples who frequently communicate with each other online have a less satisfying marriage than couples who barely keep in contact online.
<i>NRC Handelsblad</i> (2013)	The increasing pressure to be social, to want to follow everyone and to not miss anything, is a worrying trend among young people.
<i>De Limburger</i> (2014)	Overusing the Internet is bad for relationships . Partners feel left out.
<i>Trouw</i> (2016)	The frequent digital contact adolescents have with each other harms their ability to talk face-to-face’
<i>Algemeen Dagblad</i> (2016)	Smartphones stand in the way of normal conversation, which is alarming. By having less real contacts, we lose the skill to a hold a conversation, in which you listen to each other.

Table 2. Counterarguments expressed in Dutch newspapers

Newspaper	Quote
<i>NRC Handelsblad</i> (2014)	For teenagers social media are primarily an extension of their 'real' social life.
<i>NRC Handelsblad</i> (2015)	There is practically no evidence that online media affects the quality of friendships or leads to social isolation.
<i>Trouw</i> (2016)	Today's youth (Generation Z) literally grow up in social networks and are perfectly capable of making their point both online and offline.

Nevertheless, the concerns are there. People are worried that one will lose its ability to have a 'normal' face-to-face conversation by overusing online communication. Moreover, people are concerned that relational partners will lose our offline connection with each other, because they focus too much on staying connected online. In this way, people are worried that online communication is challenging one's 'normal' conversations and relationships. Hall et al. (2014) make a link between these concerns and social norms. Social norms are defined as rules that direct one's behavior and provide a framework via which one can establish which actions are normal and which not (Hall et al., 2014). According to the social norms theory of Berkowitz (2005) norms influence how one behaves.

Hall et al. (2014) explain that mobile technologies can possibly challenge social norms, violate them and in this way, effectively damage relationships. However, as these new technologies have become domesticated in our daily lives, new norms are developed as well. Domestication theory assumes that technologies and users both shape each other (Haddon, 2006; Silverstone, 1993). Nowadays, there are norms about texting via Instant Messaging programs (IM), posting on social network sites (SNS) and using these technologies while one is in public or with a group of friends. Violating these norms can also have an influence on the relationships people have (Hall et al., 2014; McLaughlin & Vitak, 2011).

The present article aims to contribute to the discussion in both society and the academic field regarding the concerns about the increasing use of online communication. This research project contributes by focusing on the norms people uphold concerning daily online behavior and how this possibly differs by specific social groups. By exploring the norms (Dutch) people uphold concerning online communication, this study aimed to offer deeper insights in the role of online communication in one's daily life. The data were gathered by means of a survey carried out among a large sample of 495 respondents. First, the key concepts of this research will be briefly introduced.

Theoretical background

Online communication

Research has demonstrated that, in the past decade and especially in Western societies, online communication is increasingly becoming more important in relationships formed offline (Hall & Baym, 2011). However, the online environment differs much from the offline environment. Rice (1993) defines three characteristics in which they may vary in; “the extent to which they a) can overcome various communication constraints; b) transmit the social, symbolic, and nonverbal cues of human communication; and c) convey equivocal information” (p. 452). Related to the first characteristic, Ishii (2006) also discusses a characteristic that makes it an attractive tool for people to use, that is its mobility. Mobility includes the possibilities to travel with the mobile communication tools, to save time, and to speed up the communication. Every moment an individual needs companionship, they can contact friends online; there are no big barriers concerning time and space (Boneva et al., 2006). Boneva et al. (2006) explain that these technologies connect people and extend ‘their opportunities to communicate’ (p. 653).

Popular tools of today are social network sites (SNS) and Instant Messaging programs (IM). boyd and Ellison (2008) define SNS as web-based services that provide users the possibility to create a (semi-)public profile within a specific community. In this community, users can connect with other users and can communicate with others. Users can share information, photos and their thoughts on these websites, but can also let connections see which things they like. Besides that, users can interact through sending private messages, through posting messages on their connections’ personal profiles, through responding to shared items or by tagging people in photos (Yang & Bradford Brown, 2012).

IM provides users the opportunity to talk text based with the speed of an offline talk with multiple people in groups and in private (Baym, 2015). Many IM tools of today offer a feature via one can determine if someone has read the message after delivery. At the one hand, this can be considered as an affordance of the medium, because users are more in control. On the other hand, it can be constraining because of the expectations to be available and to respond within an appropriate time (Baym, 2015). Subsequently, what is expected concerning the use of SNS and IM is connected to social norms.

Social norms

Individuals use social norms as guidelines in determining what normal behavior is in a particular circumstance (Burnett & Bonnici, 2003; Hall et al., 2014; Sunstein, 1996). Cialdini and Trost (1998) explain that norms are first and foremost social; “norms do not exist if they are not shared with others” (p. 153). They can be seen as shared belief systems of a specific social group (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). People get familiar with norms through experience in a relationship, group or community (Preece, 2004). Hogg and Reid (2006) explain that “groups and situations have their own behavioral attributes that regulate the behavior of people in the situation or belonging to the group” (p. 7). These specific behavioral attributes can be seen as norms.

Interaction and communication play a crucial role in the transmission and the construction of norms (Hogg & Reid, 2006). This is also reflected in Social Norms Theory, which is developed by Berkowitz (2005). This theory assumes that the way an individual perceives the attitudes and behaviors of peers change the way an individual behaves; an individual behaves according to perceived norms. In this way, a person’s beliefs about the norms that are common among his close connections influence his behavior and the norms he upholds himself. Berkowitz (2005) distinguishes descriptive and injunctive norms in which the first are defined as persons’ perceptions about the extent a certain behavior is common among their peers. The second ones, injunctive norms, include a person’s perception about the extent his peers approve certain behavior (Berkowitz, 2005).

People draw their norms from what other people do in a specific situation (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). How individuals act and what individuals say communicates information about norms (Hogg & Reid, 2006). Individuals often do not explicitly state norms, but they do communicate them through language and social cues (Martey & Stromer-Galley, 2007). This can be linked to the concept of tacit knowledge; “the aim of a skillful performance is achieved by the observance of a set of rules which are not known as such to the person following them” (Polanyi, 1962, p. 49). However, sometimes norms are also shared directly; they are deliberately shared by intentionally giving verbal and nonverbal signs about what is normal behavior and what is not (Hogg & Reid, 2006).

In short, we live in norms and we (co-)construct them in our daily interactions. Social norms can be seen as ‘rules that guide behavior’ (McLaughlin & Vitak, 2012, p. 300). Not following these rules and in this way, violating norms have consequences and have influence on the relationships people have (Hall et al, 2014; McLaughlin & Vitak, 2011). The next paragraph will look at these types of violations in the online environment.

Norms in the online environment

boyd (2014) explains that norms concerning online behavior are similarly transmitted and constructed as norms concerning offline behavior. Users of online communication “connect to people they know, observe how those people are using the site, and then reinforce or challenge those norms through their own practices” (boyd, 2014, p. 39). boyd (2014) calls this the ‘network effect’; peers influence each other by using a certain communication tool in a certain manner and in this way, norms are collectively constructed and shaped. Crucial in this research project, is determining which norms there are concerning the use of online technologies.

With a qualitative study, McLaughlin and Vitak (2011) determined multiple norms violations concerning the use of SNS and specifically Facebook that were determined by American university students. These researchers demonstrated that the American students find online scoffing and arguing ‘in public’ not normal. Besides this, the students uphold a norm about considering each other’s privacy online. Another norm the researchers suggested that is related to this, includes that one should not tag a friend “in posts or pictures that might reflect negatively on an individual” (McLaughlin & Vitak, 2011, p. 308). Besides this, the most frequently mentioned norms concerned not posting too many or too emotional status updates, because the students found this irritating and unnecessary. (McLaughlin & Vitak, 2011).

