

Sharing news in social media. Narrowcasting and social power

Compartición de noticias en redes sociales. Difusión selectiva y poder social

Compartilhamento de notícias em redes sociais. Narrowcasting e poder social

Francisco Segado-Boj, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, España (fsegado@ucm.es) y Universidad Internacional de la Rioja, La Rioja, España*

María-Ángeles Chaparro-Domínguez, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, España (ma.chaparro@ucm.es)

ABSTRACT | This research analyses the way in which news sharing activity diverges according to the different targets defined by social power theory. This theory posits that interactions among individuals are driven by goal-oriented behaviors towards their peers, namely: reward, coercion, legitimation, identification, referential or expertise showcase. Our paper aims to identify how such objectives influence on what news are shared (hard or soft, emotional, or useful) and where are they shared (open asymmetrical, broadcast model, such Facebook or Twitter, or closed, symmetrical, narrowcast platforms like WhatsApp). We applied an experience sample method that gathered information regarding 830 pieces of news shared by 279 adult participants in Spain. Among the main results introduced by our study we point that the most common targets when sharing news were reward, legitimation, and expertise showcase. Open asymmetrical social media were used to share news items with proselytizing goals (to convince, persuade or correct). Such goals were pursued by sharing hard news, meanwhile soft news were shared mostly to reward peers, understood as a way of bonding pre-existing social links. The emotional aspect (positive affect) is only relevant when the goal is identification. In the rest of occasions, usefulness is the most powerful driver to news sharing.

KEYWORDS: social media; news sharing; social power; hard news; soft news; positive affect; usefulness.

HOW TO CITE

Segado-Boj, F. & Chaparro-Domínguez, M. A. (2021). Compartición de noticias en redes sociales. Difusión selectiva y poder social. *Cuadernos.info*, (50), 45-68. <https://doi.org/10.7764/cdi.50.27433>

RESUMEN | Este artículo analiza el modo en el que los diferentes objetivos definidos por la teoría del poder social se relacionan con la forma en la que los ciudadanos comparten noticias. Esta teoría postula que las interacciones entre los individuos persiguen alcanzar determinados objetivos por parte de sus interlocutores (recompensa, coerción, legitimación, identificación y demostración de conocimiento). Se busca identificar cómo influyen en las noticias (duras o blandas, emocionales o útiles) que se comparten y dónde (plataformas abiertas asimétricas, como Facebook o Twitter, basadas en modelos de difusión, o entornos cerrados de difusión selectiva como WhatsApp). Se emplea un método de muestreo de experiencias que recogió información acerca de 830 noticias compartidas por 279 participantes adultos en España. Los objetivos más comunes fueron recompensa, legitimación y demostración de conocimiento. Las redes abiertas asimétricas se emplean para compartir noticias con objetivos proselitistas (convencer, persuadir o corregir). Estos objetivos se buscan mediante la difusión de noticias duras, mientras que las noticias blandas se emplean principalmente para recompensar a los contactos, entendido como una manera de estrechar lazos sociales ya existentes. El aspecto emocional (afecto positivo) de las noticias solo adquiere relevancia si el objetivo es la identificación. En el resto de las ocasiones, se comparten preferentemente noticias consideradas útiles.

PALABRAS CLAVE: redes sociales; compartición de noticias; poder social; noticias duras; noticias blandas; afecto positivo; utilidad.

RESUMO | Este artigo analisa como os diferentes objetivos definidos pela teoria do poder social se relacionam com a forma pela qual os cidadãos comunicam as notícias. Essa teoria do poder social postula que as interações entre os indivíduos buscam atingir determinados objetivos por parte de seus interlocutores (recompensa, coerção, legitimação, identificação e demonstração de conhecimento). Busca-se identificar como esses objetivos influenciam nas notícias (duras ou leves, emocionais ou úteis) que se compartilham e onde (plataformas abertas assimétricas, como Facebook ou Twitter, baseadas em modelos de divulgação ou ambientes fechados de divulgação seletiva como o WhatsApp). É usado um método de amostragem de experiência que coletou informações sobre 830 notícias compartilhadas por 279 participantes adultos na Espanha. Os objetivos mais comuns ao compartilhar uma história eram recompensa, legitimação e demonstração de conhecimento. As redes abertas assimétricas (como Facebook ou Twitter) são usadas para compartilhar notícias para fins de proselitismo (para convencer, persuadir ou corrigir). Esses objetivos são buscados por meio da divulgação de notícias duras, enquanto as notícias leves são utilizadas principalmente para premiar aos contatos, entendido como uma forma de fortalecer os laços sociais existentes. O aspecto emocional (afeto positivo) das notícias só se torna relevante se o objetivo for a identificação. Em outras ocasiões, notícias consideradas úteis são preferencialmente compartilhadas.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: mídias sociais; compartilhamento de notícias; poder social; notícias suaves; notícias suaves; afeto positivo; utilidade.

INTRODUCTION

Social media have revolutionized the process of news consumption and distribution (Kalsnes & Larsson, 2019), which abandons a unidirectional broadcast model and adopts a paradigm of multidirectional distribution by users (Noguera-Vivo, 2018). It is thus vital to understand how and why individuals share news in these environments.

Sharing news on social media has a relevant social aspect. From the point of view of the uses and gratifications theory (Katz, 1959), individuals share news in these environments to achieve two objectives: to project their image to their contacts, and to interact with them (Lee & Ma, 2012). That is, users share news primarily to manage their relationship with their contacts. Given the social nature of this activity, research on news and social media has included theories related to human relationships (Duffy & Ling, 2019). This study follows this trend, applying the social power theory (French Jr. & Raven, 1959), which conceptualizes the relationships between two individuals according to the goals that one subject (the sender) tries to obtain from another (the receiver). These objectives are:

1. Reward: the perception that the sender can obtain some benefit from the receiver.
2. Coercion: the ability of the sender to apply some punishment to the receiver.
3. Legitimation: the ability to prescribe or justify behaviors and attitudes.
4. Identification: the ability to increase identification between receiver and sender.
5. Demonstration of knowledge: the projection that the sender has some specific knowledge or skill.

The overall objective of this article is to study the relationship between social power and news sharing. It seeks to identify how different social power objectives influence the types of news that are shared and on what type of platforms.

Previous studies from uses and gratifications theory (Lee & Ma, 2012; Hossain et al., 2018; Thompson et al., 2019; Winter et al., 2016) point to the expectation of different uses and gratifications leading to different news sharing attitudes. Thus, symmetrically, we expect different types of social power to motivate different news sharing behaviors.

On the other hand, each social media platform has specific characteristics that influence the behavior of its users and, therefore, provoke different effects (Hasell & Weeks, 2016) and attitudes (Segado-Boj et al., 2019).

For example, Facebook and Instagram encourage self-presentation, whereas Twitter functions as a platform for information search (Boczkowski et al., 2018). Thus, users of different platforms preferentially share different types of information in one or the other environment (Larsson, 2019). Given that users do not perceive the same sense of influence when communicating in open social spaces as when communicating in more private settings (Oeldorf-Hirsch & Sundar, 2015) we expect to find differences between the social power pursued and the type of platform on which news is shared, specifically depending on whether they are open and asymmetric social media (OAS) and closed and symmetric social media (CSS) (Kim & Ihm, 2019).

In OASs, messages posted by the user can be seen by the entire community of his or her contacts (followers on Twitter or Instagram, friends on Facebook (Kim & Ihm, 2019)). In this broadcasting model, a single message is disseminated to an entire community, without differentiating between specific individuals (Yang, 2016), which often leads to the phenomenon of context collapse, i.e., the confusion of audiences with different interests, attitudes, or beliefs in the same general group (Gil-López et al., 2018). This merging of followers into the same broad, general audience leads users to apply audience management strategies (Marwick & boyd, 2011), including self-censorship or marginalization of controversial news (Kim & Ihm, 2019).

The CSS represents an opposite paradigm to the OAS. CSSs are created by a user and can only be joined by users by explicit invitation. They are constituted as private communities, not open to the public, so they have also been labeled as dark social media (Swart et al., 2018). Their most relevant examples are mobile messaging apps and some elements of OASs, such as private Facebook groups. CSSs, consequently, follow a narrowcasting or selective dissemination model (Goncalves et al., 2013), in which users distribute their messages among a reduced and specifically selected set of followers (Karapanos et al., 2016).

