

Research project “(Re-)Discovering the audience. Journalism under the conditions of web 2.0”¹

Online questionnaire for the audience

The audience questionnaire was directed to the users of the websites of:

1. a daily TV newscast called *Tagesschau* (the most traditional newscast in Germany, on a PSB)
2. a weekly political talk show on TV (*anonymous*, on a PSB)
3. a daily newspaper (*anonymous*, national circulation, but with a strong regional tradition)
4. a weekly newspaper called *Der Freitag* (national circulation, focusing on debates and commentary)

The wording, questions, items and response options were adjusted to the respective case study object. Here, we (mostly) use the questionnaire for the *Tagesschau* audience as an example. Questions, items etc. not included in all four surveys are marked: *[not included in X]*

The **starting page** of each of the four surveys contained information about the aim of the research project, the project team and the time needed for completing the survey (15–20 min.), guaranteed anonymisation, explained where the results will be published (on our project blog) and offered a link to a website explaining the storage of data.

Questions and • response options	Sources and comments
1. Frequency and breadth of usage of case study object’s offers	
<p><u>Question:</u> The [respective case study object] offers a number of formats on different platforms. First of all, we would like to know, how often you use them. <i>[5-point Likert-scale with 1=“every day”, 2=“several times a week”, 3=“several times a month”, 4=“less than that”, 5=“not at all” + “I don’t</i></p>	Own question and items, inspired by Orians (1991: 117-119), and informed through a feature analysis of the respective case study object

¹ The research project which is funded by the German Research Foundation [grant number LO 853/4-1] for 2.5 years (2011_2014).

<p><i>know this offer.</i>"</p> <p>For the political talk show: 4-point Likert-scale with 1="every week", 2="several times a month", 3="less than that", 4="not at all/no more" + "I don't know this offer."]</p>				<p><u>Comment:</u> Since the political talk show does not offer any information on a daily basis (neither on TV nor online), the scale was changed.</p>
Daily newscast	Political talk show	Daily newspaper	Weekly newspaper	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> main <i>Tagesschau</i> newscast at 8 p.m. 10 p.m. newscast <i>Tagesthemen</i> <i>Tagesschau</i> newscasts in the morning (until 9 a.m.) <i>Tagesschau</i> newscasts throughout the day late night newscast <i>Nachtmagazin</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> weekly live broadcast of the talk show rebroadcast of the talk show online livestream of the talk show 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> print issue of the newspaper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> print issue of the newspaper 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the newscast's website <i>tagesschau.de</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the talk show's website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the newspaper's website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> staff writers' articles on the newspaper's website <i>freitag.de</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> issues of the newscast in the broadcaster's online media centre (<i>Mediathek</i>) 100-seconds version of the newscast 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> issues of the talk show in the broadcaster's online media centre (<i>Mediathek</i>) 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> editorial blog on <i>tagesschau.de</i> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> editorial blog on the newspaper's website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> articles by members of the user community on the newspaper's website <i>freitag.de</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> online discussion forum <i>meta.tagesschau.de</i> on the newscast's website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> online discussion forum on the talk show's website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> user comments in the community area of the newspaper's website online discussion forum on the newspaper's website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> user community on the newspaper's website <i>freitag.de</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the <i>Tagesschau's</i> profile page on <i>Facebook</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> posts with regard to the talk show on <i>Facebook</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> articles on the newspaper's profile page on <i>Facebook</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> articles on the newspaper's profile page on <i>Facebook</i> 	<p><u>Comment:</u> The political talk show does not have a <i>Facebook</i> profile page of its own.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the <i>Tagesschau's</i> <i>Twitter</i> profile 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> tweets with regard to the talk show, e.g. with the hashtag #[title of the talk show] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the newspaper's tweets on <i>Twitter</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the newspaper's tweets on <i>Twitter</i> 	<p><u>Comment:</u> The political talk show does not have a <i>Twitter</i> profile of its own.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the <i>Tagesschau's</i> profile page on <i>Google+</i> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> articles on the newspaper's profile page on <i>Google+</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> articles on the newspaper's profile page on <i>Google+</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the <i>Tagesschau's</i> <i>YouTube</i> channel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>YouTube</i> videos of the talk show 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> videos on the newspaper's <i>YouTube</i> channel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> videos on the newspaper's <i>YouTube</i> channel 	<p><u>Comment:</u> The political talk show does not have a <i>YouTube</i> channel of its own.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the <i>Tagesschau</i> app on mobile devices the <i>Tagesschau</i> app for SmartTVs 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> digital issue of the newspaper for computers or mobile devices 		
<p>2. Expectations regarding participatory functions</p>				<p><u>Comment:</u> This question was also included in the journalist questionnaires.</p>
<p><u>Questions:</u> No matter whether you yourself use them or not: How important is to you in general that the [respective case study object] offers the following ways to participate? I think it is [very important / ... / very unimportant]... [5-point Likert-scale with 1="very important", 2= "rather important", 3="neither important nor unimportant", 4="rather unimportant", 5="very unimportant" + "I don't know / Can't tell."]</p>				<p>Own question</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...that I can see which stories are viewed/commented on/shared by many other people 				<p>Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Neuberger (2009: 82), Neuberger/Wendelin (2012), and Wehner (2010)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...that I can discuss (with regard to) the topics of reporting 				<p>Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Braun/Gillespie (2011), Neuberger (2009: 82), and Singer et al. (2011)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...that I can publicly show my attachment to the [respective case study object] 				<p>Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Orians (1991)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...that I am able to interact and/or make contact with other viewers [<i>resp.</i> "readers"/]users 				<p>Own items</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...that I am taken seriously by journalists 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...that I am able to provide own material (text, pictures, videos etc.) for news reporting 				<p>Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Neuberger (2009: 82 fig. 8), and Singer et al. (2011)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...that the newsroom provides a platform for discussing practices and quality of news reporting 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...that I am able to contact/discuss with editorial staff directly 				

