



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

Noellie Brockdorff¹, Sandra Appleby-Arnold¹, Bogdan Manolea², Ioana VasIU³,
Radim Polčak⁴

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

⁴ Institute of Law and Technology, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

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	9
3.1. General Online Attitudes	9
3.2. Information Disclosure – “Offline” and Online	10
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	16
4. Conclusion: <i>Don't use – don't care?</i>	17
Acknowledgements	18
Appendices	19
A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)	19
A.2 Interview Guidelines (Czech)	27
B. Pre-Analysis Template	35

1. Key Findings

This document presents the Czech 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 respondents' attitudes and their different gender or age, confirming the result from the quantitative study carried out in CONSENT work package 7.

Generally, privacy as a reason for (non-)disclosure of personal and private information online 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. At the same time, being engaged in UGC usage was not combined with a greater willingness to disclose information for commercial trade-offs, and being open to commercial trade-offs was not linked to a more “generous” disclosure of personal and private information.

Regarding general UGC usage, online social networking – in particular with friends living far away – appeared to play an important role for the Czech interviewees, but only one of them used SNS as a platform combining social networking with other UGC services on a frequent and daily basis, whereas most other respondents were rather low-frequency SNS and more passive UGC (non-SNS) users.

Most Czech respondents were not aware of the various practices of website owners before, and only a minority had become aware after, opening an UGC account. Regarding different acceptance levels, the customisation of content was mostly accepted as either “a normal trend”, or as a controllable practice through disclosing only limited personal or private information. Websites owners passing on user information to others was accepted by the majority of respondents under the condition that prior consent would be sought and by, again, following a “careful” disclosure strategy – or by choosing to ignore this website owners' practice. Receiving commercial offers as a consequence of having disclosed personal or private information online was predominantly accepted by linking this acceptance to the interviewees' perceived ability of using technical measures to keep control over unwanted commercial offers. Finally, selling user information to other companies was also accepted by the majority of respondents stating that, under the condition that the information sold was not linked to the user's name, they “don't mind” or “don't care”.

Generally, it appeared that these Czech interviewees had (as yet) little experience of loss of control in the context of website owners' usage of their personal or private information, and their statements did not reflect the perceived “helplessness” found in other countries , but

rather an attitude of avoiding the issue – which may, however, also be linked to their predominantly low-frequency UGC usage.

The latter may also be one of the reasons why the interviewees' answers did not reveal any particular disclosure strategies – except for the aforementioned disclosing of little information. Additionally, some of them revealed a distinct disinterest in protective measures, stating for example that they didn't know or didn't remember their privacy settings. Although the majority of interviewees had set privacy settings to a more restrictive level (“friends only”) – with the primary intention to protect the photos they were sharing – it appeared that there was little known about the possibilities, and limitations, of these settings.

Furthermore, the majority of interviewees indicated that they mostly did not read privacy policies, predominantly due to disinterest which may, again, be rooted in these interviewees' low frequency of – and, thus, experience in – UGC usage. There were also very few signs of mistrust – neither towards the website providers nor towards policy makers, and even very little towards other users. Generally it appeared that the (assumed) content of privacy policies was perceived to be of little relevance to them.

To summarise, the majority of Czech respondents were either unaware of potential risks, or perceived themselves as being in control of the, limited, personal or private information they were sharing online, and revealed, to a large extent, an avoidance of increasing their knowledge about website owners' practices and corresponding regulations. They neither expressed a desire to be (or become more) protected by a more rigid legal framework, nor did they themselves actively take protective measures apart from, partially, using some of the more established technical devices (i.e. pop-up window blockers, spam filters, anti-virus software).

However, these observations are probably not linked to an endemic indifference – a “don't know-don't care” mentality. Rather there may be a basic (mis-)perception of online privacy itself as a contained space which can be entered occasionally and left again without traces – a room with well-defined and/or self-defined borders that can be controlled by the “owner” of the room. As rare visitors, such low-frequency UGC users may appear indifferent but, actually, they could be a very vulnerable group of users, because due to their indifference and perceived self-assurance they may also be the most difficult to address.

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 the Czech Republic. Other separate reports are available for Bulgaria, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, 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 of 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 the Czech Republic is based on ten interviews with a demographic distribution which – with the exception of only one UGC (non-SNS) user and one UGC non-user being available and a slight prevalence of male respondents – complies with the required quota:

Interviewee No.	Gender	Age	Age category	Location category	UGC usage
I-1	Male	22	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-2	Male	21	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-3	Male	22	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-4	Female	33	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC non-user
I-5	Male	31	25-34	Rural	UGC user
I-6	Female	27	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-7	Female	35	35-44	Rural	UGC user
I-8	Male	39	35-44	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-9	Male	65	45+	Urban/Suburban	UGC (non-SNS) user
I-10	Female	65	45+	Urban/Suburban	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 21 years old, and the age group of 45+ is only represented by two 65 years old respondents. However, in the other age categories a comparably even split was achieved.

Most of the interviews (seven) were conducted in the interviewees' private home, the other three took place in locations of the respective interviewee's choice (university, office, and cafe). The majority of interviewees were also described as feeling comfortable, but five appeared to be – at least initially – not very keen to talk about privacy matters. Of the remaining five, three were described as interested, familiar with the subject and well informed; for two interviewees there was no information available regarding their general behaviour within the interview situation. Four out of eight UGC users described themselves as “not typical users” (I-3, I-6, I-8, I-10) due to a – in their self-perception – low frequency of SNS usage.

