



**Awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content website
users and non-users towards privacy in Romania:
a qualitative study**

Noellie Brockdorff¹, Sandra Appleby-Arnold¹, Bogdan Manolea², Ioana Vasii³

¹ Department of Cognitive Science, University of Malta, Msida, Malta

² Association for Technology and Internet, Bucharest, Romania

³ Faculty of Law, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

January 2013



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 285582.

CONSENT

Consumer Sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy
(G.A. 244643).

The project was co-financed by the European Union within the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013).
<http://www.consent.law.muni.cz>

The views expressed in this report are the sole responsibility of the authors
and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union

Correspondence about this report should be addressed to
Noellie Brockdorff, Department of Cognitive Science, University of Malta, Msida, MSD2080, Malta
noellie.brockdorff@um.edu.mt

Table of Contents

1. Key Findings	3
2. Introduction	5
2.1. Study Target	5
2.2. Methodology	6
2.3. Description of the Sample	7
3. Results	8
3.1. General Online Attitudes	8
3.2. Information Disclosure – “Offline” and Online	9
3.3. Privacy Matters	13
3.3.1. Which Privacy matters: Awareness and (Non-)Acceptance	13
3.3.2. How Privacy matters: Protective Measures	14
3.3.3. Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies	17
4. Conclusion: Privacy – nothing to be “paranoid”?	19
Acknowledgements	20
Appendices	21
A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)	21
A.2 Interview Guidelines (Romanian)	29
B. Pre-Analysis Template	38

1. Key Findings

This document presents the Romania results of a qualitative study undertaken as part of the CONSENT project (work package 8). The analyses and results are based on a set of ten semi-structured in-depth interviews regarding the awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content (UGC) website users towards privacy. The respective interview guideline consisted of 27 questions and sub-questions.

The selection of interviewees was aiming at a 8:2 split between UGC users and non-users, an even gender distribution, and a further split by age group to ensure as wide a representation as possible. However, the data did not reveal any strong links between the interviewees' attitudes and their different gender or age, confirming the result from the previous quantitative study (CONSENT work package 7).

Generally, privacy as a reason for (non-)disclosure of personal and private information can be divided into different – though partially overlapping – categories: information being perceived as generally “too private” (and, thus, not to be disclosed); information regarded as “personal” – though not very private – and its disclosure linked to the perceived risk of fraud; and information that was considered as “not relevant” for others. However, regarding the disclosure of personal and private information on UGC websites, another perception came into play: some Romanian UGC users were convinced that disclosing extensive personal and private information was required – rather than only optional – for registration and using an UGC website (primarily SNS) account.

Regarding general UGC usage, it appeared that online social networking itself did not play the most important role but was only one amongst the various functions of UGC websites. The majority of Romanian interviewees also appeared to perceive (for themselves, or others) difficulties to maintain a balance between online and “offline” social relationships, and they revealed a strong tendency to perceive these relationships as competing with rather than complementing each other. Regarding the usage of other (non-SNS) websites, interviewees described themselves mostly as passive users.

Most Romanian respondents were not aware of the various practices of website owners before, nor did they become aware after, opening a UGC account. Regarding different acceptance levels, the customisation of content was mostly accepted as either “inevitable” or as commonly known from experiences with offline service providers, revealing a certain resignation – or even passive adaptation – rather than feelings of discomfort. Websites owners' passing on personal and private information to others was accepted by the majority of respondents only under the condition that prior consent would be sought, representing the demand for privacy by default instead of publicity by default. Receiving commercial offers as a consequence of having disclosed personal or private information online was predominantly not accepted and considered as an “unpleasant”, if not suspicious, practice. Selling such information to other companies or gathering in-depth information was also not accepted, with the majority of respondents perceiving these practices as violating social norms and a contractual breach of confidence.

Regarding specific measures to protect their privacy, most Romanian respondents did not reveal any distinct disclosure strategies, which may be connected to their low level of

awareness regarding possible consequences and a low level of education in relation with the usage (beyond technicalities) of the new digital technologies.

They perceived themselves as acting in an online environment where users are faced with technical challenges, technical threats, fraud and data abuse by other users, but no need – and no option – to re-position themselves towards website owners and their practices.

It appeared that existing desires for privacy and attitudes resulting from experienced privacy violations offline were not transferred into the online environment. The general idea – or option – of separating publicity and privacy appeared to be problematic for Romanian respondents already outside the internet; thus, non-disclosure strategies such as e.g., setting up multiple online user identities may not evolve easily – neither in a playful manner nor as a protective measure.

The majority of interviewees also indicated that they mostly did not read privacy policies – either due to perceived difficulties in the policies' form and structure, but mostly to a more general disinterest and, in particular, a deep mistrust. Romanian UGC users as well as non-users showed little belief that in current laws or regulations UGC users are already assigned comprehensive rights which would only need to be reinforced. It rather appeared that policies were perceived as – intentionally or unintentionally – serving the primary purpose of protecting the website owners rather than the website users.

To summarise, most Romanian respondents were either unaware of potential risks, blocked out or accepted vague feelings of discomfort deriving from a lack of control, claimed to be “invincible”, or appeared to be keen on not leaving the impression that they were “paranoid” about privacy. But the observation that, once being informed about the various website owners' practices, Romanian respondents showed a very low level of acceptance, indicates that things may be shifting. Developing individual strategies to safeguard online privacy may just be on the verge of becoming an imaginable practice for UGC users (and non-users) and, due to Romania's post World War II political history, “offline” privacy has been – though highly valued – everything but a social norm. However, this doesn't mean that it can be dismissed as not being anymore – or becoming – such.

2. Introduction

2.1 Study Target

The analyses and results in this document are based on a set of semi-structured in-depth interviews regarding the awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content (UGC) website users towards privacy. This study was undertaken as part of the CONSENT¹ project.

This document highlights the findings from the study that are relevant to Romania. Other separate reports are available for Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

The interview guideline used in this study consisted of 27 questions and sub-questions, covering general internet usage and its perceptions, individual attitudes and behaviour regarding the specific usage of UGC websites, probing in particular those related to the disclosure of personal and private information. Here, the interview design was specifically aiming at gaining an in-depth understanding of individual levels of awareness and (non-) acceptance concerning website owners' practices of using such information for various commercial purposes, the experienced, expected – or unexpected – consequences, and the related strategies of users as well as of non-users.

¹ "Consumer Sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy" (CONSENT; G.A. 244643) – which was co-financed by the European Union under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development of the European Union (SSH-2009-3.2.1. "Changes in Consumption and Consumer Markets").

2.2 Methodology

Overall 130 interviews – ten in each country (see above) – were conducted between May and July 2012. Personal references and snowball techniques were used to find individuals willing to take part in this study which, as a qualitative analysis, does not claim to be representative for an entire EU population or any of the individual EU countries where interviews were conducted.

However, in order to gather a more in-depth insight into the individual perceptions, attitudes and behaviour as revealed in the quantitative study of the CONSENT project’s work package 7, the participating partner countries were required to select interviewees following certain quota that would ensure representation of different sub-groups:

Total Number of Interviews = 10			
UGC users		8	4 male / 4 female, of which at least 6 use SNS (at least 1 male and 1 female), and 2 (1 male and 1 female) that use UGC, but not SNS.
UGC non-users		2	1 male / 1 female
of which			
Gender	Male	5	
	Female	5	
Location	Urban/ suburban	8	4 male / 4 female
	Rural	2	1 male / 1 female
Age group	15-24	3	
	25-34	3	of which 1 UGC non-user
	35-44	2	
	45+	2	of which 1 UGC non-user

The breakdown of interviewees’ characteristics comprised, as a basic categorisation, the 8:2 split between UGC users and non-users (preferably including two UGC but non-SNS users), and an even gender distribution. Then, the interview requirements were split further down by location and age group, aiming at as wide a representation as possible whilst keeping the total number of interviews per CONSENT partner at a manageable level.

After conducting the interviews, all interviews were fully transcribed in the local language, and a pre-analysis template for each interview was filled out in English. The development of this template was based on pilot interviews conducted earlier, and it served primarily for the collating, formal structuring and pre-coding of the vast amount of collected data. Then, the content of each set of country templates was analysed section by section, labelling them with additional codes which either summarised specific processes and practices or constructions and interpretations². This process of re-coding also initialised a critical restructuring and rethinking of the codes applied first, and allowed for a more focussed data analysis and drawing together overarching themes. Finally, a draft version of each country report was submitted to the respective partner for revision and amendments.

² Data could fall into different categories at the same time and were then also double-coded as such.

2.3 Description of the Sample

The data analysis for Romania is based on ten interviews with a demographic distribution which – with the exception of UGC (non-SNS) users not being available – fully complies with the required quota:

Interviewee No.	Gender	Age	Age category	Location category	UGC usage
I-1	Male	24	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-2	Female	31	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-3	Female	33	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC non-user
I-4	Female	44	35-44	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-5	Male	56	45+	Urban/Suburban	UGC non-user
I-6	Male	60	45+	Rural	UGC non-user
I-7	Female	38	35-44	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-8	Male	34	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-9	Male	23	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-10	Female	23	15-24	Rural	UGC user

Within the age group of 15-24, though, young users at the lower end of this range are not represented, as all interviewees are at least 23 years old. However, in all other age categories a comparably even split – and a particularly good representation of UGC non-users – was achieved.