In our previous study, which focused on Dutch adolescents’ expectations concerning their friends’ online behavior, similar results were found (Daaijers & Jansz, 2015). The adolescents in our study mentioned that as a friend you should not post ugly pictures of a friend or should not simply forward personal messages to someone else. Besides this, one should not post too much content on SNS; one should not ‘overshare’. Additionally, the participants told us that it is ‘not done’ to use your phone or online communication when you are meeting up with friends face to face. Hall et al. (2014) focus on the influence of context on what is deemed as proper mobile phone use. The researchers stated “what constitutes appropriate mobile phone usage is contested, and public irritation is evidence that not everyone shares the same norms” (Hall et al., 2014, p. 148).

Hall and Baym (2011) focused on how mobile phone use influences friendship expectations, specifically maintenance expectations. They suggest that with an increasing use of the mobile phone in close friendships, “people are steered toward increased expectations of connectedness and availability” (Hall & Baym, p. 326). The researchers explain that the mobile phone stimulates what they call ‘perpetual contact’. The mobile phone enables constant contact and because of this, the quantity of contact is as important as the quality of

contact. In our own study, the participants emphasized that it is expected to respond to a personal message of a friend (Draaijers & Jansz, 2015). In the research of Horstmanshof and Power (2005), respondents expected an response to an SMS as soon as possible. Hall and Baym (2014) call this ‘the duty to be responsive’. They emphasize that expectations of mundane maintenance have grown. Mundane maintenance is defined as “reports of everyday behavior shared between relational partners” (Hall & Baym, 2014, p. 320).

This previous research shows that individuals have norms about how one should act in the online environment. This article aimed at exploring the norms users uphold concerning online communication further. Next to this, taking previous research into account, it is necessary to take the influence of peers into consideration when focusing on norms in the online environment. The present research was guided by the following research questions:

- RQ1: *Which social norms do Dutch users (12-30 years) of online technologies uphold concerning online communication?*
- RQ2: *To what extent do peers have an effect on how respondents judge violations of norms concerning online communication?*

Predictors

Social norms differentiate amongst diverse social groups (Hall et al., 2014). People of different genders, of different generations and in different relationships have different norms. Norms are contested in one culture and are upheld in another culture (Hall et al., 2014). Different social groups possibly have different social norms concerning online communication. In previous research was found that the use of online communication and customs concerning this use depended on demographic characteristics of users.

Such a demographic is gender. Women and men differ in their use of online communication; women are more actively involved in online communication than men are (Blank & Reisdorf, 2012; Lobe et al., 2011; Sonck & De Haan, 2015). Secondly, they differ in the way they use online communication; women use these technologies more often for social purposes than men do (Barker, 2009; Baron & Campbell, 2012; Lin, 2005; Wei and Lo, 2006; Yoon, 2003). Next, Hall (2011) states that women’s expectations in personal relationships and specifically friendships are slightly higher than men’s are. Specifically, Hall (2011) explains that women expect more of their friends when it concerns emotional availability and self-disclosure, but also when it concerns being trustworthy and supportive.

Age is another demographic characteristic that one should take into account. Both the internet use and the engagement in communication-based activities increase during aging

(Axelsson, 2010; Lobe et al., 2011). Axelsson (2010) established that adolescents and young-adults differ from older age groups in the ways they use mobile technologies, but also in their attitudes towards using these technologies. Besides this, adolescents go through a number of physical, sexual, but also physiological changes that have an influence on their behavior, but also influences how they view behavior of others (Delfos, 2013; Dolgin, 2011). For instance, Reisman and Shorr (1978) explain that during adolescence friendship expectations are adjusted. At the beginning of their adolescence, children expect their friends to be a source of entertainment, while this becomes of less importance as they grow up (Reisman & Shorr, 1978).

One can expect that gender and age differences can be found when it concerns the extent individuals uphold certain norms related to online communication, this was explored with the following research questions:

- RQ3: *Are there gender differences in the ways males and females judge violations of norms concerning online communication?*
- RQ4: *Are there age differences in the ways adolescents and adults judge violations of norms concerning online communication?*

Methodology

Sample

A survey was used to give the most complete answers as possible to the research questions. The decision to address Dutch users between the age of 12 and 30 was made for several reasons. First, the major part of the Dutch population uses online communication (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek [CBS], 2015). Second, Dutch users between the age of 12 and 30 use tools of communication intensely (CBS, 2015; Sonck & De Haan, 2015; Valkenburg & Peter, 2009). Lastly, this specific age segment offered this study the possibility to compare two different age groups, but was within scope of this research project.

A non-random sampling method was used to reach respondents in this specific age category. Teachers of six different education institutions in Rotterdam invited respondents to participate in the survey. Furthermore, the survey was advertised on Facebook. In total, 565 respondents started the survey, of which 495 respondents completed the survey. Respondents were 12–30 years of age, with a mean age of 19,2 years (SD = 5.27). The adolescents (12-20 years) were most dominant in the sample with 57,2% compared to the adults between 21-30 years (42.6%). 62.4% of the respondents were female and 37.6% were male. 83.1% of the

respondents indicates that they use SNS often or almost always. This increased to 94.2% when it concerned the more private IM channels.

Procedure

In the survey respondents were asked a number of questions about themselves, several questions about their and their peers' evaluation of different types of behavior, and about the importance of online communication. The survey included a set of vignettes as a specific assignment to enable participants to reflect on their behavior in a different way. The vignette method amounts to presenting a short story and asking participants to evaluate the actions of its main character (Burstin et al., 1980; Wason et al., 2002). Using vignettes was inspired by Kitzinger and Powell's (1995) observation that this type of method take the possible 'barrier of admissibility' into account, including the difficulties respondents can have in admitting having certain feelings. With the vignette exercises the respondents could report indirectly on their ideas about what they consider to be proper online behavior.

Norms concerning online communication

The survey explored the respondents' norms concerning online communication by means of the short vignette assignments. The short vignette stories in the questionnaire described certain online behavior that possibly violates a norm concerning online behavior. The respondents were asked to rate these different types of possible norm violations on a 5-point scale from 1 (not at all OK) to 5 (very acceptable). The previous research of Baumgartner et al. (2004) was used when choosing this specific scale. The online behaviors that were described in the assignments were based on previous research that revealed that people uphold norms about what one should do on SNS and what not (McLaughlin & Vitak, 2011), about being responsive online (Hall & Baym, 2011) and about using online communication while one is in public or with friends (Hall et al., 2014). A pre-test was conducted to make sure that vignettes were clear and accurate. In total, the respondents evaluated 13 types of behavior through the vignettes.

The importance of online communication

The perceptions of the respondents regarding the importance of online communication were assessed by presenting 14 statements about online communication which resulted from the qualitative analysis of the interviews in my previous study (Draaijers & Jansz, 2015). For each statement, respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement

on five-point scale from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree). The statements regarded the importance of online communication and the importance of personal versus public online communication. In the previous study, all participants indicated online communication is important to them, however; many emphasized the greater importance of offline communication in their friendships. Besides this, many participants emphasized how they prefer using more private online communication tools (IM) than the more public tools (SNS) in their friendships (Draaijers & Jansz, 2015).

Peer influence

According to the Social Norms Theory of Berkowitz (2005) one's peers are of great influence in construction of norms as one constructs them through daily interactions. This was incorporated in the survey by focusing on descriptive and injunctive norms. Descriptive peer norms were measured by asking the respondents to specify for ten different online behaviors how many of their friends showed these types of behaviors. Injunctive peer norms were measured via questions that asked the respondents to rate to what extent their friends approved the ten different online behaviors. These measures stem from Berkowitz (2005). The described online behaviors in these questions were linked to the behaviors described in the vignette stories. The research of Baumgartner et al. (2004) formed the basis for the formulation of the questions and the scales, including a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (no one) to 5 (nearly all of my friends) for the questions concerning descriptive norms and a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all OK) to 5 (very acceptable) for the questions regarding injunctive norms.