All interviewees (with the exception of I-6 and I-7 who indicated 7/9 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	22	10	12	UGC user
I-2	21	7	14	UGC user
I-3	22	10	12	UGC user
I-4	33	10	23	UGC non-user
I-5	31	10	21	UGC user
I-6	27	7	20	UGC user
I-7	35	9	26	UGC user
I-8	39	12	27	UGC user
I-9	65	15	50	UGC (non-SNS) user

I-10	65	10	55	UGC user
------	----	----	----	----------

3. Results

3.1 General Online Attitudes

Of those eight interviewees who are SNS users, only one declared that he perceived a certain peer pressure to join a social networking site (Facebook), opening an account in order “*not to be isolated*” (I-1, UGC user). Another respondent (I-7, UGC user) indicated a “soft” form of family pressure, as a sister opened an account for her. The main reason given for opening a SNS account (by five users), however, was either to stay connected with friends and family back home when studying or working abroad, to maintain contact with people met abroad after returning home, or, generally, keeping in touch with friends that live far away: “*to keep track of their lives*”. Here, online social networking was described as something required to satisfy intrinsic needs within friends’ relationships. Other motivators were the availability of “*information about various events*” (I-1, UGC user), the ease of organising events via SNS, or to share photos – the latter also being the main reason for one of the two SNS non-users to potentially open an account in the future.

It appears, though, that only one respondent (I-1, UGC user) was using SNS as a platform, combining social networking with other UGC functions, and only two respondents (I-1/I-6) reported that they used SNS on a frequent and daily basis – at the same time, it was only these two respondents who perceived a more “intimate” relationship with the internet as “*part of our lives*” (I-1, UGC user), and who associated the “distraction” available with a certain playfulness (I-6, UGC user).

All others described their SNS usage as “*not really often*” (I-2, UGC user) and from 1-2 hours per week to only once or twice per month, perceiving themselves as “untypical” SNS users who, primarily, appreciated the internet as an easy-access source of information and “*a great helper*” (I-2, UGC user) which also makes online shopping and online contact with public authorities and institutions possible. Whilst most respondents agreed about their general dislikes – too much information, a “*waste of time*” (I-1/I-10, UGC users), automatic downloads, spam, viruses, unwanted commercials – two users also outlined a loss of privacy “*when data about various connections are retained*” (I-5, UGC user), and that the “*internet disturbs our privacy a bit*” (I-3, UGC user). These comments, however, were given in the general context of internet likes and dislikes – *not* in the specific context of UGC website usage.

Finally, one respondent outlined his attitude towards a specific consequence of online communication he perceived as particularly negative. Whilst he did appreciate the possibility to exchange different opinions through online social networking, he criticised that “*people can communicate with those that have the same opinions and ideas, so they confirm their opinion*” (I-8, UGC user). Here, a function of online social media is described that highlights their “dark side” – allowing opinionated users to easily find others with similar attitudes to share, distribute and reinforce their bias on a larger scale.

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 Czech respondents would disclose it to a stranger. Being asked for their marital status was mostly (8 respondents) considered as something that is “*natural to tell*” (I-1, UGC user) and there was “*no reason to conceal it*” (I-10, UGC user), provided the person was likeable (I-1/I-8, UGC users). But it could also be perceived as “*private information*” (I-4, UGC non-user) or something “*intimate*” (I-6, UGC user) respondents would not disclose, a possible strategy being to propose a different topic of conversation (I-6, UGC user). Another respondent explained that she would answer and give the information due to a perceived need to be polite and, at the same time, not wanting “*to make anything up*” (I-7, UGC user). Here, it appears that asking for and disclosing one’s marital status, whilst generally meeting some form of social acceptance, does carry traces of discomfort, but they are mostly superseded by politeness as a norm.

In contrary, respondents predominantly indicated that they would not reveal their income to a stranger – either due to it being perceived as “*private information*” (I-3/I-7/I-8, UGC users; I-4 UGC non-user), as “*unimaginable*” (I-6, UGC user) and clearly violating a social norm, or at least as “*not polite*” to ask such question (I-10, UGC user). Strategies to re-establish the violated norm were described by revealing the information “*not precisely*” (I-1), or counter-asking and then, if an answer was given, indicating that one would have “*a similar income*” (I-5, UGC user).

Finally, perceptions towards the disclosure of ID card numbers were rather homogeneous: As “*private information*” (I-7, UGC user), being asked for it by a stranger was considered as a suspicious request – “*it doesn’t seem to me as a normal behaviour*” (I-1, UGC user) – that would bear the risk of misuse (I-5/I-6/I-10, UGC user) or even personal “*danger*” (I-10, UGC user). Such question would raise, following some of the Czech respondents, even some abrupt response: “*I would tell him he [the stranger] was mad*” (I-8, UGC user), or, only half-jokingly, “*I would call the captain to throw him out with a parachute*” (I-9, non-SNS user).

Even being asked by a friend for one’s ID card number was still mostly perceived as not acceptable and raising feelings of discomfort, although some respondents imagined a

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.

situation that, due to friendship being based on mutual trust, there may be a reason to ask (I-4, UGC non-user). Regarding the disclosure of their income towards friends, responses were increasingly heterogeneous. Again, answering was perceived as a “*matter of trust*” (I-2, UGC user), but potentially still too “*intimate*” (I-6, UGC user) and being a “*private thing*” (I-7, UGC user). Another respondent stated: “*I would tell him I earn enough to be happy*” (I-8, UGC user). Interestingly, it appears that the assumption is made that a friend’s intention for asking would be “*happiness*”, not monetary information – or transmitting the underlying message that this should be an asking friend’s intention, establishing as such, again, the perceived social norm.