Half of the interviews were conducted within university premises (office or meeting room), the other half was conducted in public places of the interviewee's choice, or the respective respondent's workplace. Most interviewees were relaxed and responded openly, only one (I-5, UGC non-user, male, 56) appeared to be rather reluctant to speak freely whilst being recorded. Whereas the majority of interviewees were reported as using an informal language, they were also described as choosing a very precise and, partially, very careful wording. Additionally, it appeared that some of the respondents perceived the research project – and used the interview itself – as an opportunity to, actually, gain information and learn about website owners' practices regarding online privacy.

All interviewees (with the exception of I-6 and I-10 who indicated 4-5/6-7 years of usage) have been using the internet for at least approximately ten years; looking at the relation between UGC usage and the age when these respondents started to use the internet, there is no recognisable link between being a "digital native" or a "digital initiate" and using – or not using – UGC websites:

Interviewee No.	Age	Years of Internet usage	Age when starting to use the Internet	UGC usage
I-1	24	9-10	14-15	UGC user
I-2	31	10	21	UGC user
I-3	33	16	17	UGC non-user
I-4	44	17	27	UGC user
I-5	56	16	40	UGC non-user
I-6	60	4-5	55-56	UGC non-user
I-7	38	15	23	UGC user
I-8	34	14-15	19-20	UGC user
I-9	23	10	13	UGC user
I-10	23	6-7	17-18	UGC user

3. Results

3.1 General Online Attitudes

Of those seven interviewees who are UGC users, five declared that they perceived a certain peer pressure to join a social networking site (primarily Facebook) – following a *“friend’s recommendation”* (I-7, UGC user), being *“told”* by a friend to use it (I-2, UGC user), they *“noticed that today most of the communication is done on Facebook”* (I-1, UGC user), or – as one interviewee expressed it: *“Somehow I wanted to be in vogue”* (I-10, UGC user). However, it appears that only two respondents (I-2/I-9, UGC users) were using SNS as a platform, combining social networking with other UGC functions, or to whom the information available on SNS and other UGC sites was perceived as contributing to their *“tastes becom[ing] more diverse”* (I-2, UGC user), turning as such into an element of individual identity construction. In both cases, though, it appeared that online social networking itself does not play the most important role but was only one amongst the various functions of UGC websites.

The other respondents who used SNS showed a more negative attitude, perceiving its usage as *“losing time”* (I-1, UGC user), a *“waste of time”* (I-8/I-10, UGC users), or they even *“hate”* it but were required to use it for work-related activities (I-4, UGC user). The majority of interviewees appeared also to perceive (for themselves, or others) difficulties to maintain a balance between online and *“offline”* social relationships, and they revealed a strong tendency to perceive these relationships as *competing with* rather than *complementing* each other.

Regarding the usage of other (non-SNS) UGC websites, the interviewees mostly described themselves as passive users, e.g. downloading videos, or holding accounts with business networking sites which, however, were not actively used. Photo sharing which appeared to play a prominent role was primarily done via Facebook.

Those three respondents who did not use UGC websites, in particular SNS, considered themselves as either not being interested in online social networking – *“it’s not useful for me to open an account on Facebook [...] I can find that information shared on Facebook if I make a phone call”* (I-3, UGC non-user) – and also expected their friends to communicate with them offline, or they perceived themselves as generally not attracted by *“technology”*: *“It’s not that the internet is not a safe place – it’s that I’m not attracted by technology in general, by electronics, gadgets, the latest TV on the market”* (I-3, UGC non-user). Another UGC non-user (I-6) described technical challenges: He tried to register on Facebook several times but, even with the help of a friend, he didn’t succeed.

Non-usage was also ascribed to a feeling of discomfort, e.g. as a general dislike to open accounts and *“complete forms”* (I-5, UGC non-user), or receiving too many friendship requests from unknown people, resulting in closing down the SNS account: *“I had enough at a certain point and left Facebook”* (I-5, UGC non-user). Here, the interviewee’s description revealed that his discomfort derived from the basic lack of knowledge how friendship suggestions are generated – in his case he believed that they were largely based on being mistakenly identified as someone else. The impossibility to *“correct”* this perceived misidentification resulted in his closing the account.

Finally, discomfort also related to a feeling of being drawn by other users into a level of privacy the respondent didn't want to – even passively – share:

“It seems to me like slums – and I remember a trip that I made to some acquaintances who were living on the 8th floor in a block of flats, and I didn't take the elevator... and it was one of those blocks where people felt the need to leave their doors open and you see all the shoes lying at the door. Sometimes you would also see some socks... This is Facebook for me: There are some things like ‘I don't want to see your shoes’” (I-4, UGC user).

Generally, it appears that online communication (as well as online entertainment) played a less important role in internet usage for most respondents. The dominant reason given was the availability and ease of access to information, and they seemed to see themselves as predominantly pragmatic rather than enthusiastic internet users: *“I use it. It's an object that I use when I need it” (I-3, UGC non-user).*

3.2 Information Disclosure – “Offline” and Online

In order to gain an insight into how UGC users’ and non-users’ behaviour corresponds with their attitudes and perceptions “offline” (e.g. regarding privacy-related social norms), respondents were encouraged to imagine a situation where, whilst travelling on a plane, a stranger would ask them a number of personal questions – whether they would reveal their marital status, their income, and their ID card number. After that, they were requested to talk about their reaction if the same questions were asked by a friend.

In these imagined “offline” situations, it strongly depended on the type of personal or private information³ whether or not Romanian respondents would disclose it to a stranger. Being asked for their marital status was mostly considered as something that is “*not a taboo*” (I-8, UGC user), “*not important*” and “*nothing to hide*” (I-6, UGC non-user), or it may be revealed to a stranger as “*it’s a person one will never meet again*” (I-3, UGC non-user), pointing at a willingness in transitory situations to reveal information that would otherwise be kept private. However, some respondents also expressed their apprehension and perception of their marital status as “*confidential*” (I-9, UGC user), or being generally suspicious towards strangers and their possibly “*hidden intentions*” (I-10, UGC user).

Even more diverse were the respondents’ perceptions regarding their income: Whilst some perceived it as “*too personal*” (I-3, UGC non-user), “*too private*” (I-7, UGC user) or “*not relevant for strangers*” (I-2, UGC user), others would choose the strategy of being evasive by giving a vague answer or talking about their financial situation in general. On the one hand, if income was rather low it was not perceived as a problem to talk about it (I-4, UGC user). On the other hand, interviewees considered specific consequences – such as talking about money possibly leading to being asked to lend some (I-6, UGC non-user), or higher income potentially arousing envy (I-9, UGC user). Here, talking – or not talking – about one’s income appears to be a social norm that may be shifting due to ongoing socio-economic changes.

On the contrary, perceptions towards the disclosure of ID card numbers were rather homogeneous: As “*private data that must be protected*” (I-10, UGC user), being asked for it by a stranger was considered as a suspicious request which would bear the risk of misuse (I-4, UGC user) or fraud (I-6, UGC non-user). However, as one respondent pointed out, there was a basic contradiction between this described attitude and the actual daily practice:

“In Romania, everybody knows your personal identification number [Cod Numeric Personal - CNP]. I don’t know why we keep it secret. Only those who don’t want it can’t have it. At the medical centre, at the post office, at the cafeteria – everybody wants your CNP” (I-4, UGC user).

³ The distinction made here between “personal” and “private” is following educational definitions where personal information cannot be used to identify someone (in the sense of identity theft), whereas private information can be used to identify someone and may be unsafe to share. This distinction is currently not being made in data protection law which only refers to “personal” data/information, in common language both terms are often used synonymously, within the various scientific disciplines there is a wealth of different definitions, and there are also different meanings in different languages. However, many respondents intuitively differentiated between the two terms – by ascribing to them different levels – or “types” (e.g. ownership vs. spatial relationship) – of privacy.

But, in contrast to this everyday practice, *none* of the interviewees would disclose their ID number – not to strangers, but also not to friends: Revealing it even to friends was perceived as bearing the risk of, again, “*misuse*” (I-10, UGC user), “*privacy abuse*” (I-8, UGC user), or fraud (I-6, UGC non-user), as even with friends there remained “*a little bit of suspicion*” (I-9, UGC user). Revealing their marital status to friends, however, was seen by all respondents as something which was subject to reciprocity and mutual trust within friendships. Attitudes regarding one’s income were shifting slightly towards a greater willingness to share this information with friends as comparably “*normal*” talk within friends relationships (I-1, UGC user), but some respondents would still remain evasive (I-2, UGC user; I-5, UGC non-user), considering it still as “*too private*” (I-7, UGC user).

Regarding the question what information would be disclosed online in the context of commercial trade-off’s⁴, the interviewees’ responses also showed wide variations – with a certain similarity to the attitudes previously revealed in the case of offline information disclosure towards strangers (marital status, income, ID card number). Additionally, there was little hesitation to disclose one’s phone number or birth date.

Privacy as a reason for non-disclosure can be divided into different – though partially overlapping – categories:

- (a) Information was perceived as generally “too private” (in particular one’s address and a spouse’s email address),
- (b) the information was perceived as “personal”, its disclosure being linked to the perceived risk of fraud (particularly insurances and ID card number), and
- (c) the information requested was considered as “not relevant” for the website owner – something “they don’t need to know”, and it wasn’t understood why they would want such information (for example annual income or the number and age of kids).