Other predictors

Next to peer influence, the questionnaire took other independent variables into account that could possibly influence how respondents evaluate online behaviors. All respondents were asked to provide information on their age and gender. Besides this, respondents were asked to indicate how often they use IM and SNS on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (practically always).

Results

Norms concerning online communication

The main focus of the study is which social norms are applied by Dutch users of online communication concerning the use of these online technologies. Likert-type scales were used

to measure the respondents' opinions about different online behaviors that possibly violate norms. Table 3 shows the mean scores for thirteen different online behaviors measured on 5-point scales. A higher value indicates a more positive evaluation of the online behavior. According to almost all respondents scoffing on SNS 'in public' and using your mobile phone while having a serious conversation with a friend violates a norm. 92.7% of the respondents found scoffing on SNS not OK or not at all OK. 91.3% of the respondents found using your mobile technologies while you are in a serious conversation with a friend not (at all) OK.

Posting something on SNS that might reflect negatively on a friend (67.8%) and posting messages that were seen as too emotional (53.5%) was considered not (at all) acceptable for a large number of respondents as well. 50.5% of the respondents found not responding to an important personal message of friend unacceptable either, which relates to the expectations of connectedness and availability that Hall and Baym (2011) discuss. Noteworthy is that not responding to a post of a friend on SNS did not violate a norm for most respondents. Only 1.4% of the users did not approve of not responding to a general post of a friend on SNS. When focusing on the standard deviations, one can see small values when it concerns the judgment of publicly scoffing on SNS ($SD = 0.77$) and of a friend not forwarding a personal message to someone else without consent ($SD = 0.71$), which means that the respondents' evaluations were more concentrated and in this way, more alike.

Table 3. The extent to which the respondents (n = 493) found certain online behavior OK

<i>Online behaviors</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Publicly scoffing on SNS</i>	1.46	0.77
<i>Using your mobile technologies while one is in a serious conversation with a friend</i>	1.67	0.70
<i>Posting something on SNS that might reflect negatively on a friend</i>	2.18	0.91
<i>Not responding to an important personal message of friend on IM</i>	2.57	1.12
<i>Forwarding personal message from a friend to someone else without consent</i>	2.58	1.02
<i>Posting too emotional messages on SNS</i>	2.60	1.04
<i>Using your mobile technologies while one is in a restaurant with friends</i>	2.64	0.90
<i>Using your mobile technologies while one is sitting in a bar with a friend</i>	2.86	0.95
<i>Posting an ugly picture of a friend</i>	2.90	0.89
<i>Not responding to a general personal message of friend on IM</i>	3.18	1.05
<i>Posting too many messages and/or photos on SNS</i>	3.38	0.94
<i>Not responding to an important post of a friend on SNS</i>	3.77	1.00
<i>Not responding to a general post of a friend on SNS</i>	4.34	0.71

Scores vary from 1 (= not at all OK) to 5 (= very acceptable).

The importance of online communication

The underlying motive to carry out this research was to provide deeper insights on the role of online communication in the lives of the respondents. The perceptions of the respondents regarding the importance of online communication were more directly assessed by presenting 14 statements about online communication. For example, 90.4% of the respondents (totally) agreed with the statement 'Online communication is a handy tool to stay in contact with friends'. At the one hand, 73.6% of the respondents indicates that online communication is important to them. While on the other hand, 75.4 % of the respondents (totally) agreed with

the statement ‘In my friendships, face-to-face/offline communication is more important than online communication’. Next to this, only 12.2% indicated that they disagreed with the statement ‘A friend is not a bad friend if he does not respond to personal messages on Whatsapp’.

In order to calculate with the 14 statements about the importance of online communication, the statements were subjected to a Principal Component Analysis. The analysis met the criteria for a factor analysis (KMO 0.78; Bartlett 0.000; Pallant, 2007). Based on the criteria of an Eigenvalue greater than 1, the factor analysis resulted in four components. To have an easier interpretation the possibility of rotation and specifically the Oblique rotation was used. Many items that loaded high on multiple factors, but not in an organized manner. Therefore, a forced factor solution with three factors was applicable. After deleting four items, three clear factors were established. The three components explained separately 28.04%, 18.95% , 11.87% and in total 58,49% (See Table 4).

Table 4. Factor matrixes about the statements concerning the importance of online communication (N = 490)

Items	1	2	3
<i>Importance of online communication</i>			
<i>I do not need online communication in my life</i>	-,757	,152	,053
<i>I cannot live without online communication</i>	,753	-,092	,045
<i>Online communication plays an important role in my friendships</i>	,685	,094	,114
<i>Online communication is important in my life</i>	,657	,309	,099
<i>Preference for personal and face-to-face communication</i>			
<i>In maintaining my relationships, I prefer to use Whatsapp than Facebook and/or Instagram</i>	,336	,591	-,053
<i>I like personal messages of my friends more than messages of my friends on my Facebook-wall.</i>	,056	,724	-,082
<i>In my friendships, face-to-face/offline communication is more important than online communication</i>	-,372	,714	,029
<i>Importance of a friend being reliable online</i>			
<i>I think it is important that friends share photos of us together on Facebook and/or Instagram to show that we are friends</i>	-,105	-,177	,818
<i>I think it is important that a friend likes/responds to messages or photo's I posted on Facebook and/or Instagram</i>	-,003	,043	,856
<i>It is important that a friend is reachable online</i>	,184	,067	,646
<i>R²</i>	28.04%	18.95%	11.87%
<i>Cronbach's α</i>	0.733	0.461	0.695

The four items that had a high loading on the first factor all concerned the extent to which the respondents find online communication important. It included statements about the importance of online communication in their lives, their friendships and how they cannot live without these technologies. This factor was labeled ‘the importance of online communication’. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was 0.73.

The second factor was defined by the three items that concerned the extent to which respondents prefer offline over online communication and personal communication (IM) over

'public' communication (SNS). However, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was too low, 0.46, because of this, this factor could not be used for further analyses.

The third factor contained three items about the extent to which respondents find it important that their friends are reliable in their use of online communication. It included statements about the importance of a friend responding to messages on SNS and IM and the importance of a friend sharing pictures of a friendship on SNS. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was 0.70. We labeled the factor 'the importance of a friend being reliable online'.

On a five-point scale from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree), the respondents averagely rated the importance of online communication with 3.13 ($SD = 0.49$) and the importance of a friend being reliable online with 2.71 ($SD = 0.74$).

Predictors

The third research question in this study focused on gender differences. A series of ANOVAs were carried out to investigate whether male and female users of online communication differed in their use of these technologies and in their judging norm violations concerning these technologies. Female participants ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.82$) used SNS significantly more than male participants ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.01$) ($F(1,329.81) = 18.85$, $p < 0.001$). Despite reaching statistical significance, the effect size, calculated using eta squared, was small (4%). When it concerned the use of IM, female users ($M = 4.62$, $SD = 0.60$) were also significantly more active than the male users ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.70$) ($F(1,345.49) = 8.94$, $p < 0.05$). The effect size was again small (2%). Finally, the analyses also explored if there were gender differences in the extent the respondents found online communication important and the extent the respondents found it important a friend was reliable in the online environment. However, these differences were not significant.

Significant gender differences were observed in how participants evaluated possible norm violations (see Table 5). Female participants significantly evaluated varying online behaviors as less acceptable than male participants. Female participants found scoffing on SNS ($F(1,344.15) = 9.11$, $p < 0.05$) and posting too emotional messages on SNS ($F(1,490) = 13.03$, $p < 0.001$) significantly less acceptable than male participants.

In their friendships, female respondents approved of posting an ugly picture of friend ($F(1,491) = 21.63$, $p < 0.001$) or posting something that might reflect negatively on a friend ($F(1,353.95) = 17.06$, $p < 0.001$) significantly less than male respondents. This was also the case when it concerned not responding to an important post on SNS ($F(1,491) = 14.56$, $p < 0.001$) or an important personal message on IM ($F(1,338.61) = 10.28$, $p < 0.05$). When

focusing on the standard deviations, one can see the largest value when focusing on the males' judgments of not responding to an important personal message ($SD = 1.23$), which indicates that the male respondents thought less alike about this norm violation. Hall (2011) states that women's expectations in friendships are slightly higher than men's are, this comes to the fore in the overarching pattern in the mean scores; in general, the female respondents evaluated almost all behaviors more negatively than the male respondents. It should be observed that the effect sizes were low for all significant results (eta squared < 4.22%).