However, revealing their marital status to friends was seen by all respondents as something being subject to reciprocity and mutual trust within friendships. Perceiving the marital status as something “*very private*” (I-2, UGC user) was, here, given as a reason *for* – not against – disclosing it to friends, constructing friendship as a sphere where not only private information is disclosed but, actually, privacy itself is shared.

Regarding the question what information would be disclosed online in the context of commercial trade-offs⁴, the interviewees’ responses showed wide variations – with some interesting differences compared to the attitudes previously revealed in the case of offline information disclosure towards strangers (marital status, income, ID card number). Whereas most interviewees would reveal, as mentioned above, their marital status to a stranger in an offline situation, only half of them would be willing to reveal it online against commercial trade-offs. On the other side, regarding annual income and ID card number the interviewees’ attitudes (i.e. non-disclosure) were comparably similar. Additionally, there was much hesitation to disclose a partner’s email address or any form of insurance data. Phone number, address, birth date, number and age of kids were considered by half of the respondents as too private or too personal. For those who would disclose particularly their phone number or address, it was perceived as some form of “*public information [...] you can find easily anyway*” (I-7, UGC user).

Thus, 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 annual income),
- (b) the information was perceived as “*personal*”, its disclosure being linked to the perceived risk of fraud (particularly the 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 (like home and life insurance data).

Another main difference observed in comparison with information disclosure offline was the interviewees’ described strategy to give fake information. Whereas even towards strangers giving fake information was not considered as an alternative reaction, in being asked online

⁴ For commercial trade-offs, 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.

against a commercial trade-off it was considered by some as a viable option, because “*it cannot be verified*” (I-7, UGC user).

Regarding the disclosure of personal and private data specifically on UGC websites, disclosing one’s name and sharing pictures of oneself was the most coherent practice amongst all interviewees; only a minority indicated that they disclosed any further information. However, there was no information given regarding their reasons for disclosure or non-disclosure. As the majority of interviewed UGC users described themselves as not very active, the reason here may, therefore, be the limited level of usage rather than a particular disclosure strategy.⁵

Finally, being engaged in UGC usage did not necessarily go together with a greater willingness to disclose information for commercial trade-offs, and being open to commercial trade-offs was not visibly linked to a more “generous” disclosure of personal and private information on UGC sites.

⁵ For a more detailed analysis regarding disclosure strategies see chapter 3.3.2 *How Privacy matters: Protective Measures*.

3.3 Privacy Matters

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

Only three Czech interviewees (two UGC users and one UGC (non-SNS) user) 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, and only two further respondents became aware of this after opening the account⁶. All other respondent UGC users were, at the time of the interview, not aware of these (or other) website owners' practices.

Acceptance levels – and the underlying motivation for acceptance – differed depending on the respective practice. In contrast to the low awareness levels, the customising of content was accepted, or accepted under the condition of previous consent, by the majority (eight) of respondents. They either perceived it as a *“normal trend in our society”* where *“one can't do much about it in case one needs to use the website”* (I-7, UGC user), or they accepted it not as an acceptable but as a controllable practice – simply by disclosing *“the minimum”* (I-9, UGC (non-SNS) user). However, there appeared to exist some misunderstanding of what the practice of customising content, actually, means, as some interviewees considered it as acceptable because they could either *“block”* it (I-1, UGC user) or *“opt-in/opt-out”* (I-3, UGC user) – mistakenly perceiving the customisation with direct advertising (like receiving newsletters or commercial emails).

Regarding the website owners' practice of passing on personal information without the user's permission, acceptance levels were lower than for other practices. Those who still accepted it (six interviewees) would do so only under the condition of having given consent. They perceived it, as described before, as acceptable due to their *“careful”* disclosure strategy – *“it would be better if [sharing information] didn't exist but I take it into consideration”* (I-1, UGC user) – or they chose to *“ignore”* it (I-2, UGC user), revealing a strategy of intentional non-knowledge: *“I don't find it [sharing anonymised information] so terrible. But it is not so pleasant when you know it”* (I-5, UGC user). Additionally, one respondent *“would accept it if the counter value made sense”* to him (I-8, UGC user).

This condition of receiving some form of (economic) reward in return for giving away personal or private information was, to a certain extent, reflected by other respondents who understood the receiving of commercial offers as a *“principle”* (I-7, UGC user) of the commercial trade-off against free services: *“I am not averse to it because the providers must earn money somehow”* (I-1, UGC user). However, these respondents' acceptance was, again, directly linked to their perceived ability of using technical measures (pop-up blockers, spam filters etc.) to control the reception of unwanted commercial offers. Otherwise, as one respondent put it – *“it would make me angry”* (I-8, UGC user).

Finally, selling personal and private information to other companies⁷ was also accepted by the majority of respondents under the condition that the information sold was not linked to

⁶ There was no information given how these respondents (I-1/I-7, UGC users) became aware – e.g. through regular usage, noticing changes, reading in the media etc.

⁷ There was no information given regarding awareness and acceptance levels towards the practice of gathering in-depth information of UGC users.

the user's name (I-1/I-7/I-10, UGC users). Additionally, they stated that *"if you put information on the internet you have to expect it"* (I-4, UGC non-user), that they *"don't mind"* (I-7/I-8/I-10, UGC users) – or even *"don't care"* (I-2, UGC user).