There were very few observable links between non-disclosure and a perceived risk of receiving unwanted commercial offers; one of the main reasons given was a general mistrust that “sales opportunities” could be, actually, good bargains: “*Why would I think – and maybe I’m just not a believer here and what I’m saying is stupid – that, if I go to a medical centre with a voucher bought online – they will offer me more or the same attention they offer if I pay a lot of money... I mean, for serious things*” (I-4, UGC user). Similarly, other respondents were convinced that no service is provided for free and therefore they “*better refuse the offer because I’m sure they are holding something back*” (I-6, UGC non-user). However, none of the interviewees linked their “suspicions” to specific expected consequences (except for the risk of fraud), and they appeared to be mostly unaware of specific online customer targeting (as being the “price” they may pay).

Regarding the disclosure of personal and private information on UGC websites, another perception came into play. Four out of seven UGC users appeared convinced that disclosing extensive personal and private information (e.g. name, email address, age, marital status,

⁴ For commercial trade-off’s, interviewees were asked whether they would disclose online their phone number, address, date of birth, marital status, income, number and age of kids, their spouse’s email address, their home insurance, life insurance, and their ID card number.

hobbies / sports, education) was required – rather than only optional – for registration and opening a UGC website (primarily SNS) account.

Sharing pictures of oneself and of family or friends was the most coherent practice amongst all respondents; however, tagging or being tagged on others' pictures was not always appreciated. Home address and medical information was not disclosed by the majority, but without giving their specific motivation.

Finally, being strongly engaged in UGC usage didn't necessarily go alongside with a greater willingness to disclose information for commercial trade-off's, and being open to commercial trade-off's was not visibly linked to a more "generous" disclosure of personal and private information on UGC sites.

3.3 Privacy Matters

3.3.1 Which Privacy matters: Awareness and (Non-)Acceptance

Only three interviewees (one UGC user, two UGC non-users) indicated that they were aware before opening a UGC website account that website owners may use personal information provided by users to customise their site's content, but only one respondent became aware of this after opening the account⁵. All other respondent UGC users were, at the time of the interview, not aware of these (or other) website owners' practices, and it appeared that most of them had just heard about it for the first time during the interview: *"I never learnt how to use Facebook – nobody showed me how my data is being used. This is why I learnt only now about these types of uses"* (I-1, UGC user). Other respondents indicated that they had just started learning about it from a recent survey about online privacy, or they considered the information given in the interview as a motivator to now improve their knowledge in this subject.

These results confirm the opinion of the Romanian partners in the project that it is currently a substantial lack of basic education regarding internet usage in general. Whereas access to the internet and using it in public education at all levels is often praised and indicated as major activities by public officials, there are not general strategies or programmes,⁶ or even interest in more than the purely technical usage of new technologies. Thus, "using the internet", or some internet websites, is learnt predominantly by "doing it".

Acceptance levels – and the underlying motivation for acceptance – differed depending on the respective website owners' practice. The customising of content was accepted, or accepted under the condition of previous consent, by a slight majority (six) of respondents: either by revealing a "fatalistic" approach – *"we can't get away from profiling or surveillance, as it is everywhere, not only on the internet"* (I-2, UGC user) – or as a practice which is commonly known from experiences with service providers offline:

"That's not the reason why I don't open an account with the social media: I remember that when I signed my contract with the mobile phone company, they said they could use the data in the scope that the company...I don't remember what... And I signed – I didn't have a problem with it. [...] Or if you have credit cards or things like that that require personal information – they tell you these are confidential but they will be used for other purposes" (I-3, UGC non-user).

Here, both types of interviewees expressed a perceived powerlessness towards either public surveillance or commercial practice of large private players (like banks, mobile phone companies). However, this loss of (or lost) control experienced in offline and online situations appeared to result in resignation, or even passive adaptation, rather than a discomfort which would trigger counter-reaction – as one (non-accepting) respondent

⁵ There was no information given how this respondent (I-4, UGC user) became aware – e.g. through regular usage, noticing changes, reading in the media etc.

⁶ There are only few exceptions in the past couple of years coming from the NGOs sides – such as activities by Save the Children Romania on Safer Internet issues, pilot training for undergraduate teachers on media and digital literacy developed by Activewatch, and IT law classes offered by some Law Faculties.

explained, she still perceived such practice as very manipulative but, at the same time, perceived herself as becoming *“more flexible”* (I-7, UGC user).

Regarding the website owners’ practice of passing on personal information without the user’s permission, acceptance levels start to decrease. Those who still accepted it, would do so only under the condition of given consent, depending on how sensitive the to-be-shared information was, or they considered themselves as vaguely being able to agree *“somehow”* (I-10, UGC user). Receiving commercial offers as a consequence of having disclosed personal or private information online was predominantly not accepted – as a *“strange”* (I-10, UGC user) or *“unpleasant”* (I-7, UGC user) practice, and as having *“a hidden purpose”* (I-6, UGC non-user). Only three respondents found this practice acceptable: as being part of the commercial trade-off against free services, due to the perception that commercial information received could always be *“cancelled”* (I-2, UGC user), or under the condition of sharing profits: *“If I received part of the profit I would give some information”* (I-8, UGC user).

Finally, selling personal and private information to other companies or gathering in-depth information of users was also not considered as acceptable by the majority of respondents, either perceiving these practices as generally *“too much”* (I-8, UGC user), or as violating a perceived social norm: *“I don’t agree to sell any personal information to those companies, no matter in exchange for what – money, lottery tickets, a percentage of profit, nothing. This is not a normal thing”* (I-10, UGC user).

The statement of another interviewee pointed at a basic misunderstanding regarding the function of password protection, from which he had derived a (false) feeling of security:

“When I made my account there, they should have offered confidentiality – this is why I wrote [provided] all my details: I made for them [the website provider] the account with password and everything – I thought that this information should have been for me only” (I-1, UGC user).

Here, the respondent had apparently assumed that the personal data disclosed in the registration process were solely for his own private use, and the registration (and subsequent password provision) would serve primarily the purpose of enabling the website provider to protect him from data misuse by other users. Any unconsented usage by the website provider was, thus, perceived as a clear contractual breach of confidence.

3.3.2 How Privacy matters: Protective Measures

Regarding specific measures to protect their privacy, Romanian respondents did not reveal any distinct disclosure strategies but instead, as described earlier, disclosed generally rather comprehensive personal and private information about themselves due to the aforementioned perception that filling out all the data fields on a registration form would be a *“must”*. The respondents also didn’t describe any attempts to adapt or develop specific strategies⁷, such as leaving parts blank, using fake or altered data, or look for similar websites where less information (or no registration altogether) was required.

⁷ With the exception of one interviewee (I-4, UGC user) who, as a basic strategy, chose to give no information, or – in the case of her home address – only vague information, i.e. only the city where she lived.

They showed little inventiveness or playful practices in “negotiating” their access to the desired online services, partially due to a belief that either information disclosure was “no problem” (I-2, UGC user)⁸, that “nothing unpleasant can happen from posting some photos on Facebook” (I-8, UGC user), that they had “nothing to hide” (I-1, UGC user), or that they were in full control of their online privacy. One respondent stated additionally: “I don’t add pictures with other persons, because it doesn’t seem fair. I don’t like myself to be tagged in other pictures” (I-2, UGC user). Here, the interviewee linked her non-disclosure (and non-tagging) with a certain expectation of mutual respect towards one’s privacy in online practices – which is, however, again only considering the attitudes of other users.

Generally, the observed low awareness of most Romanian respondents may be one of the main reasons for their substantially reduced concern about a (potential) misuse of personal or private data, resulting (yet) in a perceived online environment where users are faced with technical challenges, technical threats, fraud and data abuse by other users, but no need – or option – to re-position themselves towards website owners and their practices.

Consequently, only one interviewee declared that he was using a nickname but, as he also explained, he did this primarily by imitating what others were doing when he was still at school. One respondent used a nickname when he started using UGC sites as, at the time of initial usage, he perceived himself as requiring more protection. But since he learnt with time what he called a more “appropriate” use (I-8, UGC user) the usage of nicknames became, in his perception, irrelevant. Only one respondent was actually using a form of nickname, i.e. her incomplete name, with the intention of actively protecting her privacy – also due to her perceived professional responsibility: “I do not want to be subject of others’ scrutiny, or some information about my private life to be seen by others – especially because of my position as a public servant” (I-7, UGC user). Those who didn’t use nicknames considered using them as either “not necessary” (I-4, UGC user) or “a sign of cowardice” (I-3, UGC non-user).

Of the seven UGC users, two either left their privacy settings at default or made them even less strict: One stated that she didn’t see any negative consequences possible and perceived herself in this context as not having a “phobia” (I-2, UGC user), the other one declared: “I don’t have that thing with friends only seeing the information – I understand what I post there is for everybody to see” (I-1, UGC user).

The other five users had changed their settings to a more restrictive level – mostly to “friends only” – however, none of them considered (or was aware of) the setting “friends but not friends of friends”. Additionally, none of the interviewees described any form of “dynamic” handling of privacy settings.⁹

⁸ This respondent, for example, indicated that she had disclosed her name, home address, photos of herself and of family and friends together with her, hobbies, places she had been to, and tastes and opinions.

⁹ For example a frequent checking on changes, defining specific users groups, in- or excluding specific individuals or institutions, or using various accounts for different types of usage – like for dividing between public and private online activities.