Table 5. Mean and standard deviations for the evaluation of varying online behaviors

Online behaviors	Means (SD)		Eta Squared
	Men	Women	
Publicly scoffing on SNS	1.59 (0.83)*	1.38 (0.72)*	1.83%
Posting something on SNS that might reflect negatively on a friend	2.40 (0.96)**	2.06 (0.85)**	3.35%
Not responding to an important personal message of friend on IM	2.77 (1.23)*	2.44 (1.04)*	2.05%
Posting too emotional messages on SNS	2.81 (1.05)**	2.47 (1.01)**	2.59%
Posting an ugly picture of a friend	3.14 (0.88)**	2.76 (0.87)**	4.22%
Not responding to an important post of a friend on SNS	3.99 (0.96)**	3.64 (1.04)**	2.88%
Using your mobile technologies while one is in a serious conversation with a friend	1.74 (0.71)	1.63 (0.69)	0.59%
Forwarding personal message from a friend to someone else without consent	2.47 (0.99)	2.65 (1.04)	0.72%
Using your mobile technologies while one is in a restaurant with friends	2.63 (0.97)	2.65 (0.86)	0.01%
Using your mobile technologies while one is sitting in a bar with a friend	2.91 (0.99)	2.82 (0.93)	0.23%
Not responding to a general personal message of friend on IM	3.23 (1.07)	3.14 (1.03)	0.17%
Posting too many messages and/or photos on SNS	3.45 (0.92)	3.33 (0.95)	0.36%
Not responding to a general post of a friend on SNS	4.42 (0.70)	4.29 (0.70)	0.77%

Scores vary from 1 (= not at all OK) to 5 (= very acceptable).

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$

The fourth research question concerned age differences. A series of ANOVA analyses was carried out to investigate whether adolescents (12-20 years) and adults (21-30 years) differed in their use of online communication and in their judging norm violations concerning these technologies. When it concerns the use of IM the older group participants ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 0.54$) were significantly more active than the younger participants ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.69$) ($F(1, 489.63) = 19.06$, $p < 0.001$). The differences in the use of SNS were not significant.

Whether there were age differences in the extent the respondents found online communication important and the extent the respondents found it important a friend was reliable in the online environment was investigated as well. There were statistically significant differences for the adolescents ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 0.51$) and the adults ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.45$) when it concerned the importance of online communication $F(1, 474.7) = 9.48$, $p < 0.05$, eta squared = 0.019. The difference between the adolescents ($M = 2.90$, $SD = 0.71$) and the adults ($M = 2.47$, $SD = 0.71$) concerning the importance of a friend being reliable online was also significant $F(1, 485) = 45.06$, $p < 0.001$, eta squared = 0.085.

Besides this, age differences were observed in the extent participants evaluated a possible norm violation (see Table 7). The adults significantly evaluated possible norm violations as less acceptable than the adolescents. The older participants found posting too

many messages on SNS ($F(1,411.02) = 20.87, p < 0.001$) and scoffing on SNS ($F(1,487.68) = 5.57, p < 0.05$) significantly less acceptable than the younger participants.

Table 7. Mean and standard deviations for the evaluation of online behaviors
Online behaviors

Online behaviors	Means (SD)		Eta Squared
	Adolescents	(Young) adults	
Publicly scoffing on SNS	1.53 (0.83)*	1.36 (0.66)*	1.13%
Using your mobile technologies while one is in a serious conversation with a friend	1.74 (0.74)*	1.55 (0.60)*	1.86%
Posting something on SNS that might reflect negatively on a friend	2.09 (0.91)*	2.32 (0.90)*	1.61%
Not responding to an important personal message of friend on IM	2.31 (1.06)**	2.90 (1.10)**	6.94%
Posting an ugly picture of a friend	2.81 (0.89)*	3.03 (0.88)*	1.52%
Not responding to a general personal message of friend on IM	2.88 (1.03)**	3.56 (0.94)**	10.55%
Using your mobile technologies while one is sitting in a bar with a friend	2.99 (0.99)**	2.67 (0.86)**	2.72%
Posting too many messages and/or photos on SNS	3.54 (0.85)**	3.16 (1.00)**	4.09%
Not responding to a general post of a friend on SNS	4.26 (0.76)*	4.45 (0.60)*	1.97%
Forwarding personal message from a friend to someone else without consent	2.57 (1.07)	2.59 (0.97)	0.01%
Posting too emotional messages on SNS	2.58 (1.06)	2.61 (1.01)	0.14%
Using your mobile technologies while one is in a restaurant with friends	2.70 (0.92)	2.56 (0.86)	0.60%
Not responding to an important post of a friend on SNS	3.74 (1.02)	3.80 (0.98)	0.09%

Scores vary from 1 (= not at all OK) to 5 (= very acceptable).

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$

Next to this, the adults approved using mobile technologies while one is in a bar ($F(1,490) = 13.70, p < 0.01$) or in a serious conversation ($F(1,491) = 2.97, p < 0.05$) significantly less than the younger respondents. When focusing on the standard deviations, one can see a very small value when it concerns the young adults' evaluations of using mobile devices while one is in a serious conversation ($SD = 0.60$), which means that the adults' judgements of this specific norm violation did differ less.

In contrast, when it concerns friendship expectations, the adolescents significantly evaluated several online behaviors as less acceptable than the (young) adults. The younger group found posting an ugly picture of a friend ($F(1,490) = 7.57, p < 0.05$) or posting a picture that might reflect negatively on a friend ($F(491) = 8.01, p < 0.05$) significantly less acceptable than older respondents. There were also similar significant differences when it concerned not responding to a general post on SNS ($F(1,491) = 9.85, p < 0.05$), a general personal message on IM ($F(1,491) = 57.88, p < 0.001$) and an important personal message on IM ($F(1,490) = 36.57, p < 0.001$). One can link these results with the theory that friendship expectations during adolescence and early adulthood change with aging (Reisman and Shorr, 1978). However, the effect sizes were again low for all significant results (eta squared $< 4.09\%$). Only when it concerned the mean differences concerning the evaluation of not responding to different messages on IM, the effect sizes were moderate (eta squared 6.94% and 10.55%).

In addition, hierarchical multiple regression analysis were used. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were chosen in order to be able to determine how the different variables contributed independently to the prediction of the judgements of the respondents. It explored

and assessed the relationship between demographics and peer influence, on the one hand, and the evaluation of the online behaviors on the other hand. In the first step, the demographics, including gender, age and the frequency of using online communication, were entered (RQ 3-4). In the second step, the peer influence, including descriptive and injunctive norms, were entered (RQ 2).

Table 10 shows the relations between predictors and respondents' evaluation of six different types of behaviors on SNS and IM. In the case of posting too emotional messages on SNS, the demographics accounted for only 3% of the variance, $F(4, 482) = 4.04, p < 0.05$; whereas they accounted for only 4% of the variance in the judging of publicly scoffing on SNS, $F(4, 486) = 4.59, p < 0.05$. The measure of the evaluation of posting too many messages on SNS had a larger amount of variance explained by the demographics: 10%, $F(4, 480) = 12.61, p < 0.001$. When focusing on posting something that might reflect negatively on a friend on SNS, the demographics accounted for 6% of the variance, $F(4, 480) = 6.93, p < 0.001$; where they accounted for 7% of the variance in the judging of posting an ugly picture of friend $F(4, 480) = 8.38, p < 0.001$.