Generally, it appeared that these Czech interviewees had little experience, as yet, of loss of control in the context of website owners' usage of their personal or private information. At the same time, the interviewees' statements did not reflect resignation or frustration but rather an attitude of avoiding the issue – which may, of course, also be linked to their aforementioned predominantly low UGC usage.

3.3.2 How Privacy matters: Protective Measures

The low-frequency UGC usage amongst these participants may also be one of the reasons why the interviewees' answers did not reveal any distinct disclosure strategies.⁸ It may be questioned, though, whether they were actually "atypical users", or whether their responses reflected the perceptions, attitudes and practices of "typical" low-frequency users.

Only one respondent (who also uses UGC on a more frequent basis) expressed a certain reflectivity towards his own decision-making process:

"I really think it through before I give information online, and why I give it online [...] I wouldn't give anything online when I want to be one hundred percent sure that the information won't get to the public. One must be aware of leaking when disclosing information online" (I-1, UGC user).

However, the main disclosure "strategy" outlined by the Czech (low-frequency) users was to generally disclose very little: *"I don't think about disclosing information – I don't disclose the information at all"* (I-2, UGC user). Others stated that they didn't even know what personal or private information about themselves they had disclosed – *"To be honest, I don't know what strangers can see when they open my account"* (I-6, UGC user) – revealing a certain disinterest which may derive from the disinterest in UGC usage, but appeared to result also in a disinterest in protective measures themselves.

Consequently, five respondents declared that they were using a nickname, but only two of them considered this as a protective measure – the others explained that *"many people know me under the nickname"*, that they used a nickname because *"everybody does it"* (I-5, UGC user), because it was *"quicker than to write a whole name"* (I-7, UGC user), or they didn't remember whether they had ever used nicknames at all. Those who indicated that they didn't use nicknames gave no clear reasoning for this non-usage, except for a vague impression that they didn't require it as a form of protection.

Similarly, three of the 9 respondent UGC users stated that they didn't know – or didn't remember – their privacy settings, one of them admitting that she *"cannot use it [Facebook] properly"* (I-10, UGC user). The other six users had changed their settings to a more

⁸ Such as e.g. leaving parts blank, using fake or altered data, or look for similar websites where less information (or no registration altogether) was required.

restrictive level – to “friends only” – with the primary intention to protect the photos they were sharing. However, with only one exception none of them considered (or was aware of) the setting “friends but not friends of friends”. Additionally, none of the respondents described any form of “dynamic” handling of privacy settings, 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 – for dividing between public and private online activities. In general, it appeared that there was little known about the possibilities – and limitations – of these settings.

3.3.3 Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies

Only four out of the nine interviewed UGC users (and one UGC non-user⁹) claimed that they mostly read privacy policies. The reasons given for not reading can, generally, be divided into three categories: Most of the (non-reading) interviewees indicated that they didn't see a need to read privacy policies as they *"do not place anything which could be misused"* (I-2, UGC user), one thereof stating additionally as a reason that *"I didn't read them before [registration] because I know it [information processing] is not regulated enough"* (I-7, UGC user) – revealing as such a certain level of mistrust in the actual enforceability of these policies. Another (non-reading) respondent, however, gave as a reason that *"I trust the providers of the websites"* (I-3, UGC user), and one claimed that *"I don't know where to click to see them"* (I-6, UGC user). None outlined any of the "technical" difficulties non-readers usually refer to, such as privacy policies being too long, written in too small letters, and/or containing too many legal terms.

Also those interviewees who claimed that they mostly do read privacy policies didn't refer to any such difficulties. Mostly just skimming through them, only two indicated a certain risk awareness, reading *"when I know I would place sensitive information"* (I-5, UGC user) and *"to know whether there is not anything dangerous to me"* (I-9, UGC (non-SNS) user). Otherwise, the motivation for reading was not a special concern and/or an expectation of taking corresponding action, but rather a media-induced curiosity: *"I read some articles about the privacy policies and I was just curious what they look like"* (I-1, UGC user).

Similarly, most respondents didn't hold any specific beliefs about or expected a certain policy content, and only one stated that he *"would make arrangements according to what I would find"* (I-9, UGC (non-SNS) user), without specifying, however, what exact action would be taken.

The extensive inertia revealed here may, again, be rooted in these interviewees' low frequency of – and, thus, experience in – UGC usage. However, it contradicts the earlier indication that most of them were actually experienced internet users. There were also very few signs of mistrust – neither towards the website providers nor towards policy makers, and even very little towards other users. Rather, it appeared that low-frequency UGC usage comes alongside a certain self assurance that a usage which is limited itself (mostly to the occasional photo sharing) would limit the risk of information misuse. Generally, privacy policies seemed to widely meet disinterest, as most of the interviewed UGC users did not perceive their (assumed) content to be of any relevance to them.

⁹ This UGC non-user (I-4) claimed that she mostly reads privacy policies, but didn't reveal any specific expectations regarding the content to be found except for general *"information related to the usage of information"* (I-4, UGC non-user), and didn't know what action to take if such information wasn't found.

4. Conclusion: Don't use – don't care?

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, partially, a social norm, the respondents' associations with privacy were substantially different. Rather than being ascribed a normative character, it appeared in these descriptions as something that was highly evaluated, and strongly linked to spatial definitions – to “comfort zones”: “home”, “family”, “surroundings”, “a room of one's own”, where one finds “protection”, “safety”, and “rest”. These associations underlined the main idea of a more self-contained, static and space/ownership-related concept, rather than a dynamic practice which is constantly changing and undergoing (re-)negotiations.