It generally appeared that existing desires for privacy and attitudes resulting from experienced privacy violations offline were not transferred into the online environment. The general idea – or option – of separating publicity and privacy appeared to be problematic for Romanian respondents already outside the internet; thus, disclosure strategies of setting up multiple online user identities may not easily evolve – neither in a playful manner nor as a protective measure.

3.3.3 Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies

Only one out of the seven interviewed UGC users (and one out of the three non-users¹⁰) claimed that they mostly read privacy policies. The reasons given for not reading the policies can, generally, be divided into three categories: On a “technical” level, the (non-reading) interviewees indicated that privacy policies were illegible due to being too long, written in too small letters, and containing too many legal terms. Thus, interviewees explained that they didn’t have the “*patience*” to read them (I-1, UGC user), revealing a certain user inertia.

On the level of actual policy content, some non-readers additionally claimed that “*there is no use*” (I-9, UGC user) in reading them as they would be too broad, “*all the same*” (I-10, UGC user), and – if worth reading at all – at least not before registration and, even then, only superficially. The main reason outlined, or alluded to, was a deep mistrust:

“They found some very nice phrases in order to calm down the users and assure them that everything is legal. But behind, in most cases, ‘God have mercy!’ [...] The language is so specific that you need to make sure that you understand the things. Sometimes you may read very happily that the things are in one direction when they, actually, are in the other direction” (I-4, UGC user).

In this statement, the question remains open to what extent such misleading language is seen as, actually, intentional. Consequently, expectations towards privacy policies were, in particular, being given “*clear and precise specifications about every situation*” (I-7, UGC user) and a specific veto right: “*I don’t think it’s normal not to have the right to veto the information somebody is posting about you*” (I-2, UGC user). They were also linked to a desire to know the “*real purposes*” and having “*guarantees*” (I-10, UGC user) as well as “*very clear rights and obligations*” (I-9, UGC user) regarding personal data usage, and the definition of “*sanctions*” (I-7, UGC user) in case of breaking the agreement between user and service provider.

But it was only one interviewee who translated her critical opinion about privacy policies into making the effort of reading them and taking corresponding action:

“At the beginning, when I registered, I did not read this. But, after a while, when I had gathered some information, I started to study this, and after that I restricted the access of others to my profile, to my information [...] All the provisions are too vague, too general – when you read them, you can consider yourself protected, but after a while you must limit the access of others to have some protection, using the instruments offered” (I-7, UGC user).

However, the inertia revealed by most other interviewees may have deeper roots: One interviewee clearly expressed that he did not even want to talk about the subject altogether and claimed that “*none of my friends are interested in this either. They did not read them [privacy policies] either*” (I-8, UGC user). Here, it appears that any effort in reading policies and regulations is perceived as futile, and that such disinterest may be an attitude that can

¹⁰ This UGC non-user (I-3), however, considered privacy policies as generally “*ok*”, but admitted that it was a long time ago since she last read one, and that she doesn’t really remember the content.

also be found on a more general level. Overall, Romanian UGC users as well as non-users showed little belief that in current laws or regulations UGC users are already assigned comprehensive rights which would only need to be reinforced. It rather appeared that policies were perceived as – intentionally or unintentionally – serving the primary purpose of \protecting the website owners rather than the website users.

4. Conclusion: Privacy – nothing to be “paranoid”?

In the beginning of each interview, the respondents were asked to give their spontaneous associations with a number of terms: honesty, internet, work, family, privacy. The subsequent results show a particularly interesting contrast between the first and the last of them – honesty and privacy. Whereas honesty was mostly described as an established value and a social norm, the respondents’ associations with privacy were substantially different. Rather than being ascribed a normative character, it appeared in these descriptions as a feeling, something that was “secret” and “very personal”, linked to “confidentiality” and “intimate details” which are kept in “closed spaces others can’t look in”.

Interestingly, a number of Romanian interviewees also associated privacy with “pleasure”, “joy”, “rest”, and something “beautiful”. Now, as much as this may be due to the fact that, in Romanian language, “privacy” and “private life” are, actually, the same words and they can also be interpreted as “personal life”, it underlines the main idea of a more self-contained, static and space/time/ownership-related concept, rather than a dynamic practice which is constantly changing and undergoing (re-)negotiations.

It appeared that most interviewees were either unaware of potential risks, blocked out or accepted vague feelings of discomfort deriving from a lack of control¹¹, or they – almost defiantly – claimed to be “invincible” and, as one interviewee stated, “*can manage everything in conformity with her own will*” (I-7, UGC user). They also appeared to be keen on not leaving the impression that they were squeamish, considering “*too much concern*” about privacy as being “*paranoid*” (I-3, UGC non-user).

But interviewees *did* express a strong desire to be (or become) protected by a very clearly defined legal framework, although (online) privacy itself as a common and established right appears to be little developed¹², and there *does* exist the desire to be in control. But given the rather extensive lack of awareness regarding UGC website providers’ practices on one side, and the lack of knowledge regarding already existing technical measures to protect one’s privacy on the other side, there appeared to be little initiative to actively explore the possibilities of (re-)gaining such control.

However, the observation that, once being informed about the various website owners’ practices, Romanian interviewees showed a very low level of acceptance, indicates that things may be shifting. Developing individual strategies to safeguard one’s online privacy may just be on the verge of becoming an imaginable practice for UGC users (and non-users) and, due to Romania’s post-World War II political history, “offline” privacy has been – though highly valued – everything but a social norm. However, this doesn’t mean that it can, will be or should be dismissed as not being anymore – or becoming – such.

¹¹ Before learning about the various website owner practices.

¹² Consequently, privacy was associated by none of the respondents with any form of security of safety, or something that would need to be preserved or protected. The interviewees reported that, in the beginning of the respective interviews, some interviewees had general difficulties to spontaneously associate *anything* with the term “privacy”.

Acknowledgements

This research was carried out as part of CONSENT (Consumer sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy) a project that was funded by the European Union under the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013), Grant Agreement Number 244643.

Appendices

A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)

Instructions for Interviewers

As the intention of these interviews is to gain a deeper understanding of personal opinions, thoughts, feelings, experiences and behaviour towards privacy based on the quantitative results from WP7, it is crucial to allow the respondents to speak as freely as possible and allow them to develop their own chain of thought, rather than following a pre-defined yes/no or “multiple choice” pattern. Obviously, one of the main challenges for any interviewer conducting standardised open-ended interviews is to find the balance between allowing such openness *and* maintaining control – taking oneself back without losing the “red line” – and the wording of the interview questions is accounting for this.

However, conducting interviews about a complex subject will always remain a complex task, and the following practical recommendations are meant to help reducing at least some of the complexities involved.

Plan ahead: Make a definite appointment with the respondent in a location of her/his choice where she/he feels at ease, but keep in mind that it should be sufficiently private to allow for an interview without undue distractions or interruptions. Avoid tight time schedules, as feelings of pressure may – unwillingly – be passed on to the respondent.

Be familiar with the interview guidelines: Practice the questions beforehand, and read the questions-specific instructions (marked in italic letters) carefully. Stick to the guidelines and don't jump between questions.

Be familiar with the technical equipment: Make a short test recording before each interview to assure that the recording equipment is working fine and batteries are sufficiently charged.

Ask open questions: Particularly when probing an interviewee's response, it is tempting to ask suggestive questions (e.g. “So you think / don't think that...?”). Although not always possible, such yes/no questions should be mostly avoided. Attempt to remain asking open direct questions, and also use other probing techniques like empathy, expectant pauses or mirroring, giving the respondent sufficient time to elaborate.

Stay alert: Whilst it is important to be interactive, the interviewer's main task is to listen and observe throughout the conversation. It is also recommendable to remain alert and potentially make notes after the interview, as respondents often give crucial information immediately after the recording device is turned off.

Introduction	Briefing
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Introduction [about 5 min]</p> <p>(d) Thank you (e) Your name (f) Purpose (g) Confidentiality (h) Duration (i) How interview will be conducted (j) Signature of consent on consent form</p>	<p>I would like to thank you for taking the time to meet me today. My name is-----and I would like to talk to you about the internet, what you like about it, what you dislike, and how you use it.</p> <p>As was mentioned when we set up this appointment, this interview is being carried out as part of the CONSENT project which is co-funded by the European Union. The CONSENT aims to gather views of internet users from all countries of the EU. If you wish I will give you more information about the CONSENT project at the end of the interview.</p> <p>Your opinion is very valuable for our study and will be taken into consideration when drawing up the final report.</p> <p>The interview should take less than one hour. I will be taping the session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. Although I will be taking some notes during the session, I can't possibly write fast enough to get it all down. Because we're on tape, please be sure to speak up so that we don't miss your comments.</p> <p>All responses will be kept confidential. This means your interview responses will only be shared with research team members and will ensure that any information we include in our report does not identify you as the respondent. Your name will not be connected with the answers in any way.</p> <p>Please read and sign this consent form. Do you have any questions on that?</p> <p>Remember, you don't have to talk about anything you don't want and you may end the interview at any time. Is that OK?</p> <p><i>Running Total: 5 min</i></p>
Objectives	Questions
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Word-association exercise [about 3 min]</p> <p>- establish top of</p>	<p>Q.1 To start off we are going to play a short game/carry out a short exercise: I will read out a word and I would like you to say the first couple of things that come to mind/pops into your head when you hear the word. Let's try an example first: What is the first thing that comes to mind if I say the word "summer"? Anything else?</p> <p><i>Encourage respondents to use short phrases or single words and to</i></p>

mind associations
with privacy

avoid lengthy descriptions and statements.