The regression analyses also showed that gender and age were significant predictors of the respondents' evaluation of five different types of behaviors on SNS. Posting too many messages, posting too emotional messages and scoffing on SNS was significantly judged less acceptable by females and adults. Next to this, posting ugly pictures of friends and pictures that might reflect negatively on a friend are more negatively judged by females than by males and more accepted by adults than by adolescents. The extent respondents were active on SNS was a significant positive predictor for the evaluation of posting too many messages and scoffing on SNS.

The addition of the second block of variables representing peer influence resulted in increase in the explained variance; 8% when it concerned posting too many messages, $F(6, 478) = 14.20, p < 0.001$, and 12% when it concerned posting too emotional messages, $F(6, 480) = 17.61, p < 0.001$. The second block resulted in a larger increase in the explained variance for some of the other measures; 8% (posting an ugly picture) $F(6, 478) = 14.54, p < 0.001$, 12% (posting something that might reflect negatively on a friend) $F(6, 478) = 17.01, p < 0.001$, and 28% (forwarding a message without consent) $F(6, 480) = 39.76, p < 0.001$. As the differences between the beta values show, the participants' perceptions about the extent friends approved certain behavior was the most important predictor of respondents accepting the online behaviors. For posting something on SNS that might reflect negatively on a friend

or forwarding a message without consent, the positive effects of descriptive norms were effects that made significant contributions.

Table 11 shows the relations between predictors and the respondents' evaluation of behaviors linked to the importance of responding to different types of messages of a friend and using mobile technologies while one is with friends. Concerning not responding to a general post, the demographic predictors accounted for 6% of the variance, $F(4, 481) = 7.03$, $p < 0.001$; this was for 11% focusing on not responding to an important personal message $F(4, 481) = 14.75$, $p < 0.001$; and 12% for the measure of not responding to a general personal message $F(4, 482) = 16.01$, $p < 0.05$. In the case of the possible norm violation using mobile technologies while one is in a restaurant, the demographics accounted for only 3% of the variance, $F(4, 482) = 3.91$, $p < 0.05$; whereas they accounted for only 4% of the variance in evaluating using mobile technologies in a bar $F(4, 482) = 5.26$, $p < 0.001$. The measure of the extent using these technologies in a serious conversation violates a norm had also a low amount of variance explained by the demographics; 3% $F(4, 481) = 4.02$, $p < 0.05$.

In the judgment of these possible norm violations gender was not a significant predictor, only in the case of not responding to an important post on SNS gender had significant effects. Age was a significant predictor in the judgment of the following behaviors; adults more often disapproved using your mobile technologies in a bar or serious conversation and more often approved not responding to personal messages.

The addition of the block of peer norms resulted in an increase in explained variance. The variables representing injunctive and descriptive norms added 12% to the explained variance in the judging not responding to an important post of a friend $F(6, 479) = 14.01$, $p < 0.05$, and another 12% in the explained variance in judging not responding to a general post $F(6, 479) = 17.10$, $p < 0.001$. When it concerns IM, the variables accounted for an extra 11% to the variance explained in judging not responding to an important personal message, $F(6, 480) = 22.68$, $p < 0.001$, and 8% when it concerned a general personal message $F(6, 480) = 20.33$, $p < 0.05$. The added variables also led to an increase in the explained variance when it concerned the respondents' judgement of using one's mobile device in a restaurant (7%) $F(6, 480) = 9.30$, $p < 0.001$, in a bar (11%) $F(6, 480) = 13.68$, $p < 0.001$ and during a serious conversation (16%) $F(6, 479) = 18.03$, $p < 0.001$. Again, the participants' perceptions about the extent friends approved of certain behaviors was the most important and strongest predictor of respondents accepting the online behaviors.

Lastly, standard multiple regression analysis was used to assess the relationship between demographics, on the one hand, and the extent the respondents valued online

communication as well as a friend being reliable online on the other hand. The demographics included gender, age and the frequency of using IM and SNS. Table 11 shows the relations. In the case of the importance of online communication, the demographics accounted for 14.5% of the variance, $F(4, 481) = 20.36, p < 0.001$; whereas they accounted for 12.3% of the variance in the extent the respondents found a friend being reliable online important $F(4, 482) = 16.84, p < 0.001$. Online communication and a friend being reliable online were more frequently valued by respondents who active users of SNS. Next to this, adults were less likely to find it important that a friend responds to messages and shares pictures of the friendship on SNS.

Table 9. Standard multiple regression analyses of the respondents' evaluations

	<i>Beta values</i>	
	<i>Importance of online communication</i>	<i>Importance of a friend being reliable in the use of online communication</i>
<i>Female gender</i>	-0.02	0.03
<i>Being an adult</i>	0.08	-0.31**
<i>Being very active on SNS</i>	0.22**	0.15*
<i>Being very active on IM</i>	0.22**	0.08
<i>R square</i>	0.145	0.123
<i>F-value</i>	20.36**	16.84*

Conclusion

The aim of this research article was to explore systematically how the current ubiquity of online communication in the daily lives and relationships of the Dutch results in norms concerning these technologies. Against the backdrop of previous research, this project also intended to explore the influence of peers, gender and age on how users evaluate possible norm violations. Furthermore, by exploring the norms Dutch people uphold concerning online behavior, this study aimed to provide greater insights on the role of online communication in Dutch society. With a quantitative approach, including a survey incorporating vignette assignments, it was possible to explore what kind of norms the respondents upheld concerning online behavior. The vignettes included in the survey were short stories of norm violations.

It became clear that almost all respondents considered scoffing on SNS 'in public' to be inappropriate behavior. Other behaviors that were evaluated as unacceptable on SNS were posting something that might reflect negatively on a friend and posting too emotional messages. These norm violations correspond with the norms violations that came forward in the qualitative study of McLaughlin and Vitak (2011) about Facebook norms. Another norm upheld by half of the respondents included that one should respond to an important personal message of friend.

Table 10. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses of the evaluation of online behaviors

	<i>Beta values</i>					
	<i>Posting too many messages and/or photos on SNS</i>	<i>Posting too emotional messages on SNS</i>	<i>Publicly scoffing on SNS</i>	<i>Posting an ugly picture of a friend</i>	<i>Posting something on SNS that might reflect negatively on an friend</i>	<i>Forwarding personal message from a friend to someone else without consent</i>
<i>Step 1: Demographics</i>						
<i>Female gender</i>	-0.09*	-0.10*	-0.14*	-0.17**	-.12*	0.02
<i>Being an adult</i>	-0.13*	0.14*	-0.10*	0.13*	0.10*	0.01
<i>Being very active on SNS</i>	0.20**	-0.004	0.10*	0.05	0.04	0.07
<i>Being very active on IM</i>	0.09	-0.05	-0.06	-0.08	-0.01	0.01
<i>R square</i>	0.10	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.05
<i>F-value</i>	12.61**	4.04*	4.59*	8.38**	6.93**	6.60**
<i>Step 2: Peer influence</i>						
<i>Descriptive norm</i>	-0.04	0.04		0.13*	0.16*	0.25**
<i>Injunctive norm</i>	0.31**	0.36**		0.23**	0.25**	0.38**
<i>R square</i>	0.18	0.15		0.15	0.18	0.33
<i>F-value</i>	17.61**	14.20**		14.54**	17.01**	39.76**

Table 11. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses of the evaluation of online behaviors

	<i>Beta values</i>						
	<i>Using your mobile technologies while one is sitting in a bar with a friend</i>	<i>Using your mobile technologies while one is in a restaurant with friends</i>	<i>Using your mobile technologies while one is in a serious conversation with a friend</i>	<i>Not responding to an important post of a friend on SNS</i>	<i>Not responding to a general post of a friend on SNS</i>	<i>Not responding to an important personal message of friend on IM</i>	<i>Not responding to a general personal message of friend on IM</i>
<i>Step 1: Demographics</i>							
<i>Female gender</i>	-0.04	-0.002	-0.04	-0.13*	-0.07	-0.08	0.01
<i>Being an adult</i>	-0.15*	-0.09	-0.09*	-0.09	-0.01	0.23**	0.27**
<i>Being very active on SNS</i>	0.07	0.06	0.08	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	-0.10*
<i>Being very active on IM</i>	-0.02	0.07	-0.03	0.04	0.18**	-0.03	0.04
<i>R square</i>	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.11	0.12
<i>F-value</i>	5.26**	3.91*	4.02*	3.97*	7.03**	14.75**	16.01*
<i>Step 2: Peer influence</i>							
<i>Descriptive norm</i>	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.08
<i>Injunctive norm</i>	0.30**	0.23**	0.38**	0.34**	0.36**	0.34**	0.27**
<i>R square</i>	0.15	0.10	0.19	0.15	0.18	0.22	0.20
<i>F-value</i>	13.68**	9.30**	18.03**	14.01**	17.10**	22.68**	20.33**

*p < .05; **p < .001

These respondents seemed to act according to what Hall and Baym have called (2011) “the duty to be responsive”. However, responding to a post of a friend on SNS was clearly not a norm for most respondents. This shows there are differences in how respondents value the importance of response to personal messages and more ‘public’ messages on SNS.