It also appeared that the majority interviewees were either unaware of potential risks, or perceived themselves as being in control of the – limited – personal or private information they were sharing online, and revealed, to a large extent, an intentional avoidance of increasing their knowledge about website owners' practices and corresponding regulations. They neither expressed a desire to be (or become more) protected by a more rigid legal framework, nor did they themselves actively take protective measures apart from, partially, using some of the more established technical devices (i.e. pop-up window blockers, spam filters, anti-virus software). Only one of the (older) UGC users expressed a vague feeling of discomfort regarding future risks: *“Nowadays more and more people know how to misuse these things, and mostly they are ahead of security systems”* (I-10, UGC user) – a discomfort, though, that was primarily related to the potential information misuse by other users.

However, these observations are probably not linked to an endemic indifference – a “don't know-don't care” mentality – but rather to a basic (mis-)perception of online privacy itself: as a contained space which can be entered occasionally and left again without traces – a room with well-defined and/or self-defined borders that can be controlled by the “owner” of the room. As rare visitors, such low-frequency UGC users may appear indifferent but, actually, they could be a very vulnerable group of users, because – due to their indifference and perceived self assurance – they may also be the most difficult to address.

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thank you - Your name - Purpose - Confidentiality - Duration - How interview will be conducted - Signature of consent on consent form 	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - establish top of 	<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 your 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, fashion items) to its members.

<p>y trade-off</p> <p>[about 5 min]</p>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>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</i></p> <p><i>For items that respondent is <u>not</u> willing to provide information about to the website probe reason: Q5.i Why not? Or Why wouldn't you give your...</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 26 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Internet usage</p> <p>[about 2 min]</p>	<p>Q.6 Please tell me a little about the internet websites you use in a typical week and what you use them for.</p> <p><i>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).</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 28 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>UGC usage</p> <p>[about 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish whether UGC user or non-user - Establish whether SNS user - Establish UGC site used most frequently - Provides link to findings from online questionnaire <p><i>Show card A</i></p>	<p>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></p> <p><i>Show card A:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

	<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 (Czech)

Pokyny pro tazatele

Záměrem tohoto interview je získat hlubší porozumění osobních názorů, myšlenek, pocitů, zkušeností a chování ve vztahu k soukromí založených na kvantitativních výsledcích z WP7. Je velmi důležité, aby respondenti mluvili tak otevřeně, jak je to jen možné a aby vyjádřili svůj vlastní myšlenkový proud, spíše než aby odpovídali pouze ano/ne na předem připravené otázky nebo na výběr z možností. Problematické pro tazatele vedoucího standardní interview s otevřeným koncem je beze sporu najít rovnováhu mezi otevřeností a kontrolou, stáhnout se do pozadí bez ztráty "červené nitě", s čímž formulace interview počítá.

Plánujte dopředu: Domluvte si s respondentem/kou schůzku na místě, kde se cítí dobře, ale mějte na paměti, že na tomto místě musí být zajištěno dostatečné soukromí, které by dovolovalo vést interview bez přílišného vyrušování. Vyvarujte se pevného časového plánu. Pocit tlaku můžete přenést na respondent/ku.

Seznamte se se zásadami interview: Cvičte si otázky předem, pozorně si přečtete instrukce ke každé otázce (vyznačené kurzívou). Držte se zásad a neměňte pořadí otázek.

Seznamte se s technickým vybavením: Před každým interview vytvořte krátký záznam, abyste se ujisti/a, že nahrávací vybavení funguje bez problému a baterie jsou dostatečně nabitě.

Pokládejte otevřené otázky: Je lákavé pokládat sugestivní otázky (např. Tak vy si myslíte/nemyslíte si, že...?), na které se dá jednoduše odpovědět ano/ne. Těchto zjišťovacích otázek je třeba se co možná nejvíce vyvarovat, jelikož se pokoušíme detailně zjistit to, co si respondent/ka myslí a ne prostě ano/ne. Zkoušejte pokládat přímé otevřené otázky a používejte i jiné techniky jako empatii, přestávky či zrcadlení, které dávají respondentovi/ce dostatek času k přemýšlení.

Budte pozorní: Jelikož je důležité být interaktivní, je během rozhovoru tazatelovým hlavním úkolem poslouchat a sledovat. Je také doporučeno zůstat pozorný a dělat si poznámky i po skončení interview, protože respondenti sdělují často hlavní informaci ihned po vypnutí nahrávacího zařízení.