• ...that I am able to suggest topics for reporting, interview guests etc.	
• ...that I am able to easily forward/recommend news to friends or family members	
• ...that I am able to comment on/rate news reporting	
• ...that I receive additional information about and references to the sources a journalistic item/story is based on	Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Meier/Reimer (2011)
• ...that I receive information about editorial decisions/routines/practices	
• ...that the editorial staff members are introduced	Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Evers/Eberwein (2011), and Meier/Reimer (2011)
• ...that the editors are present and responsive on social media [<i>by mistake, "on social media" was not included in the Tagesschau questionnaire</i>]	Item taken from Neuberger/vom Hofe/Nuernbergk (2010: 108) (with slightly changed wording)
3. a) Inclusion performance I Usage of participatory functions	
<u>Question:</u> There are different ways of actively participating at the [respective case study object] and of giving the editors feedback. Which of the following options have you ever used? [multiple selection; platform-specific functions were only included if the respondent – according to question 1. – used the respective platform]	Own Question and items, informed though a feature analysis of the respective case study object
• Contacting the editorial staff via phone *	
• Sending in letters, e-mails, and/or faxes (audience mail in general) to the [respective case study object]'s newsroom [<i>also included in this item in the other three questionnaires: "using the online contact form"</i>] *	
• Personal encounters with editors [of the respective case study object]	
• [<i>Only included in the talk show questionnaire: "Being part of the studio audience"; in the daily and weekly newspaper questionnaires: "Attending one of the newspaper's events (e.g. a panel discussion)"</i>]	
• Commenting posts on the [respective case study object]'s profile page on Facebook* [<i>in the talk show questionnaire: "Commenting posts on Facebook with regard to the talk show"</i>]	
• Sharing/recommending posts on the [respective case study object]'s profile page on Facebook [<i>in the talk show questionnaire: "Sharing/recommending posts on Facebook with regard to the talk show"</i>]	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Liking” posts on the [respective case study object]’s profile page on <i>Facebook</i> [in the talk show questionnaire: “Liking’ posts on Facebook with regard to the talk show”]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenting videos on the [respective case study object]’s <i>YouTube</i> channel [in the talk show questionnaire: “Commenting videos with regard to the talk show on YouTube”] *
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forwarding/sharing/recommending videos of the [respective case study object]’s <i>YouTube</i> channel [in the talk show questionnaire: Forwarding/sharing/recommending YouTube videos with regard to the talk show”]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rating (“thumbs up/down”) videos on the [respective case study object]’s <i>YouTube</i> channel [in the talk show questionnaire: “Rating (“thumbs up/down”) YouTube videos with regard to the talk show”]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Only included in the talk show questionnaire: “Commenting the talk show on Twitter”; in the daily and weekly newspaper questionnaires: “Reacting on the newspaper’s tweets (e.g. with an @-reply)”] *
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Only included in the Tagesschau questionnaire: “Retweeting tweets by @tagesschau”]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Only included in the talk show and daily and weekly newspaper questionnaires: “Favoriting a tweet by [respective case study object]”]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenting posts on the [respective case study object]’s profile page on <i>Google+</i> [not included in the talk show questionnaire] *
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forwarding/sharing posts on the [respective case study object]’s profile page on <i>Google+</i> [not included in the talk show questionnaire]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rating (“+1”) posts on the [respective case study object]’s profile page on <i>Google+</i> [not included in the talk show questionnaire]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenting news items on [the respective case study object’s website and/or in its commentary section] *
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommending and/or bookmarking news items on [the respective case study object’s website and/or in its commentary section] (e.g. via e-mail, <i>Delicious</i> etc.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rating news items on [the respective case study object’s website [not included in the talk show and daily newspaper questionnaire]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenting posts in the [respective case study object]’s editorial blog * [not included in the talk show questionnaire] *
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Only included in the talk show and daily and weekly newspaper questionnaires: “Participate in a poll/voting on the website”]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Only included in the weekly newspaper questionnaire: “Writing own articles on freitag.de (in the online community)”] *
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Only included in the weekly newspaper questionnaire: “Paying for an article on freitag.de via flattr”]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of these options

LOOP: All options marked as “used” were included in the following question:		
LOOP	3. b) Inclusion performance II Frequency of usage	
	<u>Question:</u> And how often do you use these options to participate/give feedback? [5-point Likert-scale with 1=“every day”, 2=“several times a week”, 3=“several times a month”, 4=“less than that”, 5=“not at all” For the political talk show: 4-point Likert-scale with 1=“every week”, 2=“several times a month”, 3=“less than that”, 4=“not at all/no more”]	
FILTER: Those participants who used none of the options at least “less than that” (for the daily newspaper: “several times a month”) were presented question 4. (“Reasons for not participating”), and were not presented questions 5. (“Anonymity”), 6. (“Addressing”), 7. (“Advocacy”), 8. (“Motivations for participation”), 9. (“Involvement of journalists”), and 10. (“Evaluation of users’ posts and activities”).		
4. Reasons for not participating		
<u>Question:</u> You have stated not (or only rarely) to participate actively at the [respective case study object]. We would like to know why that is the case. I do not actively participate, ... [5-point Likert-scale with 1=“absolutely applicable”, 2=“rather applicable”, 3=“neither applicable nor inapplicable”, 4=“rather inapplicable”, 5=“absolutely inapplicable”]	Own question	
• ...because it is not fun for me.	Item taken from Springer/Pfaffinger (2012: 19, tab. 9) (with wording slightly changed)	
• ...because I do not want to discuss with people whom I do not know.		
• ...because it is too much of an effort/too time consuming.		
• ...because I’m afraid that it could have a negative effect on my image.		
• ...because I had technical problems uploading files and/or comments.	Items taken from Springer/Pfaffinger (2012: 18-19) (with wording slightly changed) and/or formulated following theoretical considerations by Engesser (2010: 160-163)	
• ...because I do not dare to send something in or comment.		
• ...because I do not want to register.		
• ...because the level of discussion is too low.		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because users are not taken seriously by journalists, anyway. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because participatory functions are too complex. 	Own items reflecting theoretical considerations by Engesser (2010: 160-163)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I do not know whether my posts violate copyright or any other rights of other people. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I do not have anything important to contribute to the discussion. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I think that the [respective case study object] is not the right medium for audience participation. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because the editors do not get back to me. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because it is not of interest to me. 	Own items
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I rather participate in the context of other media or online-platforms (fora, social media, mailing lists). 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there are any other reasons that apply to you, please, add them here: ... <i>[open answer]</i> 	
<p>FILTER: Only participants who had stated in questions 3. a) and 3. b) to use at least one of the participatory functions marked with (*) at least “less than that” (for the daily newspaper: “several times a month”) were presented questions 5., 6., and 7. These questions were repeated in a loop for a maximum of three times/functions: always for the two most important functions of the resp. case study (newscast: “Commenting on <i>(meta.)tagesschau.de</i>” & “Commenting on <i>Facebook</i> (if applicable); talk show: “Commenting in the online discussion forum” & “Sending in letters, e-mails...”; daily & weekly newspaper: “Commenting on the newspaper’s website” & “Sending in letters, e-mails...”). If any other of the functions marked with (*) were used to the amount specified, one of them was picked randomly (as well).</p>		
LOOP	5. Anonymity	
	<p><u>Question:</u> Do you usually use your real name or a pseudonym when using [the respective participatory function]? <i>[single selection with response options „I usually use my real name.“; „I usually use a pseudonym.“]</i></p>	Own question and response options reflecting theoretical considerations by Robinson (2010)
	6. Addressing	
	<p><u>Question:</u> Whom do you usually address when using [the respective participatory function]? <i>[multiple selection]</i></p>	Own question and items inspired by Loreck (1982: 279), and reflecting theoretical considerations by Schweiger/Quiring (2006) and Ziegele/Quiring (2011)

Daily newscast	Political talk show	Daily newspaper	Weekly newspaper	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the <i>Tagesschau</i> editors/newsroom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the talk show's editors in general 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the newspaper (staff) in general 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the <i>Freitag</i> (staff) in general 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a particular individual <i>Tagesschau</i> journalist or anchorman/-woman (e.g. the author of a particular news item) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the talk show host 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the editor(s) in chief 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the editor(s) in chief 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other particular individual journalists of the newspaper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other particular individual journalists of <i>Der Freitag</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other <i>Tagesschau</i> users/viewers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other viewers/users of the talk show 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other readers/users of the newspaper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other readers/users of <i>Der Freitag</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the broad public in general 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the broad public in general 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the broad public in general 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the broad public in general 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other persons, groups, namely: ... [open answer] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other persons, groups, namely: ... [open answer] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other persons, group, namely: ... [open answer] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other persons, group, namely: ... [open answer] 	
7. Advocacy				
<p><u>Question:</u> And for whom do you usually speak, i.e. whose interests do you represent when using [the respective participatory function]? I speak... [multiple selection]</p>				Own question inspired by Loreck (1982: 279)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...for a particular community/section of the population 				Own items reflecting theoretical considerations by Loreck (1982: 279)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...for a particular organisation or interest group 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...for myself 				Own items
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...for the general public 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...for someone else, namely: ... [open answer] 				
<p>FILTER: Question 8. was asked specified for one particular participatory function randomly chosen from a list of functions which contained the following items from question 3. a):</p>				

<p><i>Daily newscast</i>: “Commenting on Facebook” & “Commenting on (meta.)tagesschau.de” (if used at least “several times a month”). If those functions were used less than that, all of the following functions were included in the list (if used at least “several times a month”): “Contacting the Tagesschau via phone”, “Sending in letters, e-mails...”, “Commenting on YouTube”, “Commenting on Google+”, “Commenting on the editorial blog”</p> <p><i>Political talk show</i>: “Sending in letters, e-mails...” & “Commenting in the online discussion forum” (if used at least “less than that”. If those functions were not used, all of the following functions were included in the list (if used): “Contacting the editors via phone”, “Commenting on Facebook”, “Commenting on YouTube”, “Commenting on Twitter”</p> <p><i>Daily newspaper</i>: “Sending in letters, e-mails...” & “Commenting on the newspaper’s website” (if used at least “several times a month”). If those functions were used less than that, all of the following functions were included in the list (if used at least “several times a month”): “Commenting on Facebook”, “Reacting to tweets”, “Commenting in the editorial blog”</p> <p><i>Weekly newspaper</i>: “Sending in letters, e-mails...” & “Commenting on the newspaper’s website” (if used at least “several times a month”). If those functions were used less than that, all of the following functions were included in the list (if used at least “several times a month”): “Commenting on Facebook”, “Reacting to tweets”, “Writing own articles on freitag.de (in the community)”</p>	
<p>8. Motivations for participation</p>	<p><u>Comment</u>: This question was also included in the journalist questionnaires.</p>
<p><u>Question</u>: Now we would like to ask you directly for your reasons for [using the respective participatory function]. You can rate the items from “absolutely applicable” to “absolutely inapplicable”. I do it,... [5-point Likert-scale with 1=“absolutely applicable”, 2=“rather applicable”, 3=“neither applicable nor inapplicable”, 4=“rather inapplicable”, 5=“absolutely inapplicable”]</p>	<p>Own question</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I hope the journalists or other users can help me with a problem. 	<p>Item formulated with reference to (an item by) Altmann (2011), Henning-Thurau et al. (2004), Orians (1991: 118)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I want to share my experiences and knowledge with others. 	<p>Item subsumes items by Altmann (2011: 148), Henning-Thurau et al. (2004), Leung (2009: 1336), Kopp/Schönhagen (2008: 11), Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6), Orians (1991: 118) Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I want to bring in my opinion publicly. 	<p>Item formulated with reference to Altmann (2011: 148), Kopp/Schönhagen (2008), Orians (1991: 118), Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6), Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Sutton (2006)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I consider it my civic duty. 	<p>Item taken from Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6) (with wording slightly changed); reference to Sutton (2006)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...to pass time, out of boredom. 	<p>Item taken from Leung (2009: 1336), Orians (1991), Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1) (with wording slightly changed); reference to Altmann (2011)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I would like to be active, not just a viewer [respectively, “reader”]. 	Item subsumes items by Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1); reference to Altmann (2011)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I want to “blow” off steam and vent my anger. 	Item taken from Henning-Thurau et al. (2004), Leung (2009: 1336), Orians (1991), Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6), and Springer/Pfaffinger (2012); reference to Altmann (2011)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...to build a relationship with the editors of [the respective case study object] 	Item specifies an item by Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1); reference to Orians (1991)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I learn something in dialogue with others, get food for thought, and expand my knowledge. 	Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Leung (2009: 1336), Orians (1991), Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Wladarsch (2010); references to Altmann (2011) and Huth/Krzeminski (1981: 224)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because by doing so I feel to be part of a community. 	Item formulated with reference to items by Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Weischenberg/Scholl (1989: 425); references to Altmann (2011), Huth/Krzeminski (1981: 224), Markman (2011), and Orians (1991)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I want to assist the journalists in their work. 	Own item
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because I want to support and promote a person, a community or a specific concern with my contributions. 	Item specifies and subsumes items by Kopp/Schönhagen (2008), Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1); references to Altmann (2011), Markman (2011), and Orians (1991)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...to propose certain topics which are important to me. 	Item subsumes items by Kopp/Schönhagen (2008), Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...to point out errors in videos [respectively, “articles”] or on the website 	Item formulated with reference to Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...to display myself and my knowledge publicly. 	Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Altmann (2011), Leung (2009), and Orians (1991: 47); formulated with references to items by Kopp/Schönhagen (2008), Markman (2011), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because it is fun. 	Item taken from Leung (2009), Mitchelstein (2011: 2021, tab. 2), Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1), and Wladarsch (2010) (with wording slightly changed); references to Altmann (2011), and Markman (2011: 556, fig. 1)

		<u>Comment:</u> This item was not included in the journalist questionnaires.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because [the respective case study object] has a high reputation and it is something special to participate there. 	<p>Item specifies an item by Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1)</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> This item was not included in the journalist questionnaires.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...because by doing so I get to know and make contact with interesting people. 	<p>Item taken from Henning-Thurau et al. (2004), Mitchelstein (2011: 2021, tab. 2), and Springer/Pfaffinger (2012) (with wording slightly changed); references to Altmann (2011), and Markman (2011: 556, fig. 1)</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> This item was not included in the journalist questionnaires.</p>
	<p>FILTER: Questions 9. and 10. were presented active users and visitors (“lurkers”) of certain platforms with commentary sections and asked especially with regard to those commentary sections:</p> <p><i>Daily newscast:</i> Questions were repeated in a loop for a maximum of two platforms chosen randomly from a list containing all of the following platforms the participant had stated to use/visit at least “less than that” in question 1.: “editorial blog”, “meta.tagesschau.de”, “Facebook profile page”, “Google+ profile page”, “YouTube channel”.</p> <p><i>Political talk show:</i> Questions were asked participants who had stated to use/visit the “online discussion forum on the talk show’s website” at least “less than that” in question 1. There was no loop.</p> <p><i>Daily newspaper:</i> Questions were asked all participants who had stated to use the newspaper’s website at least “less than that” in question 1. <i>Instead or additionally</i>, they were asked with regard to a platform chosen randomly from a list containing all of the following platforms the participant had stated to use at least “less than that” in question 1.: “Facebook profile page”, “Google+ profile page”, “editorial blog”, “YouTube channel”, “the newspaper’s tweets”.</p> <p><i>Weekly newspaper:</i> Questions were asked all participants who had stated to use the newspaper’s website at least “less than that” in question 1. <i>Instead or additionally</i>, they were asked with regard to a platform chosen randomly from a list containing all of the following platforms the participant had stated to use at least “less than that” in question 1.: “Facebook profile page”, “Google+ profile page”, “YouTube channel”, “the newspaper’s tweets”, “user community on freitag.de”, “articles written by members of the user community on freitag.de”.</p>	
LOOP	9. Involvement of journalists in commentary sections	
	<p><u>Question:</u> If you think of the commentary area on [the respective platform]: How should the journalists of [the respective case study object] behave there? The journalists should... [5-point semantic differentials]</p>	Own question
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “... participate extensively in the discussions.” vs. “... keep out of the discussions.” 	Own items reflecting theoretical considerations by Robinson

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “... strictly moderate the commentary sections.” vs. “... not moderate the commentary sections at all.” [not asked with regard to Twitter] 	(2010: 132ff.), and Mitchelstein (2011: 2022)
10. Evaluation of users’ posts and activities	
<p><u>Question:</u> And how would you, by and large, describe the contributions of other users on [the respective platform]? The contributions of other users are by and large... [5-point Likert-scale with 1=“completely agree”, 2=“somewhat agree”, 3=“neither agree nor disagree”, 4=“somewhat disagree”, 5=“completely disagree”]</p>	Question taken from Mitchelstein (2011: 2023, tab. 4) and Springfield (2009: 53) (with wording slightly changed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • formulated “matter-of-factly” 	Items taken from Mitchelstein (2011: 2033) and Robinson (2010: 134) (with wording slightly changed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a helpful addition to the commented article [respectively, “issue/website of the talk show”] 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trustworthy 	Own items with reference to Springfield (2009: 53)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • of high quality 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • informative 	
<p>FILTER: Question 11. was not included in the <i>Tagesschau</i> questionnaire. In the other questionnaires, it was asked participants who had stated in question 1. to use <i>Political talk show:</i> the “live broadcast”, “a rebroadcast”, the “online livestream” and/or “issues of the talk show in the broadcaster’s online media centre (<i>Mediathek</i>)” at least “less than that” <i>Daily newspaper:</i> the “print issue” and/or the “digital issue of the newspaper for computers or mobile devices” at least “less than that” <i>Weekly newspaper:</i> the “print issue” of the newspaper at least “less than that”</p>	
11. Evaluation of other audience members’ contributions and activities on TV/in the print issue [question not included in the Tagesschau questionnaire]	
<p><u>Question:</u> Sometimes the talk show/newspaper also contains contributions by viewers/readers/users (e.g. [examples with regard to the respective case study object]). How would you, by and large, describe these contributions? The contributions are by and large... [5-point Likert-scale with 1=“completely agree”, 2=“somewhat agree”, 3=“neither agree nor disagree”, 4=“somewhat disagree”, 5=“completely disagree”]</p>	Question taken from Mitchelstein (2011: 2023, Tab. 4) and Springfield (2009: 53) (with wording slightly changed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • formulated “matter-of-factly” 	Items taken from Mitchelstein (2011: 2033) and Robinson (2010: 134) (with wording slightly changed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a helpful addition to the [“issue/website of the talk show”/“newspaper’s articles”] 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trustworthy 	Own items with reference to Springfield (2009: 53)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • of high quality 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • informative 	
<p><i>Weekly newspaper:</i> Question 11 was repeated again with regard to the “articles on <i>freitag.de</i> written by members of the user community” (if the participant had stated to use those at least “less than that”). Here, the second item was adjusted: “a helpful addition to the staff writers’ articles”.</p>	
<p>12. Journalistic role conception General expectations regarding the role/tasks of the respective case study object’s journalists</p>	<p><u>Comment:</u> This question was also included in the journalist questionnaires.</p>
<p><u>Question:</u> The next question deals with the functions of journalism you consider most important: We would like to know what – in your opinion – should be journalists’ prior-ranking tasks. Journalists of [the respective case study object] should... [5-point Likert-scale with 1=“completely agree”, 2=“somewhat agree”, 3=“neither agree nor disagree”, 4=“somewhat disagree”, 5=“completely disagree” (+ included only in the Tagesschau questionnaire: “I don’t know / Can’t tell.”)]</p>	<p>Question taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 243) (with wording slightly changed)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explain and convey complex issues. 	<p>Items taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 243-244) (with wording slightly changed)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • present their own opinion to the audience. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inform the audience as neutrally and precisely as possible. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • control politics, business and society. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • criticize problems and grievances. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • convey/share positive ideals. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide help/counseling/useful information for the audience and act as advisor/guidance. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • give the audience the opportunity to express their opinions about topics of public interest. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide entertainment and relaxation for the audience. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • show new trends and convey/highlight new ideas. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inform the audience as fast as possible. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • concentrate on news that is interesting to an audience as wide as possible. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide people with the opportunity to publish content they have generated themselves. 	Own items reflecting theoretical considerations by Kenix (2009)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • get into conversation with citizens about current topics. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build and maintain a relationship to their audience. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • give the audience topics to talk about. 	Item taken from Neuberger (2012: 49, tab. 11) (with wording slightly changed), reflects theoretical considerations by Braun/Gillespie (2011) and Huth/Krzeminski (1981: 224)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • point out interesting topics to the audience and show them where they can obtain further information on them. 	Item taken Neuberger (2012: 49, tab. 11) (with wording slightly changed), reflects theoretical considerations by Bruns (2005)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide audience members with the opportunity to maintain social ties among themselves. 	Item taken from Neuberger (2012: 49, Tab. 11) (with wording slightly changed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • initiate and moderate discussions among the audience. 	Item taken from Neuberger (2012: 50, Tab. 12) and Kopp/Schönhagen (2008) (with wording slightly changed), reflects theoretical considerations by Braun/Gillespie (2011)
<p>13. General assessment of and attitudes towards audience participation Assumed strategic, journalistic and normative relevance, perceived impact/power relations, negative effects</p>	<u>Comment:</u> This question was also included in the journalist questionnaires.
<p><u>Question:</u> Now we would like to learn a little more about your opinion about ways of participating and giving feedback. [5-point Likert-scale with 1="completely agree", 2="somewhat agree", 3="neither agree nor disagree", 4="somewhat disagree", 5="completely disagree" (+ included only in the Tagesschau questionnaire: "I don't know / Can't tell.")]</p>	Own question
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments, discussions and other contributions by the audience provide additional facets and perspectives to the reporting of [the respective case study]. 	Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Schweiger/Quiring (2006)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using user-generated content helps reduce costs. 	Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Neuberger (2009: 81-83)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The power constellations between journalists and the audience have changed. 	Own items reflecting theoretical considerations by Robinson (2010: 127-138)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journalists keep the upper hand in selecting and processing/producing stories and news items. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience participation has a high entertainment value. 	Own items reflecting theoretical considerations by Orians (1991: 36-39)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience reactions show the journalists at once whether they select the right topics and report them comprehensibly. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience participation makes the process of public information and opinion formation more democratic. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience participation makes the [respective case study object] more trustworthy/credible. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience participation increases viewer [resp. "reader"] loyalty. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience participation helps the [respective case study object] to reach/attract/win over new target groups. 	Item taken from Neuberger/vom Hofe/Nuernbergk (2010: 104) (with wording slightly changed); reference to Orians (1991)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audience participation keeps the editorial staff from performing their actual tasks. 	Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Meier/Reimer (2011)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue and exchange with the audience are an essential part/element of the [respective case study object]. 	Own items
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance ascribed to audience participation at the [respective case study object] is too high. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of audience contributions and participation is too low. 	
14. Sex	
<p><u>Question:</u> Finally, we have some questions about personal details. Like all of your answers, these data are subject to general data protection regulations, will only be used for scientific purposes, and will not be disclosed to any third party. Are you ... ? [single selection with response options: "male", "female"]</p>	
15. Age	
<p><u>Question:</u> Please, enter your age in years. [open answer]</p>	
16. Occupation	
<p><u>Question:</u> What is your current occupation?</p>	

<i>[single selection]</i>	
• apprentice	
• pupil	
• university student	
• working full-time	
• working part-time	
• temporarily unemployed	
• retired	
• something else	
• n/a / n.s.	
FILTER: Those who had stated to be pupils were also asked the following question:	
17. Type of school	
<u>Question:</u> Which type of school do you attend? <i>[single selection]</i>	
• lower secondary school (“Hauptschule”)	
• secondary school (“Realschule”)	
• higher secondary school/grammar school (“Gymnasium”)	
• n/a / n.s.	
FILTER: Those who had stated not to be pupils were also asked the following question:	
18. Highest educational achievement	
<u>Question:</u>	

Which is your highest educational achievement? <i>[single selection]</i>	
• certificate of (lower) secondary education (“Hauptschulabschluss”)	
• (general) certificate of secondary education (“Realschulabschluss”)	
• “A levels”/general qualification for university entrance (“Abitur”)	
• university/polytechnic/technical college degree (“Hochschulabschluss”)	
• doctorate/habilitation (“Promotion/Habilitation”)	
• n/a / n.s.	
19. Internet usage	
<u>Question:</u> For how long have you been using the Internet? For ... years. <i>[open answer]</i>	
20. Frequency of usage of online news sites/services	
<u>Question:</u> How often do you usually use news sites/services on the Internet/on mobile devices (not only the [respective case study object] but in general)? <i>[5-point Likert-scale with 1=“several times a day”, 2=“about once a day”, 3=“several times a week”, 4=“less than that”, 5=“never”]</i>	
21. Comments	
<u>Question:</u> We will analyse the data collected in this survey and present the results to the editorial staff of the [respective case study object] in an internal workshop. If there is something that you want to tell us or the editorial staff, please, do it now: <i>[open answer]</i>	

Last page

Thank you for your support.

If you are interested in receiving the final report of this study, please, contact us via [e-mail](#). We also provide information about the progress of our studies on our [project blog](#) and via [Twitter](#).

References

- Altmann, Myrian-Natalie (2011): User Generated Content im Social Web. Warum werden Rezipienten zu Partizipanten? Berlin: Lit.
- Braun, Joshua; Gillespie, Tarleton (2011): Hosting the public discourse, hosting the public. When online news and social media converge. In: Journalism Practice, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 383-398.
- Bruns, Axel (2005): Gatewatching. Collaborative online news production. New York: Peter Lang.
- Engesser, Sven (2010): Barrieren medialer Partizipation. Ergebnisse eines explorativen Feldexperiments. In: Wolling, Jens; Seifert, Markus; Emmer, Martin (eds.): Politik 2.0? Die Wirkung computervermittelter Kommunikation auf den politischen Prozess. Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 151-167.
- Evers, Huub; Eberwein, Tobias (2011): Can a million toothless tigers make a difference? Potentials and pitfalls of web-based accountability processes in German journalism. URL: http://www.mediaact.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/WP4/WP4_Germany.pdf (accessed on August 20 2013).
- Henning-Thurau, Thorsten; Gwinner, Kevin P.; Walsh, Gianfranco; Gremler, Dwayne D. (2004): Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms. What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the internet? In: Journal of Interactive Marketing, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 39-52.
- Huth, Lutz; Krzeminski, Michael (1981): Zuschauerpost – ein Folgeproblem massenmedialer Kommunikation. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kenix, Linda Jean (2009): Blogs as alternative. In: Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 790-822.
- Kopp, Mirjam; Schönhagen, Philomen (2008): Die Laien kommen! Wirklich? Eine Untersuchung zum Rollenselbstbild sogenannter Bürgerjournalistinnen und Bürgerjournalisten. In: Quandt, Thorsten; Schweiger, Wolfgang (eds.): Journalismus online - Partizipation oder Profession? Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 79-94.
- Leung, Louis (2009): User-generated content on the internet. An examination of gratifications, civic engagement and psychological empowerment. In: New Media & Society, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 1327-1346.
- Loreck, Sabine (1982): Leserbrief als Nische öffentlicher Kommunikation. Münster: Lit.
- Markman, Kris M. (2011): Doing radio, making friends, and having fun. Exploring the motivations of independent audio podcasters. In: New Media & Society, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 547-565.
- Meier, Klaus; Reimer, Julius (2011): Transparenz im Journalismus. Instrumente, Konfliktpotentiale, Wirkung. In: Publizistik. Vierteljahreshefte für Kommunikationsforschung, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 133-155.
- Mitchelstein, Eugenia (2011): Catharsis and community: Divergent motivations for audience participation in online newspapers and blogs. In: International Journal of Communication, vol. 5, pp. 2014-2034.
- Neuberger, Christoph (2009): Internet, Journalismus und Öffentlichkeit. Analyse des Medienumbruchs. In: Neuberger, Christoph; Nuernbergk, Christian; Rischke, Melanie (eds.): Journalismus im Internet. Profession, Partizipation, Technisierung. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 19-105.
- Neuberger, Christoph (2012): Journalismus im Internet aus Nutzersicht. Ergebnisse einer Onlinebefragung. In: Media Perspektiven, no. 1, pp. 40-55.
- Neuberger, Christoph; Nuernbergk, Christian; vom Hofe, Hanna Jo (2010): Twitter und Journalismus. Der Einfluss des „Social Web“ auf die Nachrichten. Wuppertal: LfM-Dokumentation.
- Neuberger, Christoph; Wendelin, Manuel (2012): Mehr Transparenz im Netz? Öffentlichkeit als Raum der Wahrnehmung und (Meta-)Kommunikation. In: Springer, Nina; Raabe, Johannes; Haas, Hannes; Eichhorn, Wolfgang (eds.): Medien und Journalismus im 21. Jahrhundert. Herausforderungen für Kommunikationswissenschaft, Journalistenausbildung und Medienpraxis. Konstanz: UVK, pp. 121-137.
- Orians, Wolfgang (1991): Hörerbeteiligung im Radio. Eine Fallstudie zu Motivation, Erwartung und Zufriedenheit von Anrufern. München: Reinhard Fischer.
- Pasternack, Steve (1988): The open forum: A study of letters to the editor and the people who write them. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, July 2-5 1988, Portland, USA.
- Robinson, Sue (2010): Traditionalists vs. convergers. Textual privilege, boundary work, and the journalist-audience relationship in the commenting policies of online news sites. In: Convergence. The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 125-143.
- Schweiger, Wolfgang; Quiring, Oliver (2006): User-Generated Content auf massenmedialen Websites - eine Spielart der Interaktivität oder etwas völlig anderes? In: Friedrichsen, Mike; Mühl-Benninghaus, Wolfgang; Schweiger, Wolfgang (eds.): Neue Technik, neue Medien, neue Gesellschaft? Ökonomische Herausforderungen der Onlinekommunikation. München: Reinhard Fischer .
- Singer, Jane B.; Hermida, Alfred; Domingo, David; Heinonen, Ari; Paulussen, Steve; Quandt, Thorsten; Reich, Zvi; Vujnovic, Marina (2011): Participatory journalism. Guarding open gates at online newspapers. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Springer, Nina; Pfaffinger, Michael (2012): Why users comment on online news and why they don't. Paper presented at the 62nd annual conference of the International Communication Association (ICA), May 24-28 2012, Phoenix, USA.
- Springfeld, Claudia (2009): Tourismus 2.0: Chancen und Herausforderungen des Online Tourismus im Web 2.0. Hamburg: Diplomica Verlag.
- Sutton, Shaun (Sep 1 2006): The "my" in ohmynews. A uses and gratifications investigation into the motivations of citizen journalists in South Korea. Leeds. University of Leeds.
- Wehner, Josef (2010): „Numerische Inklusion“ – Wie die Medien ihr Publikum beobachten. In: Sutter, Tilmann; Mehler, Alexander (eds.): Medienwandel als Wandel von Interaktionsformen. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 183-210.
- Weischenberg, Siegfried; Scholl, Armin (1989): Kommunikationserwartungen und Medieneffekte. Wie Publikumsvariablen Wirkungsabläufe beeinflussen können. In: Rundfunk und Fernsehen, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 421-434.
- Weischenberg, Siegfried; Malik, Maja; Scholl, Armin (2006): Die Souffleure der Mediengesellschaft. Report über die Journalisten in Deutschland. Konstanz: UVK.

- Wladarsch, Jennifer (2010): Auf der Spur der Massenmedien in sozialen Onlinenetzwerken. Wie und warum Internetnutzer massenmediale Inhalte in sozialen Onlinenetzwerken nutzen. MA-Thesis (unpublished). Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.
- Ziegele, Marc; Quiring, Oliver (2011): In search for an online discussion value. Assessing media-initiated user communication from a news value perspective. Paper presented at the 61st Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, May 26-30 2011, Boston, USA.