



# CONSENT

Consumer sentiment regarding privacy  
on user generated content services  
in the digital economy

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

Noellie Brockdorff<sup>1</sup>, Sandra Appleby-Arnold<sup>1</sup>, Christine Garzia<sup>1</sup>,  
Bogdan Manolea<sup>2</sup>, Ioana Vasiiu<sup>3</sup>, Jeanne Pia Mifsud Bonnici<sup>4</sup>, Bart Schermer<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Cognitive Science, University of Malta, Msida, Malta

<sup>2</sup> Association for Technology and Internet, Bucharest, Romania

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Law, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

<sup>4</sup> Groningen Centre for Law and Governance, University of Groningen, Groningen,  
Netherlands

<sup>5</sup> Center for Law and Digital Technologies, Universiteit Leiden, Leiden, Netherlands

April 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](mailto: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. Attitudes towards UGC websites	8
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	17
4. Conclusion: Shared Experience and Individual (Mis-)trust	18
Acknowledgements	19
Appendices	20
A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)	20
A.2 Interview Guidelines (Dutch)	28
B. Pre-Analysis Template	38

## 1. Key Findings

This document presents the Netherlands 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 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 previous quantitative study (CONSENT work package 7).

Regarding general perceptions of privacy, respondents differentiated between information that is perceived as personal but not very private, information that is perceived as private and its privacy status being a social norm, and information which is considered as private and critical, its disclosure being associated with potential personal risks.

However, in the disclosure of personal and private information on UGC websites, another level of perception was brought into play: whether respondents perceived themselves as information providers, information sharers, or merely passive information users. Whilst perceptions of providing and sharing information can coincide – and in offline situations they usually do – online they do not necessarily have to. Here, most UGC users revealed attitudes where sharing personal or private information on non-SNS websites was strongly limited to passive and/or pragmatic usage, whereas in the context of social networking it was perceived as entertaining and done in a more playful manner.

On the other hand, being strongly engaged in social networking did not necessarily go alongside a greater willingness to disclose information online 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.

The majority of Dutch interviewees had not been aware of the various practices of website owners before opening a UGC account, but mostly became aware afterwards. Regarding acceptance levels of the different practices, the customisation of content was accepted by the majority of respondents either due to their perception that it was a rampant practice, or because of an ascribed ingeniousness and potential utility of this commercial practice. With regards to the other practices – the passing on of personal and private information to others by website owners, the selling of such information and the gathering of in-depth information – in most cases this was deemed as either not acceptable or acceptable only under the condition that prior consent would be sought, or that data would be anonymised. In general, although some interviewees described their fascination with the technical possibilities in this area, they also exhibited some discomfort, mainly due to the uncertainty and lack of specific knowledge about their potential uses.

Regarding specific measures to protect their privacy, a majority of Dutch UGC users adopted nicknames and adapted their privacy settings, some of them in a rather reflective and proactive way. Attitudes and behaviour regarding privacy policies also varied widely, ranging from inertia to active reading and to a limited extent taking action when unsatisfied with the content of the policies. Generally, it appeared that reading privacy policies clearly played a less important role than actively and inventively taking a variety of protective measures. This could result in an increased level of perceived safety, but could also go alongside feelings that situations were chaotic and uncontrollable – including perceived risks of losing control over one’s own actions when based on uncertain information (e.g. uncontrolled sharing or “censorship” of information).

At the same time it appeared that the Dutch interviewees were seeking certainty in their gathering of others’ experiences and opinions about specific UGC websites– which could result in mistrust as well as in trust regarding UGC websites. In both cases, though, they outlined their appreciation and the importance of these shared experiences which, despite the interviewees’ rather divergent comfort levels regarding privacy, seemed to help them engage in their very individual path of privacy protection online.

## **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 CONSENT<sup>1</sup> project.

This document highlights the findings from the study that are relevant to the Netherlands. Other separate reports are available for Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Malta, 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> “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 (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:

<b>Total Number of Interviews = 10</b>			
<b>UGC users</b>	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.	
<b>UGC non-users</b>	2	1 male / 1 female	
<b>of which</b>			
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	5	
	<b>Female</b>	5	
<b>Location</b>	<b>Urban/ suburban</b>	8	4 male / 4 female
	<b>Rural</b>	2	1 male / 1 female
<b>Age group</b>	<b>15-24</b>	3	
	<b>25-34</b>	3	of which 1 UGC non-user
	<b>35-44</b>	2	
	<b>45+</b>	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 a 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 interpretations<sup>2</sup>. 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 Netherlands is based on ten interviews with a demographic distribution which – with the exception of female interviewees being underrepresented – complies mostly with the required quota:

Interviewee No.	Gender	Age	Age category	Location category	UGC usage
I-1	Female	24	15-24	Rural	UGC user
I-2	Female	55	45+	Urban/Suburban	UGC non-user
I-3	Female	57	45+	Rural	UGC user
I-4	Male	19	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-5	Male	30	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-6	Male	34	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-7	Male	27	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC (non-SNS) user
I-8	Male	29	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC (non-SNS) user
I-9	Male	29	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC non-user
I-10	Male	44	35-44	Urban/Suburban	UGC (non-SNS) user

The 15-24 and 35-44 age groups are slightly underrepresented but overall a comparably even split was achieved.

The interviews were conducted either in a public space (e.g. a canteen), or in private homes. Most respondents seemed very open, relaxed and keen to respond; only one interviewee was perceived by the interviewer as reluctant to share personal information with the researcher (I-2, UGC non-user, female, 55); another one appeared to know very little about UGC websites but seemed at ease during the course of the interview.

All interviewees have been using the internet for at least 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	12	12	UGC user
I-2	55	10	45	UGC non-user
I-3	57	10	47	UGC user
I-4	19	10	9	UGC user
I-5	30	12	18	UGC user
I-6	34	14	20	UGC user
I-7	27	15	12	UGC (non-SNS) user
I-8	29	16	13	UGC (non-SNS) user
I-9	29	14	15	UGC non-user
I-10	44	20	24	UGC (non-SNS) user



### 3. Results

#### 3.1 General Online Attitudes

Of those eight interviewees who are UGC users, only two declared that they perceived a certain peer pressure to join a social networking site (primarily Facebook). While one respondent started using SNS after being encouraged by colleagues, another respondent recounted how, in the beginning, he started using a particular social networking site, but when *“everybody started using Facebook”* (I-5, UGC user) he shifted there as well. Peer pressure to join a SNS was also described by one of the UGC non-users, who, notwithstanding such pressure, refused to open an account.

The main reason given by the majority of interviewees for using SNS was to re-establish or maintain contact with (potentially distant) friends; as two of the respondents stated: *“to stay in touch when I left high school”* (I-4, UGC user) and *“to see what other people are up to”* (I-3, UGC user). Other reasons for usage included *“curiosity”* and an attempt to keep up with *“modern developments”* (I-6, UGC user) as well as the perception that online social networking offers a *“cheap”* (I-1, UGC user) means of communication. The latter respondent also mentioned using micro-blogging websites for social networking; nonetheless, she preferred SNS over micro-blogging websites due to their perceived easier usage: *“It’s too fast for me – I cannot keep up so to speak. I am not fanatical enough to use it in a right way. I’ve done it for a while, but not anymore”* (I-1, UGC user).

The three respondents who were SNS non-users mostly displayed a general reluctance towards self-disclosure online, for a variety of reasons. Whilst one interviewee expressed a preference to disclose personal or private information in personal *“offline”* contacts – *“I prefer telling things over a cup of tea”* (I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user), other interviewees additionally said that *“it is superficial, and because of privacy issues”* (I-10, UGC user). One of the respondents who originally had an account with another SNS prior to signing up with Facebook de-activated her Facebook account partially as a sign of protest: *“Then I started using Facebook, for maybe half a year. But then there were privacy issues and because those were not solved by Facebook, I’ve removed my account. Also as a signal to Facebook”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user).

In addition to these motivations, another main reason given for non-usage of SNS was seeing it as *“a waste of time”* (I-10, UGC user) and a *“time-consuming”* practice (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user). The latter perception, as well as a general reluctance towards online self-disclosure was also shared by UGC non-users.

Regarding other UGC websites, a minority of respondents (four) stated that they make use of photo and video sharing websites, mainly due to their connectivity with other website services. In addition, five respondents stated that they hold accounts with business networking sites, mainly due to their general interest in career opportunities. As stated by one respondent: *“You can stay in touch, remember their names [...] I like to see what people are doing now. If I want to, I can contact them. And it can be useful for your career”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user). All other types of UGC websites (micro-blogging sites, recommendation /

review sites, wiki sites, dating sites and multiplayer online games) were only used by very few respondents<sup>3</sup>.

Generally, it appeared that online communication and online entertainment are not primary reasons for internet usage for most interviewees. In fact, only a minority (three) of respondents mentioned the role of *“communication”* (I-9, UGC non-user) and the possibility of having *“contact with others”* (I-3, UGC-user). The dominant reason given for using the internet was the availability and ease of access to information, which was mentioned by the majority of respondents. The internet was described by many as providing *“quick access to information”* (I-3, UGS user) and as a means to finding *“an enormous amount of information about almost anything”* (I-10, UGS user). Another reason mentioned by one interviewee was that the internet provides an *“open”* space: *“Everybody can participate and most people have access”* (I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user).

On the other hand, some respondents mentioned the downside of this access to information, including coming across *“a lot of nonsense”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user), the difficulty in *“distinguishing which information is reliable”* (I-2, UGC non-user), and the risk that *“sometimes the unnecessary information is too much”* (I-4, UGC user), mainly due to the perception that *“there is no control over the internet”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user). In addition to this, a number of respondents (four) mentioned several potential risks, including those pertaining to the misuse of personal information. As stated by these interviewees, once online *“the information doesn’t disappear”* (I-9, UGC non-user) and *“anyone can do anything with that [personal] information”* (I-1, UGC user). In relation to this, the internet was perceived by some respondents as *“a place for opportunists”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user) with potential risks of deception and abuse, including the risk of damaging someone’s reputation.

---

<sup>3</sup> No reasons were given in relation to their non-usage.

### 3.2 Information Disclosure – “Offline” and Online

In “offline” situations<sup>4</sup>, the majority of interviewees gave relatively similar answers regarding whether or not they would disclose certain personal or private information<sup>5</sup> to a stranger. Being asked for their marital status was mostly considered as information which can be disclosed – *“I don’t see why not”* (I-10, UGC user) – since such disclosure *“doesn’t really say something about how the relationship is”* (I-3, UGC user). Two respondents also hinted at the utility of “chit chat” in a transitory situation – providing *“something to talk about”* (I-4, UGC user), but also *“to keep the other at a distance”* (I-1, UGC user). However, a number of interviewees expressed some concern and stated that such disclosure ultimately required a certain degree of trust, based on hunches and gut feelings: *“It has to feel safe”* (I-2, UGC non-user) and *“[it] depends on what my intuition tells me. If it seems like he is a nice guy and I trust him, I would tell the truth”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user).

On the contrary, information about income and the ID card number would generally not be revealed, albeit for different reasons. Being asked by a stranger for one’s salary was considered as an improper question which violates social norms: *“I think this is not something you should ask – I never do. That is private information”* (I-4, UGC user). Such a perception was shared by the majority of respondents, predominantly considering it as being *“none of his/her business”* (I-1, UGC user; I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user and I-10, UGC user). In addition, one interviewee stated that it is *“a taboo in the Netherlands saying how much you earn”* (I-2, UGC non-user). Once again, issues of trust were brought up by a minority of respondents (two): *“I don’t know whether the other person is reliable”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user); which in turn led these respondents to think of possible consequence of disclosing one’s income: *“It can make you a target if you make a lot of money”* (I-5, UGC user).

Being asked for one’s ID card number was perceived as intrusive and as violating privacy. Considered as *“data you only give to authorities [and] not to a stranger”* (I-1, UGC user), being asked for it by unknown persons was considered as a suspicious request which could bear the risk of misuse. Nearly all respondents expressed a deep sense of mistrust and, while remarking that the ID card number could potentially be subject to misuse, at the same time some respondents admitted a lack of knowledge as to *how* such information could be “abused”: *“I don’t know whether or how the number could be abused, so I’d rather not share it with strangers”* (I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user), and *“I don’t know a lot about how the number can be used, but I know a lot of my personal information is coupled to it. Therefore I’m careful with it”* (I-5, UGC user)

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

Similarly, all interviewees responded that, in a conversation with friends, they would reveal their marital status, but mostly still not reveal their ID card number. With regards to the latter, some interviewees, here, queried the reason behind such a request: *“I wouldn’t know why they should have it”* (I-2, UGC non-user) and stated that such private information is *“none of their business”* (I-10, UGC user). On the other hand, the majority of interviewees stated that, eventually, the decision of whether or not to disclose their ID card number would mainly depend on the perceived degree of closeness and the level of trust within the relationship.

Respondents were slightly more willing to talk to friends regarding their income, however such disclosure was similarly subject to the perceived degree of closeness and level of trust, which in turn seemed to be dependent on the frequency of contact in ‘real life’: *“If certain friends were important enough for me to share [such information], I would see them more than a few times a year. Then I would trust them more and share more”* (I-1, UGC user). However, some of the interviewees still felt that information on income was *“private”* and hinted at the inappropriateness of such a conversation: *“We do not talk about that – I would say [my salary is] ‘enough’”* (I-2, UGC user).

Whereas the interviewees’ responses revealed a generally homogeneous pattern of answering in offline situations with both strangers and friends, there was a wider variation in answers regarding what information would be disclosed online in the context of online shopping / commercial trade-offs, and even more so on UGC websites<sup>6</sup>.

For commercial advantages the majority of interviewees were willing to reveal their marital status and their date of birth as well as the number and age of their kids. This type of information was mostly considered as *“not important”* and *“no need to hide”*. All other information was indicated by the majority of respondents as not to be disclosed. In this case privacy as a reason for non-disclosure can be divided into different, though partially overlapping, categories.

- (a) Some information was perceived as generally *“too private”* (in particular one’s income, partner’s e-mail and ID card number).
- (b) Disclosure was linked to the perceived risk of fraud (particularly ID card number).
- (c) Disclosure was linked to the perceived risk of receiving unwanted commercial offers, (in particular phone number).
- (d) 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, information about life insurance).

Overall, it appeared that offline attitudes (towards strangers) and online attitudes (in the situation of commercial trade-offs) were comparably coherent, differentiating between

---

<sup>6</sup> For commercial trade-offs, interviewees were asked whether they would disclose 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.

- (a) information that is perceived as personal but not very private (marital status),
- (b) information that is perceived as private and its privacy status being a social norm (income), and
- (c) information which is considered as private and critical, its disclosure being associated with potential personal risks (ID card number).

Regarding the disclosure of personal and private information on UGC websites, the majority of interviewees indicated that they had revealed their name and photos of themselves. A minority had also disclosed photos of friends and family members and information on their hobbies. However, there were no reasons given for the disclosure or non-disclosure of this information. At the same time, the most coherent attitude amongst UGC users and non-users was represented by the non-disclosure of their home address, audio and video recordings, and medical information. The latter was considered as an especially sensitive area where confidentiality was expected:

*“I do not like spam and advertisements that are aimed specifically at you. That a company knows when you are pregnant and then sends you advertisements of baby clothing you didn’t order – it is scary to me. I don’t like it when people know things about me while I do not know them. It gives me an uneasy feeling” (I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user).*

Finally, being strongly engaged in UGC usage did not necessarily go alongside 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.

### 3.3 Privacy Matters

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

Three of the eight respondent UGC 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 for commercial reasons: "[The service] can never really be 'free'" (I-4, UGC user). However, most respondents learnt about this practice with time after opening an account, primarily by noticing the appearance of advertising becoming increasingly targeted. On the other hand, only two respondents were not aware at all of these website owners' practices.

Acceptance levels, and the underlying motivation for acceptance, differed depending on the respective website owners' practice. The customising of content was accepted by six of the respondents, either due to the perception that this is a rampant practice – "everybody does it" (I-4, UGC user) – or due to the appreciation of an assumed ingeniousness (and potential utility) of this practice: "It's smart, it makes it easier, it's a good use of the internet" (I-1, UGC user). Additionally, two interviewees found it acceptable due to the comfort that a "tracker" (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user) was steering this process, as opposed to a "real" person being on the other end, and stated that "there is the idea that all my mail is being read, but on the other hand I think it is safe, because it is all automatic" (I-4, UGC user).

It seemed, though, that these respondents still felt somewhat uncomfortable with this practice, at times describing their experience of content customisation as being "followed by invisible eyes" (I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user). In addition to this, they were of the opinion that through the targeting, and hence filtering, of information, such practices serve to take away a degree of 'control' from the user: "I don't like that Facebook suggests friends and what you should see. I think it is better if you're also exposed to information you wouldn't usually look for" (I-6, UGC user). Thus, discomfort derived not so much from the fact itself of becoming the target of customised website content and advertising, but from the awareness that this practice is linked to a sharing, and possible "censorship", of information beyond one's control.

A similar viewpoint was expressed by one of two interviewees who perceived this customising of content as downright unacceptable – not only due to concerns about controlling the practices of others but also because of feelings of uncertainty regarding the control of their own resulting behaviour:

*"It is one of the reasons why I do not provide all my information on Facebook. I think it is annoying and obtrusive, the feeling that they have collected information about me. It is unpleasant: I like my privacy. And I don't like the feeling of being watched. I like to decide what I want to find on the internet for myself, because otherwise I cannot trust the information and my own judgement – the process is not transparent to me"* (I-6, UGC user).

The other interviewee, a non-user who was unaware of this practice, conveyed a rather strong negative reaction, feeling a serious violation of her privacy.

Overall, attitudes and perceptions appear to change when personal information is being passed on without their owner's permission. Only two interviewees found such practice acceptable and considered it as *"being part of the deal"* (I-6, UGC user). Three respondents considered this practice as acceptable only under the condition of being asked for permission, representing the demand for privacy by default instead of publicity by default, and expressing a very clear attitude towards their ownership of personal and private data: *"I'm very attached to my privacy...I want to decide myself what is known of me and to whom. It is not up to anyone else to do that. It is my information, my data, so I'm the one who decides"* (I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user).

Three interviewees deemed the practice of sharing users' personal information without their consent to be not acceptable at all, expressing a feeling that their information *"would end up someplace where I didn't put it myself"* (I-9, UGC non-user), highlighting in particular perceived reputational risks.

Finally, in relation to the practice of gathering in-depth information<sup>7</sup>, the interviewees' replies exhibited a similarly wide variation. Four respondents considered such a practice as being generally acceptable, for a number of different reasons. While two respondents deemed this practice as *"smart"* (I-1, UGC user) and *"ingenious"* (I-6, UGC user), the other two held the belief that such a practice would not result in any repercussions. On the other hand, three respondents stated their acceptance either under the condition of anonymity: *"I think it is acceptable, but only if it is anonymous"* (I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user) or else under the condition of *"explicit consent"* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user; I-10, UGC user).

In general, although some interviewees described their fascination for the technical possibilities in this area, to a certain extent they felt rather uncomfortable about them, mainly due to the uncertainty and lack of specific knowledge about their potential uses, affirming their attitude that a willingness to disclose certain personal or private information does not mean that users are accepting to give up control.

### **3.3.2 How Privacy matters: Protective Measures & Imagined Future Risks**

UGC users' main concerns primarily circulated around one topic: the aforementioned perceived uncertainty about who has access to personal and private information online.

In order to *"disconnect"* – rather than protect – the intentionally or unintentionally revealed information from potential personal consequences, a method chosen by the majority (six) of users was not to reveal their real name on UGC websites but to use nicknames. While some of the respondents claimed to use a nickname *"almost always"* (I-6, UGC user), perceiving such use as being rather common online – *"I think everybody does [it]"* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user) – others were not as consistent and stated more of a preference rather than an exclusive use of nicknames. In general, the tendency to employ a nickname depended on the type of site and its use; the use of nicknames was especially the case for gaming sites and for online fora.

---

<sup>7</sup> Two respondents did not provide their views on this practice.