Úvod	Schůzka
<p>VŠICHNI RESPONDENTI</p> <p>Úvod</p> <p>[cca 5 min.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Děkuji - Vaše jméno - Účel - Důvěrnost - Délka trvání - Jak bude interview vedeno - Stvrzení souhlasu podpisem 	<p>Chtěl/a bych vám poděkovat za to, že jste si dnes udělal/a čas. Jmenuji se ----- a chtěl/a bych s Vámi hovořit o internetu, co se vám na něm líbí, co se vám naopak nelíbí a jak ho používáte.</p> <p>Jak již bylo řečeno, toto interview je realizováno v rámci projektu CONSENT, který je spolufinancován Evropskou komisí. CONSENT má za cíl shromáždit názory uživatelů internetu ze všech zemí EU. Pokud byste měl/a zájem, poskytnu vám po skončení interview o projektu CONSENT více informací.</p> <p>Váš názor je pro naši studii velmi cenný a bude zohledněn při přípravě závěrečné zprávy.</p> <p>Toto interview nebude trvat více než 1 hodinu. Celý rozhovor budu nahrávat, aby mi neunikla žádná vaše připomínka. I když si budu v průběhu rozhovoru dělat poznámky, nemohu psát tak rychle, abych si vše poznamenal/a. Protože bude rozhovor nahráván, mluvte prosím nahlas, aby mi nic neuniklo.</p> <p>Všechny odpovědi budou důvěrné. To znamená, že Vaše odpovědi budou sdíleny pouze s výzkumnými pracovníky a žádná informace, kterou zahrneme do zprávy, vás nebude identifikovat jako dotazovaného. Vaše odpovědi nebudou spojeny s vaším jménem.</p> <p>Přečtěte si prosím tento dokument o udělení souhlasu. Máte k němu nějaké dotazy?</p> <p>Pamatujte na to, že nemusíte mluvit o ničem, o čem nechcete a že můžete toto interview kdykoliv ukončit. Souhlasíte?</p> <p><i>Délka trvání 5 min.</i></p>
Cíle	Otázky
<p>VŠICHNI RESPONDENTI</p> <p>Slovní asociace</p> <p>[cca 3 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Zjistěte základní asociaci se 	<p>Q.1 Na začátek si zahrajeme krátkou hru/ provedeme krátký úkol: Přečtu vám slovo a chtěl/a bych, abyste řekl/a prvních pár slov, které vás napadnou, když uslyšíte toto slovo. Zkusme to napřed na příkladu: Co Vás první napadne, když řeknu slovo “léto”? Ještě něco?</p> <p><i>Poproste respondenta/ku, aby používal/a krátká slovní spojení či slova a aby nepoužíval/a dlouhé popisy a vyjádření.</i></p> <p>Slova: upřímnost, internet, práce, rodina, soukromí</p> <p><i>Délka trvání 8 min.</i></p>

soukromím	
<p>VŠICHNI RESPONDENTI</p> <p>Ochota udat osobní informace v různých situacích [cca 8 min.]</p>	<p>Q.1.1 Teď mluvmе o něčem trochu jiném. Chtěl/a bych, abyste si představil/a, že jste v letadle a osoba vedle vás stejného pohlaví a věku, někdo, koho neznáte, a není pravděpodobné, že byste ho ještě kdy potkal/a, je velmi hovorná. On/ona se rozhovoří o různých věcech a za 15 minut se vás zeptá, zda jste sám/a, zda jste ženatý/vdaná nebo máte partnera. Co jí odpovíte? <i>Nechte respondenta/ku, aby vám bez přerušení odpověděl/a, a ptejte se ho/jí dále proč/proč ne, pouze pokud neuvede žádný důvod.</i></p> <p>Q.1.2 Co když se vás optá na to, kolik vyděláváte? Co uděláte? <i>Nechte respondenta/ku, aby vám bez přerušení odpověděl/a, a ptejte se ho/jí dále proč/proč ne, pouze pokud neuvede žádný důvod.</i></p> <p>Q.1.3 A co kdyby vám řekl/a, že může použít číslo vašeho občanského průkazu k výběru čísla v loterii. On/ona se zeptá na číslo vašeho občanského průkazu. Co uděláte? <i>Nechte respondenta/ku, aby vám bez přerušení odpověděl/a, a ptejte se ho/jí dále proč/proč ne, pouze pokud neuvede žádný důvod.</i></p> <p>Q.1.4 Nyní si představte, že stejné otázky Vám namísto hovorného spolucestujícího bude pokládat kamarád, kterého potkáváte několikrát ročně. Co uděláte? <i>Zjistěte ke každému: zda jste sám/a, zda jste ženatý/vdaná nebo máte partnera, kolik vyděláváte, jaké je číslo vašeho občanského průkazu. Pro každý jednotlivý případ se dotazte, zda by respondent/ka řekl/a pravdu a proč/proč ne.</i> <i>Délka trvání: 16 min.</i></p>
<p>VŠICHNI RESPONDENTI</p> <p>Zkušenosti s internetem a postoje k němu [cca 5 min.]</p>	<p>Q.2 Mluvmе nyní více o internetu. Jak dlouho už používáte internet?</p> <p>Q.3 Co se vám na internetu nejvíce líbí?</p> <p>Q.4 Co se vám na internetu nejvíce nelíbí? <i>Délka trvání: 21 min.</i></p>
<p>VŠICHNI</p>	<p>Představte si, že navštívíte webové stránky nabízející slevy. Např.</p>