Content features can be subjective, such as perceived relevance (Kümpel, 2019), or objective, such as topic. Thus, certain topics –like politics– have proven to be especially popular in social media (Orellana-Rodriguez & Keane, 2018). Regarding user perception, two subjective dimensions are analyzed: usefulness and positive affect (Houston et al., 2018). However, the informational aspect does not fully explain which news are shared on social media. Emotional responses, such as enjoyment of an article, also play a role (An et al., 2014). This study measures emotional response in terms of positive affect, i.e., the extent to which users find the message enjoyable, entertaining, and positive (Houston et al., 2018).

METHODOLOGY

To achieve the proposed objective –to determine how different social power objectives influence how, what, and where users share news– this study uses situations rather than actors as analysis unit (Witschge et al., 2018), and employs an experience sampling method (ESM), in which participants answer at certain random times different questions about an experience (Kubey et al., 1996).

The first research question (RQ1) is: What are the most expected social power goals when sharing news on social media? The second research question (RQ2) is what type of platforms do users choose based on the social power they want to exert when sharing news? As mentioned above, users' expectations and intentions influence the characteristics of content they share on social media (Johnson & Ranzini, 2018). Therefore, the question (RQ3) arises: What content do users choose to share based on the social power they expect to exert when sharing a news item? Given that usefulness is one of the values that predict the virality of content in social media (Knobloch-Westerwick & Kleinman, 2012), the research question (RQ4) is posed: What is the relationship between the perceived usefulness of a news item and the type of social power one wants to exert by sharing that news item in social media?

Finally, the research question (RQ5) addresses the relationship between the positive feeling regarding a news item and the social power one wants to exert when sharing a news item on social media.

To answer the above questions, 300 volunteers between 18 and 39 years of age were recruited by the Societae consulting firm. Participants were initially asked to provide a series of sociodemographic information (table 1). Twenty-one participants did not complete the initial questionnaire and were not included in the final sample (n=279). Responses were collected from November 16 to December 12, 2018. A total of 830 valid experiences were collected, i.e., news shared by users and their evaluation (tables 2, 4 and 5).

At three different moments (November 16, November 24, and December 2), users were emailed a survey with questions about the latest news they had shared on social media, instant messaging, or any other channel.

Table 2 indicates the options presented to users about the platform on which they shared the news. Options 1-2 were considered OASs and 3-6, CSSs. Options 7-8 were not considered given the low number of responses.

		n	%
Gender	Male	109	39.07
	Female	167	59.86
	Rather not answer	3	1.08
Education	Primary	5	1.79
	Secondary	40	14.34
	Professional training	71	25.45
	College	162	58.07
	Ph.D.	1	0.36
Monthly income	No income	9	3.23
	€ 0 < 300	6	2.15
	€ 301 < 600	14	5.02
	€ 601 < 900	17	6.09
	€ 0 < 1,200	36	12.90
	€ 1,201 < 2,400	67	24.01
	€ 1,801 < 2,400	46	16.49
	€ 2,401 < 3,000	38	13.62
	€ 3,001 < 4,500	29	10.39
	€ 4,501 < 6,000	7	2.51
	€ > 6,000	2	0.72
	Rather not answer	8	2.87

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample*Source: Own elaboration.*

		n	%
RAA	1. On some social network (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram...) as a post for all my contacts in general to see.	414	49.88
	2. On social networks, but I addressed a specific person, tagging them on Facebook or Instagram, or mentioning them on Twitter. Even so, the message was public and could be seen by all my contacts.	25	3.01
RCS	3. In a private group or restricted community on Facebook or any other social network so that only members of that group or community can see it.	12	1.45
	4. In a private WhatsApp, Line, Telegram, or Facebook Messenger group.	252	30.36
	5. I have sent it to a specific contact via instant messaging (WhatsApp, Line, Telegram, or Facebook Messenger).	112	13.49
	6. By email, to a specific person or group of people.	6	0.72
	7. By email, massively to a large group of people (more than 50).	0	0
	8. Other	9	1.09

Table 2. Platforms on which news were shared*Source: Own elaboration.*

Participants had to indicate the link to the news they shared. The questionnaire mentioned a broad concept of *news*, which did not require it to be published by a conventional media. In the case that the news story did not include a link, users had to indicate the headline of the news story. From these links and news, we categorized stories according to their topic (Kilgo et al., 2018) (table 3).