Some respondents considered the use of nicknames as a form of “pro-active” privacy protection, setting up separate accounts with different email addresses and fake names, mostly in order to avoid “*getting annoying e-mails*” (I-5, UGC user) and “*advertisements*” (I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user). Others used nicknames to separate their “public” and their “private” activities online, for instance as in the case of an online forum: “*It is easier to talk about your own or other people’s problems anonymously – [in such a situation] people feel less inhibited and don’t feel the necessity to stick to social rules*” (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user).

Two interviewees (one UGC user, one UGC non-user), however, pointed out that using a nickname was not a ‘fool proof’ way to avoid being identified: “*I think people can trace it back to me anyway*” (I-4, UGC user). Additionally, the non-user expressed that: “*Sometimes I make up extra information, to make it more difficult to trace information back to me*” (I-9, UGC non-user), representing a certain awareness that a full disconnection may often be an illusion, as the (real) name is only one of many possible personal identifiers.

A main strategy to deal with the uncertainty about who has access to personal data provided online was to adapt the privacy settings of UGC websites – if such option was available (and known of). Seven out of eight UGC users stated that they limited the access to their profile to varying degrees. The majority of users (six) had their profile limited to ‘friends only’ (in the case of Facebook) and to ‘people in their network’ (in the case of LinkedIn), while the remaining interviewee described his practice of choosing different settings for different types of content: “*I have thought about what I want other people to see. I don’t want a future employer to find strange pictures when he googles my name. Sometimes I adjust privacy settings for specific pictures*” (I-3, UGC user).

Similarly, those users who limited their profile expressed concern that unintended people, including “*future clients*” (I-5, UGC user) and “*strangers*” (I-1, UGC user), could potentially come across their personal information – in present, as well as in future situations: “*I don’t want the world to know everything; that information can pop up years later*” (I-6, UGC user).

Another general strategy mentioned by a number of participants in order to safeguard their privacy was to be “careful” when posting information online:

*“If I provide my information, I may lose control over it. That’s why I am careful. And if you fill out something online, you don’t know where it goes. That is different from a piece of paper that can disappear. That makes me careful”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user).

Respondents displayed their caution primarily in two ways; while some respondents pointed out that they were wary about the *amount* of content posted: “*I do not share much information online*” (I-3, UGC user), other users emphasised their discretion at the *type* of content posted: “*I always ponder in advance what exactly to share*” (I-1, UGC user). With regards to the latter, some interviewees seemed especially concerned about geo-location information and sensitive information such as medical information and religious views. Here, a number of respondents mentioned that they mainly disclose “*general things*” (I-1, UGC user).



All interviewees, though, stated that they had not yet experienced any negative consequences from their information disclosure and it seems that they mainly attributed this to the cautious behaviour mentioned above:

*“I have never regretted posting information online because I never post when I think I am not sure that I should put this on the internet. So I am reasonably cautious, I think. I am well aware that people are watching, and that more people are watching than you think”* (I-6, UGC user).

In certain cases, it also appeared that such caution provided a sense of safety: *“I think about what I post online. I think it is wise to be a little careful. I think you’re safe if you are careful about what you post online”* (I-5, UGC user), and *“that is your own responsibility, if you don’t think about these things carefully, this is what you get. Fortunately you can always remove such information”* (I-1, UGC user).

These perceptions contrast sharply with those of respondents who showed a risk awareness that any published personal or private information cannot be easily deleted from the public sphere: *“You can never remove something from the internet”* (I-4, UGC user). Such awareness led respondents to imagine a number of different scenarios in relation to future situations:

*“The internet is chaotic and sometimes companies lose control over the information and it gets lost. I worry about the future, about what people are going to post online, and about politics. I do believe in the 1984 kind of thing a little bit. If people want to misuse the information they will. The past century has seen quite some unexpected things, wars and revolutions. And such information can be used in a wrong manner”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user).

Other imagined situations included the posting of *“embarrassing”* (I-1, UGC user) or *“stupid”* (I-5, UGC user) comments which could result in *“hurting other people”* or harming one’s own *“reputation”* (I-4, UGC user), ultimately affecting one’s social relations. In particular, a number of respondents (six) expressed their concern vis-à-vis potential consequences in relation to one’s career and employment prospects. They specifically considered the possibility of employers actively searching information about their current or prospective employees – information which could influence recruitment decisions.

Perceptions of such a practice varied; whilst some respondents expressed mixed feelings – *“on the one hand I think it is wise to research someone whom you would want to get professionally involved with, but on the other hand, it is perhaps a violation of privacy”* (I-1, UGC user) – others perceived it as unethical and, hence, unacceptable: *“If people find information about me, it shouldn’t be used against me. I wouldn’t want to work for someone who googles me and uses what he finds against me in a job interview”* (I-4, UGC user).

### 3.3.3 Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies

While five out of the eight interviewed UGC users claimed that they mostly read privacy policies, the remaining three UGC users, in addition to one UGC non-user<sup>8</sup>, stated that they do not. The reasons given for not reading can be divided into two categories: one relating to how policies are presented (“technical” level) and the other to the content of policies. On a “technical” level, the (non-reading) interviewees indicated that the reading of privacy policies *“takes too much time”* (I-4, UGC user) – a perception which they shared also with some of those who declared that they *do* read them: *“it is mostly too much to read thoroughly”* (I-5, UGC user). As stated by another user: *“I browse through them, but they are so gigantic and extensive, with unintelligible language, that I quickly ‘accept’ and continue”* (I-7, UGC (non-SNS) user).

Some interviewees perceived the reading of privacy policies as a futile exercise for very different reasons. One user – who does not read privacy policies – hinted that providers cannot be trusted and that their intention was to make such policies hard to read: *“I think Facebook’s privacy policy is very smart, because it is very non-transparent”* (I-6, UGC user). On the other hand, one of the non-reading respondents reasoned that reading privacy policies is pointless since *“if there was something wrong, I would have heard about it, so I assume it will be all right”* (I-4, UGC user). Such an assumption, and a trusting attitude, was also held by three respondents who claimed to read privacy policies: *“I don’t know – sometimes I just trust it. And I think that it matters what other people say – whether they have had good experiences on that site”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user).

However, reading or non-reading may also depend on the extent to which there is a belief that certain protective measures can actually be found. Some readers stated that they particularly search for the possibility of changing privacy settings – and the specific treatment of their personal and private data: *“I want to know what happens with the information I post online. Are they allowed to share it or not? What are they allowed to do with my profile?”* (I-5, UGC user). Those respondents who stated that they do not read privacy policies seemed to equally expect such content.

Some respondents revealed a strong interest in several forms of maintaining control – a control over whom their information was shared with and a control over what specific information was potentially passed on to others. One respondent clearly stated that in case she did not find the information required, she would *“email or call a helpdesk”* (I-1, UGC user), and that she would refuse to register if she did not agree with the privacy policy. Another user showed a similarly proactive attitude; he recounted the action taken due to a “missing feature” on Facebook: *“I was irritated, and I spoke to other people about it. I searched on a help centre and joined a group of other people who were opposed to this feature of Facebook, but nothing happened”* (I-4, UGC user).

However, despite such resistance and awareness of the drawbacks of using Facebook, this respondent still declared that he continued to make use of this social networking site since he perceived that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. Only a minority (two users) claimed they would ultimately consider closing down their account.

---

<sup>8</sup> One UGC non-user did not provide a reply.

#### 4. Conclusion: Shared Experience and Individual (Mis-)trust

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 showed a particularly interesting contrast between the first and the last of them – honesty and privacy. Whereas honesty was more often described as a social norm: *“I expect it of others”* (I-2, UGC non-user), the respondents’ associations with privacy were quite different. Rather than being ascribed a normative character, it appeared in these descriptions also as a feeling, as something that was “very important” and “crucial” and as requiring “protection” (in the sense of secrecy). In addition, privacy was also linked to “safety” and to a certain ownership of space: *“something to do with keeping things out of sight”* (I-3, UGC user) and *“being able to close off”* (I-5, UGC user) – a “safe space”, though, which is not automatically granted but requires some action to assure the wished-for safety.

Regarding *online* privacy, the majority of Dutch interviewees also expressed their perception of potential risks, their strong interest *“to remain in control”* (I-8, UGC (non-SNS) user) and their activities to protect themselves. They ascribed an ability to keep (limited) control to their exercising caution and employing strategies such as using nicknames and dynamic adaptation of privacy settings on UGC sites, and some additionally explained that *“this is your own responsibility. If you don’t think about these things carefully, this is what you get”* (I-1, UGC user). On the other hand, a minority of Dutch respondents revealed a lower level of awareness, at the same time, though, acknowledging their lack of knowledge: *“I do not really understand the possibilities and risks”* (I-3, UGC user).

Attitudes and behaviour regarding privacy policies also varied widely, ranging from inertia to active reading and, partially, taking action when unsatisfied with the content of the policies. Generally, it appeared that reading privacy policies clearly played a less important role than actively and inventively taking a variety of protective measures. This could result in an increased level of perceived safety but also co-exist with feelings that the situation with disclosed personal information online was chaotic and uncontrollable – including perceived uncertainties in controlling one’s own actions.

At the same time, however, it appeared that the Dutch interviewees were seeking certainty in their gathering of other people’s experiences and opinions regarding the usage of specific UGC websites – which could result in mistrust as well as in trust. In both cases, though, they outlined their appreciation and the importance of these shared experiences and “public opinion”. They seemed – despite the interviewees’ rather divergent comfort levels about privacy – to help them engaging in their very individual path of privacy protection online.

## **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><b>ALL RESPONDENTS</b></p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>[about 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Thank you</li> <li>- Your name</li> <li>- Purpose</li> <li>- Confidentiality</li> <li>- Duration</li> <li>- How interview will be conducted</li> <li>- Signature of consent on consent form</li> </ul>	<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><b>ALL RESPONDENTS</b></p> <p><b>Word-association exercise</b></p> <p>[about 3 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- establish top of</li> </ul>	<p><b>Q.1</b> 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><b>RESPONDENTS WHO DO <u>NOT</u> USE OR NO LONGER USE UGC SITES IN Q7</b></p> <p><b>Reasons for not using UGC sites</b> [about 3 min]</p>	<p><b>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?</b> <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"> <li>- <i>the consequences of giving information online,</i></li> <li>- <i>how information about them is used,</i></li> <li>- <i>whether UGC sites can be trusted, and</i></li> <li>- <i>any other issue relating to privacy.</i></li> </ul> <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><b>Q.9 For what reasons may you be likely to open an account – or not open account - with any of these sites soon?</b> <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><b>Q10. You mentioned that one of the reasons (the reason) you don't use UGC sites is &lt;whatever respondent said that relates to privacy/information use&gt;. Can you tell me a bit more about what in particular concerns you?</b> <i>Probe <u>in depth</u> to determine</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. what aspect of UGC sites respondent finds unacceptable, and why;</i></li> <li><i>ii. beliefs about how internet sites use information;</i></li> <li><i>iii beliefs about what UGC sites are for.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Running Total: 36 min</i></p>
<p><b>RESPONDENTS WHO USE UGC SITES IN Q7</b></p> <p><b>UGC sites - Motivations &amp; Usage</b> [about 6 min]</p> <p>Establish: - motivations for</p>	<p><b>Q.11 Why did you start using &lt;Social Networking Site, if used. If respondent does not use Social Networking site, then UGC site in Q7 used most frequently&gt;? Probe to determine key motivations for using site.</b></p> <p><b>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?</b> <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.2 Interview Guidelines (Dutch)

### Richtlijnen voor interviewers

De bedoeling van deze interviews is het verkrijgen van een beter begrip van persoonlijke meningen, gedachten, gevoelens, ervaringen en gedragingen met betrekking tot privacy, gebaseerd op de kwantitatieve resultaten van WP7. Het is van cruciaal belang om de geïnterviewden vrijuit te laten spreken en ze hun eigen gedachtengang te laten ontwikkelen, in plaats van een vooraf gedefinieerde reeks ja/nee-vragen of meerkeuzevragen af te lopen. Het is een van de grootste uitdagingen voor elke interviewer die interviews met open vragen afneemt om de balans te vinden tussen openheid enerzijds en het behouden van de controle anderzijds – jezelf op de achtergrond houden zonder de rode draad te verliezen. De formulering van de vragen helpt hierbij.

Het afnemen van interviews over een complex onderwerp blijft echter een lastige taak. De volgende praktische aanbevelingen zijn bedoeld om een aantal van de moeilijkheden te overkomen.

**Plan vooruit:** Spreek af met de geïnterviewde op een locatie van zijn/haar keuze, waar hij/zij zich op zijn/haar gemak voelt. Hou er echter rekening mee dat de locatie voldoende privacy moet bieden, zodat het interview afgenomen kan worden zonder steeds afgeleid of onderbroken te worden. Vermijd strikte tijdschema's, omdat de druk die dit met zich mee kan brengen – onbedoeld - over kan slaan op de geïnterviewde.

**Wees bekend met de interviewrichtlijnen:** Oefen de vragen van tevoren en lees de specifieke instructies per vraag (in schuingedrukte letters) zorgvuldig door. Hou de richtlijnen aan en spring niet van vraag naar vraag.

**Wees vertrouwd met de technische uitrusting:** Maak een korte proefopname voor ieder interview om er zeker van te zijn dat de opname-apparatuur werkt en dat de batterijen voldoende opgeladen zijn.

**Stel open vragen:** Vooral wanneer je het antwoord van de geïnterviewde op een bepaalde vraag wil achterhalen, is het verleidelijk om suggestieve vragen te stellen (zoals "Dus je bent wel/niet van mening dat...?") die beantwoord kunnen worden met een simpel ja of nee. Zulke ja/nee-vragen moeten zoveel mogelijk vermeden worden als we meer in detail willen weten wat de geïnterviewde denkt, in plaats van ja of nee. Probeer open en directe vragen te blijven stellen en gebruik ook andere interviewtechnieken, zoals inlevingsvermogen, het laten vallen van pauzes en spiegelen. Geef de geïnterviewde voldoende tijd om uitgebreid op de vraag in te gaan.

**Blijf alert:** Hoewel een interview interactief is, is de belangrijkste taak van de interviewer om te luisteren en te observeren gedurende de conversatie. Het is aan te raden om ook als het interview is afgelopen goed op te blijven letten en eventueel aantekeningen te maken, omdat geïnterviewden vaak direct nadat de opname-apparatuur is uitgeschakeld met cruciale informatie komen.

Introductie	Aanwijzing
<p><b>ALLE GEÏNTERVIEWDEN</b></p> <p><b>Introductie</b> [ongeveer 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bedankt</li> <li>- Je naam</li> <li>- Doelstelling</li> <li>- Vertrouwelijkheid</li> <li>- Duur</li> <li>- Hoe het interview zal worden afgenomen</li> <li>- Toestemmingsformulier tekenen</li> </ul>	<p>Ik wil je bedanken dat je de tijd genomen heeft om met me af te spreken vandaag. Mijn naam is ... en ik zou graag met je willen praten over het internet, wat je er leuk aan vindt, wat je er niet leuk aan vindt en hoe je het gebruikt.</p> <p>Zoals ik al vermeld had toen we deze afspraak maakten, wordt dit interview uitgevoerd als onderdeel van het CONSENT-project dat is medegefinancierd door de Europese Commissie. CONSENT heeft als doel het verzamelen van meningen van internetgebruikers uit alle EU-landen. Als je wil kan ik je meer informatie over het CONSENT-project geven aan het einde van het interview.</p> <p>Jouw mening is erg waardevol voor ons onderzoek en wordt in beschouwing genomen bij het opstellen van het eindrapport.</p> <p>Het interview duurt minder dan een uur. Ik zal het gesprek opnemen, zodat ik niets van wat je zegt hoeft te missen. Ik zal ook aantekeningen maken tijdens het gesprek, maar ik kan onmogelijk snel genoeg schrijven om alles bij te houden. Omdat alles wordt opgenomen wil ik je vragen om zo duidelijk mogelijk te spreken, zodat ik niets hoeft te missen.</p> <p>Alle antwoorden die je geeft zijn vertrouwelijk en worden enkel gedeeld met andere onderzoekers. We verzekeren dat de informatie die we in ons rapport opnemen niet te herleiden is tot jou als geïnterviewde. Je naam zal op geen enkele manier gekoppeld worden aan de antwoorden die je geeft.</p> <p>Zou je dit toestemmingsformulier willen lezen en ondertekenen? Heb je hier nog vragen over?</p> <p>Vergeet niet dat je niet hoeft te praten over dingen waar je niet over wil praten en dat je het interview op elk moment mag beëindigen. Is dat goed?</p> <p><i>Totale tijd: 5 min</i></p>
Doelstellingen	Vragen
<p><b>ALLE GEÏNTERVIEWDEN</b></p> <p><b>Oefening met woordassociaties</b> [ongeveer 3 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- zorg voor associaties met privacy</li> </ul>	<p><b>V.1 Om te beginnen gaan we een kort spelletje spelen/een korte oefening doen: ik zal een woord oplezen en ik zou graag willen dat jij de eerste paar dingen opnoemt die in je opkomen als je het woord hoort. Laten we het eerst een keer proberen: wat is het eerste waar je aan denkt als ik “zomer” zeg? Nog iets anders?</b></p> <p><i>Moedig de geïnterviewde aan om korte zinnen of enkele woorden te gebruiken en om lange beschrijvingen en verklaringen te vermijden.</i></p> <p><i>Testwoorden: eerlijkheid, internet, werk, familie, privacy</i></p> <p><i>Totale tijd: 8 min</i></p>

<p><b>ALLE GEÏNTERVIEWDEN</b></p> <p>Bereidheid om persoonlijke informatie prijs te geven in verschillende situaties [ongeveer 8 min]</p>	<p><b>V.1.1</b> Laten we het nu over iets anders hebben. Stel je voor dat je in een vliegtuig zit. De persoon naast je is iemand die je niet kent en die je waarschijnlijk nooit meer zult ontmoeten. Het is een nogal praatgraag persoon van hetzelfde geslacht en ongeveer dezelfde leeftijd als jij. Hij/zij begint te praten over verschillende dingen en na 15 minuten vraagt hij/zij of je vrijgezel bent of een relatie hebt of getrouwd bent. <b>Wat zou je hem/haar vertellen?.</b> <i>Laat de geïnterviewde vrij antwoorden. Vraag alleen waarom wel/niet als de geïnterviewde het antwoord niet uit zichzelf toelicht.</i></p> <p><b>V.1.2</b> Wat als hij/zij vraagt hoeveel je verdient, wat zou je dan doen? <i>Laat de geïnterviewde vrij antwoorden. Vraag alleen waarom wel/niet als de geïnterviewde het antwoord niet uit zichzelf toelicht.</i></p> <p><b>V.1.3.</b> Stel dat diegene je vertelt dat hij/zij het nummer van zijn/haar ID-kaart gebruikt om getallen voor de lotto uit te kiezen en hij/zij vraagt wat het nummer van jouw ID-kaart is. <b>Wat doe je?</b> <i>Laat de geïnterviewde vrij antwoorden. Vraag alleen waarom wel/niet als de geïnterviewde het antwoord niet uit zichzelf toelicht.</i></p> <p><b>V.1.4</b> Stel je nu voor dat het niet gaat om een praatzieke medepassagier, maar om een vriend die je een paar keer per jaar ziet en die je dezelfde vragen stelt. <b>Wat zou je doen?</b> <i>Vraag naar het antwoord op elk van de vragen: of je vrijgezel bent, een relatie hebt of getrouwd bent, hoeveel je verdient, wat het nummer van je ID-kaart is. Vraag voor elk geval of de geïnterviewde de waarheid zou zeggen en waarom wel/niet.</i> <i>Totale tijd: 16 min</i></p>
<p><b>ALLE GEÏNTERVIEWDEN</b></p> <p>Ervaring met en houding tegenover het internet [ongeveer 5 min]</p>	<p><b>V.2</b> Laten we het nu eens over het internet hebben. <b>Hoe lang maak je al gebruik van het internet?</b></p> <p><b>V.3</b> Wat vind je het leukste van het internet?</p> <p><b>V.4</b> Wat vind je het minst leuke van het internet? <i>Totale tijd: 21 min</i></p>
<p><b>ALLE GEÏNTERVIEWDEN</b></p>	<p><b>V.5</b> Stel je voor dat je een website bezoekt van een kortingsaanbieder, bijvoorbeeld een website zoals Groupon &lt;kies een website die het meest geschikt is voor jouw land&gt;. <b>Deze</b></p>

**Underlying beliefs & attitudes to commercial/privacy trade-off**

[ongeveer 5 min]

aanbieder biedt kortingen van 50% aan op verschillende consumentengoederen en diensten (bijvoorbeeld boeken, reizen, huishoudelijke producten, mode) aan zijn leden. De site heeft momenteel een actie lopen en geeft kortingen tot 75% aan alle bezoekers die de site meer persoonlijke informatie willen geven dan enkel hun naam en e-mailadres. Welke informatie zou je bereid zijn om te geven voor die 75% korting?

*Lees de lijst voor: telefoonnummer, huisadres, geboortedatum, jaarinkomen, burgerlijke staat, aantal kinderen, leeftijd van kinderen, nummer van ID-kaart of paspoort, e-mailadres van je partner of echtgeno(o)t(e), status van je levensverzekering, status van je huisverzekering*

*Als de geïnterviewde niet bereid is om bepaalde informatie aan de website te geven, achterhaal waarom: Q.5.1 Waarom niet? of Waarom zou je je ... niet geven?*

*Totale tijd: 26 min*

**ALLE GEÏNTERVIEWDEN**

**Internetgebruik**  
[ongeveer 2 min]

**V.6 Zou je me iets meer kunnen vertellen over de websites die je bezoekt in een doorsnee week en waar je ze voor gebruikt?**

*Zoek uit of de hierboven beschreven internetactiviteiten (inclusief UGC en SNS) impact hebben op de levensstijl, de gewoonten en sociale relaties van de geïnterviewde. (Je hebt 2 minuten voor deze vraag, dus ga niet te diep in op de details.)*

*Totale tijd: 28 min*

**ALLE GEÏNTERVIEWDEN**

**UGC-gebruik**  
[ongeveer 5 min]

- Stel vast of het een UGC-gebruiker is of niet
- Stel vast of het een SNS-gebruiker is of niet
- Stel vast welke UGC-website het meest gebruikt wordt
- Biedt een link

**V.7 Hier is een lijst van enkele websites <laat een lijst met UGC-sites zien die in ieder land gebruikt worden voor WP7>. Zou je kunnen vertellen op welke sites je accounts hebt (dus niet enkel het bezoeken van de site) en zo ja, hoe vaak je inlogt? <Noteer of de geïnterviewde gebruik maakt van sociaalnetwerksites (SNS) en zo nee, welke UGC-website de geïnterviewde het meest gebruikt>**

*Toon kaart A:*

- A. Sociaalnetwerksite zoals Facebook, <Locale SNS gebruikt in WP7>**
- B. Zakelijke netwerksites zoals LinkedIn, Xing.com**
- C. Datingsites zoals parship.com**
- D. Websites waar je foto's, video's et cetera kan delen, zoals YouTube, Flickr**
- E. Websites met aanbevelingen en reviews (van films, muziek, boeken, hotels etc.) zoals last.fm, tripadvisor**
- F. Microbloggingsites zoals Twitter**
- G. Wikisites zoals Wikipedia, myheritage**



naar de bevindingen van de online vragenlijst

Toon kaart A

**GEÏNTERVIEWDEN DIE AANGEVEN NIET OF NIET LANGER GEBRUIK TE MAKEN VAN UGC-SITES**

**Redenen om geen gebruik te maken van UGC-sites**  
[ongeveer 3 min]

## H. Multiplayer online games zoals secondlife.com, World of Warcraft

*Zoek uit hoeveel tijd er besteed wordt op sociaalnetwerksites en UGC-services per dag/week (als dit nog niet gebleken is uit V.6)*

*Totale tijd: 33 min*

### **V.8 Waarom heb je op geen enkele van deze sites een account, of waarom ben je gestopt met het gebruiken ervan? Is er nog een andere reden?**

*Laat de geïnterviewde volledig uitpraten, maar noteer de eerste en de tweede reden.*

*We zijn geïnteresseerd in het nader onderzoeken van de redenen die de geïnterviewde heeft om zich zorgen te maken over:*

- de gevolgen van het prijsgeven van informatie online,
- hoe de persoonlijke informatie wordt gebruikt,
- of UGC-websites betrouwbaar zijn, en
- andere privacygerelateerde zaken.

Als privacy/gebruik van persoonlijke informatie/betrouwbaarheid niet wordt genoemd als reden om geen gebruik (meer) te maken van UGC-sites, vraag:

### **V.9 Om welke redenen zou je een account openen – of geen account openen – op een van deze websites?**

*Laat de geïnterviewde vrijuit spreken, maar probeer toch op vriendelijke wijze te achterhalen of de geïnterviewde enige druk voelt om een UGC-account te openen*

Als privacy/gebruik van persoonlijke informatie/betrouwbaarheid worden genoemd, vraag:

### **V.10. Je zei dat een van de redenen (de reden) om geen gebruik te maken van UGC-sites is <herhaal wat de geïnterviewde zei> . Kun je me meer in het bijzonder vertellen waarom je je daar zorgen om maakt?**

*Ondervraag diepgaand om te achterhalen*

*i. welk aspect van UGC-sites vindt de geïnterviewde onacceptabel en waarom;*

*ii. ideeën over hoe internetsites zulke informatie gebruiken;*

*iii waar zijn UGC-sites voor volgens geïnterviewde*  
Totale tijd: 36 min

**GEÏNTERVIEWDEN  
DIE IN V.7  
AANGAVEN UGC-  
SITES TE  
GEBRUIKEN**

**UGC-sites –  
Motivatie &  
gebruik**  
[ongeveer 6 min]

Vind uit:  
- motivatie voor  
UGC-gebruik  
- bereidheid om  
informatie te delen  
- ideeën &  
houdingen ten  
aanzien van  
verschillende  
soorten informatie  
- motivatie voor  
privacy-instellingen

**V.11** **Waarom ben je gebruik gaan maken van <Sociaalnetwerksite. Als de geïnterviewde geen gebruik maakt van sociaalnetwerksites, noem dan de UGC-site die in V.7 het meest gebruikt werd>? Vraag door om de belangrijkste beweegredenen te achterhalen om gebruik te maken van de site.**

**V.12** **Welke informatie over jezelf heb je op deze website(s) gezet sinds je er gebruik van maakt?**  
*Geef de geïnterviewde de tijd en laat in zijn/haar eigen woorden antwoorden, maar stuur aan op antwoorden als: naam, huisadres, foto's van zichzelf, foto's van familie en vrienden, audio- of video-opnamen, medische informatie, hobby's, sport, plaatsen waar je geweest bent, smaak, meningen etc.*

**V.13** **Wie kan je profiel en je foto's zien?**  
*Vraag door V.13.1* **Waarom heb je dat zo ingesteld?**

**V.14** **Heb je er ooit spijt van gehad dat je bepaalde informatie op deze website(s) geplaatst heb?**

*Zo ja:* **V.15** **Zou je me er iets meer over kunnen vertellen? Wat is er gebeurd? Waarom heb je er spijt van?**

*Als geïnterviewde commerciële informatie & de negatieve effecten daarvan niet noemt, stel dan ook vraag 16.1 en 16.2*

*Zo nee:* **V.16** **Zou je je een situatie kunnen voorstellen waarin je er wel spijt van gehad zou hebben?**

*Vraag door om te achterhalen of de geïnterviewde zich geen zorgen maakt om de informatie die hij/zij post vanwege:*

*i. geïnterviewde post weinig informatie, of  
ii. denkt altijd goed na voordat hij/zij iets post, of  
iii. denkt dat het geen probleem is dat iedereen toegang heeft tot informatie over hem/haar*  
*Als NIET i en ii, vraag:*

**16.1** **Ontvang je commerciële informatie waarvan je het idee hebt dat je het ontvangt vanwege de persoonlijke informatie die je gepost hebt? Zo ja, wat vind je daarvan?**

*Vraag door om exact vast te stellen:*

- iv. of de geïnterviewde zich bewust is van de gevolgen van het online plaatsen van informatie*
- v. waarom sommige gevolgen meer acceptabel is dan andere*
- vi. accepteren mensen dat het ontvangen van commerciële informatie onderdeel is van het verdienmodel van de diensten waar ze gebruik van maken*

**16.2 Denk je dat er iets kan gebeuren (bijvoorbeeld met betrekking tot het vinden van een baan, reputatie) als gevolg van persoonlijke informatie die je online gepost hebt?**

*Zo ja – Hoe denk je dat dit kan gebeuren?*

*Zo nee – Waarom denk je dat dit niet mogelijk is?*

*Vraag door om te achterhalen hoe de geïnterviewde denkt over andere mensen die gebruik maken van zijn/haar op UGC-sites geposte informatie. Wees neutraal om zowel positieve als negatieve antwoorden de ruimte te geven.*

*Totale tijd: 42 min*

**ALLE  
GEÏNTERVIEWDEN**

**Gebruik van  
alias/nicknames**  
[ongeveer 2 min]

- onderzoek  
houding ten  
opzichte van het  
prijsgeven van  
persoonlijke  
informatie in  
verschillende  
situaties

*Als dit tot nu toe nog niet vastgesteld is*

**V.17 Heb je weleens een alias of een nickname gebruikt als je informatie prijs gaf online? In welke gevallen en waarom? Of, als je het nog nooit gedaan hebt, hoe denk je er over?**

*Ga er meer in detail op in.*

*Totale tijd: 44 min*

**ALLE  
GEÏNTERVIEWDEN**

**Houding ten  
opzichte van het  
gebruik van  
persoonlijke**

**V.18 De informatie die gebruikers op hun account of profiel van een website zetten kan door de eigenaren van de website worden gebruikt voor een aantal doeleinden, zoals het aanpassen van de inhoud en de advertenties die gebruikers zien, voor het versturen van e-mails, om diepgaande persoonlijke informatie over de gebruikers te verkrijgen etc. Wist je dit toen je je aanmeldde voor een website (of UGC/SNS)? Wat vind je er van dat dit gebeurt?**

**informatie door websites**

[ongeveer 8 min]

Toon kaart B

*Noteer of de geïnterviewde zich bewust was van deze doeleinden en onderzoek de houding ten opzichte van het gebruik van persoonlijke informatie voor elk van de volgende punten:*

*Toon kaart B:*

- 4. het aanpassen van de advertenties die je ziet (je krijgt alleen advertenties te zien van producten en diensten die je waarschijnlijk interesseren)*
- 5. het delen van informatie (die gekoppeld kan worden aan jouw naam) over jouw gedrag met andere onderdelen van het bedrijf*
- 6. het verkopen van informatie (niet gekoppeld aan jouw naam) aan andere bedrijven*

*Vraag voor elk van deze punten door naar de reden van de geïnterviewde om het bepaalde gebruik acceptabel/onacceptabel te vinden.*

*Als het nog niet eerder ter sprake is gekomen, vraag voor elk van de doeleinden die de geïnterviewde onacceptabel vindt:*

**V.19 Onder welke omstandigheden, als deze er al zijn, zou je het acceptabel vinden dat websites de informatie die gebruikers over zichzelf prijsgeven gebruiken voor < het doeleinde dat de geïnterviewde onacceptabel vindt>?**

*Vraag door om te achterhalen over de geïnterviewde een lot uit een loterij, punten op een website (zoals Facebook-punten), aandelen van de website of geld zou accepteren in ruil voor gegevens.*

*Totale tijd: 52 min*

**ALLE GEÏNTERVIEWDEN**

**Houding en gedrag ten opzichte van privacybeleid**

[ongeveer 4 min]

**V.20 Wat is jouw mening over het privacybeleid van de UGC-sites/sociaalnetwerksites die je gebruikt? Heb je ze gelezen voor je je aanmeldde? (Kies een voorbeeld. Als de geïnterviewde nee heeft geantwoord op V.7, kies dan een andere website die hij/zij regelmatig gebruikt.)**

**So ja – Waar kijk je naar? Als je niet kan vinden waar je naar op zoek bent, wat doe je dan?**

*Vraag door om te achterhalen:*

- of mensen het privacybeleid daadwerkelijk lezen;*
- waarnaar (de aanwezigheid/afwezigheid van een bepaalde functie? geruststelling?) ze op zoek zijn als ze het privacybeleid lezen; en*
- 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?) wat ze doen als dat wat ze zoeken niet te vinden is in het privacybeleid (blijven ze de website gebruiken? stoppen ze er mee of, indien ze er nog*

	<i>geen gebruik van maakten, beginnen ze er niet aan?)</i>
	<i>Totale tijd: 56 min</i>
<b>ALLE GEÏNTERVIEWDEN</b>	<b>Dit is alles wat ik wilde vragen. Is er nog iets wat je er aan toe wil voegen?</b>
<b>Bedankt afsluiting</b>	<b>&amp;</b> <i>Overhandig de beloning indien van toepassing. Informeert over de vervolgstappen, geef meer informatie over CONSENT als de geïnterviewde dat wenst.</i>
	<b>Heel erg bedankt voor je waardevolle bijdrage aan ons project!</b>
	<i>Totale tijd: 60 min</i>

---



## 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)**

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

**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**

<b>Positive Aspects of the Internet (“love most”) (Q3)</b>	e.g. broadness of information, entertainment, worldwide networking, source of inspiration
<b>Negative Aspects of the Internet (“dislike most”) (Q4)</b>	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, Q.8, 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>				

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

**Additional Quotes:**

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

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

<b>Multiplayer online games</b> <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)**

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

**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
<b>Actual (own) experience</b>		
<b>Experiences of <u>others</u></b>		
<b>Imagining <u>future</u> situations</b>		

**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

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

<b>Specific Quotes:</b>
-------------------------