The second aim of this research was to explore if peers, gender and age were determinants in the extent respondents upheld certain norms. The results of our study about these possible determinants concur with the results of earlier research. First, the different analyses demonstrated that women’s expectations were slightly higher than men’s, which is similar to what Hall (2011) demonstrated. In their friendships, females accepted multiple norm violations to lesser extent than males, for example when it concerned posting an ugly picture of friend or not responding to an important post on SNS of a friend.

Next, age turned out to be a determining factor in the respondents’ evaluation on multiple online behaviors. Axelsson (2010) states that adolescents and adults differ in their attitudes towards using online communication. In this study, the adults more often found using these mobile technologies while one is with friends inappropriate than the adolescents. The online behaviors linked to friendships were more often negatively judged by the adolescents; for instance, not responding to personal messages was considered as unacceptable more often by adolescents. This concurs with the argument of Reisman and Shorr (1978) that explains friendship expectations change with aging. The results of the current study underline the importance of changes from adolescence to adulthood.

The last correspondence between previous studies and this research concerns the clear influence of peers. Much like Berkowitz (2005) and boyd (2014), this study showed that one’s peers are of great influence in construction of norms. In this study, the respondents’ perceptions about how their peers evaluate the norm violations was a significant predictor in all the hierarchical regression models. Injunctive norms were the strongest predictors in how the respondents viewed the different norm violations

The main aim of this study was to contribute to the discussion in Dutch society about the role of online communication in our daily lives and relationships. There are worries that people are overusing online communication, which could damage relationships and people’s skills to hold a face-to-face conversation. In this study, almost all respondents were actively using both IM and SNS. Many respondents indeed indicated that they find online communication important in their lives and relationships. However, an even larger percentage of the respondents indicated that they find offline communication more important than online communication. Almost all respondents found using a mobile phone while having a serious

conversation not acceptable; this shows as well that people value face-to-face conversation. One still holds on to that face-to-face connection and values it.

While this research provided interesting results, it is also important to discuss its limitations. First, one should consider that some of the mean analyses had low effect sizes. One should be careful in interpreting these specific results. A second limitation of this study concerns the descriptions of the norm violations. Due to time and space limits the survey and specifically the vignettes were possibly not as comprehensive as needed. However, this research took the importance of context into account by describing the same type of behavior in different situations.

To conclude, focusing on norms about online communication seemed to be a fruitful way to explore the role of these technologies in one's life. There are other angles in this project that can be further researched. The current study purely focused on friendship, while one can expect differences in the norms one upholds in different types of relationships. Whether this statement is plausible need to be explored in future research.

References

- Ahlers, J. (2016, February 18). Nee, schuld ligt niet bij sociale media. *Trouw*.
- Axelsson, A. S. (2010). Perpetual and personal: Swedish young adults and their use of mobile phones. *New Media & Society, 12*(1), 35-54.
- Barker, V. (2009). Older adolescents' motivations for social network site use: The influence of gender, group identity, and collective self-esteem. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*(2), 209-213.
- Baron, N. S., & Campbell, E. M. (2012). Gender and mobile phones in cross-national context. *Language Sciences, 34*(1), 13-27.
- Baumgartner, S. E., Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2011). The influence of descriptive and injunctive peer norms on adolescents' risky sexual online behavior. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 14*(12), 753-758.
- Baym, N.K. (2015). *Personal Connections in the Digital Age*. Oxford: Polity.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2005). An overview of the social norms approach. Changing the culture of college drinking: A socially situated health communication campaign. In L. Lederman, L. Stewart, F. Goodhart & L. Laitman (Eds.), *Changing the Culture of College Drinking: A Socially Situated Prevention Campaign* (pp. 193-214). New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Blank, G., & Reisdorf, B. C. (2012). The participatory web: A user perspective on Web 2.0.

- Information, Communication and Society*, 15, 537–554.
- 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. *Journal of Computer - Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-230
- boyd, D.M. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Burnett, G., & Bonnici, L. (2003). Beyond the FAQ: Explicit and implicit norms in Usenet newsgroups. *Library & Information Science Research*, 25(3), 333-351.
- Burstin, K., Doughtie, E. B., & Raphaeli, A. (1980). Contrastive Vignette Technique: An indirect Methodology Designed to Address Reactive Social Attitude Measurement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 10(2), 147-165.
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. (2015). Gebruik sociale netwerken sterk toegenomen (CBS, 30-6-2015). Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2015/27/gebruik-sociale-netwerken-sterk-toegenomen>
- Cialdini, R.B. & Trost, M.R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, Conformity and Compliance. In Lindzey, G., Gilbert, D., & Fiske, S. T. (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 151-192). Oxford University Press.
- De Valk, E. (2014, August 7). Nee, sociale media zijn echt niet eng. *NRC Handelsblad*. Consulted at <http://www.nrc.nl/handelsblad/2014/08/07/nee-sociale-media-zijn-echt-niet-eng-1404300>.
- Delfos, M. (2013). The virtual environment from a developmental perspective. *Improving the Quality of Childhood in Europe 2012*, 3, 102-157.
- Dolgin, K.G. (2011). *The adolescent: development, relationships, and culture*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Draaijers, A.H. & Jansz, J. (June, 2016). Adolescents' expectations about their friends' online behavior. Dutch adolescents reflecting on their expectations concerning online communication. Paper presented at the 66th ICA Annual Conference, Fukuoka, Japan.
- Haddon, L. (2004). The Contribution of Domestication Research to In-Home Computing and Media Consumption. *The Information Society*, 22(4), 195-203.
- Hall, J. A. (2011). Sex differences in friendship expectations: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 28(6), 723-747.