Coding was performed by one of the authors, so no inter-rater reliability index was calculated. Given the high dispersion of topics, the categories were grouped into four large thematic blocks, as indicated in the left column of table 3.

	Topic	n	%
Hard news	International relations	45	5.74
	Military / Defense	2	0.26
	Government	102	13.01
	Crime / Events	128	16.33
	Economy / Business / Finance	38	4.85
	Civil rights	28	3.57
	Environment	63	8.04
Soft news	Religion	3	0.38
	Sports	46	5.87
	Entertainment	96	12.25
Culture	Lifestyle / Health	67	8.55
	Education	69	8.80
Others	Science/Technology	25	3.19
	Others	72	9.18
	Total	784	100

*Note: 46 items were left out of the analysis because they did not provide enough information to assign them a category.

Table 3. Themes considered in content analysis

Source: Own elaboration.

Measures

A series of questions was developed to identify the aspects of social power developed in Lukes (2005) based on the five objectives formulated by French Jr. and Raven (1959). The questions were posed in Likert format and the users had to express their agreement with the statements raised (1= not agree at all, 5= totally agree), as shown in table 4.

Reward is divided into three different perceptions, interpreting that the reward may consist of helping to promote an activity or event, offering useful information, or amusing the recipient. *Legitimation* includes expressing an opinion, supporting an argument, and prescribing attitudes or ideas. *Identification* is divided into two aspects: relational and conversational. *Demonstration of knowledge* is divided into projection of skills and educational. Finally, *coercion* is interpreted in this study from the receiver's point of view, understood as the avoidance of conflict or punishment by another (table 4).

Positive feeling ($\alpha=0.86$) and usefulness ($\alpha=0.85$) were measured with Likert-type questions (1=not agree at all, 5=strongly agree) indicated in table 5 (Houston et al., 2018).

Objective	Affirmation. "I have shared this news...	Median	SD
Reward (event)	to help publicize an event or activity.	3.31	1.52
Reward (useful info.)	...because I believe that a person or a group of people could benefit from having this information.	3.80	1.16
Reward (entertainment)	...because I thought that this news was going to amuse or be of interest to a person or a group of people.	3.15	1.43
Legitimation (my opinion)	...to express an idea, a point of view or my feelings about a subject or event.	3.27	1.39
Legitimation (argumentative reinforcement)	...to reinforce my arguments on an issue.	2.77	1.44
Legitimation (influence)	...because it can help influence or modify someone's behavior.	3.03	1.46
Identification (relational)	...because it helps me to feel closer to a person or a group of people.	2.31	1.32
Identification (conversational)	...because it helps me to start a conversation.	1.39	1.29
Knowledge demonstration (my skills)	...because I wanted to demonstrate my knowledge of a subject or my mastery of a topic.	2.09	1.18
Knowledge demonstration (educational)	...to help people better understand an issue or to educate them.	3.24	1.41
Coercion	...because it helps me avoid problems or conflicts with someone.	1.58	1.02

Table 4. Measures of social power expectation

Source: Own elaboration.

Positive feeling	I liked the content.
	I enjoyed the content.
	The content is positive.
	The content is entertaining.
Usefulness	The content is valuable (in general, for me, for my friends or for society).
	The content is good and of quality.
	The content is useful.
	The content has helped me to stay informed.
	The content is relevant to my life.

Table 5. Measures for the perception of news sharing

Source: Own elaboration.

Control variables

Socioeconomic aspects affecting general social network use, such as age, economic status (Lottridge & Bentley, 2018), and education (Holton et al., 2015), were considered.

Following the recommendations of Segado-Boj and colleagues (2019), the model includes users’ personality traits. Specifically, extroversion ($\alpha=0.8$) and openness to experiences ($\alpha=0.67$) were measured, since these are the traits with the greatest influence on news sharing in social media (Liu & Campbell, 2017). Extroversion refers to a person’s ability to be sociable, and openness to experiences implies an individual’s willingness to consider alternative perspectives and be intellectually curious (Ross et al., 2009). Both constructs were measured using previous instruments (Gil De Zúñiga et al., 2017), based on Likert-type questions (1=not at all agree, 5=strongly agree) (table 6).