<p>RESPONDENTI</p> <p>Základní názory a postoje ke směně reklama/soukromí</p> <p>[cca 5 min.]</p>	<p>Slevomat nabízí svým členům až 50% slevu na různé zboží a služby (např. knihy, cestování, potřeby pro domácnost, módu). Na stránce je v současné době nabídka slevy až 75% pro všechny návštěvníky, kteří poskytnou více informací než pouhé jméno a email. Jaké informace jste ochoten/na poskytnout, abyste dostal/a až 75% slevu?</p> <p><i>Začněte číst ze seznamu: telefonní číslo, adresa bydliště, datum narození, roční příjem, stav, počet dětí, číslo občanského průkazu nebo pasu, emailovou adresu svého partnera/ky či manžela/manželky, životní pojištění, pojištění domácnosti</i></p> <p><i>Ke každé položce, kterou nechce respondent/ka poskytnout, zjistěte důvod: Q5.i Proč ne? nebo Proč byste neposkytl/a své...</i></p> <p><i>Délka trvání: 26 min</i></p>
<p>VŠICHNI RESPONDENTI</p> <p>používání internetu</p> <p>[cca 2 min.]</p>	<p>Q.6 Řekněte mi prosím něco o internetových stránkách, které užíváte v typickém týdnu a k čemu je používáte?</p> <p><i>Zjistěte, zda výše popsané aktivity na internetu (včetně navštěvování UGC a SNS) mají vliv na životní styl, zvyky a společenské vztahy respondentů (na tuto otázku jsou pouze 2 minuty, takže nezacházejte do přílišných detailů)</i></p> <p><i>Délka trvání: 28 min.</i></p>
<p>VŠICHNI RESPONDENTI</p> <p>Používání UGC</p> <p>[cca 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Zjistěte, zda používá UGC nebo ne - Zjistěte, zda používá SNS - Zjistěte UGC stránku, kterou používá nejčastěji - Poskytněte spojení mezi zjištěními z online 	<p>Q.7 Toto je seznam některých stránek. Můžete mi prosím říct, zda máte účet na některé z nich (ne pouze navštěvujete) a pokud máte účet, jak často se přihlašujete? <Poznamenejte si, zda respondent/ka používá sociální síť a pokud ne, kterou UGC stránku navštěvuje respondent/ka nejvíce. ></p> <p><i>Ukažte kartu A:</i></p> <p>A. Sociální síť jako Facebook, Lidé.cz</p> <p>B. Profesionální sociální síť jako LinkedIn, Xing.com, Jobs.cz a Práce.cz</p> <p>C. Seznamky jako libimseti.cz a Seznamka.cz</p> <p>D. Internetové stránky, na kterých můžete sdílet fotky, videa, apd. jako Youtube, flickr, Rajce.net a ZkoukniTo.cz,</p> <p>E. Internetové stránky poskytující doporučení a hodnocení (filmů, hudby, knih, hotelů, apd.) jako last.fm, tripadvisor, Česko-slovenská filmová databáze (csfd.cz) a Znamýlékař.cz,</p> <p>F. Stránky umožňující posílat microblogy jako twitter, teidu.cz a MyDamak.cz</p> <p>G. Wiki stránky jako Wikipedie, myheritage, osobnosti.cz a Celý</p>

<p>dotazníku</p> <p><i>Ukažte kartu A</i></p>	<p>Svět, H. Počítačové hry o více hráčích (Multiplayer online games) jako secondlife.com, World of Warcraft, gamepark.cz a Damakles.cz</p> <p><i>Zjistěte, kolik času je denně/týdně stráveno na sociálních sítích a UGC stránkách (pokud to není zjištěno již v Q6)</i></p> <p><i>Délka trvání: 33 min.</i></p>
<p>RESPONDENTI, KTEŘÍ NEPOUŽÍVAJÍ NEBO JIŽ NEPOUŽÍVAJÍ UGC STRÁNKY Z Q7</p> <p>Důvody pro nepoužívání UGC stránek [cca 3 min.]</p>	<p>Q.8 Proč nemáte účet na jedné z těchto stránek, či proč jste účet zrušil/a nebo proč ho již neužíváte? <i>Zjistěte úplně, ale poznamenejte si první a druhý důvod.</i></p> <p><i>Máme zájem zjistit více o důvodech týkajících se respondentových obav o:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>důsledcích poskytnutí informací online</i> - <i>jakým způsobem jsou informace o nich použity</i> - <i>zda UGC stránky jsou důvěryhodné</i> - <i>jakýkoliv jiný důvod týkající se soukromí</i> <p><i><u>Pokud je jako důvod pro (další) nepoužívání UGC stránek zmíněno soukromí/užití informací/důvěra, zeptejte se:</u></i></p> <p>Q.9 Z jakých důvodů byste si založil/a účet – či nezaložila – na jedné z těchto stránek? <i>Nechte respondenta otevřeně mluvit, ale pak zjistěte, zda cítí respondent tlak na to, aby si otevřel/a stránku.</i></p> <p><i><u>Pokud je jako důvod zmíněno soukromí/užití informací/důvěra, zeptejte se:</u></i></p> <p>Q.10 Zmínil/a jste, že jedním z důvodů (důvodem) proč neužíváte UGC stránku je <cokoliv co respondent/ka řekne o soukromí/užití informací>. Můžete mi říci více o tom, čeho se obáváte?</p> <p><i>Zjistěte detailně,</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. jaký aspekt UGC stránek je pro respondenta/ku nepříjemný a proč,</i> <i>ii. přesvědčení o tom, jak internetové stránky používají informace</i> <i>iii. přesvědčení o smyslu UGC stránek</i> <p><i>Délka trvání: 36 min.</i></p>

**RESPONDENTI,
KTERÍ POUŽÍVAJÍ
UGC STRÁNKY Z
Q7**

**UGC stránky –
motivace a použití
[cca 6 min.]**

Zjistěte:

- motivace k používání UGC
- ochota sdílet informace
- přesvědčení a postoje k různým druhům informací
- motivace k nastavení toho, kdo informace uvidí

Q.11 Proč jste začal/a používat <Sociální síť, pokud je používána. Jestliže respondent/ka nepoužívá sociální síť, pak nejčastěji používanou UGC stránku z Q.7>? Určete základní motivaci pro používání stránky.

Q.12 Jaké informace o své osobě jste vložil/a na tyto stránky po dobu, co je používáte?

Nechte respondenty v klidu odpovědět jejich vlastními slovy, ale pak zkuste: jméno, adresu bydliště, své vlastní fotografie, fotografie rodiny a přátel, audio-video nahrávky, zdravotní informace, koníčky, sporty, místa, kde, která navštívil/a, vkus a názory, atd.

Q.13 Kdo může vidět váš profil a/nebo vaše fotografie?