- Hall, J. A., & Baym, N. K. (2011). Calling and texting (too much): Mobile maintenance expectations, (over) dependence, entrapment, and friendship satisfaction. *New Media & Society, 14*(2), 316-331.
- Hall, J. A., Baym, N. K., & Miltner, K. M. (2014). Put down that phone and talk to me: Understanding the roles of mobile phone norm adherence and similarity in relationships. *Mobile Media & Communication, 2*(2), 134-153. Retrieved from <http://mmc.sagepub.com/lookup/doi/10.1177/2050157913517684>
- Hogg, M. A., & Reid, S. A. (2006). Social identity, self - categorization, and the communication of group norms. *Communication theory, 16*(1), 7-30.
- Horstmanshof, L., Power, M., 2005. Mobile phones, SMS, and relationships: Issues of access, control, and privacy. *Australian Journal of Communication, 32* (1), 33–61.
- Ishii, K. (2006). Implications of Mobility: The Uses of Personal Communication Media in Everyday Life. *Journal of Communication, 56*(2), 346–365.
- Kitzinger, C., & Powell, D. (1995). Engendering infidelity: Essentialist and social Constructionist readings of a story completion task. *Feminism & Psychology, 5*(3), 345-372.
- Lin, A. (2005). Gendered, bilingual communication practices: mobile text-messaging among Hong Kong college students. *Fibreculture Journal, 6*(6), 1-11.
- Lobe, B., Livingstone, S., 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*. London: EU Kids Online Network.
- Martey, R. M., & Stromer-Galley, J. (2007). The digital dollhouse context and social norms in the Sims Online. *Games and Culture, 2*(4), 314-334.
- McLaughlin, C. & Vitak, J. (2012). Norm evolution and violation on Facebook. *New Media & Society, 14*(2), 299-315.
- Online communicatie is slecht voor je relatie. (2013, 29 October). *De Limburger*. Consulted at <http://www.limburgonderneemt.nl/nieuws/?catID=5&newsID=7333>.
- Polanyi, M. (1962). *Personal Knowledge, Towards a Post Critical Philosophy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Preece, J. (2004). Etiquette online: from nice to necessary. *Communications of the ACM, 47*(4), 56-61.
- 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(4), 451-484.
- Rovers, D. (2014, December 10). Computer als LIEFDESRIVAAL. *De Limburger*.
- Schreuder, A. (2013, October 1). Als je niet meer zonder je scherm kan; Socialbesitas Onderzoekers maken zich zorgen over verslaving aan sociale media onder jongeren. *NRC Handelsblad*. Consulted at <http://www.nrc.nl/handelsblad/2013/10/01/als-je-niet-meer-zonder-je-scherm-kan-1300985>.
- Selfhout, M. (2009). *Me, Myself, and You: Friendships in Adolescence* (PhD thesis). Universiteit Utrecht, Utrecht.
- Silverstone, R. (1993, September). Domesticating the revolution: information and communication technologies and everyday life. In *Aslib proceedings* (Vol. 45, No. 9, pp. 227-233). MCB UP Ltd.
- Smartphone staat gesprek in de weg. (2016, February 6). *AD/Haagsche Courant*.
- Sonck, N. & De Haan, J. (2015). *Media: Tijd in beeld. Dagelijkse tijdbesteding aan media en communicatie*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Steenhuis, P. H. (2016, February 10). Sociale media vergroten de sociale afstand tot elkaar. *Trouw*.
- Sunstein, C. R. (1996). Social norms and social roles. *Columbia law review*, 96(4), 903-968.
- Turkle, S. (2012, February). Sherry Turkle: Connected, but alone? [Video file]. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/sherry_turkle_alone_together.
- 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(1), 79-97.
- Wason, K. D., Polonsky, M. J., & Hyman, M. R. (2002). Designing vignette studies in marketing. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 10(3), 41-58.
- Wei, R., & Lo, V. H. (2006). Staying connected while on the move: Cell phone use and social connectedness. *New Media & Society*, 8(1), 53-72.
- Yang C. & Bradford Brown, B. (2013). Motives for Using Facebook, Patterns of Facebook Activities, and Late Adolescents' Social Adjustment to College. *Youth Adolescence*, 42(3), 403-416.
- Yoon, K. (2003). Retraditionalizing the Mobile Young People's Sociality and Mobile Phone Use in Seoul, South Korea. *European journal of cultural studies*, 6(3), 327-343.
- Zantigh, P. (2015, November 24). Ze slapen er slecht van, maar verder....? *NRC Handelsblad*.

Consulted at <http://www.nrc.nl/next/2015/11/24/ze-slapen-er-slecht-van-maar-verder-1561525>.

Appendix

Enquête over online gedrag

Introductie

Fijn, dat je deze enquête wilt invullen. Ik ben Annabel Draaijers en ik gebruik jouw antwoorden voor het afstudeeronderzoek dat ik doe aan de Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam. De enquête gaat over wat jij en andere mensen tussen de 12 en 30 jaar van online communicatie vinden.

De antwoorden die je invult behandel ik vertrouwelijk en ik zal ze niet met anderen delen. De gegevens die je invult, worden alleen gebruikt voor het onderzoek. Weet ook dat je vrij bent om te stoppen met de enquête op elk moment.

Het invullen van deze enquête duurt ongeveer 15 minuten. Als je aan het einde van de enquête jouw e-mailadres invult, maak je kans op één van de cadeaubonnen naar keuze van €25. Wij verloten twee keer een bon.

Heb je vragen? Stuur dan een mailtje naar 345479ad@student.eur.nl

Toestemming

Voordat je begint aan deze enquête hebben wij jouw toestemming nodig om jouw antwoorden te mogen gebruiken voor het onderzoek. Jouw antwoorden en gegevens worden vertrouwelijk behandeld. Geef je ons toestemming om jouw antwoorden te gebruiken voor het onderzoek?

- Ja
- Nee

Lees tijdens de enquête de introductie van de vragen goed door!

Gebruik social network sites en IM

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

1. Hoe vaak gebruik je social network sites/app's, zoals Facebook en Instagram?

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Nooit | Zelden | Soms | Vaak | Bijna altijd |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

2. Hoe vaak gebruik je Instant Messaging (chat) programma's/apps, zoals Whatsapp?

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Nooit | Zelden | Soms | Vaak | Bijna altijd |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

3. Hoe vaak ga je gemiddeld naar social network sites, zoals Facebook en Instagram?

- 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

4. Hoe vaak kijk je gemiddeld op Instant Messaging programma's/apps, zoals Whatsapp?

- 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

Online gedrag

Hieronder volgen meerdere korte tekstjes over mensen die online communicatie gebruiken. Bij elke tekst staat een vraag. Beantwoord deze vraag.

5. Lotte is erg actief op Facebook en Instagram. Elke dag deelt zij foto's en/of status-updates op deze social network sites.

Wat vind je van Lotte's gedrag?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. De vriendin van Sam heeft hun relatie verbroken. Sam is hier erg verdrietig over en hij deelt dit via een status-update met vrienden en kennissen op Facebook.

Wat vind je van Sam's gedrag?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Karel heeft erge ruzie met Steven. Karel ziet een foto van Steven op Facebook en reageert op deze foto. In zijn reactie scheldt hij Steven uit.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Karel?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Jaap, Tim en Jasper zitten in een restaurant. Terwijl de jongens aan het eten zijn, pakt Jasper zijn mobiel om op zijn Whatsapp-berichten te reageren.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Jasper?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Online gedrag en vriendschap

Hieronder volgen meerdere korte tekstjes over Joost en Daan. Zij zijn **beste vrienden**. Bij elke tekst staat een vraag. Beantwoord deze vraag.

9. Daan heeft een foto gedeeld op Facebook waar Joost ook op staat. Joost ziet de foto en is er niet blij mee. Hij vindt het namelijk een lelijke foto van zichzelf.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Daan?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Daan was gisteravond op een feest en heeft daar te veel alcohol gedronken. Joost heeft foto's gemaakt op het feest. Joost plaatst deze foto's op Facebook, waaronder een foto van Daan waarop hij zichtbaar dronken is.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Joost?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Daan stuurt een persoonlijk bericht naar Joost via Whatsapp. Joost maakt een screenshot van het bericht en stuurt dit door naar Bram zonder dat Daan dit weet.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Joost?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Daan en Joost zitten samen **in het café**. In het café, leest Joost regelmatig zijn ontvangen berichten op Whatsapp of kijkt hij op Facebook.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Joost?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Joost en Daan hebben een **serieus gesprek**. Terwijl zij aan het praten zijn, pakt Daan zijn mobiel om op zijn Whatsapp-berichten te reageren.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Daan?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. Joost ziet een bericht van Daan op Facebook, waarin Daan schrijft dat hij **zijn diploma** heeft behaald voor zijn studie. Joost geeft geen 'like' en reageert verder ook niet op dit bericht.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Joost?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. Joost deelt een **nieuwsbericht** op Facebook dat hij interessant vindt. Daan geeft geen 'like' en reageert verder ook niet op dit bericht.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Daan?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. De ouders van Joost gaan scheiden. Joost stuurt Daan een bericht over de scheiding via Whatsapp. Door middel van de blauwe vinkjes ziet Joost dat Daan het bericht heeft gelezen. Joost krijgt geen reactie van Daan.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Daan?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. Daan stuurt een bericht naar Joost via Whatsapp, waarin hij vraagt hoe het gaat met Joost. Door middel van de blauwe vinkjes ziet Daan dat Joost het bericht heeft gelezen. Joost reageert niet op dit bericht.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Joost?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Online gedrag en kennissen

Hieronder volgen meerdere korte tekstjes over Emma en Eva. **Emma en Eva hebben elkaar een keer ontmoet op een verjaardag. Zij zijn kennissen. Zij hebben elkaar toegevoegd op Facebook, maar kennen elkaar voor de rest niet goed.** Bij elke tekst staat een vraag. Beantwoord deze vraag.

