



Second Generation Digital Native and Janus Face Social Media: Anomalies of Family Communication and Participation

Matang, Karim, Sapriya, Cecep Darmawan and Leni Anggraeni

EasyChair preprints are intended for rapid dissemination of research results and are integrated with the rest of EasyChair.

February 26, 2022

Title:

Second Generation Digital Native and Janus Face Social Media: Anomalies of Family Communication and Participation

Authors: [Removed for blind review]

Background:

Today's students are understood as the second generation of digital natives (GDN-2) who are close and accustomed to using social media. The concept of digital natives, first and second generation has been identified as a generation that is close to technology and social media (Barak, 2018; Correa, 2016; Williams et al., 2012). This is due to their ability as “native speakers” of digital computers, video games, and the Internet (Prensky, 2001). Moreover, this generation's way of thinking and acting is directly related to technology (Dingli & Seychell, 2015, p. 21). We can see in their mobility which is supported by an increasingly established internet, Wi-Fi is widely available, a choice of mobile devices from mobile phones to tablets. Therefore, for this generation a variety of information is available on different devices and can be consumed very easily for digital natives. Therefore, for this generation various information is available on various devices and can be consumed very easily for digital natives. For this reason, this study confirms the use of social media in GDN-2, looking at the role of family communication, its impact on GDN-2 participation in social media.

Objective(s):

Previous studies on digital natives discussed levels of digital literacy, in education and sociology, digital native technology experiences, digital native food content and snacks, learning strategies and practices for digital natives, and this generation's proximity to social media (Alhabash & Ma, 2017; Bennett et al., 2008; Bennett & Maton, 2010; Kivunja, 2014; Margaryan et al., 2011; Nam & Jung, 2021; Ng, 2012; Nikou et al., 2018; Scherman & Rivera, 2021; Tkalac Verčič & Verčič, 2013; Yang & DeHart, 2016). This study tries to enrich the GDN-2 literature, focusing on the Janus face of social media, the role of family communication on social media, and the participation of GDN-2 on social media.

Uses and gratifications (U&G) theory on social media will lead to the Janus face of social media (Mäntymäki & Islam, 2016). Janus face revealed that social media use is due to a desire for narcissism, but the number of friends reduces this effect. With the existence of interpersonal connectivity in social media, previous research confirms maintaining existing relationships is the main reason for using social media. This study assumes that GDN-2 has a different view, that social media with various positive sides also has various negative sides. Parents from the digital native generation because of their maturity in thinking, will certainly highlight the negative side of social media. The next assumption has an impact on the knowledge and participation of GDN-2.

Method:

In this study, 308 students of Muhammadiyah Riau University at Indonesia were willing to complete the questionnaire that we distributed using Google Forms. The student was GDN-2 who was born after 1990. An in-depth interview was then conducted on GDN-2 (N = 31) to explore their experiences with social media. This study focuses on five social media that are popular among students at the Muhammadiyah University of Riau. Of the respondents (N = 308), 66.9% indicated that they prefer to use social media Instagram, 14.3% of them use Youtube, 11% use Facebook, 6.2% use Tiktok, and 1.6% use Twitter. GDN-2 also revealed the type of social media their parents used. The results on fathers, 36.7% stated that they prefer to use Facebook social media, 4.9% prefer to use Instagram, 3.9% use Youtube, do not have Twitter and Tiktok social media, and 54.5% or most of the fathers of GDN-2 has no social media. The results on mothers, 39.9% stated that they prefer to use social media Facebook, 7.5% use Instagram, 1.9% use Youtube, 0.3% use Tiktok, do not have social media Twitter, and 50.3% or most of the mothers of GDN-2 do not have social media.

Results:

This study tries to explain GDN-2 on social media. First, students now as GDN-2, know that social media has two faces (Janus Face). The positive side they feel from social media is updated and viral information, a place to learn and increase knowledge, used for communication purposes, a place for buying and selling activities, and so on. The negative side they feel is that social media diverts their main activities and work, becomes lazy, time is wasted, fake news, has to pay for the internet that should be used for college fees, and so on. The research findings confirm the results of previous studies (Gullo, 2018; Radovic et al., 2017) that social media has benefits as well as disadvantages.

Second, the form of parental communication to GDN-2 by giving them advice on the importance of social media literacy. Various advices were given such as don't easily believe information circulating on social media, research the truth again, don't just post data on social media, and so on. However, there is an anomaly in family communication about the importance of using good and correct social media. When parents who do not have social media, do not even have the competence and knowledge of social media literacy. Facing GDN-2 as a social media user, as well as a generation that grows and develops with the increasingly established internet technology, especially social media. Various advice from parents to be careful using social media, it may be explained that parents are one of the groups that are vulnerable to the negative impacts of social media (Hassan et al., 2020). For this reason, it is natural for them to give advice so that GDN-2 is not negatively affected by social media. Third, knowledge of janus face social media and advice from parents is then reflected in GDN-2 participation in social media. GDN-2 is becoming cautious and more selective in participating in social media. This finding is in line with the results of previous studies (Kim & Chen, 2016; Valenzuela, 2013; Valenzuela et al., 2018), that social media can facilitate GDN-2 in participating in expressing their political opinions and expressions.

Future Work:

This study has implications for social media service providers to innovate to prevent the negative impact of social media. Such as blocking anonymous accounts that spread fake news or alerting users if they spend too much time on social media. Regarding the anomaly of family communication because parents do not have social media, it is hoped that parents are also equipped with adequate social media literacy. So that the advice and input given to their children is very appropriate and relevant. This study has limitations looking in more detail at the types of social media. Because each type of social media has its own characteristics such as Instagram, Youtube, Facebook, Twitter, Tiktok, and others (Auxier & Anderson, 2021; Oh & Syn, 2015). For this reason, further research is needed on the types of social media that have a very negative impact on GDN-2 and the types of social media that are very beneficial for them. The limitations of the study are also due to the focus on the nuclear family, namely the father and mother. Future research is expected to look at the characteristics and patterns of parenting in the family such as grandparents, uncles, aunts, or even older siblings (Cornejo et al., 2013; Erola et al., 2018). The next generation shift becomes even more interesting to study, as the third and fourth generations of digital natives emerge, the role of family communication, and new forms of participation are discussed.

References:

- Alhabash, S., & Ma, M. (2017). A Tale of Four Platforms: Motivations and Uses of Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat Among College Students? *Social Media + Society*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117691544>
- Auxier, B., & Anderson, M. (2021). Social Media Use in 2021 . *Pew Research Center*, 7, 1–18. www.pewresearch.org.
- Barak, M. (2018). Are digital natives open to change? Examining flexible thinking and resistance to change. *Computers & Education*, 121, 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMPEDU.2018.01.016>
- Bennett, S., & Maton, K. (2010). Beyond the ‘digital natives’ debate: Towards a more nuanced understanding of students’ technology experiences. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 26(5), 321–331. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1365-2729.2010.00360.X>
- Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The ‘digital natives’ debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 775–786. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-8535.2007.00793.X>
- Cornejo, R., Tori, M. Ten, & Favela, J. (2013). Enriching in-person encounters through social media: A study on family connectedness for the elderly. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 71(9), 889–899. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJHCS.2013.04.001>
- Correa, T. (2016). Digital skills and social media use: how Internet skills are related to different types of Facebook use among ‘digital natives.’ *Information, Communication & Society*, 19(8), 1095–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1084023>
- Dingli, A., & Seychell, D. (2015). *The new digital natives: Cutting the chord*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer.

- Erola, J., Kilpi-Jakonen, E., Prix, I., & Lehti, H. (2018). Resource Compensation from the Extended Family: Grandparents, Aunts, and Uncles in Finland and the United States. *European Sociological Review*, 34(4), 348–364. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ESR/JCY021>
- Gullo, A. (2018). The Janus Face of Social Media in Myanmar. *Südostasien – Zeitschrift Für Politik • Kultur • Dialog*, 33(3). <https://doi.org/10.11588/soa.2017.3.2329>
- Hassan, I., Azmi, M. N. L., & Abdullahi, A. M. (2020). Evaluating the Spread of Fake News and its Detection. Techniques on Social Networking Sites. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, 22(1), 111–125. <https://doi.org/10.21018/RJCPR.2020.1.289>
- Kim, Y., & Chen, H. T. (2016). Social media and online political participation: The mediating role of exposure to cross-cutting and like-minded perspectives. *Telematics and Informatics*, 33(2), 320–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TELE.2015.08.008>
- Kivunja, C. (2014). Theoretical Perspectives of How Digital Natives Learn. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3(1), 94–109. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v3n1p94>
- Mäntymäki, M., & Islam, A. K. M. N. (2016). The Janus face of Facebook: Positive and negative sides of social networking site use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 61, 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHB.2016.02.078>
- Margaryan, A., Littlejohn, A., & Vojt, G. (2011). Are digital natives a myth or reality? University students' use of digital technologies. *Computers & Education*, 56(2), 429–440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMPEDU.2010.09.004>
- Nam, J., & Jung, Y. (2021). Digital natives' snack content consumption and their goals: A means-end chain approach. *Telematics and Informatics*, 63, 101664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TELE.2021.101664>
- Ng, W. (2012). Can we teach digital natives digital literacy? *Computers & Education*, 59(3), 1065–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMPEDU.2012.04.016>
- Nikou, S., Mezei, J., & Brännback, M. (2018). Digital natives' intention to interact with social media: Value systems and gender. *Telematics and Informatics*, 35(2), 421–435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TELE.2017.12.019>
- Oh, S., & Syn, S. Y. (2015). Motivations for sharing information and social support in social media: A comparative analysis of Facebook, Twitter, Delicious, YouTube, and Flickr. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(10), 2045–2060. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ASI.23320>
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants Part 1. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816>
- Radovic, A., Gmelin, T., Stein, B. D., & Miller, E. (2017). Depressed adolescents' positive and negative use of social media. *Journal of Adolescence*, 55, 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ADOLESCENCE.2016.12.002>
- Scherman, A., & Rivera, S. (2021). Social Media Use and Pathways to Protest Participation: Evidence From the 2019 Chilean Social Outburst. *Social Media + Society*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051211059704>
- Tkalac Verčič, A., & Verčič, D. (2013). Digital natives and social media. *Public Relations*

Review, 39, 600–602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.08.008>

- Valenzuela, S. (2013). Unpacking the Use of Social Media for Protest Behavior: The Roles of Information, Opinion Expression, and Activism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(7), 920–942. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213479375>
- Valenzuela, S., Correa, T., & Gil de Zúñiga, H. (2018). Ties, Likes, and Tweets: Using Strong and Weak Ties to Explain Differences in Protest Participation Across Facebook and Twitter Use. *Political Communication*, 35(1), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2017.1334726>
- Williams, D. L., Crittenden, V. L., Keo, T., & Mccarty, P. (2012). The use of social media: an exploratory study of usage among digital natives. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 12(2), 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.1002/PA.1414>
- Yang, H. “Chris,” & DeHart, J. L. (2016). Social Media Use and Online Political Participation Among College Students During the US Election 2012. *Social Media + Society*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115623802>