[en] Motivations of youth audiences to content creation and dissemination on social network sites[1]

Mª Cruz López de Ayala López[2]; Pedro Paniagua Santamaría[3]

Abstract. Young people show very high and intensive levels of social networks use. However, users have different levels of involvement as regards their degree of interactivity in these platforms. Supported by uses and gratifications theory and applying a factor analysis, the motivations that explain their participation in several profiles of social networks and differences between those who do and those who do not comment are analysed. Based on a self-administered survey of 461 young university students, the main conclusions include the diversity of nuances in the combinations of reasons that explain participation in different types of profiles on social networks; particularly worth highlighting are the similarities between profiles of NGOs and those of celebrities. Also of note is the tendency of users who comment on commercial, political, social and leisure profiles to display motivations linked to searching for information, being useful, influencing others, interacting and showing adhesion, depending on the sphere.
Keywords: Social networks; youth, participation; interactivity; motivations.

Motivaciones de los jóvenes para la creación y difusión de contenido en sitios de redes sociales

Resumen. Los jóvenes muestran niveles de usos de redes sociales muy altos e intensivos. Sin embargo, los usuarios difieren en los niveles de participación en cuanto a su grado de interactividad en estas plataformas. Apoyado en la teoría de usos y gratificaciones y aplicando un análisis factorial, se analizan las motivaciones que explican su participación en diversos perfiles de redes sociales y las diferencias entre quienes comentan y quienes no lo hacen. Mediante una encuesta autoadministrada a 461 jóvenes universitarios, se concluye la diversidad en las razones que explican la participación en tipos diferentes perfiles en redes sociales, destacando las similitudes entre los perfiles de las ONG y los de las celebridades. También se observa una mayor tendencia de los usuarios que comentan en los perfiles comerciales, políticos, sociales y de ocio a mostrar motivaciones relacionadas con la búsqueda de información, ser útiles, influir en los demás, interactuar y mostrar adhesión, según la esfera.
Palabras clave: Redes sociales; jóvenes; participación; interactividad; motivaciones.

_____

[2]   Universidad Rey Juan Carlos (Spain)
      E-mail: mariacruz.lopezdeayala@urjc.es
[3]   Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain)
      E-mail: ppaniagu@ccinf.ucm.es

Summary. 1. Introduction. 2. Theoretical framework; 2.1. Levels of participation in social networks; 2.2. Motivations for participation in social networks 3. Objectives and Methodology; 3.1. Analysis method; 3.2. Measures; 3.2.1. Motivations for participation in profiles on social networks; 3.2.2. Participation in profiles on social. 4. Results; 4.1. Motivation for participation in profiles on social networks; 4.1.1. Companies and brands; 4.1.2. Political parties and trade unions; 4.1.3. NGOs; 4.1.4. Celebrities; 4.1.5. Other influencers; 4.2. Motivations that encourage participation with comments on the profiles. 5. Conclusions and discussion. 6. References.

1. Introduction

The exponential growth in use of social media has transformed the communicative ecosystem and it allows audiences to take on a more active role, not only in the selection of the messages to which they are exposed but also as content creators and disseminators. "Prosumers" (Toffler, 1980) become prescribers who are able to issue ratings and recommendations that have an influence on the behavior of other users, in competition with traditional media that have been losing credibility (Edelman, 2017).

In a context of the proliferation of social media, the immediacy and interactivity of social network sites (SNS) has been viewed as a revolution within the parameters of communication between individuals and organizations. By enabling direct contact by users with organizations, social networks facilitate active participation by individuals in different aspects of public life, thus empowering them as citizens who influence the reality surrounding them. Such public participation in social networks focuses on expressing personal opinions and needs, defending interests and values with the purpose of achieving objectives, and influencing decision-making by agents and institutions, or simply helping others (Kim, Jeong & Lee, 2010; Jenkins, 2008).

Against this backdrop, a growing body of research is analysing how social networks contribute to social, civic and political participation, through the interaction by users with different political organizations, NGOs, media outlets and other social agents. Studying internet users' motivations for contributing in these spaces corresponds to an interest in encouraging involvement in civic and political commitment. From the perspective of the enterprise, however, the aim is to motivate consumers to become involved in more committed activities in order to strengthen the brand's online visibility and, thus, brand awareness (De Veirman, Cauberghe & Hudder, 2016). Based on a wider approach, a plethora of studies highlight the relational and entertainment-based uses of young people (García-Jiménez, López de Ayala & Gaona, 2012), as well as the limitation of more complex uses of Internet and social networks.

By contrast, there is no studies comparing motivations for contributing in different spheres or dimensions of public life in profiles of social networks. This study attempts to fill this void and takes a deeper look at the level of participation by young university students in different spheres linked to facets of their online lives – political, social, civic, economic or leisure aspects. In addition, it analyses

and compares the motivations they give for participating on these sites and the extent to which these motivations are associated with the respondents' expressed degree of interactiveness.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Levels of participation in social networks

Young people tend to be earlier adopters of digital communications and their use has been growing in volume, complexity and interactivity (Roberts & Foehr, 2008). In 2017, 67.6% of Spaniards participated in social networks, reaching 90% among the younger population aged from 16 to 24 years old and students (INE, 2018). While the new media are associated with a youth culture that is defined by participation and production of "user-generated content", they have different types of activity and involvement in relation to their degree of interactivity in these platforms (Brake, 2014; Hargittai, Connell, Klawitter & Litt, 2014; Livingstone & Helsper, 2007). Users access these prescriptive spaces to keep themselves informed, to show their adherence or criticism with regard to institutions and other social actors, and to comment and share contents with their networks of friends and spaces of commercial firms or other organisations.

A widely established classification in research into the levels of participation in social networks distinguishes between *lurkers* and *posters*. Lurkers have been described as a silent and passive audience, as users who read social networks without posting or posting less than the average user. Conversely, posters actively generate content and facilitate online discussions (Lai & Chen, 2014; Sun, Rau & Ma, 2014).

Furthermore, Muntinga, Moorman and Smit (2011) have identified various levels of participation, with different degrees of involvement and commitment: consuming, contributing and creating. Tsai and Men (2013) also set out a hierarchical grading of the levels of activity of public commitment that would cover online consumption of passive messages, active two-way conversation, participation and recommendation. In any case, a greater degree of involvement in social networks through more committed and demanding action as regards effort required, and which is linked to creation of content, is viewed positively by the authors. De Vries, Peluso, Romani, Leeflang and Marcati (2017) have demonstrated that a greater degree of commitment, effort and time devoted is ascribed to creation-related activities (e.g. posting or uploading audiovisual materia) than to contribution-based activities (e.g. scoring in rankings, following profiles for brands, commenting on audiovisual content). Meanwhile, Cornelissen, Karelaia and Soler (2013) consider "liking" to be a low-cost action and are reluctant to assess these actions as participation.

However, the great enthusiasm generated by the opportunities for interaction offered by social networks, by contributing to the creation of a conversational public sphere in which citizens and consumers can express and debate their ideas or defend their interests, has been disrupted by the real state of affairs. Even though one element that gives rise to optimism is the confirmation that anonymity and the

reduction in social signs can foster the desire to contribute to online discussions by moderating the effect of fear of isolation generated by expressing certain opinions in public (Ho & McLeod, 2008), the empirical data collected in diverse geographical spaces and spheres demonstrate the low level of interactivity by users in social network communities and the almost absolute prevalence of those who limit themselves to just looking (Men & Tsai, 2013; De Veirman et al., 2016; Eveland, Morey & Hutchens, 2011; Nielsen, 2006).

2.2. Motivations for participation in social networks

From a psychological basis and a marked individual inclination, the uses and gratifications theory has provided a suitable theoretical framework for studying the motivations leading users to participate in social networks. This theoretical perspective assumes that people are active and selective in their media use and participate in media due to different goals (Katz & Foulkes, 1962; Sun, Rubin & Haridakis, 2008). A classic typology of this theory points to four motivations leading to the individuals' use of media: surveillance, personal identity construction, social relationships and entertainment (Katz & Gurevitch, 1974).

The research corroborates that one of the main motivations of young people for "being" on social networks is related to social needs concerning relationships and identity (Whiting & Williams, 2013; Park, Kee & Valenzuela, 2009; Urista, Dong & Day, 2009). Other motivations for using social media are entertainment, seeking information, passing the time, escapism and professional advancement (Chen, Yang & Tang, 2013; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011). Hargittai and Litt (2011) also found that interest in celebrity and entertainment news is a significant predictor of Twitter use in particular.

Focusing their attention on content creation on social media, Hunt, Atkin and Krishnan (2012) found that interpersonal communication, self-expression and entertainment motives predicted use of interactive features on Facebook among undergraduates. Ham, Lee and Lee (2014) identified five motivations for creating social media content, including social-cognition, entertainment, self-expression, social belonging and communication. In addition, the results of the student survey by Zhou (2011) show that both social identify and group norms have significant effects on participation by users.

Other research focuses on psychological variables, differentiating between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations, and suggests that motivations for participating can be different depending on the type of community (Lai & Chen, 2014; Malinen, 2015). Thus, although some factors such as enjoyability affect the knowledge-sharing intentions of both posters and *lurkers*, posters are more influenced by intrinsic motivational factors (e.g., enjoyment in helping others and knowledge self-efficacy, providing others with valuable knowledge) and *lurkers* are more affected by extrinsic motivational factors (e.g., reciprocity) (Lai & Chen, 2014).

In the context of corporate sites on social networks, factors such as social influence, entertainment, search for information, reward and trust has been associated with the use of social networks (Azar, Machado, Vacas-de-Carvalho & Mendes, 2016; Tsai & Menn, 2013; Enginkaya & Yilmaz, 2014). Muntinga et al. (2011) add empowerment to these personal and social motivations and suggest that consumers can also use social networks to influence other consumers or the brand itself. Based on this proposal, De Veirman et al. (2016) explain that the motivations for the behaviour of the lurkers and posters on Facebook differ, such that although they both are guided by reasons of social interaction, the former are also motivated by the need for entertainment and the latter by the need for empowerment. Additionally, De Vries et al. (2017) state that self-expression is more related to creating activities, whereas socializing is more related to contributing activities.

In the political and civic sphere, Ancu and Cozma (2009) found the motivations for accessing MySpace profiles of 2008 primary candidates were the desire for social interaction, followed by information seeking and entertainment. Nevertheless, there is a dearth of studies that analyse the motivations of users for interacting in online political discussions (Yoo, Kim & Gil de Zúñiga, 2017; Lyons & Sokhey, 2014; Eveland et al., 2011).

Other areas in which the degree of interactivity and the motivations for user participation have been studied cover the field of education, culture, and medicine and health (Lutz & Hoffmann, 2017). However, although it is plausible to think that young people's motivations for participating and contributing vary in different spheres of their online lives, we found no comparative studies that assess whether there are common motivations that encourage participation in different profiles types or whether, by contrast, motivations differ.

3. Objectives and methodology

Applying the uses and gratifications theory, the objective in this exploratory study is to explore the underlying motivations for participation in the different types of profiles in social networks. The aim is next to analyse to what extent these motivations are associated with the tendency to post or not post comments on those profiles.

The type of participation by users in this study is understood from a broad perspective that implies sharing and pooling. Different areas of interest regarding media citizenship, entertainment and the construction and projection of identity have been selected for the study, in terms of communication studies that include companies and brands, political parties and trade unions, NGOs, celebrities and influencers.

The data presented in this study are from a survey of university students (18-24 years old) studying for different degrees at Rey Juan Carlos University, a public university in the Madrid region which has five campuses located in Madrid, Alcorcón, Móstoles, Fuenlabrada and Aranjuez, as well as online students. The final sample obtained comprises 461 students, which is deemed suitable for applying factor analysis. In addition, all the courses are represented, as well as four branches of knowledge in similar proportions to the actual proportions at the Univeridad Rey Juan Carlos. The distribution by sex demonstrates a clear bias

towards an unequal composition of the undergraduate student body at the university, with 58.8% women in 2015-2016 (Universitas XXI- Academico cited in Portal de la Transparencia, 2017), and due in addition to them being present in greater numbers in the classroom when the questionnaire was being completed, the survey respondents are thus 71.7% women and 28.3% men and the average age is 20 years old.

The instrument used to collect the information was a questionnaire with closed questions applied in the classroom, which was tested prior to use to ensure it was understandable and consistent. Participation was voluntary and the fieldwork was performed during April 2017. The completed questionnaires were filtered upon the basis of the consistency of the information reported. A database was generated using the collected information, which was processed using the SPSS Statistics 22.0 statistical package.

Table 1. Sample demographics and characteristics. Source: own Elaboration

		Percentage				Percentage	
Sex	Male	28.3	Time spent on social networks		Diary	Weekend
	Female	71.7		Less than 2 h	24.1	15.3
				Between 2 - 3 h	33.9	29.2
Status	Only studying	76.3		Between 3 - 5 h	27.3	28.5
	Studying & working	23.7		More than 5 h	14.3	26.8
Age	18	18.4	Branches of knowledge	Social & legal Sciences		71.0
	19	20.0		Enginerring & Architecture		3.7
	20	28.4		Health Sciences		10.8
	21	17.6		Arts & Humanities		16.0
	22-24	15.7				
Year	1º	34.9				
	2º	38.8				
	3-4º	26.3				

3.1. Analysis method

In order to generate a typology of reasons for undergraduate students visiting different profiles on social networks, an exploratory factor analysis makes it possible to reduce a set of variables to a lower number of unobserved latent variables called factors. This statistical method describes variability among observed correlated variables and creates a model as linear combinations of the potential factors, thus avoiding redundancies.

Finally, we compare the motivations for participation in different profiles on social networks, among those who comment and do not comment, to assess significant differences which would correspond to a similarly sized random sample, using comparison of means.

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Motivations for participation in profiles on social networks

An initial list of items relating to motivations for participating in social networks profiles was developed using previous research. These ítems are based on a typology of motivations regarding brand-related activities in social networks by De Vries et al. (2017), including entertainment, obtaining information and knowledge, socializing with peers (others in that study) relating to a sense of belonging, identification with the group or group norm (Zhou, 2011), self-expression and remuneration. Furthermore, new categories have been included, as they have been linked to participation in social networks by different studies: relationships and interaction (Ham, Lee, & Lee, 2014; Whiting & Williams, 2013); empowerment (De Veirman et al., 2016), related to participation as Carpentier (2016) understands the term; and social utility (Lai & Chen, 2014).

Accordingly, we proposed the following classification with thirty-three items adapted to be applied to different types of profiles.

Entertainment:
- "To pass the time"(v1)
- "To have new experiences" (v2)
- "To entertain myself" (v3)
- "Their content is interesting" (v4)
- "I enjoy reading the contents" (v5)

Information and knowledge seeking:
- "To be up-to-date on the things happening around me" (v6)
- "To know more about the entity/person behind the profile" (v7)
- "To find useful information" (v8)
- "To find out different opinions" (v9)
- "To know the opinions of others about the entity/person" (v10)
- "To find out the latest news" (v11)

Social belongingness, group rules and identification:
- "My friends do it too" (v12)
- "To feel that I am part of a group" (v13)
- "Because I identify with the entity/person behind the profile" (v14)

Relationships and interaction:
- "To meet people who think the way I do" (v15)
- "To swap information with my friends" (v16)
- "To share experiences with others" (v17)
- "To interact with the entity/person behind the profile" (v18)

Self-expression, criticism and adherence:
- "To make my opinions known " (v19)
- "To demonstrate my dislike or disagreement" (v20)
- "To show complaints or my disagreement with what they do" (v22)
- "To make my experiences known to the entity/person behind the profile" (v22)
- "To show them my support " (v23)
- "To show them my empathy" (v24)

Remuneration and reward:
- "To get benefits: discounts, promotions, competitions" (v25)
- "To obtain recommendations"(v26)
- "To help me to make decisions about shopping, voting, affiliation, etc."(v27)

Empowerment and influencing others:
- "To be able to influence others" (v28)
- "To be able to change things that I do not like" (v29)
- "So they take my ideas and opinions into account" (v30)

Social utility:
- "So that my opinions and experiences can be useful in others " (v31)
- "So my opinions/experiences are useful to the entity/person behind the profile" (v32)
- "To be useful to others, contributing recommendations" (v33)

Due to the range of the questionnaire, these items were presented as categorical variables with the options of yes or no, which can potentially generate more problems when applying factor analysis. However, the high number of items and the size of the sample support it being applied.

3.2.2. Participation in profiles on social networks

In general, the authors start from the supposition that participation means an active personal contribution implying varying degrees of involvement and commitment (Muntinga et al., 2011). Involvement and commitment are subjective values which are hard to assess, and therefore there is not a definitive consensus about which types of activities have to be evaluated as participation in the sphere of social networks. However, in academic literature it is frequently accepted that users' contribution to the conversation through comments on other social network profiles than their own requires greater effort which corresponds to a higher level of involvement and commitment. As a result, this study analyses if the motivations for participating in social networks vary depending on whether the users who access profiles other than their own or those of their relatives and friends, and which refer to different spheres of their online lives, participate in conversations by commenting, asking or answering questions.

4. Results

4.1. Motivation for participation in profiles on social networks

The motivations that the survey participants state for their participation in different types of profiles in social networks were analysed. In order to obtain a typology of reasons for collegue student participating in each types of profiles, the thirty-three items referring to this issue in our survey underwent principal components analysis. This method of extracting principal components factors aims to identify the main components in which the variation in the data is maximal.

Barlett's Tests of Sphericity indicate that, for all the types of profiles studied, the null hypothesis, which indicates the correlation contains only "noise", can be rejected. In addition, in all the analyses, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy is over 0.80, which indicates it is appropriate to apply a factor analysis to the correlation matrix. However, the volume of variance explained is not very high in each of the profiles analysed (table 2).

Table 2. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO), Barlett's Test of Sphericity, variance explained of the models, eigenvalues and variance explained of the factors for the models. Source: own elaboration

	KMO	Barlett's Test of Sphericity	Variance explained of the model	Factors			
				Eigenvalues		Variance explained	
Companies and brands	.850	0.000	59.2%	F1 4,988 F2 2,159 F3 1,358	F4 1,186 F5 1,082 F6 1,056	25% 10.8% 6.7%	5.9% 5.4% 5.3%
Political parties and trade unions	.829	0.000	57.8%	F1 5,051 F2 2,067 F3 1,681	F4 1,155 F5 1,103 F6 1,074	24.1% 9.8% 8.0%	5.5% 5.3% 5.1%
NGOs	.840	0.000	54.8%	F1 5,376 F2 1,754 F3 1,431	F4 1,282 F5 1,148 F6 1,070	24.4 8.0% 6.5%	5.8% 5.2% 4.9%
Celebrities	.798	0.000	59.3%	F1 3,761 F2 1,851 F3 1,195	F4 1,072 F5 1,011	25.1% 12.3% 8.0%	7.1% 6.7%
Other influencers	.912	0.000	55.4%	F1 6,445 F2 2,584	F3 1,117 F4 1,033	32.2% 12.4%	5.6% 5.2%

In order to improve the interpretation of the results, a varimax rotation of the factors was applied. The items with a very low score in the correlations with the rest of the variables (under 0.5) were removed from the models. Although in this study we start with a model of possible factors, our interest in exploring the nature of the interactions between the original variables in each of the spheres analysed inclines us to opt for the Kaiser method to extract the factors, thus eigenvalues lower than one were removed.

Factors from the survey that synthesized the information from the thirty-three items in each type of profiles and the charges for each items obtained with Varimax rotation and Kaiser Normalisation are given below.

4.1.1. Companies and brands

Factor 1. Social utility and influence: "To be able to influence others" (.757); "To be useful to others, contributing recommendations" (.701); "So my opinions/experiences are useful to the entity/person behind the profile" (.689); "To make my experiences known to the entity/person behind the profile" (.660); "So that my opinions and experiences can be useful in others" (.645); and "To be able to change things that I do not like" (.521).

Factor 2. Self-expression to influence the company: "To show complaints or my disagreement with what they do" (.766); "So they take my ideas and opinions into account" (.698); "To demonstrate my dislike or disagreement" (.621); and "To be able to change things that I do not like" (.510).

Factor 3. Social entertainment: "To pass the time" (.832); "To entertain myself" (.815); and "My friends do it too" (.610).

Factor 4. Interaction and adherence: "To interact with the entity/person behind the profile" (.737); "To know more about the entity/person behind the profile" (.700); and "To show them my empathy" (.508).

Factor 5. Remuneration and informed decision-making: "To help me to make decisions about shopping, voting, affiliation, etc."(.777); "To get benefits: discounts, promotions, competitions" (.648); and "To find out the latest news" (.556).

Factor 6. Information seeking: "To find useful information" (.809) and "To find out different opinions" (.592).

Thirteen of the variables selected were removed from the model because they had a very low score in the correlations with the rest of the variables (under 0.5).

4.1.2. Political parties and trade unions

Factor 1. Self-expression to social utility and influence: "To show complaints or my disagreement with what they do" (.798); "To be able to change things that I do not like" (.762); "To demonstrate my dislike or disagreement" (.721); "So they take my ideas and opinions into account" (.666); "So that my opinions and experiences can be useful in others" (.565); and"So my opinions/experiences are useful to the entity/person behind the profile" (.514).

Factor 2. Information seeking: "To be up-to-date on the things happening around me" (.725); "To find out the latest news" (.670); "To know more about the entity/person behind the profile" (.580); and "To find useful information" (.571).

Factor 3. Personal benefits and identification with the group: "To get benefits: discounts, promotions, competitions" (.770); "To have new experiences" (.588); and "To feel that I am part of a group" (.567).

Factor 4. Entertainment: "To entertain myself" (.799); "To pass the time" (.726); and "I enjoy reading the contents" (.559).

Factor 5. Interaction and adherence: "To make my experiences known to the entity/person behind the profile" (.649); "To show them how empathy" (.635); and "To interact with the entity/person behind the profile" (.524).

Factor 6. Social belongingness and relationships: "My friends do it too" (.556) and "To share experiences with others" (537).

After twelve factors had been removed from the model, following the criteria of selecting scores of over 0.5, 6 factors have been obtained.

4.1.3. NGOs

Factor 1. Exchanging views in order to be useful and empowerment: "To show complaints or my disagreement with what they do"(.744); "To be able to change things that I do not like" (.645); "So they take my ideas and opinions into account" (.634); "To demonstrate my dislike or disagreement" (.604);"To make my opinions known"(.566); "To be useful to others, contributing recommendations" (.532); and "To find out different opinions" (.532).

Factor 2.Infotainment: "Their content is interesting" (.672); "To find useful information" (.630); "To be up-to-date on the things happening around me" (.615); and "I enjoy reading the contents" (.593).

Factor 3. Social entertainment: "To entertain myself" (.697); "To pass the time" (.695); and "My friends do it too" (.691).

Factor 4. Personal benefit: "To have new experiences" (.659); "To get benefits: discounts, promotions, competitions" (.656); and "To obtain recommendations" (.547).

Factor 5. Interaction and adherence: "To interact with the entity/person behind the profile" (.723); "To show them my empathy" (.582); and "To show them my support" (.521).

Factor 6: Informed decision making (remuneration and information seeking): "To help me to make decisions about shopping, voting, affiliation,…" (.666) and "To know the opinions of others about the entity/person" (.549).

In order to be able to achieve an acceptable model, following the adopted criteria of selecting the items that loaded more than 0.5, it was necessary to eliminate eleven of the variables of the proposed model.

4.1.4. Celebrities

F1. Infotainment: "To pass the time" (.780); "Entertainment" (760); "To find out the latest news" (.613); "To be up-to-date on the things happening around me" (.567); and "I enjoy reading the contents" (.567).

F2. Self-expression related to social utility: "So that my opinions and experiences can be useful in others" (.847); "To be useful to others, contributing recommendations" (.739); and "To make my experiences known to the entity/person behind the profile" (.673).

F3: Interaction and influence (empowerment): "So they take my ideas and opinions into account" (.677); "To know the opinions of others about the entity/person" (.644); and "To interact with the entity/person behind the profile" (.560).

F4: Adherence: "To show them how empathy" (.841) and "To show them my support" (.581).

F5: Remuneration and reward: "To help me to make decisions about shopping, voting, affiliation, etc." (.797) and "To obtain recommendations" (.764).

In this case, eighteen ítems were removed before the model was reached.

4.1.5. Other influencers

F1. Self-expression to be useful and to get empowerment while feeling integrated in the group: "So my opinions/experiences are useful to the entity/person behind the profile" (.776); "To be able to influence others" (754); "So that my opinions and experiences can be useful in others"(.747); "To make my experiences known to the entity/person behind the profile" (.726); "To be useful to others, contributing recommendations" (.709); "To make my opinions known" (.710); "To show complaints or my disagreement with what they do"(.643); "To demonstrate my dislike or disagreement" (.585); "To feel that I am part of a group" (.688); and "To be able to change things that I do not like" (.537).

F2. Information seeking and identification with the entity: "To be up-to-date on the things happening around me" (.743); "To know more about the entity/person

behind the profile" (.613); and "Because I identify with the entity/person behind the profile" (.637).

F3. Entertainment: "To pass the time" (.798) and "To entertain myself" (.832).

F4. Remuneration and reward: "To help me to make decisions about shopping, voting, affiliation, etc."(.740) and "To obtain recommendations" (.557).

Of the thirty-three items containing the reasons for participating in the profiles of other influencers, sixteen were removed because they did not load over 0.5 on any factor.

4.2. Motivations that encourage participation with comments on the profiles

Finally, a comparison is given below of the motivations that the survey participants gave for their participation in different profiles, according on whether or not they comment.

The normality test (the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for the largest subsamples and with the Shapiro-Wilk test for those under 50) indicates to us that at least for each of the subsamples of the pairs analysed $p < 0.05$, and therefore this distribution is not normal and the Student t-test cannot be applied. Consequently, the Mann-Whitney nonparametric test was used. The results with the average ranges of the motivations (factors) for participating in each of the profiles analysed, according to whether the students comment or not in these accounts, and the significance of the Mann-Whitney contrast are given in table 3.

Although we find diverse combinations that explain the reasons for participating in the different types of social network profiles analysed, the differences between the followers who comment and those who do not comment are similar for all the profiles analysed. However, particular characteristics for each of these spheres can also be observed.

In profiles for brands and companies, political parties and trade unions and other influencers, the motivation of social utility and/or influence (empowerment) shows significant differences ($p<0.05$) according to whether users comment or users do not comment in this spaces, with the former scoring higher. However, these differences cannot be corroborated in the profiles of NGOs (exchanging views in order to be useful and empowerment) and in those of celebrities (self-expression related to social utility). In these latter profiles, by contrast, significant differences are observed between the two types of users with regard to the motivation for the interaction, which appears linked to influence in the celebrities' accounts and to interaction and expressing adherence towards NGOs.

The motivation of searching for information demonstrates significant differences between those who do and those who do not comment in the case of political parties and other influencers, whereas this is not so for companies. There are also significant differences in the search for information as a form of entertainment (infotainment) which guides participation in profiles of NGOs and celebrities.

As regards the motivation of seeking remuneration or reward as motivation for participating in the profiles of celebrities and other influencers, only in the case of the accounts of political parties and trade unions (in which this motivation is associated with identification) can it be stated that this motivationencourages

comments. In addition, expressing adherence only encourages participation through comments in the profiles of celebrities and in those of NGOs, in the latter combined with a search for interaction.

The orientation towards entertainment does not show significant differences between those who comment and those who do not, nor do social belongingness and relationships encourage this activity in political parties and trade unions' profiles, nor does the group norm combined with entertainment encourage this activity in the accounts of companies and brands or NGOs. However, this is the case when identifying with the group is linked with the search for social utility and empowerment in the accounts of other influencers or with personal benefits of those of the political parties.

Table 3. Mean difference in motivations for participating in differents types of profiles according on whether never or rarely comment or they do it very often or sometimes. RP1= average range for not commenting RP2= average range for commenting. Mann-Whitney test: asymptotic sign (bilateral) <0.05 in bold type, which implies that the means are different. Source: own elaboration.

Companies and brands	Political parties & trade unions	NGOs	Celebrities	Other influencers
F1. **Social utility & influence** RP1: 173,60/RP2: 221,49 **(.003)**	**F1. Self-expression (critical) to social influence and utility (empowerment)** RP1: 146,27/ RP2:195,15 **(,001)**	F1. Exchanging views in order to be useful and empowerment RP1:125,67/RP2:150,11	F2. Self expression related to social utility RP1:193,15/RP2:188,04	**F1. Self-expression to be useful and get empowerment in the group** RP1=170,68/RP1=244,71**(,000)**
F2. Self-expression (critical) to get empowerment on the company RP1:178,69/RP2:188,49				
F6. Information seeking RP1:178,31/RP2:190,93	**F2. Information seeking** RP1: 147,45/RP2: 187,77 **(,006)**	**F2. Infotainment** RP1:122,97/RP2:183,58 **(,001)**	**F1. Infotainment** RP1:185,37/RP2:214,90 **(,029)**	**F2. Information seeking & identification with the entity** RP1:178,14/RP2=227,97 **(,000)**
F3. Social Entertainment RP1:176,52/RP2:202,53	F4. Entertainment RP1:152,72/RP2:154,73	F3. Social entertainment RP1:127,19/RP2:131,37		F3. Entertainment RP1:198,27/RP2:182,81
F5. Remuneration and reward RP1:176,84/RP2:200,49		Factor 6: Informed decision making RP1:125,91/RP2:147,11	F5. Remuneration and reward RP1:193,07/RP2:188,32	F4. Remuneration and reward RP1:195,07/RP2:189,97
	F3. Personal benefits and identification with the group RP1=148,67/RP2=180,08)	F4. Personal benefits RP1:124,96/RP2: 158,89		
F4. Interaction and adherence RP1:176,57/RP2:202,22	F5. Interaction &adherence RP1:153,17/RP2:151,92	**F5. Interaction & adherence** RP1:124,61/RP2:163,21**(,028)**	**F4. Adherence** RP1:177,93/RP2:240,59**(,000)**	
	F6. Social belongingness and relationships RP1:152,27/RP2:157,58		**F3: Interaction and influence (empowerment):** RP1:182,77/RP2:223,88**(,002)**	

5. Conclusions and discussion

The considerable growth of use of social networks, especially among young people, has been met with great optimism by those who have understood that the interactive potential the medium offers can contribute to greater public participation and empower citizens. From giving opinions on political issues to expressing suggestions or complaints in profiles of brands or companies, these actions potentially increase users' power to influence their environment.

This research is situated within a context of interest in understanding the motivations that guide young social network users to make use of the opportunities social networks offer them for participating and interacting with different institutions and social subjects, sharing opinions or suggestions, and defending their interests in these collective spaces for interaction. Specifically, the motivations of young university students for participating in different areas of interest regarding media citizenship, entertainment and the construction and projection of identity are compared: companies and brands, political parties and trade unions, NGOs, celebrities and other influencers.

The results of factor analysis show, firstly, the motivations of being useful or of influencing others or the entity seem to overlap considerably, with the exception of participation in celebrities' accounts, where they load on distinct factors and influence is intertwined with interactivity. One peculiarity of the profiles of companies and brands is that these variables load on two separate factors according to whether they aim to influence others or express criticism to the company with the intention of influencing it.

Focusing attention on the informational motivation, this is experienced as a form of entertainment, which explains participation in the accounts of celebrities and NGOs. Searching for the latest news and finding out the opinions of others is associated with obtaining remuneration and rewards in the profiles of companies and brands, and in those of NGOs, respectively, which can be interpreted as a search for information in order to make decisions about purchases or affiliation.

Other noteworthy aspect is the combination of the search for interaction with the entity and the expression of adherence in the profiles of companies and brands, political parties and trade unions, and NGOs. However, in celebrities' profiles, expression of adherence appears as a single factor. In addition, the group norm appears in conjunction with entertainment as motivation for participating in profiles of companies and brands and NGOs, identification with the group is linked to obtaining financial benefits and new experiences in political parties and trade unions, and with social influence and utility in the case of other influencers. In the case of the influences, identifying with the entity is associated with the search for information.

On the other hand, the differences in the motivations stated for participating among those who often or sometimes comment and those who never or almost never do so have certain similarities and some particular features according to the sphere analysed. The search for information, whether combined or not with certain forms of entertainment (infotainment) or identification, is one of the reasons that differentiate those who comment from those who do not in all the profiles with the exception of those of companies and brands. However, entertainment on its own is not associated

with commenting on any of the profiles analysed. With the exception of the NGOs' profiles, the surfers' interest in influencing (empowerment) through their comments encourages participation with comments on all the profiles. This is coherent with the results obtained by De Veirman, Cauberghe and Hudders (2016), who found the behaviour of posters in brand communities on Facebook is more motivated by the search for empowerment, compared with the needs of lurkers who are more guided by motivations of entertainment.

One peculiarity of our study is that, unlike the intent of influencing others, expressing criticism in order to influence the organisation does not differentiate between those who participate by commenting on profiles of companies and brands on social networks from those who do not. This is one noteworthy aspect as it indicates that the intention of expressing opinions and experiences to influence others, more than that of expressing a critical opinion with the aim of changing a reality that does not satisfy them, fosters participation viacommenting on commercial accounts. This point is also coherent with the findings of Lai and Chen (2014) who found that, in online communities, posters are more influenced by intrinsic motivational factors suchas helping others than *lurkers*. It could be speculated that this behaviour is coherent with the generalised institutional distrust that impliesa certain degree of scepticism about the response by companies to online criticism and complaints, which leadsusers to guide their efforts (i.e., commenting in the spaces of brands and companies) towards being useful for other followers. With regard to the motivations for participating in the rest of the profiles, with the exception of celebrities' accounts, social utility and social influence seem to go hand in hand, which can be interpreted as if the possibility of having an impact on reality were more due to the opportunity of influencing other followers through disseminating their experiences and opinions than to that of influencing the entity to whom the profile belongs.

Additionally, identifying with the group, associated with other motivations, also seems to foster active participation in the conversation.

Focusing now on the characteristics shared by the profiles of NGOs and celebrities, young people participate in these two profile types motivated by the search for information as a form of entertainment, and in both cases this motivation also foster the activity of commenting, something which also occurs with the search for interaction and adherence, whether combined in a single factor or independently. This circumstance cannot be verified in the case of profiles of political parties and trade unions, and companies and brands. Another, aforementioned aspect in which the two converge, and differ from the rest of the profiles, is that the interest in being of use to others – associated for the NGOs with expressing criticism towards the owner of the profile and influencing reality – do not foster the followers' activity of commenting, asking questions or answering themes.

In short, this study corroborates the idea proposed by Lai and Chen (2014) and Malinen (2015) that motivations to participate can be different depending on the type of community. However, the similarities observed between profiles of celebrities, with regard to the combination of reasons for participating, and those of NGOs and also other influencers must also be mentioned in this regard. On the one hand, although it is not surprising that participation in pages for celebrities is experienced as infotainment, it is remarkable that this happens in the case of NGO

pages, which suggests that young people identify this activity as being within the sphere of leisure. On the other hand, celebrities and other influencers share a more financial motivation linked to obtaining recommendations and making decisions which more than justify the function of brand ambassadors attributed to them by companies.

To end, it has been observed that being of use to others or to the entity behind the profile and searching for information foster the posting of comments on the social network profiles of the five spheres analysed, but this is not the case for entertainment when it is not linked to the search for information. Meanwhile, interest in interacting with the entity behind the profile or expressions of adherence only foster interactivity through comments on the accounts of NGOs and celebrities.

This study contributes to explaining the limited interactivity of young university students on social networks beyond the relational sphere of the group of peers and the family and cast some light on what type of motivations promote active contribution in dialogue on social networks beyond these settings.

As regards the limitations of this study, it should be noted that this is an exploratory study based on a sample made up specifically of young students at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos. Although it is a varied sample of students as regards qualifications and field of study, it is not clear how representative this sample is of the university students in Spain. Even although it is an explicative analysis, it is necessary to treat the results with caution.

6. References

Ancu, Monica & Cozma, Raluca (2009): MySpace Politics: Uses and Gratifications of Befriending Candidates. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 53 (4), 567–583. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/08838150903333064

Azar, Salim; Machado, Joana-César; Vacas-De-Carvalho, Leonor; and Mendes, Ana (2016): Motivations to interact with brands on Facebook – Towards a typology of consumer–brand interactions. *Journal of Brand Management* 23 (2), 153-178. Doi:10.1057/bm.2016.3

Brake, David-R. (2014): Are We All Online Content Creators Now? Web 2.0 and Digital Divides. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 19, 591–609. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12042

Carpentier, Nico (2016): Beyond the Ladder of Participation: An Analytical Toolkit for the Critical Analysis of Participatory Media Processes. *Javnost - The Public*, 23:1, 70-88, Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2016.1149760

Chen, Guan-Lin; Yang, Shue-Chen; and Tang, Shung-Min (2013): Sense of virtual community and knowledge contribution in a P3 virtual community: motivation and experience. *Internet Research* 23 (1), 4-26. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/10662241311295755

Cornelissen, Gert; Karelaia, Natalia; and Soyer, E. (2013): Clicktivism Or Slacktivism? Impression Management and Moral Licensing. *ACR European Advances in Consumer Research* 10, eds. Gert Cornelissen, Elena Reutskaja, and Ana Valenzuela, Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research, 244.

http://docshare03.docshare.tips/files/25302/253020614.pdf

De Veirman, Marijke; Cauberghe, Veroline; and HUDDERS, Liselot (2016): Why are people interacting with brands on Facebook: unraveling consumers' motivations for lurking and posting on Facebook brand pages. *EMAC 2016*. Presented at the EMAC 2016. http://hdl.handle.net/1854/LU-7223539.

Edelman (2017): Edelman Trust Barometer. Retrieved from http://www.edelman.com/global-results/

Enginkaya, Ebru & Yilmaz, Hakan (2014): What Drives Consumers to Interact with Brands through Social Media? A Motivation Scale Development Study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 148, 219-226. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.037

Eveland, William-P.; Morey, Alyssa; and Hutchens, Myiah (2011): Beyond deliberation: New directions for the study of informal political conversation from a communication perspective. *Journal of Communication* 61, 1082–1103. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01598.x

García-Jiménez, Antonio; López de Ayala, Maria-Cruz; y Gaona, Carmen (2012): A vision of uses and gratifications applied to the study of Internet use by adolescents/Una visión desde la Teoría de los Usos y Gratificaciones aplicada al estudio del uso de Internet por los adolescentes. *Comunicación y Sociedad* XXV (2), 231-254. https://dadun.unav.edu/handle/10171/27962

Ham, Chang-Dae; Lee, Joonghwa; and Lee, Hyung-Seok (2014): Understanding consumers' creating behaviour in social media: an application of uses and gratifications and the theory of reasoned action. *International Journal of Internet Marketing and Advertising* 8 (4), 241-263. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIMA.2014.067652

Hargittai, Eszter & Litt, Eden (2011): The tweet smell of celebrity success: Explaining variation in Twitter adoption among a diverse group of young adults. *New Media & Society* 13(5): 824 – 842. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444811405805

Hargittai, Ester; Connell, Sabrina; Klawitter, Erin; and Litt, Eden (2014): Persisting Effects of Internet Skills on Online Participation. *TPRC Conference Paper*. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2418033

Ho, Shirley & Mcleod, Douglas (2008): Social-Psychological Influences on Opinion Expression in Face-to-Face and Computer-Mediated Communication. *Communication Research* 35 (2), 190-207. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650207313159

Hunt, Daniel; Atkin, David; and Krishnan, Archana (2012): The Influence of Computer-Mediated Communication Apprehension on Motives for Facebook Use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 56 (2), 187-202. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.678717 [Consulta: 20 de marzo 2018]

Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE] (2018): Encuesta sobre equipamiento y uso de tecnologías de la información y comunicación en los hogares españoles, 2017. http:www.ine.es

Jenkins, Henry (2008): *Convergence cultura: la cultura de la convergencia de los medios de comunicación*. Barcelona, Paidós Ibérica.

Katz, Elihu & Foulkes, David (1962): On the use of the mass media as 'escape': Clarification of a concept. *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 26, 277–388. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1086/267111

Katz, Edihu; Gurevitch, Michael; and Haas, Hadassah (1973): On the use of the mass media for important things. *American Sociological Review* 38, 164–181. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2094393

Kim, Won; Jeong, Ok-Ran; and Lee, Sang-Won (2010): On social Web sites. *Information Systems 35*, 215-236. Doi:10.1016/j.is.2009.08.003

Lai, Hui-Ming & Chen, Tsung-Teng (2014): Knowledge sharing in interest online communities: A comparison of posters and lurkers. *Computers in Human Behavior* 35: 295–306. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.02.004

Livingstone, Sonia & Helsper, Ellen (2007): Gradations in digital inclusion: Children, young people and the digital divide. *New Media & Society* 9 (4), 671-696. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444807080335

Lutz, Christoph & Hoffmann, Christian-Pieter (2017): The dark side of online participation: exploring non-, passive and negative participation, Information. *Communication & Society* 20 (6), 876-897. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1293129

Lyons, Jeffrey & Sokhey, Anan (2014): Emotion, motivation, and social information seeking about politics. *Political Communication* 31, 237-258. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2013.828138

Malinen, Sanna (2015): Understanding user participation in online communities: A systematic literature review of empirical studies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 46: 228–238. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.004

Men, Linhuan-Rita & Tsai, Wan-Hsiu (2013): Beyond liking or following: Understanding public engagement on social networking sites in China. *Public Relations Review* 39 (19), 13-22. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.09.013

Muntinga, Daniel-G.; Moorman, Marjolein; and Smit, Edith-G. (2011): Introducing COBRAs: Exploring Motivations for Brand-Related Social Media Use. *International Journal of Advertising* 30 (1), 13–46. Doi: https://doi.org/10.2501/IJA-30-1-013-046

Nielsen, Jakob (2006): *The 90-9-1 Rule for Participation Inequality in Social Media and Online Communities.* http://www.nngroup.com/articles/participation-inequality/

Papacharissi, Z.; & Mendelson, A. (2011): Toward a new (er) sociability: uses, gratifications and social capital on Facebook. In S. Papathanassopoulos (Ed.): *Media Perspectives for the 21st Century.* New York, Routledge, pp. 212-213.

Park, Namsu; Kee, Kerk-F.; and Valenzuela, Sebastián (2009): Being immersed in social networking environment: Facebook groups, uses and gratifications, and social outcomes. *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 12 (6): 729-733. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2009.0003

Portal de La Transparencia de la Universidad Rey Juan Carlos (2017): Cifras de estudiantes. https://transparencia.urjc.es/cifras/estudiantes.php

Roberts, Donald-F. & Foehr, Ulla-G. (2008): Trends in media use. *Future of Children* 18 (1): 11-37.Doi:10.1353/foc.0.0000

Sun, Na; Rau, PatrickPei-Luen; and Ma, Liang (2014): Understanding lurkers in online communities: A literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior* 38, 110–117. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.05.022

Sun, Shaojing; Rubin, Alan; and Haridakis, Paul (2008): The Role of Motivation and Media Involvement in Explaining Internet Dependency. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 52 (3), 408-431. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/08838150802205595

Toffler, Alan (1980): *La tercera Ola.* Bogotá, Plaza & Janés.

Tsai, Wan-Hsiu & Men, Linjuan-Rita (2013): Motivations and Antecedents of Consumer Engagement with Brand Pages on Social Networking Sites. *Journal of Interactive Advertising* 13 (2), 76-87. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2013.826549

Urista, Mark; Dong, Qingwen; and Day, Kenneth (2011): Explaining why young adults use Myspace and Facebook through uses and gratifications theory. *Human Communication* 12 (2): 215-229. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.568.9846

Vries, Lissette de; Peluso, Alessandro-M.; Romani, Simona; Leflang, Peter; and Marcati, Alberto (2017): Explaining consumer brand-related activities on social media: An investigation of the different roles of self-expression and socializing motivations. *Computers in Human Behavior* 75: 272e282. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.05.016

Whiting, Anita & Williams, David (2013): Why people use social media: a uses and gratifications approach. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* 16 (4): 362-369. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-06-2013-0041

Yoo, Sung-Won; Kim, Ji-Won; and Gil de Zúñiga, Homero (2017): Cognitive Benefits for Senders: Antecedents and Effects of Political Expression on Social Media. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 94 (1), 17–37. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699016654438

Zhou, Tao (2011): Understanding online community user participation: a social influence perspective. *Internet Research* 21 (1), 67-81. Doi: ttps://doi.org/10.1108/10662241111104884

María Cruz López de Ayala, doctora en Comunicación por la Universidad Rey Juan Carlos de Madrid, es profesora interina en esa universidad y ha sido *Visiting Fellow* en el Departament of Media and Communications de la London School of Economic (2017). Sus líneas de investigación, en las que ha participado en numerosos proyectos de investigación competitivos (I+D+I) y artículos 83, son: cultura digital y jóvenes; televisión y protección de menores; usos y riesgos de los menores en Internet; mediación parental y comunicación corporativa.

Pedro Paniagua Santamaría es profesor titular de la Universidad Complutense donde imparte docencia sobre géneros periodísticos y periodismo deportivo. Sus líneas de investigación, en las que colabora con las universidades Rey Juan Carlos y Carlos III, se centran en la relación entre adolescencia y medios de comunicación y memoria histórica.