18. Emma en Eva zitten samen op een verjaardag. Op de verjaardag leest Emma regelmatig haar berichten op Whatsapp of kijkt zij op Facebook.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Emma?

- | Helemaal niet OK | Niet OK | Deels OK/deels niet OK | OK | Helemaal OK |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

19. Emma heeft een foto op Facebook waar Eva ook op staat. Eva ziet de foto en is er niet blij mee. Zij vindt het namelijk een lelijke foto van zichzelf.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Emma?

- | Helemaal niet OK | Niet OK | Deels OK/deels niet OK | OK | Helemaal OK |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

20. Eva was op een verjaardag en heeft daar te veel alcohol gedronken. Emma heeft foto's gemaakt op de verjaardag. Emma plaatst deze foto's op Facebook, waaronder een foto van Eva waarop zij zichtbaar dronken is.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Emma?

- | Helemaal niet OK | Niet OK | Deels OK/deels niet OK | OK | Helemaal OK |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

21. Emma stuurt een persoonlijk bericht naar Eva via de Facebook Messenger. Eva maakt een screenshot van het bericht en stuurt dit door naar Rosa zonder dat Emma dit weet.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Eva?

- | Helemaal niet OK | Niet OK | Deels OK/deels niet OK | OK | Helemaal OK |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

22. Emma stuurt een bericht naar Eva via Facebook Messenger, waarin zij vraagt hoe het gaat met Eva. Eva reageert niet op dit bericht.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Eva?

- | Helemaal niet OK | Niet OK | Deels OK/deels niet OK | OK | Helemaal OK |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

23. Emma ziet een bericht van Eva op Facebook, waarin Eva schrijft dat zij een nieuwe baan heeft. Emma geeft geen 'like' en reageert verder ook niet op dit bericht.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Emma?

- | Helemaal niet OK | Niet OK | Deels OK/deels niet OK | OK | Helemaal OK |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

24. Emma deelt een nieuwsbericht op Facebook dat zij interessant vindt. Eva geeft geen 'like' en reageert verder ook niet op dit bericht.

Wat vind je van het gedrag van Eva?

- | Helemaal niet OK | Niet OK | Deels OK/deels niet OK | OK | Helemaal OK |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Online gedrag van jouw vrienden

Hieronder volgen vragen over hoe jouw vrienden online communicatie gebruiken.

25. Hoeveel van jouw vrienden ...

1. sturen weleens ontvangen persoonlijke berichten van vrienden door naar anderen zonder dat die vrienden het weten?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

2. delen weleens foto's waar een vriend(in) lelijk opstaat?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

3. delen weleens foto's die slecht kunnen zijn voor het imago van een vriend(in)?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

4. plaatsen te veel berichten op Facebook en/of Instagram?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

5. plaatsen weleens erg emotionele berichten op Facebook en/of Instagram?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

6. gebruiken weleens hun mobiel wanneer ze met vrienden face-to-face/offline bij elkaar zijn?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

7. gebruiken weleens hun mobiel wanneer ze in een serieus gesprek zijn met vrienden face-to-face/offline?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

8. reageren of liken meestal niet bij berichten van vrienden op Facebook en Instagram?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

9. reageren soms niet op een persoonlijk bericht van vrienden op Whatsapp?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

10. reageren soms niet snel (binnen een halfuur) op een persoonlijk bericht van vrienden op Whatsapp?

Niemand **Minder dan de helft** **De helft** **Meer dan de helft** **Bijna allemaal**

26. Wat denk je dat jouw vrienden vinden van...

1. het doorsturen van een persoonlijk bericht van een vriend naar andere personen zonder dat die vriend het weet?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. het delen van foto's waar een vriend(in) lelijk opstaat?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. het delen van foto's die slecht kunnen zijn voor het imago van een vriend(in)?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. te veel berichten plaatsen op Facebook en/of Instagram?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. erg emotionele berichten plaatsen op Facebook en/of Instagram?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. het gebruiken van je mobiel wanneer je met vrienden face-to-face/offline bij elkaar bent?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. het gebruiken van je mobiel wanneer je met vrienden een **serieus** gesprek voert face-to-face/offline?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. niet reageren of liken bij berichten van vrienden op Facebook en Instagram?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. niet reageren op een persoonlijk bericht van vrienden op Whatsapp?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. niet snel reageren (binnen een halfuur) op een persoonlijk bericht van vrienden op Whatsapp?

Helemaal niet OK	Niet OK	Deels OK/deels niet OK	OK	Helemaal OK
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Stellingen

Hieronder volgen stellingen over online communicatie. Vul in hoeverre je het eens bent met deze stellingen.

27. Stellingen

1. Online communicatie is belangrijk in mijn leven.

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

2. In het onderhouden van mijn relaties gebruik ik liever Whatsapp dan Facebook en/of Instagram.

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

3. Online communicatie is een handig hulpmiddel om in contact te blijven met vrienden.

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

4. Via online communicatie communiceren is makkelijker dan via face-to-face

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

5. Ik heb online communicatie niet nodig in mijn leven.

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

6. Online communicatie speelt een belangrijke rol in mijn vriendschappen.

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

7. Ik vind het vervelend als een vriend niet reageert op persoonlijke berichten via Whatsapp.

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

8. Ik kan niet zonder online communicatie.

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

9. Persoonlijke berichten van vrienden vind ik leuker dan berichten van vrienden op mijn Facebook-wall.

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

10. Als een vriend niet reageert op persoonlijke berichten via Whatsapp, maakt hem dat geen slechte vriend.

Zeer mee oneens **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**

29. Stellingen

11. Ik vind het belangrijk dat vrienden op Facebook en/of Instagram laten zien dat wij vrienden zijn door foto's te delen waar wij beide opstaan.

- Zeer mee oneens** **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**
-

12. Ik vind het belangrijk dat een vriend liked/reageert op berichten of foto's die ik heb gepost op Facebook en/of Instagram

- Zeer mee oneens** **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**
-

13. In mijn relaties is face-to-face/offline communicatie belangrijker dan online communicatie.

- Zeer mee oneens** **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**
-

14. Het is belangrijk dat een vriend online bereikbaar is.

- Zeer mee oneens** **Mee oneens** **Oneens/eens** **Mee eens** **Zeer mee eens**
-

Afsluiting

Dit is het laatste onderdeel van de enquête. We vragen naar enkele persoonlijke gegevens. Ook kan je bij dit onderdeel jouw e-mailadres invullen als je kans wilt maken op één van de cadeaubonnen. Jouw gegevens behandelen wij vertrouwelijk en zullen wij niet met anderen delen.

28. Ik ben een...

- Man
- Vrouw

29. Mijn leeftijd is (Graag in cijfers vermelden)

30. Wat is de hoogste opleiding die je volgt / gevolgd hebt?

- basisschool
- vmbo-opleiding
- havo-opleiding
- vwo-opleiding
- mbo-opleiding
- hbo-opleiding
- universitaire opleiding

31. Wil je kans maken op de cadeaubonnen naar keuze van €25? 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 en zal niet gekoppeld worden aan je antwoorden op de vragen.

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