Test words: honesty, internet, work, family, privacy

Running Total: 8 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

Willingness to disclose personal information in various situations.
[about 8 min]

Q.1.1 Now let's talk about something a little different. I would like you to imagine you are on a plane and the person next to you, somebody you don't know and who you are unlikely to ever meet again, is a really talkative member of the same sex about your age. He/she starts talking about different things and after 15 minutes he/she asks you whether you were single, married or in a relationship, what would you tell her/him?

Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.

Q.1.2 What if he/she asked you about how much you earn What would you do? *Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.*

Q.1.3 And what if they would tell you they can use their ID card number to choose lottery numbers to play. He/she asks you what your ID card number is. What would you do?

Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.

Q.1.4 Now let's imagine that instead of this talkative fellow passenger, you were asked the same questions by a friend who you meet a few times a year. What would you do?

Probe about each of: whether you are single, married or in a relationship, how much you earn, ID card number. And in each case whether respondent would say the truth and why/why not

Running Total: 16 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

Internet experience and attitudes
[about 5 min]

Q.2 Let's talk a bit more about the internet now, how long have you been using the internet?

Q.3 What do you love most about the internet?

Q.4 What do you dislike most about the internet?

Running Total: 21 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

Underlying beliefs & attitudes to commercial/privac

Q.5 Imagine that you are visiting a website of a discount club, for example a site similar to Groupon <or similar, please choose the one most appropriate for your country>. The club offers up to 50% discounts on different consumer products and services (e.g. books, travel, household goods, and fashion items) to its

y trade-off

[about 5 min]

members. The site is currently running a promotion and giving a discount up to 75% to all visitors who provide the site with more information than the standard name and email. Which information would you be willing to provide this website to get this up to 75% discount offer?

Start reading out list: phone number, home address, date of birth, annual income, marital status, number of kids, age of kids, ID or passport number, email address of partner or spouse, life insurance status, home insurance status

For items that respondent is not willing to provide information about to the website probe reason: Q5.i Why not? Or Why wouldn't you give your...

Running Total: 26 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

Internet usage

[about 2 min]

Q.6 Please tell me a little about the internet websites you use in a typical week and what you use them for.

Probe if Internet activities describe above (including usage of UGC and SNS) have an impact on the respondents' lifestyles, habits and social relationships (just 2 minutes for this question, so do not go into too many details).

Running Total: 28 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

UGC usage

[about 5 min]

- Establish whether UGC user or non-user
- Establish whether SNS user
- Establish UGC site used most frequently
- Provides link to findings from online questionnaire

Q.7 This is a list of some websites <show list of UGC sites used in each country for WP7 >. Could you please tell me whether you have accounts with (not just visit) any of them and if you do have an account how often you log in? <Make a note which whether respondent uses Social Networking Site and if not which UGC website respondent uses most>

Show card A:

A. Social networking website such as Facebook, <Local SNS used in WP7>

B. Business networking websites such as LinkedIn, Xing.com

C. Dating websites such as parship.com

D. Websites where you can share photos, videos, etc., such as YouTube, Flickr

E. Websites which provide recommendations and reviews (of films, music, books hotels etc), such as last.fm, tripadvisor

F. Micro blogging sites such as twitter

G. Wiki sites such as Wikipedia, myheritage

H. Multiplayer online games such as secondlife.com, World of Warcraft

Show card A

	<p><i>Probe how much time is spent on social networks and UGC services daily/weekly (if not established already in Q6)</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 33 min</i></p>
<p>RESPONDENTS WHO DO <u>NOT</u> USE OR NO LONGER USE UGC SITES IN Q7</p> <p>Reasons for not using UGC sites [about 3 min]</p>	<p>Q.8 Why don't you have accounts with any of these sites, or why did you cancel or don't use them anymore? Anything else? <i>Probe fully, but make note of first and second reason given.</i></p> <p><i>We are interested in exploring further any reasons that relate to respondents' concerns about:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>the consequences of giving information online,</i> - <i>how information about them is used,</i> - <i>whether UGC sites can be trusted, and</i> - <i>any other issue relating to privacy.</i> <p><u><i>If privacy/information use/trust related issues not mentioned as a reason for not using (anymore)UGC sites ask:</i></u></p> <p>Q.9 For what reasons may you be likely to open an account – or not open account - with any of these sites soon? <i>Allow respondents to speak freely, but then gently probe to establish if respondent feels any pressure to open a UGC account;</i></p> <p><u><i>If any privacy/information use/trust related issues mentioned ask:</i></u></p> <p>Q10. You mentioned that one of the reasons (the reason) you don't use UGC sites is <whatever respondent said that relates to privacy/information use>. Can you tell me a bit more about what in particular concerns you? <i>Probe <u>in depth</u> to determine</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. what aspect of UGC sites respondent finds unacceptable, and why;</i> <i>ii. beliefs about how internet sites use information;</i> <i>iii beliefs about what UGC sites are for.</i> <p><i>Running Total: 36 min</i></p>
<p>RESPONDENTS WHO USE UGC SITES IN Q7</p> <p>UGC sites - Motivations & Usage [about 6 min]</p> <p>Establish: - motivations for</p>	<p>Q.11 Why did you start using <Social Networking Site, if used. If respondent does not use Social Networking site, then UGC site in Q7 used most frequently>? Probe to determine key motivations for using site.</p> <p>Q. 12 During all of the time that you've been using these sites, what information about yourself have you put on the site/sites? <i>Allow respondents to take their time and reply in their own words but probe for: name, home address, photos of you, photos of family and friends, audio-video recordings, medical information, hobbies, sports, places where you've been, tastes and opinions, etc</i></p>

UGC use
- willingness to share information
- beliefs & attitudes on different types of information
- motivations for settings of who can view information

Q.13 Who can see your profile and/or your photos?

Probe Why have you set things up in that way?

Q.14 Have you ever regretted posting some information on one of these sites?

If yes: Q.15 Can you tell me a little bit about it...what happened? Why did you regret the posting?

If respondent does not mention commercial info & negative effects, then also ask 16.1 and 16.2

If no: Q.16 Could you imagine a situation when you might regret it?

Probe to determine whether lack of concern about respondent's own posting is due to:

- i. respondent posting little information, or*
- ii. always thinking carefully before posting, or*
- iii. thinking that it is no problem that everybody has access to information about them*

If NOT i and ii then ask:

16.1 Do you receive commercial info that you think is a result of the personal information that you have posted? If yes, how do you feel about this?

Probe to determine exactly:

- i. if the respondents are aware of consequences of putting information online*
- ii. why some are more acceptable than the others*
- iii. do people accept that receiving commercial info is part of the commercial trade-off for using the service*

16.2 What do you think can happen (for example regarding job selection, reputation) as a result of personal information you have posted?

If Yes- How do you think this will happen?

If No- Why don't you think this is possible?

Probe to determine exactly how the respondents think about other people using their own information posted on UGCs. Use a neutral tone to allow both positive and negative reactions.

Running Total: 42 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

If not previously established up to this point

Usage of

Q.17 Have you yourself ever used an alias or a nickname when giving information online? In what case/s and why? Or, if you

aliases/nicknames
[about 2 min]

- explore attitudes
towards revealing
personal
information in
different situations

ALL RESPONDENTS

Attitudes towards
use of personal
information by
websites
[about 8 min]

Show card B

haven't, what do you think about it?

Probe more in detail.

Running Total: 44 min

Q.18 The information users include in their account or profile on a website can be used by the website owners for a number of purposes, such as to customize the content and advertising that users see, to send them emails, to gather in-depth personal information about them etc. Did you know this when you signed up with a website (or UGC/SNS)? What do you think of it?

Make a note whether respondent was aware of purposes and probe to determine attitude to use of users' information for each of the following:

Show card B:

- 1. customize the advertising you see (show you only advertising for things/services that likely to interest you)*
- 2. share information (which could be linked to your name) about your behaviour with other parts of the company*
- 3. sell information (not linked to your name) about your behaviour to other companies*

For each purpose probe respondent for the reason behind finding the use acceptable/unacceptable.

If not already mentioned, for any purpose respondent finds unacceptable ask:

Q.19 Under which conditions, if any, would you find it acceptable for users to give information about themselves to be used by a website for < purpose respondent finds unacceptable>?

Probe to determine whether respondent would accept a ticket in a sweepstake/lottery, points on website such as Facebook points, a share of profits from the website, money.

Running Total: 52 min

**ALL
RESPONDENTS**

Attitudes towards
& behaviour on
privacy policies.

Q20 What do you think about privacy policies of the UGCs/SNS that you are using? Did you read them before you signed up? (choose one as an example, if no to Q 7, then any other website that you use frequently)

If yes – what would you look for? If you didn't find what you have looking for, what would you do?

[about 4 min]

Probe to determine:

- *if people really read the privacy policy;*
- *what (presence/absence of some feature? reassurance?) they are looking for when they do read privacy policies; and*
- *what they do if what they are looking for isn't in the policy (carry on using the website anyway? not start/stop using it?)*

Running Total: 56 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

That's all from me, is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank & close

Hand out incentives if used

Inform about the next steps, give more information about CONSENT project if respondent wishes

Thank you very much for your valuable contribution to our project!

Total: 60 min

A.1 Interview Guidelines (Romanian)

Instrucțiuni pentru Intervievatori

Cum intenția acestor interviuri este de a obține o înțelegere mai profundă a opiniilor personale, gândurilor, sentimentelor, experiențelor și comportamentului legate de viața privată, pe baza rezultatelor cantitative din WP7, este crucial ca respondenții să fie lăsați să vorbească cât de liber posibil și să li se permită dezvoltarea propriilor direcții de gândire, mai degrabă decât să urmeze un model predefinit pe sistem da/nu sau cu “răspunsuri multiple”. În mod evident, una dintre provocările principale pentru un interviuator care conduce interviuri standardizate deschise este aceea de a găsi un echilibru între a permite o astfel de deschidere și a menține controlul - menținerea unei poziții reținute fără a pierde “firul roșu” – și modul în care au fost gândite întrebările chestionarului ține cont de acest lucru.

Totuși, un interviu legat de un subiect complex va rămâne totdeauna o sarcină complexă și următoarele recomandări practice sunt menite să contribuie la reducerea cel puțin a câtorva dintre elementele de complexitate implicate.

Planificați dinainte: Stabiliți o întâlnire clară cu respondentul într-o locație la alegerea acestuia, unde se simte în largul său dar țineți cont că ar trebui să fie un loc destul de privat încât să permită desfășurarea interviului fără întreruperi ne-necesare sau elemente de distragere a atenției. Evitați să fiți grăbit/presat de timp, deoarece sentimentul de presiune poate fi – fără intenție – transmis respondentului.

Familiarizați-vă cu liniile directoare ale interviului: Repetați întrebările înainte și citiți atent instrucțiunile specifice acestora (marcate cu caractere înclinate). Păstrați indicațiile și nu modificați ordinea întrebărilor.

Familiarizați-vă cu echipamentele tehnice: Faceți o înregistrare de testare înaintea fiecărui interviu pentru a vă asigura că echipamentul funcționează bine și bateriile sunt încărcate suficient.

Puneți întrebări deschise: În special când testați răspunsul unui interviuat, este tentant să puneți întrebări sugestive (de ex. (nu) credeți că....?) prin care se poate răspunde simplu prin da/nu. Astfel de întrebări da/nu ar trebui evitate pe cât posibil deoarece ceea ce dorim să obținem când facem un sondaj, este să avem cât mai multe detalii despre ceea ce crede interviuatul și nu un simplu răspuns da/nu. Încercați să puneți întrebări deschise și să folosiți alte tehnici de sondare ca empatia, pauzele de așteptare sau oglindire care să dea respondentului suficient timp să detalieze.

Păstrați o stare alertă: În vreme ce e important să fie interactiv, interviuatorul are ca sarcină principală să asculte și să observe în timpul conversației. Se recomandă de asemenea păstrarea unei stări alerte și eventual notarea observațiilor de după interviu deoarece deseori, interviuații dau informații cruciale imediat după închiderea echipamentului de înregistrare.

Introducere	Scurtă prezentare
<p>TOȚI RESPONDENȚII</p> <p>Introducere</p> <p>[aprox. 5 min]</p> <p>(k) Mulțumesc (l) Numele Dvs. (m) Scop (n) Confidențialitate (o) Durată (p) Cum se va desfășura interviul (q) Semnătura de acord pe formularul de consimțământ</p>	<p>Aș dori să vă mulțumesc pentru că v-ați găsit timp să vă întâlniți cu mine astăzi. Numele meu este ----- și aș vrea să vă vorbesc despre internet, ce vă place în legătură cu acesta, ce vă displace și cum să-l folosiți.</p> <p>Așa cum am menționat când am stabilit această întâlnire, acest interviu face parte din proiectul CONSENT care este co-finanțat de către Comisia Europeană. Proiectul CONSENT are ca scop colectarea părerilor utilizatorilor de internet din toate țările UE. Dacă doriți, vă voi da mai multe informații despre proiectul CONSENT la sfârșitul interviului.</p> <p>Părerile Dvs. este foarte importantă pentru studiul nostru și vom ține cont de aceasta în elaborarea raportului final.</p> <p>Acest interviu ar trebui să dureze mai puțin de o oră. Voi înregistra această sesiune deoarece nu aș vrea să pierd ceva din comentariile Dvs. Deși o să iau notițe în timpul sesiunii, nu pot scrie atât de rapid încât să rețin tot. Deoarece veți fi înregistrat, rugămintea este să vorbiți suficient de tare încât să nu se piardă nimic din comentariile Dvs.</p> <p>Toate răspunsurile vor fi confidențiale. Aceasta înseamnă că răspunsurile Dvs. din cadrul interviului nu vor fi împărtășite decât cu alți cercetători și ne vom asigura ca informațiile incluse în raportul nostru să nu ducă la identificarea Dvs. ca respondent. Numele Dvs. nu va fi legat de răspunsuri în nici un fel.</p> <p>Vă rog să citiți și să semnați acest formular de consimțământ. Aveți întrebări legate de asta?</p> <p>Vă reamintesc că nu trebuie să vorbiți despre ceea ce nu doriți și că puteți încheia interviul oricând doriți. Este în regulă?</p> <p><i>Durată Totală: 5 min</i></p>
Obiective	Întrebări
<p>TOȚI RESPONDENȚII</p> <p>Exercițiu de asociere cuvinte</p> <p>[aprox. 3 min]</p> <p>- stabiliți asocieri spontane cu “viața privată”</p>	<p>Î.1 Pentru început o să jucăm un joc scurt/o să facem un scurt exercițiu: o să citesc un cuvânt și aș vrea să spuneți primele două lucruri care vă trec prin minte când auziți cuvântul. Să începem cu un exemplu: Care este primul lucru care vă vine în minte când spun cuvântul “vară”? Altceva?</p> <p><i>Încurajați respondenții să folosească expresii scurte sau doar un cuvânt și să evite descrierile și afirmații lungi.</i></p> <p><i>Cuvinte-Test: cinste, Internet, muncă, familie, viață privată</i></p> <p><i>Durată Totală: 8 min</i></p>

<p>TOȚI RESPONDENȚII</p> <p>Dorința de a dezvălui informații personale în diverse situații</p> <p>[aprox. 8 min]</p>	<p>Î.1.1 Să vorbim acum despre ceva un pic diferit. Aș vrea să vă imaginați că sunteți în avion și persoana de lângă Dvs., o persoană pe care n-o cunoașteți și pe care n-o veți mai întâlni probabil vreodată, este o persoană relativ vorbăreață, de același sex, cam de aceeași vârstă cu Dvs. El/ea începe să vorbească despre diverse lucruri și după aprox. 15 minute, vă întreabă dacă sunteți necăsătorit/ă, căsătorit/ă sau într-o relație, ce i-ați spune? <i>Lăsați respondentul să răspundă liber și doar dacă nu dă motive pentru care ar răspunde într-un fel sau altul, abia atunci întrebați de ce/de ce nu?</i></p> <p>Î.1.2 Dacă vă întreabă cât câștigați? Ce ați face? <i>Lăsați respondentul să răspundă liber și doar dacă nu dă motive pentru care ar răspunde într-un fel sau altul, abia atunci întrebați de ce/de ce nu?</i></p> <p>Î.1.3 Și dacă v-ar spune că ar putea folosi numărul Cărții de Identitate (CI) pentru a alege numerele pe care să le joace la loterie. El/ea vă întreabă care este numărul dvs de CI. Ce ați face? <i>Lăsați respondentul să răspundă liber și doar dacă nu dă motive pentru care ar răspunde într-un fel sau altul, abia atunci întrebați de ce/de ce nu?</i></p> <p>Î.1.4 Să ne imaginăm acum că în locul acestui pasager vorbăreț, sunteți întrebat aceleași lucruri de către un prieten pe care-l întâlniți de câteva ori pe an. Ce ați face? <i>Testați în legătură cu fiecare din următoarele subiecte: dacă respondentul e necăsătorit, căsătorit, într-o relație, cât câștigă, numărul de CI. și, în fiecare caz, dacă respondentul ar spune adevărul și de ce/de ce nu.</i> <i>Durată Totală: 16 min</i></p>
<p>TOȚI RESPONDENȚII</p> <p>Experiență și atitudini legate de Internet</p> <p>[aprox. 5 min]</p>	<p>Î.2 Să vorbim acum un pic mai mult despre internet, de când folosiți internetul?</p> <p>Î.3 Ce vă place cel mai mult în legătură cu internetul?</p> <p>Î.4 Ce vă displace cel mai mult în legătură cu internetul? <i>Durată Totală: 21 min</i></p>
<p>TOȚI RESPONDENȚII</p>	<p>Î.5 Imaginați-vă că vizitați un site al unui club de reduceri, de exemplu un site similar cu Groupon <sau Fundeal, Zumzi,</p>

<p>Subliniați convingerile și atitudinile privind raportul comercial/viață privată</p> <p>[aprox. 5 min]</p>	<p><i>Goldendeals, Kuponiada , în funcție de ce cunoaște respondentul>. Clubul oferă membrilor săi reduceri de până la 50% la diverse produse de consum și servicii (ex. cărți, călătorii, bunuri casnice, produse de modă). Site-ul respectiv oferă o promoție de până la 75% tuturor vizitatorilor care dau pe site mai multe informații decât cele standard – nume și adresă email. Ce informații ați fi dispus să dați pe site pentru a obține această ofertă de reducere de până la 75%?</i></p> <p><i>Citiți o listă cu: număr de telefon, adresa de acasă, data nașterii, venitul anual, starea civilă, numărul de copii, vârsta copiilor, numărul CI sau pașaport, adresa de email a partenerului sau soțului/soției, starea de asigurat social, starea asigurării locuinței</i></p> <p><i>Pentru subiectele asupra cărora respondentul <u>nu</u> dorește să dea informații pe site sondați motivele: Î5.i De ce nu? sau de ce nu ați da...</i></p> <p><i>Durață Totală: 26 min</i></p>
<p>TOȚI RESPONDENȚII</p> <p>Folosire Internet</p> <p>[aprox. 2 min]</p>	<p>Î.6 Vă rog să-mi spuneți câte ceva despre site-urile web pe care le folosiți în cursul unei săptămâni obișnuite și pentru ce le folosiți.</p> <p><i>Testați dacă activitățile descrise mai sus [inclusiv utilizarea site-urilor UGC (conținut generat de utilizator) și a rețelelor de socializare] au un impact asupra vieților, obiceiurilor și relațiilor sociale ale respondenților (doar 2 minute pentru această întrebare așa că nu intrați în prea multe detalii).</i></p> <p><i>Durață Totală: 28 min</i></p>
<p>TOȚI RESPONDENȚII</p> <p>Folosire UGC</p> <p>[aprox. 5 min]</p> <p>- Stabiliți dacă este utilizator UGC sau nu - Stabiliți dacă este utilizator de rețele sociale - Stabiliți care este site-ul UGC cel mai frecvent folosit</p>	<p>Î.7 Aceasta este o listă a câtorva site-uri web <arătați o listă de situri UGC folosite în fiecare țară pentru WP7 >. Puteți să-mi spuneți dacă aveți conturi pe vreunul dintre ele (nu doar dacă le-ați vizitat) și dacă da, cât de des vă logați?</p> <p><i><Notați dacă respondentul folosește o rețea socială și dacă nu, ce UGC folosește cel mai mult></i></p> <p><i>Arătați fișa A:</i></p> <p>A. Site-uri de rețele sociale cum ar fi Facebook, Neogen.ro, Hi5 B. Site-uri de rețele de afaceri cum ar fi LinkedIn, Xing.com C. Site-uri de întâlniri cum ar fi parship.com, noi2.ro D. Site-uri unde poți împărtăși fotografii, video etc. cum ar fi Youtube, flickr, Trilulilu.ro E. Site-uri care oferă recomandări și recenzii (de filme, muzică, rezervări de hotel etc.), cum ar fi last.fm, tripadvisor, Tpu.ro F. Site-uri de micro blogging cum ar fi Twitter, Cirip.ro G. Site-uri Wiki cum ar fi Wikipedia, myheritage</p>

- Asigură legătura cu informațiile aflate din chestionarul online

Arătați fișa A

RESPONDENȚII CARE NU FOLOSESC SAU NU MAI FOLOSESC SITE-URI UGC LA Î7

Motivele pentru neutilizarea de site-uri UGC
[aprox. 3 min]

H. Jocuri online cu jucători multipli cum ar fi secondlife.com, World of Warcraft, Travian, Triburile

Aflați cât timp se petrece pe rețele sociale și servicii UGC zilnic/săptămânal (dacă nu e deja stabilit la Î.6)

Durată Totală: 33 min

Î.8 De ce nu aveți conturi la nici unul dintre aceste site-uri sau de ce le-ați anulat sau nu le mai folosiți? Alte detalii?

Testați complet, dar luați notă de primul și al doilea motive oferite.

Ne interesează să explorăm orice alte motive legate de problemele respondenților cu privire la:

- consecințele oferirii de informații online,
- modul în care sunt folosite informațiile despre ei,
- dacă se poate avea încredere în site-uri UGC,
- și
- orice alte probleme legate de viața privată.

Dacă problemele legate de viața privată/utilizarea informațiilor/încredere nu sunt menționate ca motive pentru neutilizarea (sau încetarea utilizării) site-urilor UGC întrebați:

Î.9 Care sunt motivele pentru care ați deschide –sau n-ați deschide – un cont pe oricare dintre următoarele site-uri în curând?

Permiteți respondenților să vorbească liber dar testați apoi cu grijă dacă respondentul se simte presat să deschidă un cont UGC;

Dacă au fost menționate probleme legate de viața privată/utilizarea informațiilor/încredere, întrebați:

Î.10. Ați menționat că unul dintre motivele (motivul) pentru care nu folosiți site-uri UGC este <ori ce a spus respondentul legat de viața privată/utilizarea informațiilor> . Puteți să-mi spuneți un pic mai mult despre ce anume vă preocupă în mod special?

Testați în profunzime pentru a determina:

- i. ce aspect al site-urilor UGC e considerat de respondent ca inacceptabil și de ce;
- ii. convingerile legate de modul în care site-urile internet folosesc informațiile;
- iii convingerile legate de scopurile site-urilor UGC.

Durată Totală: 36 min

**RESPONDENȚII
CARE FOLOSESC
SITE-URI UGC LA
Î.7**

**Site-uri UGC -
Motivații &
Utilizare**
[aprox. 6 min]

Stabiliți:
- motivații pentru
utilizarea de UGC
- dorința de a
împărtăși
informații
- convingeri &
atitudini privind
diversele tipuri de
informații
- motivații privind
setările legate de
cine poate vedea
informațiile

Î.11 De ce ați început să utilizați <site-ul de rețea socială, dacă e cazul. Dacă respondentul nu folosește site de rețea socială, atunci site-ul UGC de la Î.7 folosit cel mai frecvent>? Testați să determinați motivațiile cheie pentru care e folosit site-ul.

Î. 12 Pe toată perioada în care ați folosit aceste site-uri, ce informații ați dat pe site/site-uri despre Dvs.?

Lăsați timp respondenților să se gândească și să vă răspundă cu cuvintele lor dar încercați să aflați dacă acestea includ: nume, adresa de acasă, fotografii personale, fotografii cu familia și prietenii, înregistrări audio-video, informații medicale, hobby-uri, sporturi, locuri unde au fost, gusturi și opinii etc.

Î.13 Cine poate vedea profilul și/sau fotografiile Dvs?

Testați Î.15 De ce ați stabilit astfel setările?

Î.14 Ați regretat vreodată postarea unor informații pe unul dintre aceste site-uri?

Dacă da: Q.15 Puteți să-mi spuneți ceva mai multe despre asta.....ce s-a întâmplat? De ce ați regretat postarea?

Dacă respondentul nu menționează info comerciale & efecte negative, puneți și întrebările 16.1 și 16.2

Dacă nu: Î.16 Vă puteți imagina o situație în care ați putea regreta?

Încercați să determinați dacă lipsa de preocupare a respondentului legată de propriile postări se datorează faptului că:

- i. postează puține informații, sau*
- ii. se gândește atent înainte de a posta, sau*
- iii. se gândește că nu e o problemă dacă toată lumea are acces la informațiile despre el/ea*

Dacă răspunde NU la i și ii atunci întrebați:

16.1 Primiți informații comerciale care credeți că sunt rezultatul informațiilor personale pe care le-ați postat? Dacă da, ce părere aveți despre asta?

Încercați să determinați exact:

- 4. dacă respondenții sunt conștienți de consecințele punerii informațiilor online*
- 5. de ce unele sunt mai acceptabile ca altele*
- 6. dacă oamenii acceptă faptul că informațiile comerciale sunt parte din pactul comercial al folosirii site-ului*

16.2 Ce credeți că se poate întâmpla (de exemplu cu privire la selectarea locurilor de muncă, reputație) ca rezultat al informațiilor pe care le-ați postat? Cum credeți că s-ar întâmpla?

Încercați să determinați exact ce cred respondenții despre alte persoane care le folosesc informații postate pe site-uri UGC. Folosiți un ton neutru pentru a obține atât reacții pozitive cât și negative.

Durată Totală: 42 min

**TOȚI
RESPONDENȚII**

**Folosirea numelor
false/porecle**
[aprox. 2 min]

- explorați
atitudinile privind
dezvăluirea
informațiilor
personale în
diferite situații

Dacă nu s-a stabilit până în acest punct

Î.17 Ați folosit vreodată un nume fals sau o poreclă când ați pus informații online? În ce caz/uri și de ce? Sau, dacă n-ați făcut-o, ce credeți despre asta?

Cercetați mai în detaliu.

Durată Totală: 44 min

**TOȚI
RESPONDENȚII**

**Atitudini privind
folosirea
informațiilor
personale pe site-
uri web**
[aprox 8 min]

Arătați fișa B

Î.18 Informațiile pe care utilizatorii le includ în contul sau profilul lor pe un site pot fi folosite de către deținătorii site-ului pentru mai multe scopuri, cum ar fi personalizarea conținutului și a reclamelor pe care le văd utilizatorii, trimiterea de emailuri acestora, colectarea de informații personale aprofundate despre aceștia etc. Ați știut acest lucru când v-ați înregistrat pe un site web (sau UGC/rețea socială)? Ce credeți despre asta?

Notați dacă respondentul cunoaște scopurile și încercați să determinați care este atitudinea pe care trebuie s-o adoptați pentru a folosi informațiile utilizatorului cu privire la următoarele:

Arătați fișa B:

- *personalizarea reclamelor pe care le vedeți (se arată doar reclamele pentru lucruri/servicii care v-ar putea interesa)*
- *distribuirea informațiilor (care ar putea fi legate de numele Dvs.) legate de comportamentul Dvs., către alte secțiuni ale companiei*
- *vânzarea informațiilor (ne-legate de numele Dvs.) despre comportamentul Dvs., către alte companii*

În acest scop încercați să aflați care este motivul din spatele faptului

	<p><i>că respondentul consideră utilizarea acceptabilă/inacceptabilă.</i></p> <p><i>Dacă nu a fost deja menționat, pentru fiecare scop pe care respondenții îl consideră inacceptabil, întrebați:</i></p> <p>Î.19 În ce condiții, dacă e cazul, ați considera ca acceptabil ca utilizatorii să dea informații personale pentru a fi folosite de un site pentru < scopul pe care respondentul în consideră inacceptabil >?</p> <p><i>Încercați să determinați dacă respondentul ar accepta un bilet la jocuri de noroc/loterie, puncte pe site cum ar fi punctele Facebook, o parte din profitul site-ului, bani.</i></p> <p><i>Durată Totală: 52 min</i></p>
<p>TOȚI RESPONDENȚII</p> <p>Atitudini și comportament legate de politicile cu privire la viața privată</p> <p>[aprox. 4 min]</p>	<p>Î.20 Ce părere aveți despre politicile legate de viața privată ale site-urilor UGC/rețelelor sociale pe care le folosiți? Le-ați citit înainte de a vă înscrie? (alegeți unul ca exemplu. Dacă răspunsul e nu la Î.7, atunci orice alt site folosit frecvent)</p> <p>Dacă da – ce ați căuta? Dacă nu găsiți ce căutați, ce faceți?</p> <p><i>Încercați să determinați:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>dacă oamenii citesc cu adevărat politicile legate de viața privată;</i> - <i>ce caută (prezența/absența unei anumite caracteristici/ garanții) atunci când citesc politicile legate de viața privată?; și</i> - <i>ce fac dacă ceea ce caută nu se găsește în politicile legate de viața privată? (continuă să folosească totuși site-ul? Nu încep/încetează să-l folosească?)</i> <p><i>Durată Totală: 56 min</i></p>
<p>TOȚI RESPONDENȚII</p> <p>Mulțumiți & încheiați</p>	<p>Eu atât am avut, dacă doriți să adăugați ceva?</p> <p><i>Acordați stimulente dacă e cazul.</i></p> <p><i>Dați informații în legătură cu următoarele etape și mai multe informații despre proiectul CONSENT dacă doresc respondenții</i></p> <p>Mulțumesc foarte mult pentru contribuția Dvs. valoroasă la proiectul nostru!</p> <p><i>Total: 60 min</i></p>

B. Pre-Analysis Template

Interview Country: _____ Interviewer (name): _____
Date: _____ Interview number: _____

Interviewee age: _____ Gender: Female Location: urban / suburban
 Male rural

SNS/UGC usage: SNS/UGC user
 UGC (non-SNS) user
 SNS/UGC non-user

Description of interview situation / overall impression:

Here, the idea of such general description is to provide a sense of how the interview went, and a general feeling of how the interviewee behaved during the interview. The interviewer (and/or the person transcribing the interview / filling out the template) is encouraged to reflect upon the general tone (e.g. relaxed, stiff), emotional expression (e.g. enthusiastic, reserved, interested, keen) and language use (e.g. formal/informal, precise, casual choice of words) of/by the interviewee as well as any specific content that is considered particularly important, e.g. highlighting contradictory statements, shifting perspectives and perceived ambivalences. Any quotes are particularly welcome!

A. Word Associations (Q1)

	Word Associations <i>(Please use single words or short phrases)</i>
Honesty	
Internet	
Work	
Family	
Privacy	

B. General Attitudes and Behaviour towards Disclosure of Personal Information

Willingness to give the following information:

To "Strangers"	Yes	No	Other <i>(please specify)</i>	Reasons
Marital Status (Q1.1)				
Income (Q1.2)				
ID Number (Q1.3)				

To Friends	Yes	No	Other <i>(please specify)</i>	Reasons
Marital Status (Q1.4)				
Income (Q1.4)				
ID Number (Q1.4)				

Additional Quotes:

C. Years of Internet **Usage (Q2):**

D. General Internet-related Attitudes

Positive Aspects of the Internet (“love most”) (Q3)	e.g. broadness of information, entertainment, worldwide networking, source of inspiration
Negative Aspects of the Internet (“dislike most”) (Q4)	e.g. misleading information, meaningless chatting, source of distraction, peer pressure to use SNS websites

Additional Quotes:

E. Commercial “Trade-Off’s” (Q5, Q5.i)

Information the interviewee would be willing to provide for a large discount on online purchases or services:

	Yes	No	Reasons
Phone Number			
Home Address			
Date of Birth			
Annual Income			
Marital Status			
Number of Kids			
Age of Kids			
ID / Passport Number			
Email address of partner/spouse			
Life Insurance Status			
Home Insurance Status			
Other			

Additional Quotes:

F. Everyday Internet Routines (Q6, Q7)

Frequency per day/week of

	Frequency	Potential Impact on lifestyle, habits, social relationships
Checking Emails		
Using Search Engines		
Using SNS websites (<i>which?</i>)		
Using other UGC websites (<i>which?</i>)		
Checking News		
Other (<i>please specify</i>)		

Additional Quotes:

G. SNS/UGC-related Perceptions, Attitudes and Behaviour

G.1 Interviewee holding / not holding accounts with one or more of the following sites (Q7, Q8, and Q11):

	Yes	No	Reasons for closing / not using the account anymore	Reasons for starting to use the account (Q11)
SNS websites (<i>e.g. Facebook, local SNS websites</i>)				
Business networking websites (<i>e.g. LinkedIn</i>)				
Dating websites (<i>e.g. parship.com</i>)				
Photo/video sharing websites (<i>e.g. Flickr,</i>				

YouTube)				
Websites providing reviews (e.g. tripadvisor)				
Micro blogging sites (e.g. Twitter)				
Wiki sites (e.g. Wikipedia)				
Multiplayer online games (e.g. World of Warcraft)				

Additional Quotes:

G.2 Likelihood of SNS/UGC non-users to open an Account in the future (Q9)

	Likely	Not so likely	Reasons
SNS websites (e.g. Facebook, local SNS websites)			
Business networking websites (e.g. LinkedIn)			
Dating websites (e.g. parship.com)			
Photo/video sharing websites (e.g. Flickr, YouTube)			
Websites providing reviews (e.g. tripadvisor)			
Micro blogging sites (e.g. Twitter)			
Wiki sites (e.g. Wikipedia)			

Multiplayer online games <i>e.g. World of Warcraft</i>			

Additional Quotes:

G.3 Specific Privacy Concerns of SNS/UGC non-users (Q10)

Please quote the interviewees response to question 10; if she/he doesn't have any concerns regarding privacy in the context of opening/not opening or closing any SNS/UGC account, please indicate the reasons why (if given by the interviewee).

G.4 Personal Information Disclosure on UGC websites (Q12, Q13)

Name / Type of website		Type of information disclosed	Reasons for disclosure	Disclosure Strategies <i>(e.g. leaving questions blank, looking for similar websites that require less information)</i>
		Name		
		Home address		
		Photos of the interviewee		
		Photos of the interviewee's family & friends		
		Audio-video recordings		
		Medical information		
		Hobbies		
		Sports		
		Places where the interviewee has been		
		Tastes and opinions		
		Other		

Additional Quotes:

G.5 Privacy Settings (Q13)

Name / type of website	Form of setting <i>(e.g. stricter, less strict, limiting who can see personal information, (de-)activating newsletters / commercial offers, further usage of personal information provided)</i>	Motivation for this form of privacy setting
<i>(add lines if required)</i>		

Specific Quotes:

G.6 Consequences of Disclosing Personal Information (Q14, Q15, Q16, Q16.2)

	Situation where the disclosure of information was regretted	Consequences
Actual (own) experience		
Experiences of <u>others</u>		
Imagining <u>future</u> situations		

Specific Quotes:

G.6.1 Commercial Offers as a result of disclosing personal information (Q16.1)

Receiving commercial offers as a result of having disclosed personal information is	Reasons / Conditions	
Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Acceptable under conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Specific Quotes:

G.7 Using an alias or a nickname (Q17)

		Reasons for/against using an alias or nickname
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Specific Quotes:

G.8 Interviewee’s Awareness of website owners using personal information for a number of purposes (Q18, Q19)

	Awareness		How did the interviewee learn about this	Attitude	Reaction / Resulting Behaviour
Customising the content and advertising users see	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Passing on personal information to third parties without permission	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Sending unwanted emails / newsletter	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Selling personal information to other companies	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Gather in-depth information about users	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				

Specific Quotes:

G.9 Privacy Policies (Q20)

G.9.1 Reading privacy policies

Reading privacy policies before signing up		Reasons
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly yes	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly not	

G.9.2 Content of privacy policies

Beliefs about privacy policies ("What do you think about privacy policies")	
Content expected to find ("What do you look for")	
Action taken if not found	
Other comments	

Specific Quotes:
