Caring is sharing:

The effects of news consumption via self-curated Facebook feeds

Jonas Hedenquist and Magnus von Goës Karlström

JMG - The institution of journalism, media and communication

Abstract

The purpose of our study was to research people's media habits when it comes to news consumption through social media, Facebook in particular, and to try to ascertain if our theory that people today are lacking in source criticism skills has any basis in reality.

Our theory is that social media users who rely solely or primarily on Facebook for news consumption are less likely to compare media coverage between outlets and channels, and validate sources, than consumers of traditional media.

Broken down into component parts, the main questions we were looking to answer were:

- To what extent does our population rely on Facebook as a primary or sole source for news and media coverage?
- In what manner does relying primarily or solely on Facebook for news content influence criticism of sources and user acceptance of news content posted directly to their curated feeds?

The method we chose was a quantitative study, as we believed that it was more important to begin with finding the frequency of these phenomena before studying the subject on a deeper level. This was done through an online survey that we had intended to send to certain groups of Swedes within the age range of 18-36, but due to being unable to find a way to reach this population we were forced to lessen our scope, and ended up with a highly limited group of respondents that led to a total of only 122 replies. As a result, our conclusions are only relevant for Swedish students of media, journalism and communication sciences. But within that subset, we did not find any conclusive evidence that the theories that we based our study on are grounded in reality. Also, due to the training and expertise of our population, it is not unlikely that they have a more critical approach to news, especially unsourced reports on social media sites. It also seems prudent to assume that they spend more time consuming news than the average person. In conclusion, it would seem that students of these sciences have a very balanced and self-aware approach to source control and criticism in social media environments, applying the same or even stricter guidelines.

We also believe that our theoretical framework is sound and that the groundwork that we have done is solid, and as such present this thesis in part as a proof of concept with components that would be suited to be used for larger studies within the field in the future.

Keywords: Facebook, social media, self-curated feeds, echo chambers, filter bubbles, gatekeeping, comparisons of media coverage, source validation, source, criticism, source control, gatewatching, experiment, quantitive study, survey, ideological separation, future of news.

Contents

1. Introduction

General introduction

In today's society, more and more importance is being put on quick and easy access to all sorts of information and content. News are no exception to this, and with the proliferation of faster and smaller devices and a 24/7 access to the internet, the potential for quickly spreading information is bigger than ever. But the same goes for misinformation. Information that comes quickly can sometimes be valued higher than information that has been confirmed, only thanks to the first report coming faster. The first report is the one that will reach the news feeds and get shared on social media such as Facebook and Twitter first,[1] and we believe that there is a risk that many people trust their feeds and do not take the time to confirm the information as correct. We suspect that source criticism might be a lost art among a majority of everyday news consumers, especially when some big event is going on and a lot of people want to know what's going on as soon as possible. Rumours easily start when there is a lack of information, and these rumours can spread quickly. After a rumour has been shared enough times, it might start getting accepted as fact. This phenomenon is something that established news channels currently seem unable to combat in an adequate way.

Simultaneously, we've also reached a point where everyone can create their own news feed, and select specific sources to follow. Every news consumer turns into their own gatekeeper, and we believe that once you have created your personal, self-curated news feed, it's easy to trust the information it provides without questioning it to any greater extent. It's been shown that there is a tendency among social media users to create a feed where they get served only information that they agree with, avoiding any dissenting opinions.[2] Thusly, they receive a very one-sided version of news reporting.

Because a large number of sources is needed for a nuanced journalism, and that one of the ideals of journalistics is a nuanced and faceted reporting, a lack of source criticism can easily lead to a highly skewed and perhaps even false view of what's happening in the world.

Our purpose with this study is to find how widespread this phenomenon is and if those that do use Facebook as a primary news source do perform any kind of source critical checks, such as seeking out several news reports from different sources about events.

It should be mentioned that even before the proliferation of social media and the capabilities to create your own curated feed, it has been possible to keep to only one single news source. However, a vast majority of the available news sources before the internet were at least a product of a journalistic process

---

[1] Griffee, 2012

[2] Garrett, 2009:265-285; Iyengar and Hahn, 2009:19-39; Munson and Resnick, 2010:1457-1466

with a professional nature. With the rise of the internet, there are now a host of sources that primarily consist of user generated content, and it is not at all impossible to get your information solely from sources that lack the more critical view of a trained journalist.

Outline of the essay

Following the introduction, we introduce the *Theoretical framework* that we have built our study upon. After that comes a chapter where we list all the *Previous research* that we have found and used to find what holes there are in the current collected knowledge about the field, and also statistics that we believe have been relevant in the creation of our study.

The next chapter, *Purpose and questions*, delves into our purpose with the study and what specific research questions we have set out to find the answers to, based on the theoretical framework.

The following chapter, *Method and material*, will specify the method we used to conduct our study, and what choices we had to make in the early stages of it. This chapter also touches on how representative we find our study to be, as well as validity and reliability.

Then comes the *Results* we received from our survey, plus the analysis of a selection of answers we found especially important or interesting.

Finally there is the *Conclusion and discussion* chapter, where we discuss what we actually have been able to find out through this study, and perhaps most important given our situation, suggestions for possible future research on the same topic.

As *appendices* at the end of the essay you can find our survey and cover letter, both as they appeared in Swedish when sent out to our population, and translated into English.

2. Theoretical Framework

Overview

The past decade has seen the propagation of some of the most drastic changes to the news industry in the history of published journalism. Consumer habits often seem to inversely mirror this trend, leading to an unrivalled variety in how regular readers, listeners and viewers approach news content.

One such trend with a potential for tremendous impact on consumer access to news is the self-curated social news feed.[3] A consequence of the interplay between digital conveniences such as curated contact feeds, unrestricted linking features and a common desire to spread awareness of events perceived as important, social media users can now potentially rely exclusively on their community of choice for filtering of news content.

Without additional years or decades of study, it might be hard to say whether this behaviour is paradigmatic in the long-term. But with the hindsight of a mostly linear progression over the past years,[4] the phenomenon is still common enough to be ubiquitous among heavy social media users, even if not all-encompassing.

Enter a world of literally genre-breaking possibilities. Early research suggests this passive mode of news consumption might enrich and broaden the perspective of regular users, potentially heightening political and social awareness,[5] and increase the frequency of exposure to diverse coverage of current events.[6] Eroding the barriers to the spread of relevant and contemporary information has probably always been a missive of journalism. From a strictly technical viewpoint, social media offers some of the most efficient tools yet.[7]

But there are also potential adverse effects. Flaxman, Goel and Rao suggest that reliance primarily or solely on curated community feeds for news reporting leads to an increase in the mean ideological distance between individuals. Users become subject to a very restrictive *echo chamber* effect. This view is supported by both Pariser (2011) and Sunstein (2001, 2009). Modern consumers exhibit a tendency of confirmation bias that is especially relevant to news reporting, and doubly so when combined with

---

[3] Mitchell, A. et al., 2015

[4] Mitchell, A. et al., 2015

[5] Messing and Westwood, 2012, Goel et al., 2010

[6] Goel et al., 2012a; Obendorf et al., 2007

[7] Mitchell, A. et al., 2015

communal contact lists; we seek out information that confirm our opinions and beliefs,[8] and prefer to surround ourselves with individuals who do the same.[9] Indeed, we sometimes even tailor the information we spread to the majority belief of the target audience.[10]

The effects of these tendencies upon a highly curated and strictly controlled group of individuals (such as Facebook friends lists and Twitter follows) that is entirely subject to our own whims has been suggested to create highly restrictive *filter bubbles*.[11] We share what we perceive as news among restricted groups of sympathetic individuals, reinforcing each others' beliefs, further strengthening our conviction, and confirming our decisions (whether intentional or reflexive) to limit ourselves to that particular group of contacts.[12]

There is also the potential for insufficient source control and validation in social news feeds. Over the past decade, we have seen entirely unsubstantiated news stories and outright hoaxes gain considerable traction in social media before being debunked. Barely a few weeks ago as of this time of writing, a short film clip of a group of young Pakistani men celebrating was attributed to the recent terror attack in Paris; what was claimed to be members of the Islamic State commemorating the death and destruction turned out to be a group of British cricket players from 2009 celebrating their recent tournament victory.[13]

Similarly, in december 2013, a story began to circulate in Swedish social media about a young woman murdered by her ex-boyfriend, a supposed immigrant. The post, written by a regular Facebook user, reached more than 7000 shares (which Jack Werner of Viralgranskaren equates to approximately 70 000 views)[14] before the unsubstantiated claims were finally debunked. The proposed picture of the victim turned out to be entirely unrelated, the name and identity of the victim non-existent, and the story had no grounds in any recently reported events. But the stir it caused was widespread,[15] and there is a possibility that the resulting anti-immigration sentiments might sustain their influence in spite of the revelation of falsehood.[16]

---

[8] Lord et al., 1984, 1979; Nickerson, 1998; Garrett, 2009; Iyengar and Hahn, 2009; Munson and Resnick, 2010

[9] McPherson et al., 2001

[10] Moscovici and Zavalloni, 1969; Myers and Bishop, 1970; Schkade et al., 2007; Spears et al., 1990

[11] Pariser, 2011; Flaxman, Goel and Rao, 2014

[12] Lord et al., 1984, 1979; Nickerson, 1998; Garrett, 2009; Iyengar and Hahn, 2009; Munson and Resnick, 2010

[13] Wang, 2015

[14] Panel discussion, 2015

[15] Werner, 2013; Panel discussion, 2015

[16] Kunda, 1990; MacCoun, 1998; Nyhan and Reifler, 2006

With all these tools and usage consequences, we suddenly carry the potential to become our own gatekeepers, with all the associated risks and rewards. A role typically contentious even when held by trained journalists, it might require a wholly new approach and set of skills when filled by regular social media users in order to avoid extreme bias and restrictive information feedback loops. Sundar's research support this idea, with the claim that there is "no assurance of any uniformity in content quality" in a user-curated information network.[17]

Some even suggest that this shift in power of content dilutes the core mechanics of gatekeeping, until no one holds assertive power any longer. Instead, we watch as information pass through the gates, promoting that which agrees with our preconceptions, making collective, indirect, opposing or secondary choices about topic relevance and usefulness.[18] Brun titles this new hybridized state "gatewatching", and explains that we are now watchers, co-creators and reposters of content.

What this new state of informational existence holds in common with the idea of co-opting the role of gatekeeper - apart from the transposition of curation from traditional media to users - is the potential need for new user routines, traditions and habits in order to avoid the pitfalls of self-curated news feeds as the sole or dominant source of news.

To do that, however, we need to first identify WHAT the potential shortcomings of these models might be. For any of these tendencies to have tangible and adverse effects on our social and political awareness, bias in reporting, restrictive opinionating and lack of source validation has to carry inherent risks.

And for us to make a valuable contribution, journalism has to offer a remedy.

Since the notion of the value of journalistic method in reporting is the underpinning of the profession, we can assume, infer or outright claim these effects as universally accepted truths. However, there are many examples in this specific context that are worthy of illumination. Two such examples are mentioned in the two last paragraphs on the previous page. But the past years have been filled with similar stories of falsehoods going viral, social media posts without a basis in reality picked up by newspapers and reported as fact, and rumors accepted as reporting by both professionals and consumers.

Survey Design

There has been no shortage of studies related to our topic of interest in the past decade. As reliance on social media has progressed from budding to commonplace to ubiquitous in parts of the world, examination of how users employ these tools and channels have swelled proportionally.

---

[17] Sundar, 2008

[18] Brun, 2008

To our knowledge, however, no study directly explores the relation between use of Facebook as a primary or sole news channel and the limitations traditionally associated with non-journalistic reporting. Pew Research Center provides, through a multitude of studies, plenty of data on the fundamental tendencies behind social media propagation and related news consumption. Studies such as Flaxman, Goel and Rao's "Ideological Segregation and the Effects of Social Media on News Consumption" and "Filter Bubbles, Echo Chambers, and Online News Consumption" opens up the phenomenon to closer inspection, with a particular focus on the social and informational constructs that result from social media interaction and self-curated news channels. But while we know that the behaviour creates filter bubbles, echo chambers and related effects of gatekeeping exclusivity, and to some extent why, our knowledge on how it occurs, what the repercussions might be, and how to counter any potential shortcomings of this model is still highly limited.

There is most likely a wide array of diverging but interconnected behavioural tendencies and usage patterns that amalgamate to provide the appeals and potential obstructive effects of self-curated social news feeds. In lieu of a comprehensive theoretical framework to map out these synergistic effects, we aim to illuminate one specific and distinctive expression: how news consumption in self-created feedback loops carry risks of insufficient source validation and control. And how this element translates into a lack of comparison of media coverage, and the related risks of filter bubble and echo chamber creation.

Our questionnaire design reflects this focus. We probe respondents for both general usage patterns online as well as in social media, changes in news consumption behaviour, Facebook-specific actions and reactions, source validation and variety of informational tendencies, and topical preferences and particularities. With the resulting data, we aim to both map out some general areas where previous studies lack in density - such as news consumption in self-curated feeds - as well as specifically target the behaviour we predict in our hypothesis.

With our sample base currently limited to adult students across Sweden (see both Results and Method for further discussion), we have excluded generic questions made redundant by the survey population - the vast majority of students in Swedish universities can be assumed to have academic ambitions, a basic familiarity with the relevant technology, products and solutions touched upon, as well as a basic familiarity with traditional models for news consumption.

There is a very significant but purposeful gap in our survey design in regards to source validation and secondary source habits - when we query respondents for comparisons of media coverage, we do not explore the ideological and informational separation and spread of those sources.

The purpose of this design is twofold. The first reason is that ideological separation of news channels and how this influences source contrasts is a topic broad enough to warrant its own experiment. Integrating a variety of questions to explore this cognitive mechanic in our experimental design might

have spread our focus - and thus our results and validity - too thin. There is also the risk of alienating respondents with question density and quantity.

The second reason is that the social media echo chamber effect referred to above alludes primarily to the potential of almost total isolation from professional media coverage, as well as views in contrast to those of the respondent. As long as social media users take voluntary steps to prevent this effect (in our case, contrasting Facebook posts with third-party sources of news), the social media in itself will not give rise to rigid or absolute filter bubbles and echo chambers.

This tenet holds true even if they rely on professional sources close to their own sentiments along the ideological spectrum. It still breaks the principle of informational isolation, and provides the potential for contrasting views. The very habit of and desire to validate sources and contrast information alone is a potential antithesis to the echo chamber effect.[19]

---

[19] Flaxman, Goel and Rao, 2014; 2015

3. Previous Research

Naturally, due to the rise of the internet, social media and a greater accessibility to all kinds of information in more and more ways, as well as the far improved ability for anyone to publish information to be seen by a large audience, studies within the field have been conducted before ours. But, no studies we could find had attempted to target the subject and questions that we intended to crack open. Nevertheless, the studies show that it is a field that is approachable from a variety of angles and previous studies have helped us identify the "missing" information when it comes to data on media habits on social media.

Debunking in a World of Tribes, Echo Chambers in the age of misinformation, Emotional Dynamics in the age of misinformation, Trend of Narratives in the age of misinformation, Quattroiocchi et al. 2015

A series of scientific articles that under a five year period investigated tendencies among 54 million Facebook users in the context of scientific/verified information versus conspiratory/unverified information. From the results, one of the conclusions was that the groups are heavily polarized - people are in general more interested in confirming their own worldview rather than search for a truth that might challenge it, and fighting this phenomenon is one of the challenges that journalism of today is facing.

The Evolving Role of News on Twitter and Facebook, Pew Research Center, 2015

A study that shows how Facebook and Twitter have become important news sources these days. The study found that 41 percent of Facebook users use it for news, out of a total of 66 percent that use Facebook. Twitter is a much less used source of news than Facebook and is more important in critical situations. The study compares its results to a study from 2013, and it's seen that there's been a noticeable change in only two years with a 16 percentage point increase of people who obtain their news from Facebook. The study has gotten a lot of attention and has been featured in several larger publications. We believe that Sweden and USA are similar enough culture-wise to make the numbers relevant for us as well. However, we are somewhat critical of the limited selection compared to the total population of the US for such a general study, as it's based on only 2035 replies.

Sweden's largest Facebook study, Gothenburg Research Institute 2012

A study that intended to show what Swedes do on Facebook and what areas of use were considered more important than others. Additionally about reasons to use status updates and what psychological effects they might have. However, the study didn't approach news as a reason for Facebook use, at most it

mentioned "spreading information/knowledge", which doesn't necessarily have to do with news as it can also include personal information.

Sociala medier - En viktig nyhetskälla, Heba Faraj, Södertörn university 2011

A master's thesis about how Swedish journalists approached the reports on social media about the revolution in Egypt. The study touched upon how specifically the journalists applied source criticism to the information that spread concerning the revolution in social media and how that information was being used in news reports. Our study intends to check the field news consumers rather than producers.

Källkritik för internet, Göran Leth & Torsten Thurén, Styrelsen för psykologiskt försvar (now Myndigheten för samhällsskydd och beredskap) 2000

What's being presented in this publication is not to any greater degree relevant for our purpose as it was composed long before the social media sites we're interested in were thought of. However, it displays that already one and a half decade ago, when the internet was still fairly new in Sweden and information was consolidated on specific sites rather than an actively moving feed, there was considered to be enough reason to create a study about approaching the medium from a source-critical perspective.

Digital: As Mobile Grows Rapidly, the Pressure on News Intensify, Jane Sasseen, Kenny Olmstead & Amy Mitchell, Pew Research Center 2013

A yearly report about the factors that put pressure on media. The report contains details about the spread of misinformation that is highly relevant to our hypothesis.

How Social Media is Reshaping News, Monica Anderson & Andrea Caumont, Pew Research Center, 2014

A detailed report about the effects of social media on news consumption that both partly forms our underlying view of the phenomenon and supports some of our theories.

Ideological Segregation and the Effects of Social Media on News Consumption and *Filter Bubbles, Echo Chambers, and Online News Consumption*, Seth R. Flaxman, Sharad Goel & Justin, M. Rao Microsoft Research, Carnegie Mellon University & Stanford University, 2013 and 2014

Two detailed studies of the phenomena that we're looking to investigate (however in a somewhat different context, as it has a broader and less specific focus and vastly different circumstances), that supports many of our theories and our hypothesis.

4. Purpose and research questions

The purpose of our research

The overarching purpose of this study is to delineate news consumption tendencies and habits in self-curated Facebook feeds, and what impact this new media paradigm has on comparisons of media coverage, source validation and user exposure to a variety of channels. In this way, we want to investigate the filter bubble and echo chambers effects said to accompany the sharing of news and opinions within potentially isolated digital communities.

Primarily, we want to identify the manner in which - if any - relying primarily or solely on Facebook for news content influences criticism of sources and user acceptance of news content posted directly to their curated feeds.

Ultimately, we do not seek to criticize the principle of spreading news via social media, but instead help users strengthen their awareness of the subjective nature of news reporting within curated social feeds. Identifying further usage patterns could also be of use on the developer end of the social media spectrum. A practical implementation of pertinent results might even help social media developers to integrate mechanics for contrasts of media coverage, and to spread awareness of the ideological and informational distribution of relevant issues.

Primary research questions

The primary question our study aims to refute or prove is "Social media users who rely solely or primarily on Facebook for news consumption are less likely to compare media coverage between outlets and channels, and validate sources, than consumers of traditional media".

We also seek to determine to what extent these users compare and contrast media coverage in general - even with the same habits as consumers of print and digital media publications, social media news consumers might still be at greater risk of ideological separation thanks to social media's self-curated contact feeds and increased potential for filter bubbles and echo chambers.

Finally, among the different forms of news shared, we look especially long and hard at news reported in personal Facebook posts - contributions with no reported sources, without links to professional articles or sites. In a closed feedback loop such as provided by self-curated social media feeds, these posts carry the greatest risk of misinformation and information dilution (as exemplified in our Theory). We theorise that users have a tendency not to contrast these posts against professional media coverage in general.

5. Method and material

Population and delimitations

Our original intent was a much larger population than we ended up with. Because we originally were hoping to see how widespread the phenomenon was when looking at Swedish social media users at large, we were aiming to conduct the survey on a population consisting of Swedes aged 18-36, with some further delimitation that we didn't quite manage to narrow down enough, but we ran into some difficulties in obtaining ways to reach these in a meaningful way. Out of necessity we then decided to lessen our scope somewhat and reach out to university students at larger Swedish higher education institutions, as we believed that it could provide a large enough population from a variety of fields and ages that was still within the scope of our original intent. We contacted nineteen different institutions, but we had not expected that many of them would be unwilling to provide contact details and mailing lists in any useful way, as they could only be provided through physical mail and we had no guarantees for when we would receive it. Because we had a very limited time to perform the study, we were to our great disappointment forced to accept a highly limited population that was not nearly as varied as we originally had intended for the study, as while we believed the results would not be what we wanted with this population, waiting any longer would have resulted in not having enough time to perform a thorough analysis of the responses we did get.

The only institution that we were able to get any contact lists from in time was the Institution for Journalism, Media and Communications in Gothenburg (JMG), and therefore the study was performed only on media students studying in Gothenburg in November 2015. Therefore, we cannot claim that our results are generalizable for the population where we believe that the phenomena of a self-curated news consumption carries with it the most potential risks. We do believe that we can make a claim for our results to be generalized for students at JMG, and by extension, we theorize that it can be generalized for Swedish media students in in the whole country. So while this limited set of responses does not allow us to draw any conclusions relating to Swedish social media users as a whole, that they all come from the same academic field lets us find what we believe to be fairly concrete answers about this specific group.

Choice of method

We decided early on that our research would be performed on a purely quantitative level. We believe there are grounds for doing also a qualitative study on the subject, to further narrow down the causes and effects of the phenomena that we are interested in, but we believe that such a study is less meaningful if we have not first found out if the phenomena really is as widespread as we believe it to be. We also

believed the results from a quantitative approach, regardless of what those results actually would turn out to be, would be easier to use as the basis for future research projects about the subject.

We chose Facebook as our primary research target only because it is the most widely used of the social media where we believe that the phenomena we want to study occurs. Other social media such as Twitter and Instagram were discussed, but while they have their places in getting news through social media, they have different functions and as such we wanted to concentrate on one kind of news use. Also, recent research suggests Twitter is used primarily for breaking news, and less for news consumption in general than Facebook[20], making it less ideal for our study in a multitude of ways. It would certainly be very interesting, however, to conduct a similar survey on Twitter users, and see how the filter bubble and echo chamber effects translate to Twitter's more open-ended design, and to breaking news and crisis reporting.

After knowing that we wanted to perform a quantitative study, we elected to do this through an anonymous web survey sent to each person in the population, a total population sample from those that we had ways of reaching. We decided to create a survey that didn't draw too much attention to the fact that it was specifically media habits as it relates to Facebook we were looking for, but as we thought it would be important to also get statistics on how the respondents use other media, we were able to do this in a natural way that did not detract from the true purpose.

In its original inception, our survey contained questions about education level and what field the respondent was studying or working in. With the lessened scope, and a population consisting only of students at higher education institutions, we believed these questions to no longer be meaningful for our purpose, and as such didn't include them in the finalized survey.

Our survey included 23 questions, of which a majority asked the respondent to mark their answer on a Likert scale. Because we wanted a somewhat simple response set in order to easier be able to find relations between media habits, we also opted to not include any open questions save for asking the respondent to specify examples of media channels they made use of when asked how often they use other ones than those we specifically asked about. The survey was thus designed such that all questions could be reduced to a single answer, with few to no openings for the respondents to interpret them in a way that we had not intended, something we found we had to be sure of to be able to use the responses we got for a meaningful study.

Our survey was active for a week, from 14:00 on November 26th to 14:00 on December 3rd. During this period, reminders were sent out on November 28th, November 30th and December 2nd. We received a total of 122 responses during this period from a total of roughly 375 students. This gives us a response frequency of 32,5 percent. Within this figure, there is also a small natural loss of respondents, namely

---

[20] Mitchell, A. et al., 2015

those who are not Facebook users and thus would be unable to respond to the survey. The survey as well as the enclosed cover letter can be found in both their original Swedish form and translated to English as appendices at the end of this thesis.

After the survey had been closed, we imported the responses as a data set to the analytics software SPSS where each answer functioned as a separate variable. In this data set, we would then perform cross tabulation analysis in order to find any relations between answers that were relevant to our research. The most significant answers and relationships between them as it relates to the media habits of the respondents can be found in the results chapter of this thesis.

The disadvantage of such a simple model for comparison is the lack of ability to pinpoint behavioural tendencies with exact accuracy, and apply traditional statistical correlations to the results. However, we believe that the merits far outweighs this limitation, as this approach allows us to analyze the results with the flexibility such a fluid and broadly intricate phenomenon requires for relevant insight. With such novel and unpredictable elements involved, a more dynamic approach to data analyzis opens up the results to wider interpretation, and avoids the adaptation of the data to conventional models that might never have been intended for this material. Furthermore, it offers headroom for correlations that go beyond the primary variables, and the chance to map out secondary behaviour that directly influences the mechanics we seek to study.

Representativeness

Of our respondents, there was a split of 40 percent men and 60 percent women. The ages of the respondents was in the range of 19-40 years old, with a majority falling within the range of 20-27 years. Only two respondents fell outside of our originally intended range of 18-36.

For our population, we claim a degree of representativeness. The gender split of the respondents almost perfectly reflects the actual gender split when it comes to students at JMG at the time of the study, and it is believed that media studies in Sweden in general are similar in this regard. The age range that the majority of our respondents were in is also highly believable to be the age range of the majority of students at Swedish higher education institutions. Thus, our set of respondents and replies can at the very least be said to be a representation of Swedish media students at higher education institutions.

Validity and reliability

We cannot claim that the results of our study have achieved a good validity, either internal or external, due to the highly limited set of respondents from the somewhat skewed population. We believe that media students differ in their news consumption and source criticism habits in significant ways compared to individuals that have not studied the very things that we wanted to gather data about.

The reliability is somewhat better, as while we did not obtain the means to contact either the originally intended population or the adjusted population, the reasons for why we did not was not due to any fundamental error in our work. We believe the study and survey as it is would not need any significant adjustments to be repeatable, and if repeated on the same population that we obtained our answers from in this case, would produce similar results even with a higher amount of responses. Likewise, if a larger population but still consisting chiefly of media students were to be reached, the answers would likely be somewhat close. Our goal, however, is to see the study repeated on a larger population, and in such a case it is not unlikely that the results would paint a different picture.

In conclusion

We chose a method that we believed would provide a somewhat shallow but wide response to our original research questions, to pave the way for future, more specific studies on the subject. This gives us results that are devoid of any nuances, and in general we are able to answer "how much?" but not "why?". As we did not set out to answer "why?" in this specific study, we do not find it to be to our detriment - but at the same time, means that additional studies are required before any big reveals about the subject can actually be made. Additionally, we think that the more interesting responses can be found in the population that we did not manage to capture in this study, as media students are presumably more alert when it comes to our themes for the study. However, it did allow us to capture a presumably accurate picture of the social media habits of this one specific subset of the population.

6. Results

Limitations of respondents

While we (as detailed in Methods) sought out a wide variety of respondents, only one institution responded within the allotted time. As a result, our survey yielded 122 responses, and our population consists exclusively of students within journalism and media studies at the Institution of Journalism, Media and Communication in Gothenburg (JMG).

As our survey population consists almost entirely of university students within the fields of media, journalism and communication, we cannot dismiss the notion that news consumers with academic ambitions and training - and in some cases, media training and journalistic method - are not representative for individuals even within the same age range in regards to media habits.

With this limitation to our population, any established validity, statistical relevance or any universally or otherwise large-scale applicable trends are only relevant for this particular group. However, it might be reasonable to assume that any tendencies that occur as a result of the expertise, professional focus and training of the students of JMG might partially of fully recur across the whole spectrum of students within the fields of journalism, communication and media sciences. At the very least, these trends might be a feature of Swedish students within above doctrines. A baseline study of non-homogenic social media users (see **Analysis**, below) would be required to ascertain such consistency, however.

These inherent limitations constitute the premise for all analysis and discussion that follows. That said, there are still several interesting tendencies and potentially relevant trends in our results. And for this particular population, these numbers indicate several significant aspects. Furthermore, we hope to identify important elements in our survey and experimental design that can be used as a practical basis for further but broader studies within this topic.

Notable survey results

Out of our 122 respondents, 65 media and journalism students relied on Facebook for news consumption on a daily basis, and another 11 used it every other day for the same purpose. In contrast, 75 users sought out traditional digital news publications on a daily basis, and another 21 visited the same journalistic outlets every other day. Print media reports predictably diminishing numbers; only 19 respondents relied on the medium with any frequency.

There is also significant overlap between users of digital news channels in general. Out of the respondents who rely either on Facebook or digital news publications or a daily basis, 44 favour both.

93 respondents report that their Facebook contacts share news at least once a day. This data lends further credence to the oft-reported idea that Facebook is quickly becoming an important news outlet, at least among Swedish students of media, communication and journalism sciences.

In the cross-tabulation between share frequency and media coverage comparison, there is a deviation that might hold some significance (certainly if replicated on a larger scale): the tendency to compare news reported in Facebook posts with other sources diminishes as the frequency of news material in Facebook posts goes down. 35 out of 77 respondents who report that they see news material in Facebook posts several times a day have a habit of contrasting media coverage on a regular basis. This gives us a 45.45% of users in that group who make a habit of regularly accessing secondary outlets for source validation and opinionated variety. Conversely, only 30-33% of students who report seeing news material in Facebook posts no more than seven times per week make a habit of regular source control. If the awareness of the importance of source validation, criticism and comparison diminishes as the number of shared news in a particular social media goes down, at least among a population such as ours, there might be a windowed potential for ideological isolation.

However, the percentage of dutiful comparisons rises to roughly 40% again as the number of Facebook news shares go down to only several times a month. As such, this discrepancy might be dismissible as a fluke, but might also represent the increased ease of and less time invested into source control and comparison when shares reach a critically low threshold number.

Another trend that recurs across the whole spectrum of respondents is the disposition towards those who regularly share news in Facebook posts (no matter if as links to digital publications, or in personally written posts). Whether these users rely primarily on print media, digital publications, Facebook shares, or a combination thereof, they all believe that sharing news via Facebook constitutes positive behaviour. Less than half of respondents has no opinion in the matter, and only five percent or less has a negative disposition towards this habit. This is another tendency which might be grounded strongly in the academic interests and training of our respondents, and indicates that at least among users with a personal or professional interest in the media industry, the spreading of information and opinion is highly regarded.

A high Facebook news share frequency also does not seem to have any significant influence on the perceptions of the sharers among their contacts. No matter if the news shares occurred several times a day, daily, weekly or monthly, a majority of users did not perceive the sharers as any more or less socially conscious or aware of current issues.

Analysis

Across our limited population, we found no evidence to support our thesis. In fact, regardless of through what channel, the majority of news consumers in our survey exhibited strikingly similar tendencies in

regards to source validation and secondary source contrast habits. Whether news were obtained through Facebook posts, Facebook links to regular news sources, traditional news outlets both paper and digital, and more, approximately 40-50% of respondents who read news every day regularly compared news articles from their favoured source with at least one other outlet. In fact, Facebook users exhibited a slightly higher frequency in comparisons of media coverage than consumers of traditional digital media outlets, the most notable indication that the informational isolation required for a severe echo chamber or filter bubble effect is not in effect among our respondents.

The exact effects of the the academic training and experience of our respondents upon these results are impossible to determine without a baseline of non-homogenic social media users. As discussed in Future Research, this might be a very important follow-up study that could open the topic up for further analysis and insight. But even without additional data, the consistency of news consumption and source-critical behaviour among our population across different media is noticeable, and potentially relevant for a number of secondary or peripheral conclusions.

Further research would be required to determine in what ways users validate and contrast sources (primarily if users compare sources to outlets of similar, related or opposed ideological inclination, and how this behaviour varies between users of different news channels). With that in mind, a similar frequency among a larger and less specialised population sample could have been an early indication that the filter bubble and echo chamber effects are not as prevalent among users who rely primarily on social media for news consumption as we would have assumed. If there is a self-curated gatekeeping effect at play among Facebook users, results like these on a larger scale would at least indicate it is not based in total isolation from outside influences or separate news sources. It certainly does not seem to be among students of the journalistic sciences and arts, if our small population is representative of any greater whole.

The only notable deviation from the norm was found among consumers who rely primarily on print media. Roughly 10% compared any given news article to another source. But given that the population in this group was only 19 respondents, these findings are small in significance in terms of in validity and relevance. Furthermore, this behaviour was also present among users who relied primarily on digital sources of news, in the few cases they did read news through printed publications. This suggests it might be a symptom of the medium in question, rather than its dedicated users.

As previously stated, the inherent limitations of our limited response frequency cannot be overlooked. But if our results are any indication of correlations that could have relevance if applied on a larger scale, whether to Swedish students of journalism, media and communication, Swedish social media users, of even social media users as a whole, we believe concepts like echo chambers, filter bubbles and individual gatekeeping might be more intricate and unpredictable in effect than previously demonstrated.

7. Conclusion and discussion

Summary

With only 122 respondents, we are unable to establish any large-scale validity or generalize our results to greater extents than our population. As such, we can draw no conclusion regarding our actual research query and results for any group greater than students of journalism, media and communication at JMG and the University of Gothenburg. While there is a possibility for similar results among all students of similar disciplines, further study would be required before any such consistency could be ascertained. But there was no proof to confirm our hypothesis among our population.

We hope that this study can also serve as a proof-of-concept for the topic, experimental design and survey composition. The following discussion will focus partially on these elements, and future research that could complement, build upon and extend our thesis.

While our basis for conclusive statements beyond these 122 students (and to some extent their peers among the other 68% non-respondent student body) is tenuous, it would seem to us that our survey design and questions did query respondents for relevant factors and mechanics in their use of Facebook as a platform for news, and in the effects this new paradigm might have upon source validation and comparisons of media coverage.

There there are quite a few questions designed to map out users' general news consumption behaviour. While a more narrow and focused design might yield the same results within the most relevant focal points, we also believe that the additional, related and sometimes peripheral questions allowed us a broader overview of the all the factors that influence the behaviour which we sought to study. With the help of this tangential information, we hoped to pinpoint tendencies left out of related studies, and create wider opportunities for a discussion of how users can develop their critical skills, and developers design to counter and balance self-curated gatekeeping effect, echo chambers and filter bubbles.

Discussion

Without applicable and reliable results, this discussion will remain highly theoretical. That said, should the issue we theorize but are unable to prove exist on a large scale to any relevant extent, it seems that Facebook and other social media are excellently positioned to enrich and diversify even private media coverage in their respective realms on a user interface level. In this way, they might counter much of the implications of self-curated news feeds and echo chambers. There are already powerful algorithms for comparison, filtering and even the dynamic writing of news coverage.[21] Implemented for the purpose of

---

[21] DeVigal, A (2015); Lecompte, C (2015)

diversifying media coverage, such code could be used to identify current issues and automatically suggest alternate sources to any news reported through social media, no matter if posted as links to news sites or even regular status updates. Especially if implemented in a non-optional but also non-intrusive manner, such mechanics could alone satisfy many demands for varied coverage, even against the poster's wishes. Otherwise, the classical principles for news coverage variety still apply. Much like a consumer of any form of news, responsibility needs to be taken on an individual level to avoid bias and ideological segregation of consumed content. But if previous research is indicative of any permeative elements of echo chamber/filter bubble effects, and there is any truth to our theory, the need to train regular consumers in these principles might be greater than ever.

Social media might or might not have a responsibility to remind and train their user base in these skills. But it seems hard to deny they are in a powerful position to do so. And if they did, they might do much to help provide both depth and width to our perceptions of contemporary issues.

Just like in so many other aspects of modern journalism and publishing, it seems like the only concerned group that is without power to influence these new forms of consumer-news interactions is traditional digital and print media. To our minds, it only places a greater emphasis on both users and social media providers to bear responsibility for diversification and breadth in coverage, and to make the best use of these unique possibilities. It might be a symptom of the shift in media power, one of the instigators, or - most likely - both. But either way, it is apparent that the traditional rules of journalism no longer and might never more apply.

8. Suggestions for future research

From the beginning, one of the things we have wanted to achieve with this study is to create grounds for future research projects within the field of news consumption through social media. Due to not reaching the population we were wishing for, the results we have presented here are perhaps not the best starting point for such projects, but we at least believe that our groundwork is solid and in that aspect provides a platform to work from.

The main thing we would like to see done is to repeat this study on the population we had originally intended for it, as we believe that it would produce a more interesting result and answer our research questions to a greater degree. This would also allow for comparisons with our population, and thus determine how non-homogenic and media-trained and -interested social media users diverge in user behaviour. Such a comparison might well yield very significant differences. These could, in turn, lead to further conclusions, both regarding the specific digital news consumption habits and patterns of media-trained individuals, and how to improve upon the critical behaviour of both groups in regards to news consumption via social media.

Furthermore, even if the results that we obtained did not bring with them any major revelations, they also did not do much to invalidate the original theories we built this study upon. Thus, while it would be prudent to perform the survey on a larger population first, there is also reason to perform a more qualitative study to find out people's reasoning behind how they handle their news consumption through social media in general and Facebook in particular.

Additionally, once a conclusive answer has been given to how people in general use social media for news consumption, there is room for a study to find out the deeper reasoning behind these uses and specific reasons as to why it gets used in such a way. Also, if it is found that our hypothesis is closer to the truth when it comes to users in a more general perspective, with not a majority media students, then there is room for an in-depth study on what it is that makes people disregard being source-critical, and whether or not this is a phenomena that is born out of the self-curated feed type of news consumption or if there is a more general trend to simply accept things that appear to be news.

References and bibliography

Anderson, M & Caumont, A. (2014), "How Social Media is Reshaping News". *Pew Research Center,* http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/09/24/how-social-media-is-reshaping-news/

Denti, L. et al. (2012), "Sweden's largest Facebook study". *Gothenburg Research Institute*, https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/28893

DeVigal, A (2015), "Robot Journalism: Algorithms are More of a Tool than a Threat". *Mediashift.org*, http://mediashift.org/2015/05/robot-journalism-algorithms-are-more-tool-than-threat/

Faraj, H. (2011), "Sociala medier - En viktig nyhetskälla". *Södertörns Högskola*, http://sh.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A433048&dswid=2788

Flaxman, S. R., Goel, S. & M. Rao, J. (2013 och 2014), "Ideological Segregation and the Effects of Social Media on News Consumption" och "Filter Bubbles, Echo Chambers, and Online News Consumption". *Carnegie Mellon University*, *Stanford University & Microsoft Research*, https://bfi.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/research/flaxman_goel_rao_onlinenews.pdf och https://5harad.com/papers/bubbles.pdf

Garrett, R. K. (2009), "Echo chambers online?: Politically motivated selective expo- sure among internet news users." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*

Goel, S., Mason, W., and Watts, D. J. (2010), "Real and perceived attitude agreement in social networks." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99(4)*

Goel, S., Hofman, J. M., and Sirer, M. I. (2012a), "Who does what on the web: A large-scale study of browsing behavior." *ICWSM*

Griffee, S. (2012), "Fact-Checking the Newtown Shootings." *Kicker*

Iyengar, S. and Hahn, K. S. (2009), "Red media, blue media: Evidence of ideological selectivity in media use". *Journal of Communication, 59(1)*

Kunda, Z (1990), "The case for motivated reasoning". *Department of Psychology: Psychological Bulletin, Vol 108(3):480-498*

Lecompte, C (2015), "Automation in the Newsroom". *Niemanreports.org*, http://niemanreports.org/articles/automation-in-the-newsroom/

Leth, G. och Thurén, T. (2000), "Källkritik för internet". *Styrelsen för psykologiskt försvar (numera Myndigheten för samhällsskydd och beredskap)*, http://libris.kb.se/bib/10076384

Lord, C. G., Ross, L., and Lepper, M. R. (1979), "Biased assimilation and attitude polarization: The effects of prior theories on subsequently considered evidence". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37(11):2098*

Lord, C. G., Lepper, M. R., and Preston, E. (1984), "Considering the opposite: A corrective strategy for social judgment". *Journal of personality and social psychology, 47(6):1231*

MacCoun, R., (1998), "Biases in the interpretation and use of research results". *Review of Psychology, 1998, Vol. 49*

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., and Cook, J. M. (2001), "Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks." *Annual review of sociology*

Messing, S. and Westwood, S. J. (2012), "Selective exposure in the age of social media: Endorsements trump partisan source afilliation when selecting news online." *Communication Research*

Mitchell, A. et al. (2015) "The Evolving Role of News on Twitter and Facebook". *Pew Research Center*, http://www.journalism.org/2015/07/14/the-evolving-role-of-news-on-twitter-and-facebook/

Moscovici, S. and Zavalloni, M. (1969), "The group as a polarizer of attitudes." *Journal of personality and social psychology, 12(2)*

Munson, S. A. and Resnick, P. (2010) "Presenting diverse political opinions: how and how much." *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*

Myers, D. G. and Bishop, G. D. (1970), "Discussion effects on racial attitudes.". *Science*

Nickerson, R. S. (1998), "Confirmation bias: a ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises". *Review of General Psychology, 2(2):175*

Nyhan, B., and Reifler, J. (2006), "When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions". *University of Michigan*, https://www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/nyhan-reifler.pdf

Obendorf, H., Weinreich, H., Herder, E., and Mayer, M (2007), "Web page revisitation revisited: implications of a long-term click-stream study of browser usage." *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*

Panel discussion (2015), "Battling online misinformation". http://youtu.be/L3uh3uvSMCw

Sasseen, J., Olmstead, K. & Mitchell, A. (2013), "Digital: As Mobile Grows Rapidly, the Pressure on News Intensify." *Pew Research Center*, http://www.stateofthemedia.org/2013/digital-as-mobile-grows-rapidly-the-pressures-on-news-intensify/#fn-12962-23

Schkade, D., Sunstein, C. R., and Hastie, R. (2007), "What happened on deliberation day?" *California Law Review*

Spears, R., Lea, M., and Lee, S. (1990), "De-individuation and group polarization in computer-mediated communication." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(2)

Sundar, S. S. (2008), The MAIN model: A heuristic approach to understanding technology effects on credibility". *In M. J. Metzger & A. J. Flanagin (Eds.), Digital media, youth, and credibility (pp. 73–100). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press*

Werner, J. (2015), "På Facebook bryr sig ingen om sanningen". *404-bloggen*, http://digital.di.se/artikel/blogg-pa-facebook-bryr-sig-ingen-om-sanningen

Wang, Y. (2015), "Fake video, images claim to show Muslim joy over Paris attacks". https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2015/11/18/fake-video-images-claim-to-show-muslim-joy-over-paris-attacks/

Werner, J. (2013), "Fejkad mordhistoria spreds på Facebook". *Metro*

Further reading

Benkler, Y. (2006), "The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom." *Yale University Press*

Carlsson, E. (2013), "På Facebook är källkritiken död". *Nyheter24*, http://nyheter24.se/nyheter/kolumner/751241-pa-facebook-ar-kallkritiken-dod

Garcia, M & Stark, P. (1990-1991), "Eyes on the News". *The Poynter Institute*

Sundar, S. S., & Nass, C. (2001), "Conceptualizing sources in online news". *Journal of Communication, 51, 52–72*

Quattrociocchi, W. et al. (2015), "Debunking in a World of Tribes" (http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.04267), "Echo chambers in the age of misinformation" (http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.00189), "Emotional Dynamics in the Age of Misinformation" (http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.08001), "Trend of Narratives in the Age of Misinformation", (http://arxiv.org/abs/1504.05163)

Appendices

Appendix A: Survey (original Swedish)

Kön

○ Man   ○ Kvinna   ○ Annat

Ålder

[   ]

Hur mycket tid lägger du normalt under en dag på att aktivt använda internet? (med aktivt avses både webbläsare och andra program som använder internetuppkoppling, men ej passivt användande som att lyssna på Spotify, se på Netflix eller spela onlinespel)

○ Under 30 minuter

○ 30 minuter till en timme

○ En till två timmar

○ Två till fem timmar

○ Mer än fem timmar

Hur mycket tid tror du att du normalt under en dag lägger på att leta och läsa nyheter?

○ Under 30 minuter

○ 30 minuter till en timme

○ En till två timmar

○ Två till fem timmar

○ Mer än fem timmar

Hur mycket tid lägger du normalt under en dag på sociala medier (här avses tid då du aktivt använder sidan, inte bara lämnar den öppen i bakgrunden)?

○ Under 30 minuter

○ 30 minuter till en timme

○ En till två timmar

○ Två till fem timmar

○ Mer än fem timmar

Hur mycket tid lägger du normalt under en dag på Facebook (här avses att läsa, skriva inlägg, titta på bilder, etc. men exklusive tid på Messenger.com och i Messenger-appen)?

○ Under 30 minuter

○ 30 minuter till en timme

○ En till två timmar

○ Två till fem timmar

○ Mer än fem timmar

[>>]

Hur ofta använder du följande källor för nyheter?

	Varje dag	Varannan dag	En gång i veckan	Två till tre gånger i månaden	En gång i månaden	Nästan aldrig	Aldrig	Vet inte
Papperstidning	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Internettidning (exempelvis DN.se eller GP.se)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Magasin	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
TV (ej internet-TV)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Radio	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Facebook	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Länkat via Facebook (gäller video, text, bild eller ljud, oavsett vilken sida länken leder till)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Twitter	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Youtube	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Bloggar	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Annan källa [＿＿＿]	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Vilka typer av nyheter är du intresserad av?

☐ Politik

☐ Kultur

☐ Sport

☐ Utrikes

☐ Ekonomi

☐ IT

☐ Vetenskap

☐ Mode

☐ Brott

Hur ofta delar någon av dina personliga kontakter med sig av nyheter (antingen länkar, eller i egna inlägg) till ditt Facebook-flöde?

○ Flera gånger per dag

○ En gång per dag

○ Flera gånger per vecka

○ Flera gånger per månad

Tycker du att det är positivt eller negativt när dina kontakter delar med sig av nyheter till ditt Facebook-flöde?

○ Positivt

○ Ingen åsikt

○ Negativt

Uppfattar du kontakter som ofta delar med sig av nyheter till ditt Facebook-flöde som:

○ Mer samhällsmedvetna

○ Varken mer eller mindre samhällsmedvetna

○ Mindre samhällsmedvetna

Brukar du själv dela med dig av länkar till nyheter via Facebook?

○ Ja   ○ Nej

Brukar du själv dela med dig av nyheter som du formulerar i ett eget inlägg, utan att redovisa någon källa eller länk?

○ Ja

○ Nej

Hur ofta följer du länkar till nyheter som delas i ditt Facebook-flöde?

Alltid	Ofta	Sällan	Aldrig
○	○	○	○

När du läser en nyhet på en tidnings hemsida (DN.se, GP.se, etc.), hur ofta söker du upp artiklar om samma nyhet i andra internettidningar?

Alltid	Ofta	Sällan	Aldrig
○	○	○	○

När du läser en nyhet i en papperstidning (dags- eller kvälls-), hur ofta söker du upp artiklar om samma nyhet i andra papperstidningar för att kontrollera om nyheten stämmer?

Alltid	Ofta	Sällan	Aldrig
○	○	○	○

När du läser nyheter som rapporteras som personliga inlägg på Facebook (utan länkar), hur ofta söker du sedan upp artiklar om samma nyhet i traditionella tidningar (antingen via internet eller i pappersformat) för att kontrollera om nyheten stämmer?

Alltid	Ofta	Sällan	Aldrig
○	○	○	○

När du letar efter andra källor till en nyhet som publicerats i en dags- eller kvällstidning (via internet eller papperstidning), hur många olika artiklar letar du oftast upp då?

1	2	3	4	5+
○	○	○	○	○

När du letar efter andra källor till en nyhet som publicerats i ett personligt inlägg på Facebook, hur många olika artiklar letar du oftast upp då?

1	2	3	4	5+
○	○	○	○	○

Litar du på att nyheter du läser i dags- och kvällstidningar (internet och papper) stämmer?

○ Ja ○ Nej

Litar du på att nyheter du läser i personliga inlägg på Facebook stämmer?

○ Ja ○ Nej

Hur uppskattar du att tiden du lägger på att läsa nyheter genom traditionella nyhetskanaler (papperstidningar, de stora tidningarnas hemsidor, etc) har förändrats de senaste 5 åren?

Ökat kraftigt	Ökat	Ingen skillnad	Minskat	Minskat kraftigt
○	○	○	○	○

Hur uppskattar du att tiden du lägger på att ta del av nyheter genom Facebook (både genom att följa länkar, och genom att läsa inlägg från kontakter som kan anses som nyheter) har förändrats de senaste fem åren?

Ökat kraftigt	Ökat	Ingen skillnad	Minskat	Minskat kraftigt
○	○	○	○	○

>>

Appendix B: Cover letter (original Swedish)

Goddag!

Vi är två studenter på Institutionen för journalistik, medier och kommunikation vid Göteborgs Universitet. Vi genomför nu en enkätundersökning gällande medievanor och nyhetskonsumption via sociala medier bland studenter vid svenska högre lärosäten.

Enkäten består av 23 frågor, och tar ungefär 10 minuter att gå igenom. Alla svar är självklart anonyma, och kommer redovisas som statistik och visuell information som ej går att leda tillbaka till svaranden.

För att komma till enkäten, klicka på nedanstående länk:

[länk]

Resultaten kommer ligga till grund för en kandidatuppsats som kommer opponeras och redovisas internt på JMG under december 2015. Efter uppsatsen har godkänts kommer den finnas tillgänglig via JMGs databas. Om ni är intresserade av att läsa det färdiga arbetet får ni gärna kontakta oss, så mailar vi ut länk när uppsatsen är online!

Enkäten är tillgänglig under en vecka, och varje enkätsvar hjälper oss i vår forskning!

Om ni har frågor om enkäten, får ni gärna höra av er via kontaktuppgifterna nedanför.

Tack för er tid och medverkan!

Med vänliga hälsningar,

Magnus von Goës Karlström och Jonas Hedenquist

gusvongm@student.gu.se

073-0442432

Appendix C: Survey (translated to English)

Gender

○ Male   ○ Female   ○ Other

Age

[   ]

How much time do you normally spend during a day actively using the internet? (active use includes both web browsers or and other programs that make use of an internet connection, but not passive uses like listening to Spotify, watching Netflix or playing online games)

○ Under 30 minutes

○ 30 minutes to one hour

○ One to two hours

○ Two to five hours

○ More than five hours

How much time do you think you normally spend during a day looking for and reading news?

○ Under 30 minutes

○ 30 minutes to one hour

○ One to two hours

○ Two to five hours

○ More than five hours

How much time do you normally spend during a day on social media? (intending time you actively use the website, not just keeping it open in the background)

○ Under 30 minutes

○ 30 minutes to one hour

○ One to two hours

○ Two to five hours

○ More than five hours

How much time do you normally spend during a day on Facebook (intending time spent on reading, writing posts, looking at pictures etc. but excluding time on Messenger.com and in the Messenger app)?

○ Under 30 minutes

○ 30 minutes to one hour

○ One to two hours

○ Two to five hours

○ More than five hours

`>>`

How often do you use the following sources for news?

	Every day	Every other day	Once a month	Two to three times a month	Once a month	Almost never	Never	Don't know
Physical newspaper	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Internet newspaper (for example DN.se or GP.se)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Magazines	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Television (not internet television)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Radio	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Facebook	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Links on Facebook (video, text, images or audio, no matter what page the link leads to)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Twitter	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Youtube	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Blogs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Other source [_____]	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

What types of news are you interested in?

- ☐ Politics
- ☐ Culture
- ☐ Sport
- ☐ Foreign news
- ☐ Economics
- ☐ IT
- ☐ Science
- ☐ Fashion
- ☐ Crime

How often does any of your personal contacts share news (either links or self-written posts) to your Facebook feed?

- ○ Several times a day
- ○ Once a day
- ○ Several times a week
- ○ Several times a month

Do you find it positive or negative when your contacts share news to your Facebook feed?

- ○ Positive
- ○ No opinion
- ○ Negative

Do you find contacts that share news to your Facebook feed often as:

- ○ More socially conscious
- ○ Neither more nor less socially conscious
- ○ Less socially conscious

Are you in the habit of sharing news links through Facebook yourself?

- ○ Yes   ○ No

Are you in the habit of sharing news that you phrase in a personal post, without presenting a source or link?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

How often do you visit links that get shared in your Facebook feed?

Always	Often	Rarely	Never
○	○	○	○

When you read a news item on the website of a newspaper (DN.se, GP.se, etc.) how often do you look for articles about the same news item on other newspaper sites?

Always	Often	Rarely	Never
○	○	○	○

When you read a news item in a physical newspaper (morning paper or tabloid), how often do you look for articles about the same news item in other newspapers to confirm the validity of it?

Always	Often	Rarely	Never
○	○	○	○

When you read about news that gets reported in personal posts on Facebook (without any links), how often do you look for articles about the same news item in established media (either on the internet or in a physical newspaper) to confirm the validity of it?

Always	Often	Rarely	Never
○	○	○	○

When you look for other sources for a news item that's been published in a morning or tabloid paper (either on the internet or in a physical newspaper), how many different articles do you usually look for?

1	2	3	4	5+
○	○	○	○	○

When you look for other sources for a news item that's been published in a personal post on Facebook, how many different articles do you usally look for?

1	2	3	4	5+
○	○	○	○	○

Do you trust that the news reports you read in morning and tabloid papers (both on the internet and physical papers) are correct?

○ Yes   ○ No

Do you trust that the news reports you read in personal posts on Facebook are correct?

○ Yes   ○ No

How do you gauge that the time you spend on reading news though traditional news channels (physical newspapers, the websites of larger newspapers, etc.) has changed in the last five years?

Increased drastically	Increased	No difference	Decreased	Decreased drastically
○	○	○	○	○

How do you gauge that the time you spend on getting news through Facebook (both through following links and through reading posts from contacts that can be considered news) has changed in the last five years?

Increased drastically	Increased	No difference	Decreased	Decreased drastically
○	○	○	○	○

>>

Appendix B: Cover letter (translated into English)

Hello!

We are two students at the Institution for journalism, media and communications at Gothenburg University. We are now conducting a survey relating to media habits and news consumption through social media among students at Swedish higher education institutions.

The survey consists of 23 questions, and takes about ten minutes to complete. All replies are of course anonymous, and are going to be presented as statistics and visual information that cannot be traced back to the respondent.

To reach the survey, click this link:

[link to survey]

The results are going to form the basis of a bachelor's thesis that will be opposed and presented internally at JMG in December 2015. When the thesis has passed it will be available through JMG's database. If you are interested in reading the finalized thesis you are welcome to contact us, and we'll mail you a link when the thesis is online!

The survey is available for a week, and every reply helps our research!

If you have any questions about the survey, you're welcome to get in touch with us through the contact information below.

Thank you for your time and participation!

Sincerely,

Magnus von Goës Karlström and Jonas Hedenquist

gusvongm@student.gu.se

073-0442432