Political orientation also causes differences in the type of information users share on social media (Guess et al., 2019). Similarly, political extremism has been linked to a more intense frequency of news sharing (Kalogeropoulos et al., 2017). Participants had to identify themselves on an 8-point ideological scale (0=extreme left, 7=extreme right; median=3.80; SD=1.14). This response was subsequently recoded to measure extremism. The extreme ranges of the scale (0 and 7) were given a maximum of 4, and those in the middle (3 and 4), a minimum of 1 (median=1.48, SD=0.74).

The order of the questions on social power, positive affect, perceived usefulness, extraversion, and openness to experience was randomized in each questionnaire.

Openness to experiences	"I find it hard to imagine things" (recoded).
	"I'm not interested in new ideas" (recoded).
	"I don't like to try new things" (recoded).
	"I tend to have a lot of ideas".
	"It takes me a long time to learn anything new" (recoded).
Extroversion	"I understand things quickly".
	"I like to start conversations".
	"I don't like to talk to a group of people" (recoded).
	"I feel comfortable introducing myself to people I don't know".
	"I feel shy when I am with strangers" (recoded).
	"I talk to different people at events and gatherings".
	"I find it difficult to approach other people" (recoded).

Table 6. Measures used for personality traits

Source: Own elaboration.

Data analysis

The computer language R was used for the analysis. ANOVA tests were applied to detect differences between the type of social network (OAS or CSS) in which the news is shared and the different social power objectives (RQ2). ANOVA tests were also employed to identify differences following news topics (RQ3). The results are shown in tables 7 and 8. Given the high disparity of sets considered, we applied the Bonferroni post hoc test (tables 8 and 10). Finally, a multiple regression analysis was applied to test whether the perception of the message (RQ4) influenced the intention of each social power target considered. In all cases (tables 7-12), values where differences exist are highlighted in bold, as are significant associations ($p < 0.05$). The disaggregated ANOVA results for each specific theme listed in table 3 are provided as additional material.

RESULTS

Differences between the type of social network and the social power objective

We found significant differences (table 7) between the type of social power objectives pursued and the platform on which the news is shared.

Social power objectives	F	P
Reward (event)	0.571	.565
Reward (useful info.)	1.357	.258
Reward (entertainment)	1.824	.162
Coercion	0.654	.520
Legitimation (my opinion)	16.246	<.001
Legitimation (argumentative reinforcement)	3.485	.031
Legitimation (influence)	11.787	<.001
Identification (relational)	0.769	.464
Identification (conversational)	2.627	.073
Knowledge demonstration (my skills)	1.305	.272
Knowledge demonstration (educational)	12.265	<.001

Table 7. Differences between the type of social power objectives pursued and the type of platform on which the news is shared

Source: Own elaboration.

	Diff	Lwr	Upr	P adj
Legitimation (my opinion)				
OAS – CSS	0.544	0.263	0.826	<.001
CSS – Others	0.352	1.707	1.004	1
OAS – Others	0.193	-1.161	1.547	1
Legitimation (argumentative reinforcement)				
OAS – CSS	0.249	-0.047	0.545	.041
CSS– Others	0.562	-0.863	1.987	.738
OAS– Others	0.313	-1.114	1.740	1
Legitimation (influence)				
OAS– CSS	0.477	0.180	0.773	<.001
CSS– Others	-0.788	-2.219	0.642	.315
OAS– Others	-0.312	-1.740	1.117	1
Knowledge demonstration (educational)				
OAS– CSS	0.476	0.190	0.762	<.001
CSS– Others	-0.574	-1.951	0.803	0.661
OAS– Others	-0.098	-1.473	1.278	1

Table 8. Post hoc (Bonferroni) analysis of differences between social power objectives pursued and type of social network

Source: Own elaboration.

The post hoc analysis (table 8) identifies differences in favor of OAS, i.e., the mass broadcast model of networks such as Facebook, Twitter, or others compared to selective broadcast paradigms, such as WhatsApp or Facebook Messenger. Significant differences were also found (table 9) between the type of social power target and the topic of the shared news item.

Social power objectives	F	P
Reward (event)	8.48	<.001
Reward (useful info.)	2.774	.040
Reward (entertainment)	17.97	<.001
Coercive	3.197	.023
Legitimation (my opinion)	3.003	.030
Legitimation (argumentative reinforcement)	2.133	.095
Legitimation (influence)	7.226	<.001
Identification (relational)	4.673	.003
Identification (conversational)	0.924	.429
Knowledge demonstration (my skills)	0.127	.944
Knowledge demonstration (educational)	11.67	<.001

Table 9. Differences between the objectives of the social power pursued and the topic of news shared

Source: Own elaboration.

The post hoc analysis of the significant cases (table 10) shows differences in favor of hard news and soft news. Preference for other topics was less common.

In the cases of Reward (event), no significant differences are found between soft and hard news. The preference is towards Culture and Other topics, to the detriment of soft and hard news. Reward (entertainment) shows a similar pattern, with a lower tendency to hard news, less prominent than the rest of the topics. In Legitimation (my opinion), Legitimation (influence), and Knowledge demonstration (educational), soft news is less common than hard news.

In Identification (relational), differences are only found between the category Others, which predominates over hard news. A similar fact occurs in Coercion. This could be interpreted as meaning that the objectives of Identification and Coercion are independent of the current media agenda.

Reward (event)

	Diff	Lwr	Upr	P adj
Soft news - Hard news	-0.013	-0.416	0.388	1
Culture - Hard news	0.585	0.044	1.126	.004**
Others - Hard news	0.736	0.132	1.340	<.001***
Culture - Soft news	0.598	0.012	1.185	.008**
Others - Soft news	0.749	0.103	1.395	.002**
Others - Culture	0.151	-0.589	0.891	1

Reward (entertainment)

	Diff	Lwr	Upr	P adj
Soft news - Hard news	0.731	0.361	1.101	<.001***
Culture - Hard news	0.824	0.327	1.321	<.001***
Others - Hard news	0.464	-0.092	1.019	.052
Culture - Soft news	0.093	-0.447	0.633	1
Others - Soft news	-0.268	-0.862	0.327	.934
Others - Culture	-0.360	-1.042	0.320	.572

Coercion

	Diff	Lwr	Upr	P adj
Soft news - Hard news	0.042	-0.225	0.308	1
Culture - Hard news	0.093	-0.265	0.451	1
Others - Hard news	0.389	-0.011	0.790	.013*
Culture - Soft news	0.051	-0.338	0.440	1
Others - Soft news	0.348	-0.080	0.776	.063
Others - Culture	0.296	-0.194	0.787	.342

Legitimation (my opinion)

	Diff	Lwr	Upr	P adj
Soft news - Hard news	-0.339	-0.711	0.034	.025*
Culture - Hard news	-0.167	-0.669	0.334	1
Others - Hard news	-0.262	-0.822	0.298	.842
Culture - Soft news	0.172	-0.373	0.716	1
Others - Soft news	0.077	-0.522	0.676	1
Others - Culture	-0.095	-0.782	0.591	1

Legitimation (influence)				
	Diff	Lwr	Upr	P adj
Soft news - Hard news	-0.552	-0.940	-0.164	<.001***
Culture - Hard news	-0.272	-0.794	0.250	.6061
Others - Hard news	<0.001	-0.583	0.584	1
Culture - Soft news	0.281	-0.286	0.847	.7116
Others - Soft news	0.553	-0.071	1.176	.032*
Others - Culture	0.272	-0.443	0.987	1
Identification (relational)				
	Diff	Lwr	Upr	P adj
Soft news - Hard news	0.267	-0.082	0.617	.096
Culture - Hard news	0.196	-0.274	0.666	1
Others - Hard news	0.550	0.0250	1.075	.006**
Culture - Soft news	-0.071	-0.581	0.439	1
Others - Soft news	0.283	-0.279	0.844	.673
Others - Culture	0.354	-0.290	0.998	.498
Knowledge demonstration (educational)				
	Diff	Lwr	Upr	P adj
Soft news - Hard news	-0.684	-1.054	-0.314	<.001***
Culture - Hard news	-0.084	-0.581	0.413	1
Others - Hard news	-0.213	-0.769	0.342	1
Culture - Soft news	0.600	0.060	1.140	.003**
Others - Soft news	0.471	-0.123	1.065	.075
Others - Culture	-0.129	-0.810	0.552	1

*Note: significance codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Table 10. Post hoc analysis (Bonferroni) of differences between social power aims and news topics

Source: Own elaboration.

