



2018

# College Students' Dual-Screening, Political Habits, and Attitudes: A Survey Analysis

Jonathan Weskey Bruce

*University of the Pacific*, [jonathanwbruce@gmail.com](mailto:jonathanwbruce@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds)

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Bruce, Jonathan Weskey. (2018). *College Students' Dual-Screening, Political Habits, and Attitudes: A Survey Analysis*. University of the Pacific, Thesis. [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds/3110](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3110)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgibney@pacific.edu](mailto:mgibney@pacific.edu).

COLLEGE STUDENTS' DUAL-SCREENING, POLITICAL HABITS AND  
ATTITUDES: A SURVEY ANALYSIS

by

Jonathan Bruce

A Thesis submitted to the

Graduate School

In partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

College of the Pacific  
Communication

University of the Pacific  
Stockton, California

2018

COLLEGE STUDENTS' DUAL-SCREENING, POLITICAL HABITS AND  
ATTITUDES: A SURVEY ANALYSIS

by

Jonathan Bruce

APPROVED BY:

Master Advisor: Qingwen Dong, Ph. D.

Committee Member: Graham Carpenter, Ph. D.

Committee Member: Paul Turpin, Ph. D.

Department Chair: Paul Turpin, Ph. D.

Dean of Graduate School: Thomas H. Naehr, Ph.D.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication .....	5
Acknowledgements .....	6
Chapter 1: The Problem .....	8
Introduction .....	8
Purpose of the Thesis .....	9
Definition of Key Terms .....	9
Significance of the Study .....	11
Chapter II: Literature Review .....	13
Introduction to Literature Review .....	13
College Students' Political Behaviors Based on their Social Media Tendencies .....	14
What is Known about Social Media and Politics? .....	16
What we Know About College Students and Social Media .....	17
Understanding the Act of Dual-Screening .....	18
Most Recent Research of Dual-Screening .....	20
Theoretical Framework of Dual-Screening .....	22
Summary of Literature Review .....	26
Hypotheses and Research Questions .....	27
Chapter III: Method .....	30
Variables .....	30
Sample .....	32
Measurement .....	32
Chapter IV: Results .....	34
Demographic Information .....	34

Independent Variables and Dependent Variables (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, H1, H2).....	36
Correlation Analysis (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, H1, H2).....	37
Answering the Research Questions and Hypotheses with Multiple Regression Analysis (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, H1, H2).....	40
Chapter V: Discussion .....	46
Implications of the Study.....	46
Limitations of the Study .....	48
Suggestions for Future Research .....	49
Conclusion.....	50
References.....	52
Appendix A: Survey .....	61

### **Dedication**

My mother, Marynella McLaughlin, is the reason for all of this. It has been a challenging year without you on this Earth. The world lost a Saint: February 11th, 2017. I do not know what I will do in my future, but everything I will do—I will do to honor you. My life and my work is an extension of you and the footprint that you laid upon this green Earth: including this thesis. The words in ‘I love you’ are gravely impoverished for how I feel. You left singing it going into the UCSF operating room and I’m here still singing it for you, “Yo voy caminando a la montana donde naci. No puedo vivir. Que al lado del camino ir que no vivo pasa el tiempo del camino.” I will walk to the mountain and join you soon.

## Acknowledgements

This thesis would not be possible without the help I received from so many folks. All throughout my collegiate career I have been blessed. All of my friends and family members are insightful, inquisitive thinkers. My sister, Kathleen, helped me find debate, which paved my way to this graduate program: I owe so much to your vision. Taylor Evans would help me keep perspective during the writing of my thesis by reminding me that there are much more important things than college and academia. I would like to thank Alison Coss for all the conversations. Thank you to Thalia for celebrating Lenny Kravitz with me; our future study on of the physical/emotional effects of watching his videos will be groundbreaking. Reed Ramsey was an excellent partner-in-crime during this process supporting me academically and emotionally, while I faced great loss. I would also like to thank Lupe Fiasco for teaching me a Bachelor's degrees doesn't mean anything with a Master's degree "next to it." Furthermore, I wish to thank all of the faculty of the Communication Department who have been such a great help: Dr. Dong, Dr. Bates, Dr. Turpin, Dr. Carpenter, Dr. Day, and of course Dr. Hether. Jesus Christ, up above, dances with my mother: Marynella McLaughlin. He is my savior, and she is my eternal compass: this is for you two.

## College Students' Dual-Screening, Political Habits, and Attitudes: A Survey Analysis

### Abstract

by Jonathan Bruce

University of the Pacific  
2018

With the rise of technology, the way people may communicate is becoming infinitely more creative and complex. Dual-screening, or second screening, is one way in which people may now engage with live television events. Dual-screening occurs when an individual uses their phone, while watching television, in such a way that aids them in their viewing of television: this is called hybrid media. Previous research has been done that has indicated people who dual-screen typically are more politically active. According to Hybrid Media System Theory, as dual-screening rises in relevance, the political power of normal citizens increases. Therefore, this study uses political dual-screener as the independent variable. By surveying 235 college students, this study found a number of strong correlations between political dual-screening and political activism, trust in social media, and psychological motivations to meet their needs for coordination and affection. By running bivariate correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis, this study discovered that political dual-screening individuals are strongly to all of these dependent variables.



## Chapter 1: The Problem

### Introduction

Many studies have investigated the correlations between social media usage and college students' political habits and attitudes, and these studies have created a dichotomy between traditional media and social media (Certon, 2015; Barnidge, 2015; Nielsen & Schroder, 2014; Park 2015; Lee & Kim, 2016; Lee, Chen, & Chan, 2017; Kushin & Yamamoto 2010; Yamamoto, Kushin, & Dalisag, 2015). Distinctions made between new and old media have existed for a while. They have also been made to describe the actors involved in the news and political processes. Dayan and Katz (1992) said media actors narrated events, political actors performed, and normal civilians were passive actors with no access to intervening in meaning-making. However, media and the complicated ways in which it is used is rapidly changing, as social media and traditional forms of media like the television are often used simultaneously (Bruns & Enli, 2015). Such distinctions and dichotomies do not grasp hybrid media events. Individuals are now able to use social media to interact with live television events together, and this has connected an otherwise isolated population (Hambrick, Simmons, Greenhalgh, & Greenwell, 2010). Hashtags have allowed social networking sites (SNS) like Facebook and Twitter to create dedicated pages for people who are commenting on live political events: this is social viewing. This type of dual-screening however is a new phenomenon, and SNS are constantly making new innovations for how the social media

users may socially view and interact with an event. Therefore, there is lack of literature on how individuals dual-screen and for what reasons they may do so (Vaccari, Chadwick, & O'Loughlin 2015). No substantive study has been done on how college students politically, socially view through dual-screening, and the predictions that may have for their political efficacy and activism.

### **Purpose of the Thesis**

This thesis intends to discover whether political, social viewers in college are politically active and why they chose to use social media. Many communication scholars have inquired into what forms of social media habits can predict political activism. In general, studies agree that people who use social media for political purposes are more likely to be a politically active population: this is rather intuitive. This study seeks to understand the political activity, motivations, and expressions of college students who politically dual screen: are active in both traditional forms of and new forms of media for political purposes. The first purpose of this thesis is to better understand the young-adult generation by discovering what type of dual-screening habits may predict their political behaviors and ideas; this thesis uses political dual-screening as the independent variable to explore the aforementioned question. Furthermore, another purpose of this thesis is to further progress the general dual-screening literature base for Communication's understanding of social viewers and why they chose to engage with SNS.

### **Definition of Key Terms**

*Facebook:*

“Facebook is a popular free social networking website that allows registered users to create profiles, upload photos and video, send messages and keep in touch with friends,

family and colleagues. The site, which is available in 37 different languages, includes public features such as: Groups, Marketplace, Events, Pages, Presence technology” (Rouse, n.d.a).

*Twitter:*

“Twitter is a free social networking microblogging service that allows registered members to broadcast short posts called *tweets*. Twitter members can broadcast tweets and follow other users' tweets by using multiple platforms and devices. Tweets and replies to tweets can be sent by cell phone text message desktop client or by posting at the Twitter. com website” (Rouse, n.d.b).

*Social Networking Site (SNS):*

“A social networking site is an online platform that allows users to create a public profile and interact with other users on the website. Social networking sites usually have a new user input a list of people with whom they share a connection and then allow the people on the list to confirm or deny the connection. After connections are established, the new user can search the networks of connections to make more connections. A social networking site is also known as a social networking website or social website” (Techopedia, n.d.).

*Political Efficacy:*

“External political efficacy considers an individual’s views on government institutions and officials, whereas internal political efficacy seeks to understand individual-level assessments of one’s own ability to understand and effectively participate in the political process” (Niemi, Craig, & Mattei, 1991, p. 1407-1408).

*Political Activism:*

Activism consists of efforts to promote, impede, or direct social, political, economic, or environmental reform or stasis with the desire to make improvements in society.

*Dual Screening:*

Dual screening is “the bundle of practices that involve integrating, and switching across and between, live broadcast media and social media, particularly Facebook and Twitter” (Vaccari et al., 2015, p. 1041)

*Social Viewers:*

Individuals who engage in dual screening. It is the noun of the verb: dual screening.