Zjistěte Q.15 Proč jste si svůj profil takto nastavil/a?

Q.14 Litoval/a jste někdy toho, že jste některé informace vložil/a na některou z těchto stránek?

Pokud ano: Q.15 Může mi říci více o tom ... co se stalo? Proč tohoto vložení litujete?

Pokud respondent/ka nezmíní reklamu a negativní důsledky, pak položte otázku 16.1 a 16.2

Pokud ne: Q.16 Mohl/a byste si představit situaci, kdy byste toho litovala?

Zkuste určit, zda má absence obav respondenta/ky příčinu v tom, že

- i. respondent/ka vkládá málo informací*
- ii. vždy pečlivě promýšlí před tím, než informace vloží*
- iii. nevidí problém v tom, že mají všichni přístup k informacím o nich samých*

Pokud důvodem NENÍ i. a ii., zeptejte se:

16.1 Dostáváte reklamu, o které si myslíte, že je zobrazována na podkladě osobních informací, které jste vložil/a?

Pokud ano, co si o tom myslíte?

Zkuste přesně určit:

- i. zda si je respondent/ka vědom/a důsledků zveřejnění informací online*
- ii. proč jsou některé akceptovatelnější než jiné*

iii. přijímají lidé to, že reklama je součástí obchodní směny za užívání služby

16.2 Co si myslíte, že by se mohlo stát (např. s ohledem na hledání práce, reputaci) s informacemi, které jste vložil/a?

Zkuste přesně určit, co si respondenti myslí o to, že jiní lidé používají jejich informace vložené na UGC stránky. Použijte neutrální tón, aby mohly zaznít pozitivní i negativní reakce.

Délka trvání: 42 min.

**VŠICHNI
RESPONDENTI**

**Používání
pseudonymů/přez
dívek**

[cca 2 min.]

- zjistěte postoje k zveřejňování osobních informací v různých situacích

V případě, že toto ještě nebylo zjištěno

Q.17 Použil/a jste někdy pseudonym nebo přezdívku, když jste vkládal/a informace na internet? V jakém případě/případech a proč? Pokud ne, jaký na to máte názor?

Zjistěte podrobnosti.

Délka trvání: 44 min.

**VŠICHNI
RESPONDENTI**

**Postoje k
používání
osobních informací
online**

[cca 8 min.]

Ukažte kartu B

Q.18 Informace zveřejněné na účtu nebo v profilu na internetové stránce mohou vlastníci stránek užít pro nejrůznější účely, jako k osobnímu nastavení obsahu a reklamy, kterou uživatelé vidí, k zasílání emailů, ke shromažďování osobních informací o uživatelích, atd.

Věděl/a jste to, když jste se přihlašoval/a na stránku (nebo UGC/SNS)?

Jaký na to máte názor?

*Poznamenejte si, zda respondent/ka znal/a tyto účely a zkuste určit postoj k užití informací o uživatelích pro každý z následujících účelů:
Ukažte kartu B:*

- 1. osobní nastavení reklamy, kterou vidíte (ukazuje vám pouze reklamy na zboží/slужby, jež by vás mohly zajímat)*
- 2. sdílení informací (které by mohly být spojeny s vaším jménem) o vašem chování s jinými společnostmi*
- 3. prodej informací (které nejsou spojeny s vaším jménem) o vašem chování s jinými společnostmi*

Pokud to nebylo již výše zmíněno, zeptejte se u každého důvodu,

	<p><i>který je pro respondenta/ku nepřijatelný:</i></p> <p>Q.19 Za jakých podmínek, pokud vůbec, by pro vás bylo přijatelné, aby uživatelé zveřejňovali informace o sobě, které by byly užity k: < účel, jenž respondent/ka považuje za nepřijatelný>?</p> <p><i>Pokuste se zjistit, zda by respondent/ka přijala sázkový/loterijní lístek, body na stránce jako jsou body na Facebooku, podíl na zisku stránky, peníze.</i></p> <p><i>Délka trvání: 52 min.</i></p>
<p>VŠICHNI RESPONDENTI</p> <p>Postoje resp. chování ve vztahu k podmínkám ochrany soukromí</p> <p>[cca 4 min.]</p>	<p>Q.20 Jaký je váš názor na podmínky ochrany soukromí stránek UGC/SNS, které užíváte? Přečetl/a jste si je před přihlášením? (uveďte příklad, pokud nefiguruje v Q.7, jiné stránky, kterou užíváte nejčastěji)</p> <p>Pokud ano – Co byste hledal/a? Kdybyste nenašel/a to, co hledáte, co byste dělal/a?</p> <p><i>Zkuste určit:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - zda lidé opravdu čtou podmínky ochrany soukromí, - co hledají, když čtou podmínky ochrany soukromí (přítomnost/nepřítomnost určitého prvku? ujištění?, - co dělají, v případě, že to, co hledají, v podmínkách není (pokračují v užívání stránek? nezačnou ji užívat/skončí s užíváním?) <p><i>Délka trvání: 56 min.</i></p>
<p>VŠICHNI RESPONDENTI</p> <p>Poděkování a závěr</p>	<p>To je ode mě vše. Je ještě něco, co byste rád/a dodal/a?</p> <p><i>Předejte odměnu, pokud máte.</i></p> <p><i>Informujte o dalších krocích, poskytněte více informací o projektu CONSENT, pokud si to respondent/ka přeje.</i></p> <p>Velice vám děkuji za cenný příspěvek do našeho projektu!</p> <p><i>Délka trvání: 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:
