



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

Noellie Brockdorff<sup>1</sup>, Sandra Appleby-Arnold<sup>1</sup>, Bogdan Manolea<sup>2</sup>, Ioana Vasiiu<sup>3</sup>,  
A Savin

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

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

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

January 2013



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

CONSENT

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

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

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

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

## Table of Contents

1. Key Findings	3
2. Introduction	5
2.1. Study Target	5
2.2. Methodology	6
2.3. Description of the Sample	7
3. Results	8
3.1. Attitudes towards UGC websites	8
3.2. Information Disclosure – “Offline” and Online	9
3.3. Privacy Matters	12
3.3.1. Which Privacy matters: Awareness and (Non-)Acceptance	12
3.3.2. How Privacy matters: Protective Measures	13
3.3.3. Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies	14
4. Conclusion: The Power of Rumpelstiltskin	15
Acknowledgements	16
Appendices	17
A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)	17
A.2 Interview Guidelines (Danish)	25
B. Pre-Analysis Template	34

## 1. Key Findings

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

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

Regarding general perceptions of privacy, respondents differentiated between information that is perceived as personal but not very private, information that is perceived as private and its privacy status being a social norm, and information which is considered as private and critical, its disclosure being associated with potential personal risks. At the same time, being strongly engaged in social networking did not necessarily go together with a greater willingness to disclose information online for commercial trade-offs, and being open to commercial trade-offs was not visibly linked to a more "generous" disclosure of personal and private information on UGC sites.

Looking at the different specific practices of websites owners, a slight majority of respondents didn't accept the customising of website content seeing it as an invasion of privacy or – at least – a dislikeable and unrequested service. However, some respondents also accepted it due to their perception that they do have a choice to ignore it, or even finding it a valuable service. Sharing and, in particular, selling user information was, though, not accepted by most Danish interviewees, indicating as a main reason that third parties to whom their personal information is sold may not be governed by the same terms and conditions as the company they gave their information to in the first place. Thus, they felt that their information may be used in a different way than what they initially had given permission for. Generally, however, only very few interviewees clearly expressed their feelings of unease and an uncertainty that their perceptions of privacy may differ from those of website owners.

As specific measures taken to maintain control, the specific disclosure strategies developed by Danish interviewees were restricted to being "careful" and limiting the personal or private information they would reveal to a perceived minimum. In this context, privacy settings were partially adapted, but appeared not to play a predominant role. Some interviewees would rather rely on only disclosing about themselves what they perceived as "public" information anyway, or they would question the efficiency of privacy settings themselves. Similarly, all interviewees stated that they mostly don't read privacy policies, revealing a strong user inertia based on self-confidence.

Ultimately, it appeared that most Danish interviewees perceived online privacy as something that can be normally expected, deducing their attitudes probably from experience in

everyday social life “offline”, where privacy was perceived as being rather secure and protected by common values and common sense. However, the respondents’ occasional use of sarcasm, often being a sign of perceived helplessness, may indicate that the comparably strong self-confidence of Danish UGC users has just started to be shaken.

## **2. Introduction**

### **2.1 Study Target**

The analyses and results in this document are based on a set of semi-structured in-depth interviews regarding the awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content (UGC) website users towards privacy. This study was undertaken as part of the CONSENT<sup>1</sup> project.

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

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

---

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

## 2.2 Methodology

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

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

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

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

After conducting the interviews, all interviews were fully transcribed in the local language, and a pre-analysis template for each interview was filled out in English. The development of this template was based on pilot interviews conducted earlier, and it served primarily for the collating, formal structuring and pre-coding of the vast amount of collected data. Then, the content of each set of country templates was analysed section by section, labelling them with additional codes which either summarised specific processes and practices or constructions and interpretations<sup>2</sup>. This process of re-coding also initialised a critical restructuring and rethinking of the codes applied first, and allowed for a more focussed data analysis and drawing together overarching themes. Finally, a draft version of each country report was submitted to the respective partner for revision and amendments.

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

## 2.3 Description of the Sample

The data analysis for Denmark is based on ten interviews with a demographic distribution where male and interviewees from rural areas are slightly overrepresented in comparison to the aforementioned desired quota:

Interviewee No.	Gender	Age	Age category	Location category	UGC usage
I-1	Female	35	35-44	Urban/suburban	UGC user
I-2	Male	26	25-34	Rural	UGC user
I-3	Female	24	15-24	Urban/suburban	UGC user
I-4	Male	24	15-24	Urban/suburban	UGC non-user
I-5	Male	44	35-44	Urban/suburban	UGC user
I-6	Male	26	25-34	Rural	UGC (non-SNS) user
I-7	Male	23	15-24	Rural	UGC user
I-8	Female	55	45+	Rural	UGC user
I-9	Male	58	45+	Rural	UGC user
I-10	Female	26	25-34	Urban/suburban	UGC non-user

Additionally, there is an overrepresentation of interviewees between the age of 23 and 26 (six), whereas young users (below 23) are not represented; however, in the other age categories a comparably even split was achieved.

Most interviews were conducted in places that were described as being “familiar” to the respective interviewee; one interviewee took place at university, one at the interviewee’s workplace, and for two interviewees there was no information available regarding the specific interview location. The interviewer described the majority of interviewees as very interested and keen to respond, with the exception of interviewee number 4 (24 years, male, UGC non-user) who was described as stiff and nervous. But most respondents appeared to be open and relaxed though, partially, making sure that they chose their words carefully.

All interviewees have been using the internet for at least ten years; looking at the relation between UGC usage and the age when these respondents started to use the internet, there is no recognisable link between being a “digital native” or a “digital initiate” and using – or not using – UGC websites:

Interviewee No.	Age	Years of Internet usage	Age when starting to use the Internet	UGC usage
I-1	35	“many”	max. 25 (?)	UGC user
I-2	26	16	10	UGC user
I-3	24	“late 1990s”	about 10	UGC user
I-4	24	10	14	UGC non-user
I-5	44	“somewhere between long and very long”	max. 30-34 (?)	UGC user
I-6	26	15	11	UGC (non-SNS) user
I-7	23	10	13	UGC user
I-8	55	10	45	UGC user
I-9	58	10-12	46-48	UGC user
I-10	26	10	16	UGC non-user



### 3. Results

#### 3.1 Attitudes towards UGC Websites

Of those seven interviewees who were UGC users, five declared that they perceived a certain peer pressure to join a social networking site (primarily Facebook) – because *“everyone else had it”* (I-5, UGC user), being *“encouraged”* (I-2, UGC user) by fellow students, colleagues, or by family members: *“My son thought I should have it and he set it up for me. It sounded exciting and he told me everyone had it and used it as a way of communication”* (I-9, UGC user).

Additionally, the main reason given was to re-establish or maintain contact with old or distant friends and family members, or the coordination of activities with school mates or other students. Respondents also described it as easier to maintain online contacts than offline contacts, as it was *“easy to reach people that way”* (I-7, UGC user).

Those respondents who didn't use SNS websites, gave as reasons that they had *“no trouble keeping in touch with friends and family without a Facebook account”* (I-6, UGC (non-SNS) user), and they perceived SNS, in particular Facebook, as providing quantity rather than quality relationships. One interviewee, here, explained that she could imagine opening a SNS account, but only to maintain contact and express solidarity with a club or association that has members all over the world.

Regarding other UGC websites, the respondents mostly stated that they were either not interested or, particularly in the case of multiplayer online games, *“got tired of it”* (I-4, UGC non-user) and found them *“too time consuming”* (I-1, UGC user); dating websites were perceived as not necessary due to being in a relationship, and micro blogging was perceived as not needed because the interviewees' social networks online were already established via SNS. Generally, it appeared that micro blogging websites such as Twitter were seen as having a similar social function to SNS sites. Only one interviewee explained the motivation for her micro blogging activity as *“just for the fun of it”* (I-3, UGC user), following up celebrities' updates and occasionally blogging about her own life – acquiring and producing *“chatty”* everyday information, but not in the sense of mutual exchange.

With one exception all interviewees held accounts with photo/video sharing websites; however, most of them didn't indicate their reasons for using them.

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

In “offline” situations<sup>3</sup>, the majority of interviewees gave very similar answers regarding whether or not they would disclose certain personal or private information<sup>4</sup> to a stranger. Being asked for their marital status was mostly considered to be a “common” question, and as giving away a piece of information that could not be abused. In contrast, information about income and the ID card number would generally not be revealed – although for substantially different reasons.

Being asked by a stranger for one’s salary was considered as *“too personal”* (I-6, UGC (non-SNS) user), impolite and a question that violates social norms; however, not answering the question at all was partially perceived as *“rude”* (I-1, UGC user) and, thus, equally colliding with social norms. The interviewees explained that they would follow various evasive strategies giving approximate or imprecise numbers, or prefer describing her or his lifestyle which they would feel more comfortable to share with strangers. Another aspect considered was the perceived relevance of such question: *“If we were talking about jobs or career possibilities then it might be relevant for her [the stranger] to know – but I wouldn’t answer her right away”* (I-10, UGC non-user).

Being asked for one’s ID card number was perceived by all interviewees as strongly intrusive and violating privacy, combined with a perceived risk of becoming subject to fraud.

Similarly, the interviewees responded that, in a conversation with friends, they would also reveal their marital status – although *“a friend would know anyway”* (I-4, UGC non-user) – but still mostly not reveal their ID card number: Even a friend *“doesn’t need to know”* (I-5, UGC user) and could misuse it. However, they were more willing to respond to the question regarding their income, arguing that – although still being perceived as a somewhat “uncomfortable” situation – it could become subject to mutual trust and the principle of reciprocity within friendship relations. One interviewee explained that he would, perhaps, still give an imprecise number, but *“try harder to give him or her something close to the truth”* (I-4, UGC non-user).

Whereas the interviewees’ responses revealed a rather homogeneous pattern of answering in offline situations with both strangers and friends, there was a wider variation in answers

---

<sup>3</sup> Respondents were encouraged to imagine a situation where, whilst travelling on a plane, a stranger would ask them a number of personal questions – whether they would reveal their marital status, their income, and their ID card number. After that, they were requested to talk about their reaction if the same questions were asked by a friend.

<sup>4</sup> The distinction made here between “personal” and “private” is following educational definitions where personal information cannot be used to identify someone (in the sense of identity theft), whereas private information can be used to identify someone and may be unsafe to share. This distinction is currently not being made in data protection law which only refers to “personal” data/information, in common language both terms are often used synonymously, within the various scientific disciplines there is a wealth of different definitions, and there are also different meanings in different languages. However, many respondents in the various countries intuitively differentiated between the two terms – by ascribing to them different levels – or “types” (e.g. ownership vs. spatial relationship) – of privacy.

regarding what information would be disclosed online in the context of online shopping / commercial trade-offs and on UGC websites.<sup>5</sup>

Generally, for commercial advantages the majority of interviewees were willing to reveal their address, their marital status, and the number and age of their kids. Particularly the home address was perceived as somewhat public, as *“they could find that out with little effort”* (I-9, UGC user). Whether or not they would reveal their own date of birth depended on whether they felt that this could be subject of fraud and, in this context, disclosing only the year of birth was seen as a viable option.

All other information was mostly indicated as not to be disclosed; here, privacy as a reason for non-disclosure can be divided into different – though partially overlapping – categories:

- (a) Information was perceived as generally “too private”,
- (b) the disclosure was linked to the perceived risk of fraud (in particular one’s ID card number),
- (c) the disclosure was linked to the perceived risk of receiving unwanted commercial offers, though mostly referring to becoming target of “offline” advertising, and
- (d) the information requested was considered as “not relevant” for the website owner – something “they don’t need to know” (particularly one’s annual income).

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

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

The widest spread of perceptions and attitudes could be noted for the (non-)disclosure of life insurance and home insurance data. Whereas half of the Danish interviewees perceived them as too private and subject to the risk of fraud, others referred to them as something that couldn’t be (mis-)used for personal identification and, as one respondent stated, that it was *“very normal to have insurances in Denmark. So I expect almost everyone to answer ‘yes’ to whether or not they had one”* (I-4, UGC non-user). Such statement may point at a certain local “risk culture”, linked to the perception that (certain) risks are “insurable” and thus, perhaps, controllable.

Regarding the disclosure of personal and private information on UGC websites, it appeared that the Danish interviewees were rather restrictive in their information disclosure, primarily giving their name and uploading a profile picture, but otherwise being quite hesitant to reveal any further data. Only half of the respondent UGC users were willing to reveal, additionally, photos of family members or friends, and some information about their

---

<sup>5</sup> For commercial trade-offs, interviewees were asked whether they would disclose their phone number, address, date of birth, marital status, income, number and age of kids, their spouse’s email address, their home insurance, life insurance, and their ID card number.

hobbies or places they had been to. Generally, it appeared that they were quite aware and happy to disclose only a minimum of data required for opening an UGC account and getting access to the desired website content and/or services.

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

### 3.3 Privacy Matters

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

Only three respondents indicated that they were aware before opening a UGC website account that website owners may use personal information provided by users to customise their site's content; four declared that they became aware after opening such an account. However, there was no information given by the interviewees how this specific awareness was actually achieved, nor when and how the interviewees became aware of the other prevailing practices of website owners: passing on personal information to third parties without the user's permission, sending unwanted emails or newsletters, selling personal or private information to other companies, or gathering in-depth information about users.<sup>6</sup>

Acceptance levels – and the underlying motivation for acceptance – differed depending on the respective website owners' practice. The customising of content was mostly not accepted – either simply because it was something the interviewee *"hadn't asked for"* (I-5, UGC-user), it invoked strong feelings of dislike, or it was clearly perceived as an invasion of privacy and linked to the idea of surveillance. On the other side, those four interviewees who perceived it as acceptable felt that *"it's ok if companies make money from marketing"* (I-3, UGC-user), being a *"necessary evil"* (I-5, UGC (non-SNS) user) where it is the user's choice to ignore or to look at it, or it was even appreciated as *"a good thing – a service"* (I-1, UGC user).

Similarly, a slight minority of interviewees found the website owners' practice of passing on user information acceptable – either because it was considered as the sharing of information which the user had provided voluntarily, or because the respondent wouldn't disclose any information that he didn't perceive to be public anyway. The other interviewees, however, only accepted such practice if being asked for consent (3), or they wouldn't find it acceptable at all (2), but without giving specific reasons.

Attitudes and perceptions of the Danish interviewees changed, though, once being asked for their acceptance regarding the selling of personal information: Here, a large majority didn't accept this practice of website owners, indicating as a main reason that third parties their information is being sold to may not be governed by the same terms and conditions as the company they gave their information to in the first place. Thus, they felt that such information may be used in a different way than what they initially gave permission for. One interviewee considered an acceptance depending on the type of personal information, e.g. opinions or tastes, may be sold, whereas others – such as address or phone number – were seen as strictly private and not sellable.

However, only very few respondents clearly expressed the basis for their feelings of unease and uncertainty relating to selling of personal information to third parties:

---

<sup>6</sup> There were also very few responses provided regarding the awareness and acceptance or non-acceptance of being sent unwanted emails or newsletters, and regarding the gathering of in-depth user information, as well as any resulting user behaviour.

*“This is why I think the internet is so unsafe: You never know how things are used and who has access to them. I would never truly know whether some of my personally sensitive information would be included in what, and what was being sold on” (I-10, UGC non-user).*

Such statements revealed that some Danish interviewees clearly distinguished between what type of information they perceived as public and which as private – being aware that their perceptions of privacy may differ from those of website owners.

### **3.3.2 How Privacy matters: Protective Measures**

The interviewed Danish UGC users didn’t reveal any distinct disclosure strategies regarding the protection of their personal or private data; primarily, they strongly emphasised that they would *“think carefully”* (I-5, UGC user) before disclosing any information and, as a rule, disclose only a *“minimum”*: *“I never disclose much expect for my name when I open an account [...] I assume the worst and act accordingly”* (I-6, UGC (non-SNS) user).

A method chosen by the majority of UGC users was not to reveal their real name but use nicknames on a UGC website. Some of them outlined that by using nicknames *“you are more anonymous that way, and it means something to me when there are people whom I don’t want to be recognised by”* (I-9, UGC user). Most of them, though, perceived the usage of nicknames not as a measure of protecting their privacy, but as a procedure which was *“very common”* and *“easier that way”* (I-7, UGC user) – a generally accepted common practice which, if being reflected upon, was rather linked to a preference for anonymity than to privacy. Additionally, one interviewee explained that he used a nickname predominantly in multiplayer online games for the role playing experience itself.

Those two UGC users who didn’t use nicknames declared that they *“can’t see the advantage of doing it”* (I-2, UGC user) but *“don’t mind if other people are doing so unless it is to be harmful to other people”* (I-3, UGC user).

Another possible strategy to deal with the aforementioned uncertainty is to adapt the privacy settings of UGC websites – if such option is available (and known of). Here, half of the interviewed UGC users declared that they limited access to their profile to ‘only friends’, giving as a motivation privacy reasons and maintaining control over who can see their information. However, none of them stated that they changed it specifically to friends but not friends of friends. It appeared that they perceived the ‘only friends’ setting as a general measure to avoid revealing personal or private information about themselves to the public – mostly in combination with the aforementioned disclosure of an overall limited amount of data.

Those four interviewees who kept the public default privacy setting either declared that *“I don’t think I have anything to hide on the account”* (I-5, UGC user), or they felt that they wouldn’t be better protected by keeping the provided information secret, revealing as such a general mistrust in the efficiency of privacy settings. One respondent UGC user admitted that she, actually, didn’t know her privacy settings but assumed basically that her profile was public.

### 3.3.3 Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies

All of the Danish interviewees, UGC users as well as non-users, stated that they mostly don't read privacy policies. The reasons given for their not reading can, generally, be divided into two categories: On a "technical" level, two interviewees indicated that privacy policies are *"too long to read"* (I-4, UGC non-user). Such statement, however, may also refer to a certain level of user inertia, as one respondent pointed out that she would read privacy policies only if something went wrong – and, then, only the relevant section.

On the level of policy content it appeared, generally, that some interviewees didn't find privacy policies worth reading at all: *"In principle, they make a new privacy policy every time there is an update or a small change, and mostly it is stuff that is basic good behaviour, and I don't want to waste my time with anything that is so fundamental"* (I-4, UGC non-user). As a consequence, they would *"just click 'accept' – I assume that's the standard thing to do"* (I-5, UGC user).

Two of the interviewees (one UGC user and one non-user), though, described a certain learning process and explained that they have recently started looking at privacy policies differently: *"I didn't read them when I opened my hotmail account, but I would definitely read them if I was opening it today"* (I-10, UGC non-user) – *"I am more aware of privacy policies now, and I check which rights they reserve"* (I-9, UGC user). Another interviewee explained that that she didn't read the privacy policy when she opened a SNS account, but that she would always read the terms and conditions. However, such reading was described as explicitly not being related to privacy: *"I would look for conditions that obliged you to pay something or to do something. As long as it has something to do with maintaining privacy I take it for granted"* (I-10, UGC user).

Only one interviewee reflected upon not only the content of privacy policies, but also the consent procedure itself: *"I think there should be more boxes to check, rather than just having to click 'accept' once and then you're through"* (I-9, UGC user). Relating to his own history and experience of non-reading, this interviewee pointed at a perceived need to make it harder (for himself and, probably, others) to accept privacy policies – being led, or forced, through a more comprehensive consent procedure which, then, would move closer towards an informed choice. Those two respondents who considered reading privacy policies in the future were also the only ones who, if in doubt, wouldn't register to open a UGC account: *"If there are things that I won't agree with I do not make a profile"* (I-9, UGC user).

All others, given that they declared themselves as non-readers due to a perceived ability to protect themselves by primarily careful information disclosure, didn't indicate any specific action to be taken in case they wouldn't find any expected policy content.

Thus, increasing the proportion of policy readers substantially may require a considerable effort to raise a certain "unsettledness" (in the sense of a critical awareness of the possible consequences of privacy violations). Such critical awareness, then, together with a consenting process which "forces" the user to make choices rather than simply tick one box, may overcome user inertia and (mis-)perceptions of security.

#### 4. Conclusion: The Power of Rumpelstiltskin

In the beginning of each interview, the respondents were asked to give their spontaneous associations with a number of terms: honesty, internet, work, family, privacy. The subsequent results show a particularly interesting contrast between the first and the last of them – honesty and privacy.

Whereas honesty was mostly described as a value and a social norm, the respondents' associations with privacy were rather different: Privacy was depicted as something that is related to a homely place and a somewhat "traditional" state of being – a closeness that was strongly linked to other family members, partners and friends who are connected through "solidarity", protected by the "sanctity of private life", and providing "peace". Not quite being a norm, it appeared, though, that privacy "offline" was something that could be taken for granted and is a stable element of everyday life.

Similarly, it appeared that most Danish interviewees perceived online privacy as something that can be normally expected, and the majority of them appeared rather self-confident emphasising their ability to control negative consequences from disclosing personal or private information. Correspondingly, being asked to imagine a future situation in which they may regret any information disclosure they would usually argue that this couldn't happen due to their "careful" behaviour. This self-confidence was confirmed by their perception that it is not necessary to read privacy policies and – partially – nor is it necessary to adapt their privacy settings.

However, there may be more latent feelings beneath this top "layer" of self-confidence, as one respondent stated the following in relation to his non-reading of privacy policies and consent procedures: *"I look forward to the day when it says 'If you sign here we have full ownership of your firstborn. Yours, Rumpelstiltskin'"* (I-5, UGC user). Alluding at this point to Rumpelstiltskin<sup>7</sup> – although originally being a tale about greed and deception – may express feelings that one (like the miller's daughter) is forced to give something away that is perceived as very precious but, at the same time, one also has no choice other than accepting the existing conditions.

Obviously, this interviewee may have used the fairytale only as an illustrative example, but the use of sarcasm itself, often being a sign of perceived helplessness, may indicate that the aforementioned self-confidence of Danish UGC users has just started to be shaken. Transforming these underlying feelings into an active awareness that online privacy is probably not as secure and protected by common values and common sense as it has been deduced from Danish social life "offline", may be a rather demanding task.

---

<sup>7</sup> In the fairy tale, the miller's daughter is locked up by the king and is requested to turn straw into gold by threat to her life; the only option she has is either to accept the death penalty, or give Rumpelstiltskin whatever he desires.



## **Acknowledgements**

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

## Appendices

### A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)

#### Instructions for Interviewers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Introduction	Briefing
<p><b>ALL RESPONDENTS</b></p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>[about 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Thank you</li> <li>- Your name</li> <li>- Purpose</li> <li>- Confidentiality</li> <li>- Duration</li> <li>- How interview will be conducted</li> <li>- Signature of consent on consent form</li> </ul>	<p>I would like to thank you for taking the time to meet me today. My name is-----and I would like to talk to you about the internet, what you like about it, what you dislike, and how you use it.</p> <p>As was mentioned when we set up this appointment, this interview is being carried out as part of the CONSENT project which is co-funded by the European Union. The CONSENT aims to gather views of internet users from all countries of the EU. If you wish I will give you more information about the CONSENT project at the end of the interview.</p> <p>Your opinion is very valuable for our study and will be taken into consideration when drawing up the final report.</p> <p>The interview should take less than one hour. I will be taping the session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. Although I will be taking some notes during the session, I can't possibly write fast enough to get it all down. Because we're on tape, please be sure to speak up so that we don't miss your comments.</p> <p>All responses will be kept confidential. This means your interview responses will only be shared with research team members and will ensure that any information we include in our report does not identify you as the respondent. Your name will not be connected with the answers in any way.</p> <p>Please read and sign this consent form. Do you have any questions on that?</p> <p>Remember, you don't have to talk about anything you don't want and you may end the interview at any time. Is that OK?</p> <p><i>Running Total: 5 min</i></p>
Objectives	Questions
<p><b>ALL RESPONDENTS</b></p> <p><b>Word-association exercise</b></p> <p>[about 3 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- establish top of</li> </ul>	<p><b>Q.1</b> To start off we are going to play a short game/carry out a short exercise: I will read out a word and I would like you to say the first couple of things that come to mind/pops into your head when you hear the word. Let's try an example first: What is the first thing that comes to mind if I say the word "summer"? Anything else?</p> <p><i>Encourage respondents to use short phrases or single words and to</i></p>

mind associations  
with privacy

*avoid lengthy descriptions and statements.*

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

*Running Total: 8 min*

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Running Total: 16 min*

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

**Internet experience and attitudes**  
[about 5 min]

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

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

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

*Running Total: 21 min*

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

**Underlying beliefs & attitudes to commercial/privac**

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

**y trade-off**

[about 5 min]

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

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

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

*Running Total: 26 min*

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

**Internet usage**

[about 2 min]

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

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

*Running Total: 28 min*

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

**UGC usage**

[about 5 min]

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

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

*Show card A:*

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

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

**C. Dating websites such as parship.com**

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

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

**F. Micro blogging sites such as twitter**

**G. Wiki sites such as Wikipedia, myheritage**

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

*Show card A*

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

UGC use

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

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

*Probe Why have you set things up in that way?*

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

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

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

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

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

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

*If NOT i and ii then ask:*

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

*Probe to determine exactly:*

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

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

*If Yes- How do you think this will happen?*

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

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

*Running Total: 42 min*

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

*If not previously established up to this point*

**Usage of**

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

aliases/nicknames  
[about 2 min]

- explore attitudes  
towards revealing  
personal  
information in  
different situations

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

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

Show card B

haven't, what do you think about it?

*Probe more in detail.*

*Running Total: 44 min*

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

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

*Show card B:*

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

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

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

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

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

*Running Total: 52 min*

**ALL  
RESPONDENTS**

Attitudes towards  
& behaviour on  
privacy policies.

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

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



[about 4 min]

*Probe to determine:*

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

*Running Total: 56 min*

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

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

**Thank & close**

*Hand out incentives if used*

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

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

*Total: 60 min*

---

## A.1 Interview Guidelines (Danish)

### Instruktion til intervieweren

Da hensigten med disse interviews er at opnå en dybere forståelse af personlige meninger, tanker, følelser, oplevelser og adfærd i forhold til privatliv baseret på kvantitative resultater fra den tidligere undersøgelse [WP7], er det afgørende, at respondenterne tillades at tale så frit som muligt, og at de får lov til at udvikle deres egne tanketråde i stedet for at følge et allerede defineret spørgeskema med ja/nej eller flere svarmuligheder. Det er tydeligt, at en af interviewerens større udfordringer ved at udføre standardiserede, åbne interviews er at opnå åbenhed, samtidig med at han/hun bevarer kontrollen – spørgsmålene i interviewet går efter dette mål.

Det vil dog altid være en vanskelig opgave at udføre interviews, når det drejer sig om et kompliceret emne, og de følgende praktiske retningslinjer skal være en hjælp til at mindske i hvert fald nogle af de besværligheder, intervieweren kan komme ud for.

**Planlæg i god tid:** Lav en fast aftale med respondenterne på et tidspunkt og sted som passer hende/ham bedst, og hvor de føler sig godt tilpas, men husk, at det skal være tilpas privat, så I ikke bliver forstyrret under interviewet. Undgå for stramme tidsplaner, for hvis du føler dig presset, kan det være, at det utilsigtet smitter af på respondenterne.

**Læs og hav styr på retningslinjerne for interviewet:** Øv dig på spørgsmålene i forvejen, og læs de instruktioner grundigt (som står i kursiv), som beskriver spørgsmålenes formål. Hold dig til retningslinjerne, og stil spørgsmålene i deres oprindelige rækkefølge.

**Bliv fortrolig med det tekniske udstyr:** Foretag en prøveoptagelse inden hvert interview for at være sikker på, at udstyret virker, og at batterierne er opladet.

**Spørg åbne spørgsmål:** Når du stiller spørgsmål til respondenterne, er det fristende at stille spørgsmål såsom "synes du ikke"/ "synes du at", hvilket kan besvares med et simpelt "ja" eller "nej". Denne slags spørgsmål bør så vidt muligt undgås, da vi ønsker detaljer omkring, hvad respondenterne synes, og ikke et "ja" eller "nej" svar. Forsøg desuden at blive ved med at stille åbne spørgsmål og at benytte andre teknikker såsom empati, forventningsfulde pauser og spejling, dvs. imitere respondenterens kropssprog og ansigtsudtryk, for at give respondenterne rigelig tid til at uddybe sit svar.

**Vær opmærksom hele tiden:** Selvom det er vigtigt at interagere med respondenterne, er det interviewerens hovedopgave at være lyttende og observerende under samtalen. Det er desuden anbefalelsesværdigt at være opmærksom og eventuelt skrive noter, efter optageren er slukket, da respondenterne ofte bidrager med afgørende informationer efter interviewets formelle afslutning.

Introduktion	Instruktion
<p><b>ALLE RESPONDENTER</b></p> <p><b>Introduktion</b></p> <p>[ca. 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tak</li> <li>- Dit navn</li> <li>- Formål</li> <li>- Fortrolighed</li> <li>- Varighed</li> <li>- Hvordan interviewet skal forløbe</li> <li>- Underskrivelse af samtykkeerklæring</li> </ul>	<p>Tak fordi du har afset tid til at mødes med mig i dag. Mit navn er-----og jeg vil gerne tale med dig om internettet, såsom hvad du kan lide og ikke kan lide ved det og hvordan du bruger det.</p> <p>Som jeg nævnte, da vi aftalte vores møde, er dette interview en del af CONSENT-projektet, som til dels bliver finansieret af EU-Kommissionen.</p> <p>CONSENT-projektets formål er at indsamle synspunkter fra internetbrugere i alle EU-lande. Hvis du er interesseret, kan jeg give dig flere informationer omkring CONSENT efter interviewet. Din mening er afgørende for vores undersøgelse og tages i betragtning, når den endelige rapport udfærdiges.</p> <p>Interviewet tager ikke mere end en time. Jeg optager vores samtale fordi jeg helst ikke vil glemme eller gå glip af nogen af dine svar. Selvom jeg skriver nogle noter ned under interviewet er det umuligt for mig at nå at få det hele med. Jeg vil bede dig om at tale højt og tydeligt, så det er nemmere at høre optagelsen bagefter.</p> <p>Alle svar er fortrolige. Det vil sige, at interviewet kun bliver oplyst til andre forskere, og enhver information, vi inkluderer i vores rapport, vil ikke identificere dig som respondent. Du er anonym, og svarene bliver ikke forbundet med dig på nogen måde.</p> <p>Vær venlig at læse og underskrive samtykkeerklæringen. Har du nogen spørgsmål til erklæringen?</p> <p>Husk, at du ikke er forpligtet til at tale om noget, du ikke vil tale om, og du kan afslutte interviewet når som helst. Er det i orden?</p> <p><i>Varighed: 5min.</i></p>
Formål	Spørgsmål
<p><b>ALLE RESPONDENTER</b></p> <p><b>Ordassociationstest</b></p> <p>[ca. 3 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Etablér ordforbindelser til ordet privatliv</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sp.1 Vi starter med en lille leg/en kortvarig øvelse:</b></p> <p>Jeg læser et ord op, og så vil jeg gerne have, at du siger de første par ord, du tænker på. For eksempel hvis jeg siger ordet "sommer"?.....</p> <p>- Andre ord?</p> <p><i>Husk at opfordre respondenterne til at bruge korte sætninger eller enkelte ord, og undgå for så vidt muligt at lange beskrivelser eller udtalelser.</i></p> <p><i>Spørgeord: ærlighed, internet, arbejde, familie, privatliv</i></p> <p><i>Varighed: 8 min</i></p>

**ALLE  
RESPONDENTER**

Villighed til at oplyse personlig information i forskellige situationer.  
[ca. 8 min]

**Sp.1.1** Nu går vi videre til noget andet. Forestil dig, at du sidder i et fly, og personen, der sidder ved siden af dig, er meget snakkesalig. Personen er samme køn som dig, du kender ikke personen og vil sandsynligvis aldrig møde ham/hende igen. Han/hun taler om forskellige ting, og efter ca. et kvarter spørger han/hun om du er enlig/gift/i et forhold – hvad ville du svare til det?

*Lad respondenterne tale frit, og spørg kun yderligere ind, hvis respondenterne ikke specificerer hvorfor.*

**Sp.1.2** Hvad hvis han/hun spurgte, hvor meget du tjener? Hvad ville du så gøre?

*Lad respondenterne tale frit, og spørg kun yderligere ind, hvis respondenterne ikke specificerer hvorfor.*

**Sp.1.3** Og hvad hvis han/hun sagde, at han/hun brugte sit CPR-nummer til at udvælge lottotal med. Han/hun spørger, hvad dit CPR-nummer er. Hvad gør du?

*Lad respondenterne tale frit, og spørg kun yderligere ind, hvis respondenterne ikke specificerer hvorfor.*

**Sp.1.4** Forestil dig nu, at i stedet for en snakkesalig medpassager, er det en af dine venner, som du mødes med få gange om året, som stiller spørgsmålene. Hvad ville du så svare?

*Spørg ind til hver enkelt: om respondenterne er enlig/gift/i et forhold, hvor meget respondenterne tjener og CPR-nummer. Spørg i hvert tilfælde om de ville sige sandheden og hvorfor/hvorfor ikke.*

*Varighed: 16 min*

**ALLE  
RESPONDENTER**

Oplevelser med og holdninger til internettet  
[ca. 5 min]

**Sp.2** Nu skal vi snakke lidt mere om internettet. I hvor lang tid har du brugt internettet?

**Sp.3** Hvad kan du bedst lide ved internettet?

**Sp.4** Hvad kan du mindst lide ved internettet?

*Varighed: 21 min*

**ALLE  
RESPONDENTER**

Grundlæggende holdning til

**Sp.5** Forestil dig, at du besøger en hjemmeside, hvor der sælges rabatkuponer, for eksempel Groupon, Just-half-price, eller lignende.

På hjemmesiden tilbydes rabatter op til 50 % på diverse forbrugerprodukter og ydelser såsom bøger, rejser,

<p><b>kommerciel gevinst på bekostning af privatlivet</b></p> <p>[ca. 5 min]</p>	<p>husholdningsprodukter og modevarer til medlemmerne af den pågældende "rabatforening".</p> <p>Siden reklamerer lige nu med en rabat på op til 75% til de af hjemmesidens besøgende, som oplyser flere personlige oplysninger end bare det sædvanlige navn og e-mail. Hvilke personlige oplysninger ville du være villig til at give for at opnå 75% rabattilbuddet?</p> <p><i>Begynd at læse følgende liste op: telefonnummer, adresse, fødselsdato, årlig indkomst, civil status, antal børn, dine børns alder, CPR-nummer eller pasnummer, din partners/kærestes/ægte mand/hustrus e-mail-adresse, hvor vidt du er livsforsikret og om du har en indbosforsikring/boligforsikring.</i></p> <p><i>Ved punkter hvor respondenterne ikke vil oplyse informationer til hjemmesiden, spørg da ind til <b>Sp. 5: hvorfor ikke?</b> : eller Hvorfor ville du ikke oplyse din....?</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 26 min</i></p>
<p><b>ALLE RESPONDENTER</b></p> <p><b>Brug af internettet</b></p> <p>[ca. 2 min]</p>	<p><b>Sp.6 Vær venlig at fortælle mig om de internet hjemmesider, du besøger i løbet af en uge, og hvad du bruger dem til.</b></p> <p><i>Spørg yderligere, hvis respondentens internetaktiviteter har betydning for respondentens livsstil, vaner eller sociale forhold (inklusive brug af digitale medieteknologier såsom spørgsmål/svar databaser, digital video, blogging, internetradio/podcast (udgivelse af lydfiler på internettet), fora, sociale netværk, mobiltelefonfotografi, og wikipedia.</i></p> <p><i>(Brug dog kun 2 minutter til dette spørgsmål, så lad være med at gå ind i for mange detaljer).</i></p> <p><i>Varighed: 28 min</i></p>
<p><b>ALLE RESPONDENTER</b></p> <p><b>Brug af UGC (User-Generated-Content)</b></p> <p>[ca. 5 min]</p> <p>- etabler hvorvidt respondenterne er en UGC-bruger, en SNS-bruger eller en</p>	<p><b>Sp.7 Dette er en liste over nogle hjemmesider. Kan du sige mig hvilke, hvis nogen, du har konto hos (altså hvilke sider, du ikke bare besøger). Hvis du har en konto hos nogle, hvor ofte logger du så ind?</b></p> <p><i>&lt;lav en notits om, hvor vidt respondenterne benytter sociale netværkssider og hvis ikke, hvilken UGC side respondenterne bruger oftest&gt;</i></p> <p><i>Vis Kort A:</i></p> <p><b>A. Sociale netværkssider såsom Facebook, Myspace, Jubii m.fl.</b></p> <p><b>B. Erhvervsnetværkssider såsom LinkedIn, Xing.com</b></p> <p><b>C. Datinghjemmesider såsom parship.com, dating.dk</b></p> <p><b>D. Hjemmesider hvor man kan dele billeder, videoer, etc, såsom</b></p>

ikke-bruger?  
Etablér hvilken  
UGC side,  
respondenten  
oftest bruger

-kæder  
undersøgelse  
sammen med det  
tidligere studie  
[WP7]

Vis Kort A

**RESPONDENTER  
SOM IKKE BRUGER  
ELLER IKKE  
LÆNGERE BRUGER  
UGC SIDER I SP7**

**Grunde til ikke at  
benytte UGC sider**  
[ca. 3 min]

**YouTube eller Flickr**

**E. Hjemmesider som indeholder anbefalinger og anmeldelser (af film, music, bøger, hoteller m.fl.) såsom Yelp, last.fm, tripadvisor**

**F. Miniblogging hjemmesider såsom Twitter**

**G. Wiki-sider såsom Wikipedia, myheritage**

**H. Multiplayer-online-spil såsom Second Life, World of Warcraft**

*Spørg ind til, hvor meget tid respondenter bruger på sociale netværkssider og andre UGC ydelser dagligt/ugentligt. (Hvis det ikke er tydeligt nok specificeret i Sp.6)*

*Varighed: 33 min*

**Sp.8 Hvorfor har du ikke konto hos nogen af disse sider? / Hvorfor annullerede du dem? / Hvorfor bruger du ikke din konto hos siden mere? Ellers andet?**

*Spørg grundigt, men notér første og anden grund, der nævnes.*

*Vi er interesserede i at undersøge, hvorfor respondenter er bekymret omkring:*

- konsekvenserne ved at oplyse informationer på nettet,
- hvordan information om respondenter bliver anvendt,
- hvorvidt UGC sider er pålidelige, og
- andre spørgsmål relaterende til privatliv

*Hvis privatliv, informationsanvendelse og tillid/pålidelighed ikke nævnes som grund til, at respondenter er holdt op med at bruge (eller aldrig har brugt) UGC sider, spørg da om følgende:*

**Sp.9 Hvilke årsager kunne du have til at åbne en konto – eller ikke åbne en konto – på nogen af disse sider inden for nærmeste fremtid?**

*Lad respondenter tale frit, men spørg så forsigtigt for at finde ud af om respondenter føler sig presset til at åbne en UGC konto;*

*Hvis respondenter ikke nævner nogle privatlivs-, informationsanvendelses- eller tillidssgrunde, spørg da om følgende:*

**Sp10. Du nævnte, at en af grundene (grunden) til,**

at du ikke besøger UGC sider er <hvad respondenterne sagde, som relaterer sig til privatliv/informationsanvendelse>.

**Kan du sige mig mere omkring, hvad der helt præcist bekymrer dig?**

*Spørg i dybden for at finde ud af*

*i. hvilket aspekt af UGC sider respondenterne finder uacceptable, og hvorfor;*

*ii. holdninger til hvordan internetsider anvender information;*

*iii holdninger til, hvad UGC-sider er til for.*

*varighed: 36 min*

## RESPONDENTER SOM BRUGER UGC SIDER I Sp.7

**UGC sider -  
Motivation &  
Anvendelse**  
[ca. 6 min]

Etablér:

- motivation for UGC brug
- villighed til at dele information
- holdninger til forskellige typer information
- motivation for indstillinger af hvem der kan se respondenterens information

**Sp.11 Hvad fik dig til at bruge <Social netværksside, hvis respondenterne siger han/hun bruger den. Hvis respondenterne ikke benytter nogen social netværksside, spørg da til den UGC-side respondenterne bruger mest fra sp.7 >?**

*Spørg ind for at undersøge respondenterens motivation for at bruge siden.*

**Sp. 12 I løbet af al den tid, hvor du har brugt disse sider, hvilken information har du oplyst til siden/siderne?**

*Lad respondenterne få rigelig tid til at svare med egne ord, men spørg ind til: navn, adresse, billeder af respondenterne, billeder af respondenterens familie og venner, lyd/billedoptagelser, information ang. medicin/læge, hobbyer, sportsgrene, steder respondenterne har været, smag og meninger, m.fl.*

**Sp.13 Hvem har adgang til at se din profil og/eller billeder?**

*Spørg Sp.15 Hvorfor har du indstillet det på den måde?*

**Sp.14 Har du nogensinde fortrudt, at du har lagt noget information ud på nettet på en af disse sider?**

*Hvis ja: Sp.15 Vil du fortælle mig lidt om det? Hvad skete der? Hvorfor fortrød du?*

*Hvis respondenterne ikke nævner kommerciel information og negative konsekvenser, spørg da også om sp. 16.1 og 16.2.*

*Hvis nej: Sp.16 Kunne du forestille dig en situation, hvor du kunne fortryde det?*

*Spørg for at finde ud af, om manglen på bekymring over for det at lægge informationer ud på nettet er fordi:*

- i. respondenter lægger meget lidt information ud, eller*
- ii. respondenter altid tænker sig grundigt om, inden han/hun lægger noget ud, eller*
- iii. respondenter ikke mener, at det er noget problem, at alle har adgang til hans/hendes information.*

*Hvis IKKE i og ii, spørg da:*

**16.1 Tror du, du modtager kommerciel information, fordi du har lagt personlig information ud på nettet? Hvis ja, hvordan har du det så med det?**

*Spørg for præcis at finde ud af:*

- iv. Om respondenter er klar over konsekvenserne ved at lægge personlig information ud på nettet*
- v. Hvorfor nogle konsekvenser er mere acceptable end andre*
- vi. Om folk accepterer, at modtagelsen af kommerciel information er en naturlig konsekvens af at benytte sidens ydelse(r).*

**16.2 Hvad tror du, der kan ske (fx med hensyn til jobsøgning og ry) som et resultat af den personlige information, du har lagt ud på nettet?**

*Hvis ja- Hvordan tror du, det kan ske?*

*Hvis nej- Hvorfor tror du, ikke det kan ske?*

*>Spørg ind for præcis at finde ud af hvad respondenter synes om andre mennesker, der bruger deres egen information lagt ud på UGC-sider. Spørg i et neutralt toneleje, så der er plads til både en positiv og negativ reaktion.*

*Varighed: 42 min*

**ALLE  
RESPONDENTER**

**Brug af alias eller  
kælenavn**

*Hvis det endnu ikke er blevet talt om:*

**Sp.17 Har du nogensinde brugt et alias eller et kælenavn, når du har lagt information op på nettet?**

**Hvis ja, i hvilke situationer og hvorfor?**

**Hvis nej, hvad synes du om at gøre det?**



<p>[ca. 2 min]</p> <p>- Udforsk holdninger til at oplyse personlig information i forskellige situationer</p>	<p><i>Spørg mere ind til detaljer.</i></p> <p><i>Varighed: 44 min</i></p>
<p><b>ALLE RESPONDENTER</b></p> <p><b>Holdninger til hjemmesiders anvendelse af personlig information</b></p> <p>[ca. 8 min]</p> <p><i>Vis kort B</i></p>	<p><b>Sp.18 Den information, som internetbrugere lægger ud på deres konto eller profil på en hjemmeside, kan anvendes af ejerne til en række formål, såsom at tilpasse det indhold og de reklamer, som brugeren ser, til at sende dem e-mails, til at indsamle meget personlige oplysninger m.fl.</b></p> <p><b>Vidste du det, da du oprettede en konto hos en hjemmeside (eller UGC/SNS)?</b></p> <p><b>Hvad synes du om det?</b></p> <p><i>Gør notits, om hvor vidt respondenterne var klar over formålene, og spørg ind for at finde ud af, hvilken holdning respondenterne har til anvendelsen af internetbrugerinformation til hver af de følgende:</i></p> <p><i>Vis Kort B:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>4. Tilpasning af de reklamer respondenterne ser (det vil sige, at hjemmesiden kun viser ting, som sandsynligvis interesserer brugeren).</i></li> <li><i>5. Deling af information (som kan hænge sammen med brugerens navn) om brugerens adfærd med andre afdelinger i virksomheden, der ejer siden.</i></li> <li><i>6. Salg af information (der ikke hænger sammen med dit navn) om din adfærd til andre virksomheder.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Spørg respondenterne for <u>hvert formål</u>, hvad grunden er til, at de finder dem acceptable/uacceptable.</i></p> <p><i>Stil følgende spørgsmål for hvert af de formål, som respondenterne finder uacceptable, hvis det ikke allerede er blevet nævnt:</i></p> <p><b>Sp.19 Under hvilke forhold, om nogle, ville du finde det acceptabelt for internetbrugere at oplyse personlig information til &lt;formål som respondenterne finder uacceptabelt &gt;?</b></p> <p><i>Spørg for at finde ud af, om respondenterne ville godtage en lottokupon, points på en hjemmeside såsom Facebook, en andel af indtægter fra en hjemmeside, penge m.fl. mod at oplyse personlig information.</i></p> <p><i>Varighed: 52 min</i></p>
<p><b>ALLE</b></p>	<p><b>Sp.20 Hvad synes du om privatlivspolitikkerne hos de UGC/SNS-</b></p>

**RESPONDENTER**

**Holdning til og adfærd i forhold til privatlivspolitik.**

[ca. 4 min]

**sider, du bruger? Læste du dem, før du tilmeldte dig?**

*(vælg en ud som eksempel; hvis "nej" til Sp.7, så vælg en anden hjemmeside, som respondenteren bruger jævnligt.)*

**Hvis "ja" – Hvad ville du være særlig opmærksom på? Hvis du fandt noget, der ikke var i orden, hvad ville du så gøre?**

*Spørg for at finde ud af:*

*- om folk virkelig læser privatlivspolitikken,*

*- Hvad respondenteren er opmærksom på, når han/hun læser privatlivspolitikker (tilstedeværelse af/fravær af/ garanti om et specifikt element?), og*

*- hvad respondenteren gør, hvis hvad, han/hun er opmærksom på, ikke står i politikken (Fortsætte med at bruge hjemmesiden alligevel? Lade være med at bruge den?)*

*Varighed: 56 min*

**ALLE  
RESPONDENTER**

**Tak og afslutning**

**Det var alt fra mig. Er der noget du vil tilføje?**

*Informér respondenteren om de næste trin i projektet, giv mere information omkring CONSENT-projektet, hvis respondenteren ønsker det.*

**Tusind tak for din værdifulde deltagelse i vores projekt!**

*Varighed ialt: 60 min*

## B. Pre-Analysis Template

Interview Country: \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewer (name): \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Interview number: \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewee age: \_\_\_\_\_ Gender:  Female Location:  urban / suburban  
 Male  rural

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

---

### Description of interview situation / overall impression:

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

**A. Word Associations (Q1)**

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

**B. General Attitudes and Behaviour towards Disclosure of Personal Information**

Willingness to give the following information:

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

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

**Additional Quotes:**

C. Years of Internet  Usage (Q2):

**D. General Internet-related Attitudes**

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

**Additional Quotes:**

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

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

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

**Additional Quotes:**

**F. Everyday Internet Routines (Q6, Q7)**

Frequency per day/week of

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

Additional Quotes:

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

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

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

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

**Additional Quotes:**

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

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

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

**Additional Quotes:**

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

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

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

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

**Additional Quotes:**



**G.5 Privacy Settings (Q13)**

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

**Specific Quotes:**

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

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

**Specific Quotes:**

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

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

**Specific Quotes:**

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

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

**Specific Quotes:**

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

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

**Specific Quotes:**

## G.9 Privacy Policies (Q20)

### G.9.1 Reading privacy policies

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

### G.9.2 Content of privacy policies

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

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