Social viewing “encompasses past discussions on dual viewing, second screening, social TV, and co-viewing. Incorporating discussions of past studies, social viewing in this study is theorized as follows: It emphasizes that social viewers can partake in a virtually communal experience of television viewing with other co-viewers through the use of online media (e. g. , blog, comments, chatting, messenger, etc. ) pre, post, and during television viewing” (Lee & Choi, 2017).

*Political dual-screener:*

“Political dual-screener” refers to an individual who dual-screens a live event on television for political purposes. This report uses this term quite often, as it is the independent variable of the study.

**Significance of the Study**

Social media is becoming highly engrained in all aspects of life. Bruns and Enli (2015) indicated that people who use social media to interact with live political events are

exercising a new form of political power. They are no longer passive agents in the news making and political processes. They are able to compete with traditional forms of media like CNN and Fox News. Now, large news entities will actually respond to social media users in live time which allows for political transformation and persuasion to occur (Chadwick & Dennis, 2017). This form of power has manifested itself in a number of ways. According to Sloam (2016) the political utilization of dual screening and social media has allowed for successful protests to occur all over Europe, particularly in Spain and Italy. Therefore, understanding dual-screening and the population that utilizes its practice is critical to illuminating a new construct of rising political power. This report helps the literature pool understand the motivations political dual-screener have for engaging with social media. Furthermore, it explores the disputed question as to whether political dual-screener are indeed politically active, offline.

## **Chapter II: Literature Review**

### **Introduction to Literature Review**

The following literature review is divided into four sections. The first section covers college students and how their social media habits may predict their political behavior. This section is important to the study as it illuminates the scholarly work that has shown positive relationships between colleges students and political behavior via social media use. This thesis proposal takes this a step further by looking at college students who engage in a particular type of social media use: particularly social viewing. The second and third section of the literature review covers how informational sources of social media may predict political behavior and attitudes. This section is particularly useful, as it shows how social media may predict political exposure, participation, and interesting trust issues with political information. This thesis seeks to settle disputes over political participation that occur in this section and whether social viewers have the same trust issues with news and political information found on social media as regular social media users do. The fourth section of the literature review discusses the rising literature of dual-screen use and what is known about the phenomenon thus far. It is important to note that dual-screening is a fairly new ground for literature, as the publications really began gaining traction as recent as 2015. The final section of the literature review covers a discussion of hybrid media systems theory and uses and gratifications theory. This section is important as it covers the newly-developing literature of dual-screen usage and subsequent theories involved.

### **College Students' Political Behaviors Based on their Social Media Tendencies**

Individuals who are part of political discussions are more politically active. Panel data was collected from college dorms attempting to discover relationships between political discussions and activity (Klofstad, 2015). Data indicated that exposure to political discussion in college predicted increased levels of participation (Klofstad, 2015). This study proved that by people being exposed to political discussions the more likely it is that that very individual will engage with political activism.

Another study sought to identify what exactly leads to pro-environmental behavior. By surveying over 500 college students, the researchers wished to figure out what exactly characteristics people have who are more environmentally minded (Meyer, 2016). First, the study showed that the more years a student remains on campus the more pro-environmental they are (Meyer, 2016). This model demonstrated that universities uphold environmental principles and it also demonstrated that universities have a political influence on students.

College students have also been shown to become more connected to protests and political activism through their social media use. One study, in particular, focused on Hong Kong's Umbrella Movement in 2014. Lee, Chen, and Chan (2017) were able to discover that sharing political information and connection with political actors on social media had a significant impact on participation for the Umbrella Movement. Social media had an influence on each dependent variable in their survey. This is significant because it showed that social media is a huge environmental influence in student's

awareness and participation in protests (Lee, Chen, & Chan, 2017). It is very intriguing to discover whether social media has the same amount of influence in the United States.

Further research explored possible relationships between campus life and political participation for college students. The study found that frequency of political communication at the group and individual level explains normative perceptions of politics (Shulman, Levine, & 2012). This study is important because it solidified the notion that political communication not only increases participation but also makes the students' viewpoints more mainstream and reflective of the culture on mass. This demonstrated that political mainstreaming begins by a person entering more political discussions.

Furthermore, another study wanted to discover universities' capacity to encourage student political participation. Therefore, they looked at the following: civic instruction, deliberative course-based discussion, community service, service learning, and youth participation during the 2008 presidential election (Pritzker, Springer, & McBride, 2015). The study verified the notion that increased exposure to politics leads to increased amounts of political activity. This study specifically demonstrated that students are more likely to engage in voting if they are engaged and exposed to increased amounts of political literature. Hao, Wen, and George (2014) surveyed a number of university students from Singapore. It found that news consumption through varying sources is related to the students' political and civic participation in different ways (Hao, Wen, & George, 2014). Print and internet news, for example, was found to be highly associated to civic engagement and political knowledge.



## **What is Known about Social Media and Politics?**

Determining whether and how social media networks expose individuals to political disagreement is critical to understanding how individuals experience civil society in the digital age (Barnidge, 2015). Research done in the U. S. and Europe demonstrated that heavy social media users are exposed to political disagreements more so than light users of social media (Barnidge, 2015). Another study explored the relationship between internet usage and political trust. The results disclosed the differences between Web 1.0 websites and Web 2.0 social media, showing that consumption of news from information/news websites is positively associated with higher trust, while access to information available on social media is linked with lower trust (Ceron, 2015). A third study, struck a similar theme, as it assessed differences in use of SNSs and relates them to different patterns of political participation, media use motivations, and political efficacy. Based on a Web survey of 1,230 South Korean voters, it found that informational uses of SNSs are positively associated with expressive participation both online and offline, but not with collective participation (Park, 2015). The findings suggested that the political impact of SNS is mostly limited to expressive participation and dependent upon users' motivations (Park, 2015).

Another study also looked at the correlation between political exposure online and the 2008 election participation. This study expanded research on SNS by examined what encourages people to become politically expressive and the implications of that expression (Bode, Vraga, Borah, & Shah, 2014). Results demonstrated that political SNS use strongly impacted levels of participation in the 2008 election between Barack Obama and John McCain (Bode, Vraga, Borah, & Shah, 2014). By investigating social-

media-based public forums and using content analysis, a second study explored how and what forms of political discussion are actually impactful. The results of this study implied that the flow of political discussions is not necessarily centralized (Choi, 2014). Participants refer and defer to like-minded individuals (Choi, 2014). Political discussions are more emotional than cognitive and express more anger than anxiety.

#### What we Know About College Students and Social Media

Another study directly tackled college students' orientation to politics and their SNS use. Data shows positive correlations between attention to traditional internet news sources and political self-efficacy and situation political involvement (Kushin & Yamamoto, 2010). Social media usage showed no direct correlation to political efficacy. A web survey of college students was conducted to examine whether online political expression moderates the effects of political media use on political participation (Yamamoto, Kushin, & Dalisay 2015). Results showed that online political participation had a positive correlation with offline political participation (Yamamoto et al., 2015). Another study conducted had really interesting findings on the way in which news is retained when it is received incidentally and how these incidental news findings mostly happen through SNS (Lee & Kim, 2016). Their study discovered that social media heterogeneity is positively associated with the likeliness of incidental exposure to news online (Lee & Kim, 2016). Little research has looked into the predictors of political discussion on Facebook. Using survey data from 442 college students in the United States, this final study found network size influences students' expressive, political behavior when it comes to two different items: gay rights issues and politics (Jang, Lee,

& Park, 2014). An interesting result is that students who have more friends are less likely to talk about issues like gay rights issues (Jang, Lee, & Park, 2014).

### **Understanding the Act of Dual-Screening**

It has been established that for a long time in communication studies, researchers only discuss new versus traditional media. New theories account for the ways in which both new and traditional media are used simultaneously and are dependent upon each other. An example, of this would be when Anderson Cooper is hosting a live event and is looking at his phone for Twitter reactions. The people who are tweeting are reacting to the television, while at the same time the people producing the works on the television are dependent upon social media for their production. Therefore, it is important for research to begin to understand new and traditional media as a media assemblage: where traditional and new media logics form a cohesive unit, which is separate yet whole.

Dual-screening has become the new normal in the contemporary household. Recent findings suggest that most TV viewing is accompanied by some sort of mobile device. Accenture, in 2015, estimated that 87% of TV viewing was accompanied by these devices. There are many different ways dual-screening may occur (Fig. 1 for examples). Most dual screen usage comes in the form of a smart-phone.



**Figure 1**


Dual-screening can take many different forms: an individual may simply use social media while watching TV (a), read more about what is on television (b), or they may download an app or some program specific to their TV program (c). This figure and image is adapted from Neat and Evans (2017).

Television cannot keep our attention. There are scene change changes that one may find less stimulating or commercials. Therefore, it is natural for one to engage with their phone, as it helps keep themselves stimulated. Smart phones allow for the user to be an active, engaged agent. The television, in and of itself, does not require much at all from the audience. The phone, subsequently, may be viewed as a tool to make the television interactive. It can be seen as a way of re-territorializing a once passive space (television viewing) into an active arena where the audience members now may become active participants in meaning-making. People have always multi-tasked in front of a playing television: this is nothing new. Before digital prominence, one study found that watching television was usually partnered with social interactions, eating, or reading: 46% of the time (Schmitt, Woolf, & Anderson, 2003).

TV programs, magazines, and newspapers would all usually contain some type of material made to accompany television viewing: the TV Guide magazine is a great example of this. Broadcasters have always been interested in closing the bridge between broadcast production and audience interaction. With the rise of the digital age,

this bridge is fading away altogether. The two islands are beginning to merge.

However, not all programs made for audience interaction and audience retention of content is created equally well. BBC made the figure below to clearly map which type of programs, features, and app create a successful experience for the television viewer (from the broadcaster's perspective).



**Figure 2**

The BBC experimented with dual screen interactions. Adapted from Jones (2011), Figure 2 illuminates their general conclusions—a map of concentration and interactivity in the dual-screen. *Green* discerns most common trends on dual screen apps.

### Most Recent Research of Dual-Screening

As this is a new field of inquiry, particularly in the Communication field, much still has yet to be discovered. A lot still has yet to be discovered about how college

students utilize dual-screening: particularly students who politically dual-screen.

McGregor et al. (2017) analyzed a survey of college students in Brazil and the United States, though. They wanted to compare dual screening frequency, motivations, types, and platforms used between the two countries. They discovered that Brazilians dual screen much more frequently than Americans. In both countries, the students who used the interactive features of SNS were more likely to dual screen.

Even though that study looked into college students it did not have any inquiries into the political practices of dual screeners. McGregor and Mourao (2017) created a cross-lagged autoregressive panel survey design and discovered that there is a positive association to dual screening and political participation. However, they also discovered that people, who were not in favor of Trump, dual-screening during news leads lead to a decrease in political participation: online and offline. Based on original survey data collected in twenty societies, Gil de Zuniga and Liu (2017) have found that young people tend to second screen more than their older peers. Furthermore, heavy users of dual-screening politically express themselves more on social media and tend to be more politically active, offline (Gil de Zuniga & Liu, 2017). However, heavy and light users of dual-screening seemed to have similar voting habits. Dual screeners being more active online should not come as a surprise, as Ciu, Rui, and Su (2016) discovered, via survey analysis, that viewers experienced emotional arousal during a live broadcast when they watched the media through perceived co-viewing conditions. Mediated co-viewing, operationalized as social media engagement, was the strongest predictor of emotional arousal (Ciu, Rui, & Su, 2016). A survey of 500 individuals in South Korea found that dual-screeners were more likely to have increased conversations with people who had

opposing opinions (Lee & Choi, 2017). (Chiang & Lin, 2017) conducted a survey of 961 dual screen users in Taiwan. The researchers discovered that dual screening is positively associated to offline and online political participation. Furthermore, they discovered that dual screen users had low trust in mainstream media whereas they had high trust in alternative media.

### **Theoretical Framework of Dual-Screening**

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattaria (2015) first created a well-known assemblage theory in 1980. They discussed how boundaries between different modular units are permeable. These fixtures, or rather assemblages, can only be comprehended by their interaction and dependent-relation with various, other modular units. Andrew Chadwick (2011) mentions how the hybrid media system demonstrates how political news making and information distribution is delivered through such assemblages. People or news organizations enter into the political and news process through new and older media outlets: often strategically, thoughtfully, and simultaneously.

However, today there are so many layers of media that it is necessary to include the word media logics: plural. Media logic was defined by Peter Dahlgren as “the imperatives that shape the particular attributes and ways of doing things within given media... the procedures of selection, form, tempo, informational density, aesthetics, contents, modes of address, and production schedules” (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 52).

However, due to the rising assemblage, communication studies should begin focusing on a growing and rapidly evolving negotiation of the norms for how and when certain media outlets are used for certain events (Bruns & Enli, 2015). Online formats have created the rapid expansion of media logics. It is necessary therefore to discover which

demographics chose which permutation of certain media logics during certain events. For example, this theory is an inquiry into what assemblage and permutation of media logics does a conservative chose during a presidential campaign.

Hybrid media system theory is used by Rasmus Nielsen and Kim Schroder (2014) in one survey in which they wanted to discover if “ordinary people can use social media and other new internet tools to actively engage in commenting on, sharing, and producing news in a more interactive and decentered environment.” They discovered, however, that television remains the most significant source of news for their chosen demographic, and this was also true for the portion of their sample that used social media most frequently. However, it is true that the way in which the possible permutation of media logics may be used that what is considered to be political participation is rapidly changing (Bruns & Enli 2015). The way in which power is enacted and produced in the political arena, subsequently, is evolving. For example, organizations like Moveon and Getup! ask their followers to raise money for advertisements for television and newspapers or they ask their followers to do a survey or petition in order to be recognized by traditional media.

A good example of this theory being deployed was a study done by James Sloam in 2016. This study covered citizen protests in Spain and in Italy, akind to Occupy movement in the U. S. Mr. Sloam discovered that occupation, political protests are enabled by the organizational structures allowed in social media (Sloam, 2016). He also used hybrid media system by demonstrating how political activists disrupt and structure information content that was typically structured by broadcast media. Activists are able to compete with the well-funded apparatuses of corporate broadcasting structures by their



ability to use likes, shares, viral videos and image, and online petitions (Bruns & Enli 2015).

The ability to “dual screen” has also given rise for new forms of political engagement. Dual screening is when someone opens up their laptop and/or mobile device while a live televised event is occurring in order to comment on that live event. Studies have shown that such live comments allow for political persuasion and transformation to occur (Chadwick & Dennis, 2017). This idea was further proven by Olof Larsson and Moe (2012) when they discovered that political tweeting greatly increases while live political events are occurring. In fact, this is so true, that Yu-Ru Lin (2014) discovered, while analyzing 290 million tweets during the 2012 presidential U. S. campaign that interpersonal communication greatly dropped on twitter. People became more interested in sharing and talking to opinion leaders with larger followings.

Gil de Zuniga (2015) used dual screening as a dependent variable and discovered it to be a positive predictor of online participation. Subsequently, dual screening is an important pathway for understanding modern political engagement. Hybridization does not mean that the establishment, traditional media outlets lose power, according to (Bruns & Enli, 2015). However, as hybridization increases it decreases the control of power that traditional forms of media has over political participation and the flow of information (Bruns & Enli, 2015). Therefore, it is important to understand when and how people are currently negotiating which forms of assemblage they use to express and pronounce their political participation and identity. Furthermore, it is important to understand where dual screeners may successfully predict other dependent variables. Past studies have well-articulated predictions for online, political activism. However, this study seeks to

understand whether this evolving theory, structured as a variable on a survey, may predict offline, political activism and certain motivation for using social media.

Hybrid Media System Theory greatly is in lock-step with the theory of Uses and Gratifications which was well organized by Philip Palmgreen (1984). Uses and Gratifications assumes for agents to be active in their choices of media. According to this understanding of media participants, we engage in media thoughtfully and strategically. People are not passive but rather deliberately engage in some form of media for a distinct purpose. These deliberate reasons are sought in order to satisfy certain needs or desires that the mind of the agent has. As this study seeks to understand who engages in assemblages of media logics for which political purpose and psychological need, Uses and Gratifications and Hybrid Media System theories give perfect justification and reason behind possible correlations that may be found.

Uses and Gratification theory does argue that people will use media in varying ways based on the individual's psychological needs and interests (Katz, Blumberg, & Gurevitch, 1974). When people are dual-screening they are having a discussion with a wide-array of people: this leads to a community of viewing. It is community building. In this sense, community building refers to individuals who share their thoughts, experiences, and opinion with a large community about a particular television program (Ceasar & Geerts, 2011). Through this method of viewing and community building, people are no longer passive agents in the political and news arenas. They are a self-reflexive population that is more critical of the information that news and political organizations are exposing them to (Choi, 2014). Hwang and Lim (2015) believe that social viewers participate in the activity of dual-screening for the interpersonal

relationships and communication it allows. In other words, people engage in the process of dual-screening for political power and social interaction. One study by Dias (2016) explored dual screening by inquiring into the users' motivations to engage in the activity. This study used the state of dual-screening and uses and gratifications as their theoretical framework, as this study does also. They found, through focus groups, that people dual screened most commonly when their activity on the mobile device was irrelevant to the content being delivered by the television programming. They found that two primary gratifications were pulled out from dual screening: being connected to one's network of relationships and making an efficient use of their time (Dias, 2016).

### **Summary of Literature Review**

As it has been shown, many studies that investigated social media and politics have been published. A few key elements do stand-out from the pool of literature, though. Sharing political information with political actors does predict offline, political activism (Lee et al., 2017). The more someone discusses politics on social media, the more normative their opinions become (Shulman, Levin, 2012). Individuals who use SNS a lot more than light users are exposed to more varied levels of political disagreement (Barnidge, 2015). However, political information that is found on SNS has less trust with users than information found on traditional forms of media like newspaper and television (Ceron, 2015). Folks who engage in online political participation, nonetheless, are more likely to be politically active offline (Yamamoto et al., 2015). Furthermore, social media offers a platform that aids communities in successfully forming political protests (Sloam, 2016). Subsequently, political activists are able to compete with traditional political, news sources, as they are able to build their own

political community (Bruns & Enli, 2015). Individuals who engage in media should be understood as active agents who do engage for specific reasons (Katz et al., 1974). Social viewers are critical of political information that they are exposed to and negotiate their critical inquiries through the community they interact with while they dual-screen (Choi, 2014; Hwang & Lim, 2015). Therefore, this report creates political, dual-screeners as the independent variable. The dependent variable are based in possible psychological gratification and motivations they have to engage with social media. Furthermore, political activism is also surveyed as an independent variable. This study is landmark in the way in which it calculates a political, dual screener as the independent variable.

### **Hypotheses and Research Questions**

*Research Question 1: Do political dual-screen users utilize SNS to form interpersonal relationships with users?*

*Research Question 2: Do political dual-screen users utilize SNS for diffusion of political information?*

The first two research questions are an attempt to identify the main reasons social viewers have for engaging with social media: It may be to build communities (Hwang & Lim, 2015) or it may be for political diffusion (Gil de Zunigam, 2015). These research questions are designed through the fifth scale of the survey which asks respondents about their perceptions of social media's preferred uses: the dependent variable. These are important questions to further the literature pool of social viewers and communication's understanding of this population. Specifically, this proposed thesis furthers the

understanding of social viewers by only using college students as the population. The second and sixth scale will isolate who qualifies as a social-viewer.

*Research Question 3: Are political dual-screening users more likely to trust political information found on SNS*

According to Ceron (2015) individuals have less trust with news found on SNS than they do on traditional media. Choi (2014) seems to agree with this sentiment, with social viewers being the independent variable, as his study found that social viewers are more critical of news information, in general. However, if it is that social viewers dual-screen for the purposes of building power and community (Hwang & Lim, 2015; Chadwick & Dennis, 2017; Sloam, 2016) then it would be within reason that the sample population that dual screens is more likely to have a bolstered trust in the diffusion of information on SNS.

*Hypothesis 1: Political dual-screenerers are more likely to be politically active offline.*

As Yamamoto, Kushin, and Dalisay (2015) discovered that online political participation leads to offline political participation, this hypothesis should follow within the same line of reasoning. This is particularly true as Bruns and Enli (2015) have concluded that social viewing is a new site of political power. However, Neilson and Schroder (2014) have created some tension as they have stated that politically engaged individuals still privilege watching television before dual screening. This hypothesis thus surmises that college aged folk who politically socially view live events positively predicts offline political activism.

*Hypothesis 2: Political users of dual screening use social media to gratify their desire for offline coordination.*

The third scale of the survey was constructed by Xu, Ryan, Prybutok, and Wen (2012) with a Cronbach reliability of .94. The scale was developed in order to gauge psychological needs and desires people are attempting to meet by using social media: a U&G scale. The scale is broken up into four sections: affection, escape, disclosure, and coordination. As previous studies have indicated that social viewers engage in dual-screening in order to build community and relationship (Hwan & Lim, 2015) this hypothesis surmises that political social viewers primarily use SNS for coordination purposes.

## Chapter III: Method

### Variables

The independent variable for this study is political dual-screening and to what extent respondents engage in social viewing for political purposes. This variable will be calculated through two different scales: the second and sixth scale of the survey. The second scale was developed by Vaccari, Chadwick, and O'Loughlin (2015) with a reliability of .85. This study added to the scale's original questions. Vaccari, Chadwick, and O'Loughlin (2015) asked three questions about checking in to twitter during certain events. This report added four questions to the scale to consider other SNS platforms like Facebook. Together, the adjusted scaled ask respondents how much they check in to live, political events through Facebook and Twitter. The sixth scale calculates social viewers by asking respondents how they react with phones during live, political television events through a vignette. Both of the scales measure the same variable: who is the person that dual screens for political purposes. The variable is calculated through two different scales to ensure internal-consistency and reliable results. Vignettes have shown immense success in past studies, so it is a fair assumption that the sixth scale will have strong internal consistency.

Political dual screening is the independent variable. Most past studies have used dual screening as a dependent variable. Some have used dual screening as the independent variable. Very few, if any at all, studies have used political dual screening as an independent variable so thoroughly as this study. This gives this study a unique approach to the literature pool. Furthermore, using political dual screening as an independent variable is justified, as most studies in dual screening have shown positive

correlations and prediction rates between dual screening and online political activism. By the count of how many studies have demonstrated this correlation, it is safe to have confidence that it may be assumed as an independent variable. Finally, having political dual screening as an independent variable makes this study rather experimental, by design. Past studies certainly give this approach confidence, albeit.

The dependent variables for this study are political participation/activism, attitudes of social media as a political tool, and psychological needs/desires people use SNS. Political participation, the fourth scale, is measured using Cao and Brewer's (2008) scale which asks respondents what they have politically participated in during their life. This scale is set to answer the first hypothesis: *Heavy users of political dual-screening are more likely to be politically active offline*. A number of studies have already supported this notion (Yamamoto, Kushin, & Dalisay, 2015; Chiang & Lin, 2017; McGregor et. al, 2017). However, these studies were based internationally. This study, in particular, predicts this hypothesis to be true in the United States, using college students. Cao and Brewer's (2008) scale is essential to this discovery.

The psychological reasons for using SNS is a scale that has four subsections within it: affection, escape, and disclosure, and coordination (respectively). It was developed by Xu, Ryan, Prybutok, and Wen (2012). This is the third scale of the survey. It is positioned to answer the second hypothesis and the first research question. Affection, escape, disclosure, and coordination are the four different psychological needs this survey, altogether, gauges.

Finally, the last dependent variable is a measure of the uses of social media for political purposes. From strongly disagree to strongly agree, this scales ask respondent



whether they believe SNS is good for varying political purposes like: sharing information, meeting like-minded individuals, criticizing politicians, etc. This scale is positioned to answer all three research questions to a varying degree.

### **Sample**

The subjects of the study, college students, took the survey during class: beginning or at the end of class. Consent is either given by merely taking the survey, as no signature is required from the student for the sake of the anonymity. The college students were from University of the Pacific and San Joaquin Delta College: both in Stockton, California. I gave a short speech before students took the survey for the sake of full transparency about the study and about who I am as a graduate student. I pretested the survey amongst my peers in order to make sure that my survey is clear to them. Revisions were made when necessary.

### **Measurement**

With regards to reliability, the Cronbach Alpha for the psychological needs and desires for SNS usage ranges from .85 to .94 between the four different subjects, as construct by Xu, Ryan, Prybutok, and Wen (2012). The Facebook/Twitter check-in scale developed by Vaccari, Chadwick, and O'Loughlin (2015) had a reliability of .85. It was adopted and adjusted for the sake of the study, but a similar reliability was expected. Political participation, the fourth scale, is measured using Cao and Brewer's (2008) scale, which demonstrated strong internal consistency, also.

Most of the tests I ran on SPSS, the statistician software program, were done to find correlations and the subsequent regression analysis. After running means testing on the variables and demographics, I conducted bivariate correlation tests to find significant

relationships between variables. The multiple regression analysis that was calculated was vital to understanding the chances of explanation within variance. Although, surveys rely upon self-reporting; they are good because they allow a researcher to generalize the results, from a sample population, based on these aforementioned tests.

### Chapter IV: Results

This chapter shows the results of the survey. Overall, most of the scales enjoyed excellent reliability. Many correlations were discovered between variables; some unexpected moderate correlations were also found. After the results, a discussion will demonstrate the importance of these correlations.

#### Demographic Information

Table 1 illuminates the basic demographic information about the population that was surveyed. The average age of the respondents was 21.75. The most common age was 19 years old with 58 respondents being that old. As these were all college students, the survey asked them how many years they have gone to college. 33.6% of the population has been going to college for 2 years while 32.3% of the students have been going to college for only 1 year. This may be observed in the below table (Table 1b).

**Table 1a. Demographic Information**  
(N=235)

		Male	Female	Total
		0	2	2
Year in school	1	31	45	76
	2	32	47	79
	3	24	20	44
	4	6	11	17
Total	98 (42%)		132 (56%)	

41. 7% of the population was male, and 56. 2% of the sample was female. The large majority of respondents identified as Hispanic (45. 6%) followed by: Asian American (19%), Caucasian (13. 7%), African American (13. 3%), Other (7%), and Native Americans (1. 3%). Finally, most respondents qualified themselves as nonpartisan (36. 1%) followed by: liberal (30. 6%), conservative (18. 1%), very liberal (9. 3%), and very conservative (5. 6%). A striking feature one may notice is that a good portion of the population identified as Hispanic. Furthermore, more students identified as being liberal and very liberal than they did as being conservative or being very conservative. The complete breakdown of ethnicity and political affiliation may be referenced in the following table (Table 1c).

**Table 1b. Demographic Information**  
(N=235)

		Male	Female	Total
Ethnicity	African American	6	24	30
	Hispanic	41	62	103
	Caucasian/Non-Hispanic	16	15	31
	Native American	1	2	3
	Asian American	23	20	43
	Other	9	17	16
Political Affiliation	Very Conservative	5	7	12
	Conservative	18	21	39
	Nonpartisan	37	41	78
	Liberal	25	41	66
	Very Liberal	7	13	20

### **Independent Variables and Dependent Variables (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, H1, H2)**

The independent variables of this study were fairly low (scaled 1 through 5). In particular, the scale which gauged ‘checking-in to live political events’ (M=1.78) had a much lower mean than the vignette scaled which calculated people ‘dual screening political events’ (M=2.26). Both scales were rather experimental, yet were designed to calculate the same population. It is interesting, therefore, that their means were so distant from each other. However, ‘checking-in to live political events’ did enjoy a strong standard deviation (SD=.83).

The dependent variables were all closer to the 3 on their respective 1 through 5 scales. ‘Using social media for coordination’ (M=3.21) enjoyed the highest meanwhile ‘using social media for disclosure’ (M=2.40) was had the lowest mean for the U & G scales. ‘Political activism’ (M=1.98) and ‘using social media for affection’ (M=2.90) remained behind ‘using social media for escape’ (M=3.22). It seems many folks agreed social media was a good way to escape from daily tasks and responsibilities. However, ‘using social media for escape’ (SD=1.21) also boasted the largest standard deviation. See table 2 for reference of all variables’ means, deviations, and populations.

**Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Independent and Dependent Variables**

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Dual Screening Political Events	2.26	1.16	229
Checking-In to Live Political Events	1.78	.83	234
<u>Dependent Variables</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Affinity for Social Media as Political Tool	2.59	1.0	232
Political Activism	1.98	.84	231
Using Social Media for Affection	2.90	1.11	233
Using Social Media for Escape	3.22	1.21	233
Using Social Media for Disclosure	2.40	1.13	233
Using Social Media for Coordination	3.21	1.31	233

**Correlation Analysis (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, H1, H2)**

Correlation analysis was run to understand possible correlations. Dual Screening Political Events, Checking-in to Live Political Events, Affinity for Social Media Political Tool, Political Activism, Using Social Media for Affection, Using Social Media for Escape, Using Social Media for Disclosure, Using Social Media for Coordination all have significant correlations with each other at  $p < .01$  level. As the following Table 3 illuminates, every variable shared correlation to one and another. As these variables all

have significance, this result section will highlight the most significant and relevant correlations.

Dual screening live political events has a strong, significant correlation to affinity for social media as a political tool ( $r=.74, p<.01$ ) and political activism ( $r=.63, p<.01$ ). Dual screening live political events has a moderate significant correlation with using social media for coordination ( $r=.49, p<.01$ ) and using social media for affection ( $r=.48, p<.01$ ). Checking in to live political events had a moderate, significant correlation with using social media for affection ( $r=.48, p<.01$ ) at the same exact rate that dual screening live political events demonstrated. As checking in to political events and dual screening live political events were the two scales that calculated the independent variable, it is no surprise that they shared a strong, significant correlation ( $r=.78, p<.01$ ). All of these correlations answers each of the research questions and hypotheses. However, the next part of the results shows the amount of variance explained by these correlations. Refer to Table 3, on the next page, for a list of all the correlations.

**Table 3.** Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities for all eight, computed variables (N=235)

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	M	SD
1	Dual Screening Political Events	(.91)	.76 **	.74 **	.62 **	.48 **	.46 **	.39 **	.49 **	2.26	1.16
2	Checking-In to Live Political Events		(.89)	.67 **	.60 **	.48 **	.34 **	.35 **	.43 **	1.78	.83
3	Affinity for Social Media as Political Tool			(.93)	.61 **	.52 **	.47 **	.32 **	.56 **	2.59	1.05
4	Political Activism				(.86)	.41 **	.30 **	.31 **	.43 **	1.98	.84
5	Using Social Media for Affection					(.93)	.43 **	.30 **	.46 **	2.90	1.11
6	Using Social Media for Escape						(.88)	.29 **	.37 **	3.22	1.21
7	Using Social Media for Disclosure							(.86)	.28 **	2.40	1.13
8	Using Social Media for Coordination								(.74)	3.21	1.31

\* p<.05 \*\* p<.01



## **Answering the Research Questions and Hypotheses with Multiple Regression**

### **Analysis (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, H1, H2)**

Multiple regression analysis was conducted four times in order to discover what dependent variable dual screening political events and checking in to live political events is best able to predict. Once a solid prediction of variance may be accounted for then this study may confidently answer the research questions and hypotheses.

*Research Question 1: Do political dual-screen users utilize SNS to form interpersonal relationships with users?*

The first multiple regression analysis was run in order to discover what amount of variance in using social media for affection may be predicted by the combined independent variables (see Table 4). Remember, in the previous correlation analysis, both of the independent scales had strikingly similar Pearson scores with using social media for affection ( $r=.48$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Unsurprisingly, the combination of variables to predict using social media for affection was statistically significant,  $F(2, 227)=41.00$ ,  $p<0.01$ . The adjusted  $r$  squared value was .27 which, is a high effect, according to Cohen (1988). It means that 27% of the variance in using social media for affection can be explained by the model. As the table shows below, for every single, whole unit increase in dual screening political events variable and checking-in to live political events variable, using social media for affection simultaneously increased .25 and .39, respectively. Therefore, these results demonstrate that political dual-screener do in fact utilize social media sites to form and nurture their relationships with others.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Analysis. Dependent variable = Using Social Media for Affection

Predictor Variables	B	SE	$\beta$	t	
(Constant)	1.63	.15		10.55	.00
Dual Screening Political Events	.25	.08	.26	3.04	.00
Checking-in to Live Political Events	.39	.12	.29	3.27	.00

$R^2 = .27$ ;  $F(2, 227) = 41.00$ ,  $p < .01$

*Research Question 2: Do political dual-screen users utilize SNS for diffusion of political information?*

*Research Question 3: Are political dual-screening users more likely to trust political information found on SNS*

The second multiple regression analysis was run in order to discover what amount of variance in affinity for social media as a political tool may be predicted by the combined independent variables (see Table 5). Remember, in the previous correlation analysis, political dual screening had a very strong correlation with the dependent variable ( $r=.74$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Checking in to live political events also boasted a strong, significant correlation with affinity for social media as a political tool ( $r=.57$ ,  $p<.01$ ). The combination of variables to predict an affinity for social media as a political tool was statistically significant,  $F(2, 226)=155.70$ ,  $p<0.01$ . The adjusted r squared value was .57 which, is a very strong effect, according to Cohen (1988). It means that 57% of the

variance in using social media for affection can be explained by the model. Affinity for social media as a political tool gauged two dimensions of using social media for political purpose: diffusion of political information and SNS's credibility for political information. Due to the high reliability the variable enjoyed (.93), they were joined together. As the table shows below, for every single, whole unit increase in dual screening political events variable and checking-in to live political events variable, affinity for social media as political tool variable increased .49 and .34, respectively. It is clear that political dual-screenerers believe SNS is a good source for political information and subsequent disbursement of political knowledge.

Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis. Dependent variable = Affinity for Social Media as Political Tool

Predictor Variables	B	SE	$\beta$	t	p
(Constant)	.897	.111		8.10	.00
Dual Screening Political Events	.49	.06	.54	8.10	.00
Checking-in to Live Political Events	.34	.09	.27	3.98	.00

$R^2 = .57$ ;  $F(2, 226) = 152.70$ ,  $p < .01$

*Hypothesis 1: Political dual-screenerers are more likely to be politically active offline.*

The third multiple regression analysis was run in order to discover what amount of variance in political activism may be predicted by the combined independent variables (see Table 6). Remember, in the previous correlation analysis, dual screening political events and checking in with live political events both had strong, significant correlations with political activism ( $r=.63, p<.01$ ;  $r=.60, p<.01$ ; respectively). Subsequently, the combination of variables to predict political activism was statistically significant,  $F(2, 225)=84.69, p<0.01$ . The adjusted r squared value was .43 which, is a very strong effect, according to Cohen (1988). It means that 43% of the variance in political activism can be explained by the model. As the table shows below, for every single, whole unit increase in dual screening political events variable and checking-in to live political events variable, political activism increased .29 and .31, respectively. Therefore, these results demonstrate that political dual-screenerers are in fact active politically in the offline, corporeal space. The following table demonstrates all of these results.

Table 6. Multiple Regression Analysis. Dependent variable = Political Activism

Predictor Variables	B	SE	$\beta$	t	p
(Constant)	.771	.104		7.41	.00
Dual Screening Political Events	.29	.06	.40	5.14	.00
Checking-in to Live Political Events	.31	.08	.31	3.95	.00

$R^2 = .43$ ;  $F(2, 225) = 84.69$ ,  $p < .01$

*Hypothesis 2: Political users of dual screening use social media to gratify their desire for offline coordination.*

The fourth multiple regression analysis was run in order to discover what amount of variance in using social media for coordination may be predicted by the combined independent variables (see Table 7). Remember, in the previous correlation analysis, dual screening political events and checking in with live political events both had strong, significant correlations with political activism ( $r = .49$ ,  $p < .01$ ;  $r = .43$ ,  $p < .01$ ; respectively). Consequentially, the combination of variables to predict using social media for coordination was statistically significant,  $F(2, 227) = 37.97$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . The adjusted  $r$  squared value was .25 which is a moderate effect, according to Cohen (1988). It means that 25% of the variance in using social media for coordination can be explained by the model. As the table shows below, for every single, whole unit increase in dual screening political events variable and checking-in to live political events variable, using social

media for coordination simultaneously increased .44 and .23, respectively. With a moderate 25% of the variance explained, it is clear that political users of dual screening use social media to gratify their desire for coordination: a desire to organize with others offline.

Table 7. Multiple Regression Analysis. Dependent variable = Using Social Media for Coordination

Predictor Variables	B	SE	$\beta$	t	p
(Constant)	1.82	.19		9.81	.00
Dual Screening Political Events	.44	.10	.39	4.40	.00
Checking-in to Live Political Events	.23	.14	.14	1.59	.00

$R^2 = .25$ ;  $F(2, 227) = 37.97$ ,  $p < .01$

## Chapter V: Discussion

### Implications of the Study

This study has demonstrated an impressive array of strong correlations and predicting power. First, this study has shown that using “political dual screeners” is safe for an independent variable. Both scales (dual screening political events; checking in live political events) had strong reliability. The vignette, in particular, demonstrated a fantastic reliability. Dual-screening, or second screening, is often used as a dependent variable. This study certainly has made the case that dual-screening is becoming so prevalent that it may be used confidently as an independent variable.

Furthermore, this study has shown that political dual screeners are a deeply active and complex population. By answering the first hypothesis question, this study has shown that although previous literature disagreed on whether political online activity predicted offline political behavior, political dual-screening is certainly a strong predictor of offline political activity. Discovering this about the population can be very resourceful for a number of lobbying, news media organizations, and political consultation firms. The people who tweet Anderson Cooper while he is speaking at a political event are most likely the same people that are calling their congressmen and congresswomen to take political action. Therefore, this helps existing literature and research create a more robust picture and profile of the young, political activist.

By learning that individuals who politically dual screen actively chose to use social media as a way of organizing with people offline and online, we gain an insight

into their political dual screeners' motivations. As previous research has shown (Sloam, 2016) people who dual screen have done so with an amazing awareness of how to organize. This study has shown that we may rely on predicting power for this conclusion ( $r=.25$ ,  $p<.01$ ). They are not merely using SNS to chat about live, political events. They use social media to network, to meet folk, and to organize people sometimes (this may be reliably predicted 25% of the time). This is a predictable motivation of this population. This should change our perception of people who use their phone while watching political events. Often times dual screeners are ridiculed for not 'being in the moment.' However, this result demonstrates that not only are they paying attention to the political aspect of the moment but they are also dual screening out of the motivation to organize others around their cause. That profile is a lot different than the cliché that can often befall young folk as they dual screen. This finding points to the possibility of an organizer's mind at work. Furthermore, by answering the first research question with predicting power, this study has also shown that political dual screeners have their phone in front of their face to make meaningful connection with people. They are motivated to use their phone for affection. In all likelihood, they want people to care and want people to know they care. Their decision to engage with the phone while a political event on television is occurring is suddenly appearing to be a concerned, caring, and activist profile.

The affinity for social media as a political tool scale boasted the loudest  $r$  squared value as the independent variables were able to account for 57% of its variance. A number of other studies have stated that heavy users of social media still trusted traditional media and were highly skeptical of news on social media. However, the



results found through the second and third research questions show that political dual screeners are much more likely to have an elevated trust of political news found on social media. They are more likely to perceive social media as an incredible tool for political diffusion. These results point to a number of items. First, this does indicate that as hybrid media does rapidly evolve so will the populations' respective opinions. Second, it demonstrates that as individuals gain more political power in meaning-making their trust possibly also does increase. For if Hybrid Media Systems Theory's base of assumptions is correct then it is reasonable to believe that citizens' rising power in SNS would transform their perception of the sphere. These results, subsequently, would seem to spotlight the way in which Hybrid Media Systems Theory's conception of power is correct and manifesting strongly in the year of 2018.

### **Limitations of the Study**

There are number of limitations to this study that should be well noted. First, this study relies upon a survey design which is a self-reporting method: this does place a limit on how scientific the findings may be construed. The first scale which was designed to gauge respondents' attitudes toward traditional media and social media for news performed with a terrible reliability, as it could not even reach a .3 Cronbach Alpha value, with the best possible variable omissions considered. Third, this study only found 235 respondents and when it comes to surveys—the more the respondents the more researchers may be assured of its representative power. Finally, the collection of surveys was done through a convenient sample, as the researcher went to the most proximal, general-education classes where permission was given by the respective professors.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

This study has certainly created a few interesting insights. As it has been discussed earlier, the results have demonstrated that political dual screening works just fine as an independent variable. Future studies should take this independent variable, particularly through the proven reliability of the vignette, and investigate dependent variables that this study did not include. The fact that this study discovered strong correlations and predicting power with people using social media for affection and coordination is incredibly interesting. Future research should look into other motivations this population may have to engage with social media. Third, more research should look into what specific kinds of coordination do political dual screeners feel motivated by. Specific and more in-depth scales should be developed for using social media for affection, also. This way we may understand the specific anticipations political dual screeners have for social media. This would enhance our profile of the person who engages in this evolving activity and it would advance U&G theory in this newly developing literature pool.

Second, future research should develop more specific scales for different kinds of news sources that exist on social media. This would allow a clearer understanding of what types of news information do political dual screeners actively search for. This study showed they, in general, trust news and information that is political in nature. However, this is broad and it is all too possible that there are many sources of political information on SNS that political dual screeners are not correlated to. Overall, developing more specific dependent scales based off the foundation of this study, would greatly enhance our profile of the political dual screener.

These results demonstrate a certain characteristic of political dual screeners: efficiency. This is a population that has increased chance of using social media to coordinate meeting with people and emotionally connect with folks. This is a population that has increased chance of being politically active and using social media for their political expression/networking. While they do these activities they are also watching television, simultaneously. It is a population that saves times by multi-tasking. This study has certainly confirmed that they deliberately dual-screen for definitive reason, at least a portion of the time. They economize the space and time around them with this efficiency. Future studies can certainly look into economically based theoretical frameworks as a way of explaining the behavior of political dual-screening individuals.

### **Conclusion**

The way people engage with social media is rapidly changing, and it will do so every single day. Scholars have increasingly struggled to keep up with the diverse ways communication changes. Long gone is the day of traditional versus new media. They exist in assemblages. They are co-dependent wholes. As we interact with a television, mentions of the phone in our pocket is inevitable. As this inevitability has become more prevalent, the birth of the political dual screener has become possible. This study took a minor risk attempting to map the political dual screener as the independent variable through newly developed scales. However, this study has shown that 2018 is a fine time to have a political dual screener be the independent variable. By running bivariate correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis, this study discovered that dual-screeners are correlated to offline political activism. They are likely motivated to use social media by their psychological need for affection and coordination. Finally, they are

very likely to trust social media as a tool for political purposes. This study has illuminated a clearer picture of the political dual screener. However, technology advances fast: often too fast. Future research must keep illustrating the developing characteristics of the dual-screener, subsequently.

If we may take a look at the state of society, this study certainly finds relevance and importance. As Mark Zuckerberg just faced the United States Senate to answer for privacy concerns on Facebook, trust with social media is facing new attacks. Since the recent 2016, Presidential election it has come to the public's knowledge that fake stories and hacked accounts were used to manipulate certain demographics. It is fair to assess that social media is facing issues with ethos. However, this study has found that the political dual screening individual has increased chance (57%) of being the same individual who has a heightened trust in social media. They believe social media is a good platform for political information, expression, discussion, and debate.

Furthermore, this study has demonstrated that the rise of hybrid media is becoming very accessible to the general public. Studies have only recently begun delving and catching up to the way folks may dual-screen. However, the fact that this study was able to create a political dual screener using social media as an independent variable with solid (both with a solid mean value) illuminates just how common dual screening is becoming. This study has also demonstrated Hybrid Media System Theory correct in so far as people who are dual screening have an increased chance of interjecting themselves in a political discourse (as shown by the political activism results). Therefore, if the theory may be safely assumed, it may then be concluded that the political power of the establishment media is slowly fading as political dual-screening becomes more prevalent.

## REFERENCES

- Adkins, B. (2015). *Deleuze and guattari's A thousand plateaus* (1st ed.). GB: Edinburgh University Press. doi:10.3366/j.ctt1g0b18p
- Barnidge, M. (2015). The role of news in promoting political disagreement on social media. *Computers In Human Behavior*, 52211-218. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.011
- Bode, L., Vraga, E., Borah, P., & Shah, D., (2014). A new space for political behavior: Political social networking and its democratic consequences. *Journal Of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(3), 414-429. doi:10. 1111/jcc4.12048
- Bruns, A., Enli, G., Skogerbo, E., Larsson, A. O., & Christensen, C. (2015). *The routledge companion to social media and politics* (1st ed. ). London: Routledge Ltd - M.U.A. doi:10.4324/9781315716299
- Ceron, A. (2015). Internet, News, and Political Trust: The Difference Between Social Media and Online Media Outlets. *Journal Of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 20(5), 487-503. doi:10.1111/jcc4.12129
- Chadwick, A. (2013). *The hybrid media system*. Cary: Oxford University Press. doi:oso/9780199759477.001.0001

Chadwick, A., & Dennis, J. (2017). Social media, professional media and mobilisation in contemporary Britain: Explaining the strengths and weaknesses of the citizens' movement 38 degrees. *Political Studies*, 65(1), 42-60.

doi:10.1177/0032321716631350

Chenyan Xu, Sherry Ryan, Victor Prybutok, & Chao Wen. (2012). It is not for fun: An examination of social network site usage. *Information & Management*, 49(5), 210.

doi:10.1016/j.im.2012.05.001

Choi, S. (2014). Flow, Diversity, Form, and Influence of Political Talk in Social-Media-Based Public Forums. *Human Communication Research*, 40(2), 209-237.

doi:10.1111/hcre.12023

Choi, Y. (2014). Watching TV while chatting online: The concept explication of 'social viewing'. *Korean Association for Broadcasting and Telecommunication Studies*, 315-355.

Cui, X., Rui, J., & Su, F. (2016). From immediate community to imagined community: Social identity and the co-viewing of media event. *Global Media and China*, 1(4), 481-496.

doi:10.1177/2059436416681177

Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and political engagement : Citizens, communication, and democracy*

Dayan, D., & Katz, E. (1992). Media events.

- Dias, P. (2016). Motivations for multi-screening: An exploratory study on motivations and gratifications. *European Journal of Communication, 31*(6), 678-693. doi:10.1177/0267323116674111
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Garcia-Perdomo, V., & McGregor, S. C. (2015). What is second screening? exploring motivations of second screen use and its effect on online political participation. *Journal of Communication, 65*(5), 793-815. doi:10.1111/jcom. 12174
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., & Liu, J. H. (2017). Second screening politics in the social media sphere: Advancing research on dual screen use in political communication with evidence from 20 countries. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 61*(2), 193 doi:10.1080/08838151. 2017. 1309420
- Hambrick, M. E., Simmons, J. M., Greenhalgh, G. P., & Greenwell, T. C. (2010). Understanding profession athletes use of twitter: A content analysis of athlete tweets. *International Journal for Sport Communication, 454-471.*
- Hao, X., Wen, N., & George, C. (2014). News consumption and political and civic engagement among young people. *Journal Of Youth Studies, 17*(9), 1221-1238. doi:10.1080/13676261.2014.901490
- Hwang, Y., & Lim, J. S. (2015). The impact of engagement motives for social TV on social presence and sports channel commitment. *Telematics and Informatics, 32*(4), 755-765. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2015.03.006

- Jang, S. M., Lee, H., & Park, Y. J. (2014). The more friends, the less political talk? Predictors of Facebook discussions among college students. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior And Social Networking*, *17*(5), 271-275. doi:10.1089/cyber.2013.0477
- Jones, T. (2011). Designing for second screens: The autumnwatch companion . Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/legacy/researchanddevelopment/2011/04/the-autumnwatch-companion---de.shtml>
- Katz, E., Blumler, J.,G, & Gurevitch, M. (1974). The uses and gratifications approach to mass communication. *Sage*
- Klofstad, C. (2015). Exposure to Political Discussion in College is Associated With Higher Rates of Political Participation Over Time. *Political Communication*, *32*(2), 292-309. doi:10.1080/10584609.2014.944322
- Kushin, M., & Yamamoto, M., (2010). Did social media really matter? college students' use of online media and political decision making in the 2008 election. *Mass Communication And Society*, *13*(5), 608-630. doi:10.1080/15205436.2010.516863
- Larsson, A. O., & Moe, H. (2012). Studying political microblogging: Twitter users in the 2010 swedish election campaign. *New Media & Society*, *14*(5), 729-747. doi:10.1177/1461444811422894



- Lee, J., & Kim, E. (2016). Incidental exposure to news: Predictors in the social media setting and effects on information gain online. *Computers In Human Behavior*, doi:10.1016/j.chb.2017.02.018
- Lee, F., Chen, H., & Chan, M. (2017). Social media use and university students' participation in a large-scale protest campaign: The case of Hong Kong's Umbrella Movement. *Telematics And Informatics*, 34(2), 457-469. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2016.08005
- Lee, J., & Choi, Y.(2017). Shifting from an audience to an active public in social viewing: Focusing on the discussion network. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 301. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2017.05.027
- Lin, Y., Keegan, B, Margolin, D., & Lazer,D. (2014). Rising tides or rising stars?: Dynamics of shared attention on twitter during media events. *PloS One*, 9(5), e94093. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0094093
- Lee, J., & Choi, Y. (2017). Shifting from an audience to an active public in social viewing: Focusing on the discussion network. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 301. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2017.05.027
- Lin, T. T. C., & Chiang, Y. (2017). Dual screening: Examining social predictors and impact on online and offline political participation among taiwanese internet users. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 61(2), 240. doi:10.1080/08838151.2017.1309419

- McGregor, S. C., & Mourão, R. R. (2017). Second screening donald trump: Conditional indirect effects on political participation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 61(2), 264. doi:10.1080/08838151.2017.1309418
- Meyer, A. (2016). Heterogeneity in the preferences and pro-environmental behavior of college students: The effects of years on campus, demographics, and external factors. *Journal Of Cleaner Production*, 1123451-3463. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro. 2015. 10.133
- Neate, T., Jones, M., & Evans, M. (2017). Cross-device media: A review of second screening and multi-device television. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 21(2), 391-405. doi:10.1007/s00779-017-1016-2
- Nielsen, R. K., & Schrøder, K. C. (2014). The relative importance of social media for accessing, finding, and engaging with news. *Digital Journalism*, 2(4), 472-489. doi:10.1080/21670811.2013.872420
- Niemi, R. G., Craig, S. C., & Mattei, F (1991) Measuring internal political efficacy in the 1988 national election study. *The American Political Science Review*, 85(4), 1407-1413
- Palmgreen, P. (1984). Uses and gratifications: A theoretical perspective. *Communication Yearbook*, 8, 20. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1292221470>
- Park, C. (2015). Pathways to Expressive and Collective Participation: Usage Patterns, Political Efficacy, and Political Participation in Social Networking Sites. *Journal Of*

*Broadcasting And Electronic Media*, 59(4), 698-716. doi:10. 1080/08838151. 2015. 1093480

Pritzker, S., Springer, M., & McBride, A. M. (2015). Learning to Vote: Informing Political Participation Among College Students. *Journal Of Community Engagement & Scholarship*, 8(1), 69-79.

Rao, K. (2014). Talking social TV 2. *Research Excellence*, Retrieved from [http://www.researchexcellence.com/files/pdf/2015-01/id32\\_talking\\_social\\_tv\\_2\\_april\\_10th\\_2014.pdf](http://www.researchexcellence.com/files/pdf/2015-01/id32_talking_social_tv_2_april_10th_2014.pdf)

Rouse, M. (n. d.). What is Twitter? - Definition from WhatIs. com. Retrieved March 01, 2018, from <http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/Facebook>

Rouse, M. (n. d.). What is Twitter? - Definition from WhatIs. com. Retrieved March 01, 2018, from <http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/Twitter>

Schmitt, K. L. ,Wolf, K. D., & Anderson, D. R. (2003). Viewing the viewers: Viewing behaviors by children and adults during television programs and commercials. *Journal of Communication*, 53(2), 265-281. doi:10. 1111/j. 1460-2466. 2003. tb02590. x

Shulman, H., & Levine, T., (2012). Exploring Social Norms as a Group-Level Phenomenon: Do Political Participation Norms Exist and Influence Political Participation on College Campuses?. *Journal Of Communication*, 62(3), 532-552. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01642. x

- Sloam, J. (2016). Diversity and voice: The political participation of young people in the european union. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 18(3), 521-537. doi:10.1177/1369148116647176
- Straibhaar, J., McGregor, S., Mourao, R., Neto & Angeluci, A., (2017). Second screening as convergence in brazil and the united states. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 61(1), 163. doi:10. 1080/08838151. 2016.127392
- Suh, M. (2014, June 11). Appendix A: The Ideological Consistency Scale. Retrieved March 06, 2017, from [http://www. people-press. org/2014/06/12/appendix-a-the-ideological-consistency-scale/](http://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/appendix-a-the-ideological-consistency-scale/)
- Techopedia. (n.d.). What is a Social Networking Site (SNS)? - Definition from Techopedia. Retrieved March 01, 2018, from [https://www. techopedia. com/definition/4956/social-networking-site-sns](https://www.techopedia.com/definition/4956/social-networking-site-sns)
- Yamamoto, M., Kushin, M., & Dalisay, F., (2015). Social media and mobiles as political mobilization forces for young adults: Examining the moderating role of online political expression in political participation. *New Media And Society*, 17(6), 880-898. doi:10.1177/1461444813518390

Vaccari, C., Chadwick, A., & O'Loughlin, B. (2015). Dual screening the political: Media events, social media, and citizen engagement. *Journal of Communication*, 65(6), 1041-1061. doi:10.1111/jcom.12187

## Appendix A: Survey

Dear Participant,

The Communications Department at the University of the Pacific would like to thank you for taking part in this survey; we understand your time is very important. With your help, the data being collected will be used in research pertaining to Social Networking Site (SNS) usage, screen-time, and political involvement. Completion of this survey will indicate your consent in participation. You may skip any question or stop taking the survey at any point. Please answer all questions as fully and honestly as you can, as failure to do so can alter our results. Again, we thank you for your contribution to our research.

My name is Jonathan Bruce. I am in graduate school at University of the Pacific. I am currently doing research on college students screen time and their political engagement. It is up to you whether you would like to take this survey, it will take 15 minutes of your time. There is minimal risk to your anonymity.

If you have any questions about the research at any time, please call me at (209) 639-4298, or Dr.

Qingwen Dong, Professor Communication Department, at (209) 946-3033.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research project please call the Research & Graduate Studies Office, University of the Pacific (209) 946-7716. In the event of a research related injury, please contact your regular medical provider and bill through your normal insurance carrier, then contact the Office of Research & Graduate Studies.

All surveys will be assigned a numeric value for coding: to ensure your anonymity. All surveys, after the data is collected, will be placed in a lock for 3 years then destroyed.

By completing and submitting this survey you indicate that you are at least 18 years of age and have read and understand the information provided above.

Results of the study can be obtained via e-mail request at [b\\_bruce@u.pacific.edu](mailto:b_bruce@u.pacific.edu)

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the University of the Pacific Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (209) 946-7716. University of the Pacific's Institutional Review Board acknowledgment of this project is on file.

If you have any further questions about this study, please contact the Primary Investigator Jonathan Bruce at, [b\\_bruce@u.pacific.edu](mailto:b_bruce@u.pacific.edu) (209) 639-4298, or the faculty project advisor Dr. Qingwen Dong at, [qdong@pacific.edu](mailto:qdong@pacific.edu).

*Part 1 of 5*

Below are situations in which a person might or might not choose to consume media. **Presume you have a completely free choice.** Please mark your preferred level of communication (0-6) as explained below:

- 1 – Never
- 2 – Very Unlikely
- 3 – Sometimes
- 4 – Frequently
- 5 – All the Time

*Please, clearly circle only the one number that best represents how you view yourself.*

**On a scale of 0-5, I would be likely to:**

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I use social media.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I watch news stories on social media daily.                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. At least once a week I watch the news on Television.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I get most of my news from alerts on my phone.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I try to stay away from politics as much as possible.        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I get most of my news from Facebook                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I get most of my news from <i>Twitter</i>                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I try to read about politics a few times during a given week | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Only when politics affect me I will watch the news.          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. I get most of my news from sources on the TV                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

*Part 2 of 5*

Below are items that relate to the respondents' dual-screen usage. Work quickly and record your first reaction to each item. ***There are no right or wrong answers.*** Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each item using the following five-point scale:

**Strongly Disagree = 1      Disagree = 2      Neutral = 3      Agree = 4      Strongly Agree = 5**

\_\_\_\_ 1. Facebooking about live political events that you are watching on TV is something I like to do

\_\_\_\_ 2. When I am watching a politician give a speech, I like to use the story features on Snapchat and/or Instagram to show people what I am watching

\_\_\_\_ 3. I like to use Facebook's "Check-In" feature to post when I am watching a political event on television.

\_\_\_\_ 4. While watching a presidential debate, I believe it is more important to fact-check and/or look for third opinions on my phone during the debate than giving undivided attention

\_\_\_\_ 5. I like to encourage my friends on social media, to tune into a political event I am watching via hashtags on Twitter

\_\_\_\_ 6. I like to encourage my friends on social media, to tune into a political event I am watching via mentions on Twitter

\_\_\_\_ 7. I like to post about my excitement for a high-profile political interview that is about to take place on one of my social media profiles.



*Part 3 of 5*

Below are items that relate to the respondents' reasons for using social media. Work quickly and record your first reaction to each item. ***There are no right or wrong answers.*** Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each item using the following five-point scale:

**Strongly Disagree = 1      Disagree = 2      Neutral = 3      Agree = 4      Strongly Agree = 5**

**I use social media...**

- \_\_\_ 1. To show others I care about their feelings
- \_\_\_ 2. To show others encouragement
- \_\_\_ 3. To help others
- \_\_\_ 4. Because I am concerned about others
- \_\_\_ 5. To get away from what I am doing
- \_\_\_ 6. To put off something I should be doing
- \_\_\_ 7. To forget about my problems
- \_\_\_ 8. To get away from pressures (or responsibilities)
- \_\_\_ 9. Because I need someone to talk to or be with
- \_\_\_ 10. Because I just need to talk about my problems sometimes
- \_\_\_ 11. To post my feelings to attain others' attention quickly and easily
- \_\_\_ 12. To get a quick response from others when I desire attention
- \_\_\_ 13. To spread news (messages, events, and other information) fast and easily
- \_\_\_ 14. To make arrangement to get together
- \_\_\_ 15. To organize social events
- \_\_\_ 16. To meet people who follow similar interests

Below are statements that seek to understand respondents political participation. ***Presume you have a completely free choice.*** Please mark your preferred level of communication (1-3) as explained below:

**Never = 1      Rarely = 2      Neutral = 3      Sometimes = 4      Very Frequently = 5**

- \_\_\_ 1. Have you ever contacted a public official?
- \_\_\_ 2. Have you ever voted in an election of a public official?
- \_\_\_ 3. Have you ever attended a campaign event?
- \_\_\_ 4. Have you ever joined an organization in support of a cause?
- \_\_\_ 5. Have you ever contributed money to a candidate running for public office?
- \_\_\_ 6. Have you ever held an online discussion about politics?
- \_\_\_ 7. Have you submitted messages to a public official online?
- \_\_\_ 8. Have you ever voiced your political opinions on social media?
- \_\_\_ 9. Have you ever started an online political event through social media?
- \_\_\_ 10. Have you had discussions with friends about politics either in person or through social media?

Below are items that relate to the respondents' affinity for political usage of social media. Work quickly and record your first reaction to each item. *There are no right or wrong answers.* Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each item using the following five-point scale:

**Strongly Disagree = 1      Disagree = 2      Neutral = 3      Agree = 4      Strongly Agree = 5**

- \_\_\_\_ 1. I appreciate social media because it helps inform me of recent political news
- \_\_\_\_ 2. I appreciate social media because I am able to hear political viewpoints different from mine
- \_\_\_\_ 3. I appreciate social media because it gives me a platform to have my political opinion heard
- \_\_\_\_ 4. I appreciate social media as it allows for people to share local, political events that are coming up
- \_\_\_\_ 5. I appreciate social media because it helps me reduce any anxiety I feel toward a current political issue
- \_\_\_\_ 6. I appreciate social media as it allows me to share political articles and videos that are important for my friends to see
- \_\_\_\_ 7. I appreciate social media because it is a space where I can effectively criticize politician and policies
- \_\_\_\_ 8. I appreciate social media as it allows for me to create a stronger bond with people that politically disagree with me
- \_\_\_\_ 9. I appreciate social media as it is easier to create a stronger bond with people who have similar political opinions as me

*Part 4 of 5*

Below are a series of scenarios where someone may use both their and television at the same time: dual-screen. **There are no right or wrong answers.** Please record your first impression by indicating the degree to which it is likely that you would participate in such hypothetical scenarios. Thank you for your time in completing the survey!

1. You are watching the Trevor Noah Show on T. V. , and the episode is really funny to you as it is making fun of how dysfunctional politics is. You can't stop laughing. So you go to Facebook, Instagram, or Twitter and tell people to tune in while the show is still playing

SELECT ONE					
	Never Happens	Rarely	Sometimes	Likely	Very Likely
	1	2	3	4	5

2. You are scrolling through Facebook, and you see that many of your friends are posting about a serious political event that is currently happening on the news. You turn on the television and begin commenting on your friends' posts while watching the live event

SELECT ONE					
	Never Happens	Rarely	Sometimes	Likely	Very Likely
	1	2	3	4	5

3. You begin watching the State of the Union speech and you want to see what people think of the speech while it is occurring. You pull out your phone and you search the following hastags: #SOTU and/or #StateoftheUnion in order to see tweets that are talking about the speech while it is happening

SELECT ONE					
	Never Happens	Rarely	Sometimes	Likely	Very Likely
	1	2	3	4	5

4. You just find out a major tragedy is occurring in another part of the country. While it is happening you think about people you follow on Twitter and Facebook that you look up to for their social opinions. So you pull-up their profiles to see if they are saying anything while you are still watching the news

SELECT ONE

Never Happens | Rarely | Sometimes | Likely | Very Likely

1 2 3 4 5

5. It's election day. You watching your favorite news station as the national results are being revealed. While you are eagerly watching to see who wins, you simultaneously have your phone in hand to Facebook, Instagram, or Tweet about the live updates and results.

SELECT ONE

Never Happens | Rarely | Sometimes | Likely | Very Likely

1 2 3 4 5

6. It's election day. While watching television or listening to the radio for the results, you are checking your phone simultaneously to see what your liberal and your conservative friends are saying about the results.

SELECT ONE

Never Happens | Rarely | Sometimes | Likely | Very Likely

1 2 3 4 5

*Final Section – Please fill out the following information and you are complete with this survey!*

Below is a series of questions regarding demographic information. **The following information is critical to our study; please answer the questions as fully as possible.**

1. I am a (*check only one*):            1. Male \_\_\_\_\_            2. Female \_\_\_\_\_

2. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_(Years)

3. I would describe myself as (*check only one*):

\_\_\_\_\_ African American            \_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic

\_\_\_\_\_ Caucasian/Non-Hispanic            \_\_\_\_\_ Native American

\_\_\_\_\_ Asian American            \_\_\_\_\_ Other

4. Estimate how many Facebook friends you have. (Write “0” if you do not have a profile on this site)

0: 0    1: 1 to 250    2: 251 to 500    3: 501 to 750    4: 751 to 1,000    5: 1,001 to 1,250    6: 1,250 and greater

Specify quantification by “0” through “6” : \_\_\_\_\_

5. Estimate how many Instagram followers you have. (Write “0” if you do not have a profile on this site)

0: 0    1: 1 to 250    2: 251 to 500    3: 501 to 750    4: 751 to 1,000    5: 1,001 to 1,250    6: 1,250 and greater

Specify quantification by “0” through “6” : \_\_\_\_\_

6. Estimate how many Snapchat followers you have. (Write “0” if you do not have a profile on this site)

0: 0    1: 1 to 250    2: 251 to 500    3: 501 to 750    4: 751 to 1,000    5: 1,001 to 1,250    6: 1,250 and greater

Specify quantification by “0” through “6” : \_\_\_\_\_

7. How many years have you been going to college? \_\_\_\_\_ (years)

8. How do you tend to politically label yourself?

Very Conservative = 1    Conservative = 2    Nonpartisan = 3    Liberal = 4    Very Liberal = 5

Identify yourself by writing "1" through "5" : \_\_\_\_\_

*You have completed the survey!*

*Thank you for your time*