News perception and social power

Multiple linear regression indicates a significant effect of the proposed model on the evaluation of positive affect ($F(18.811) = 16.17, p < .001, R^2 = .26$). Further analysis of the individual predictors indicates that Reward (entertainment), Identification (relational), and Identification (conversational) exert a significant influence on positive affect (table 11).

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	6.221	1.510	4.120	<.001 ***
Reward (event)	0.149	0.094	1.586	.113
Reward (useful info.)	0.172	0.135	1.276	.202
Reward (entertainment)	1.358	0.100	13.614	<.001 ***
Legitimation (my opinion)	0.040	0.126	0.320	.749
Legitimation (argumentative reinforcement)	-0.058	0.128	-0.456	.648
Legitimation (influence)	-0.158	0.122	-1.296	.195
Identification (relational)	0.488	0.124	3.920	<.001 ***
Identification (conversational)	-0.345	0.125	-2.757	.006 **
Knowledge demonstration (my skills)	0.191	0.141	1.355	.176
Knowledge demonstration (educational)	0.081	0.132	0.614	.539
Coercion	0.017	0.151	0.112	.911
Age	0.043	0.024	1.829	.068
Income	-0.072	0.061	-1.173	.241
Ideology	0.129	0.128	1.008	.314
Openness to experience	0.014	0.046	0.302	.763
Extroversion	-0.002	0.031	-0.070	.944
Education	-0.108	0.175	-0.616	.538
Ideological extremism	0.325	0.194	1.674	.094

*Note: significance codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Table 11. Regression results for positive affect evaluation

Source: Own elaboration.

Regarding usefulness, the regression test shows a significant effect of the model ($F(18.811) = 30.4, p < .001, R^2 = .40$). Reward (event), Reward (useful info.), Legitimation (my opinion), and Knowledge demonstration (educational) function as significant predictors (table 12); i.e., the more relevant the pursuit of those goals, the higher the evaluation of the positive affect of the shared news.

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	8.710	1.346	6.472	<.001 ***
Reward (event)	0.477	0.084	5.716	<.001 ***
Reward (useful info.)	1.373	0.120	11.425	<.001 ***
Reward (entertainment)	-0.056	0.089	-0.628	.531
Legitimation (my opinion)	0.321	0.112	2.859	.004 **
Legitimation (argumentative reinforcement)	-0.024	0.114	-0.206	.837
Legitimation (influence)	0.151	0.109	1.393	.164
Identification (relational)	-0.035	0.111	-0.316	.752
Identification (conversational)	-0.052	0.111	-0.468	.640
Knowledge demonstration (my skills)	0.016	0.126	0.124	.901
Knowledge demonstration (educational)	0.727	0.118	6.189	<.001 ***
Coercion	-0.183	0.134	-1.361	.173
Age	-0.009	0.021	-0.413	.680
Income	0.027	0.055	0.500	.617
Ideology	-0.058	0.114	-0.506	.612
Openness to experience	-0.005	0.041	-0.126	.900
Extroversion	0.030	0.028	1.081	.280
Education	-0.059	0.156	-0.380	.704
Ideological extremism	0.122	0.173	0.707	.480

*Note: significance codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Table 12. Regression results for the evaluation of positive affect

Source: Own elaboration.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The most common social power objectives (RQ1) were Legitimization and Reward (table 4). Users share content for proselytizing purposes (to convince, persuade, or correct), but also to elicit gratitude or recognition from their contacts. Therefore, the data reveal a duality between proselytizing and offering in users' motivations when sharing news on their social media.

The answer to RQ2 (table 8) points out that Legitimization, in all its facets (personal opinion, argumentative reinforcement, and influence), is mainly sought

by sharing news on OASs such as Facebook or Twitter. Thus, that proselytizing sharing explains the dominance of political and evaluative content in this type of environments (Lottridge & Bentley, 2018). OASs become auditoriums where users launch their proclamations, supported by the news they share.

In CSS, on the contrary, the persuasive goal is not predominant, which can be explained in several ways. As these networks can be organized around specific common experiences or interests –for example, groups of coworkers (Swart et al., 2018)– proselytizing could thus be interpreted as an improper attitude in these settings. Thus, efforts to disseminate ideas are directed to a more diverse and heterogeneous audience in OAS. In this regard, sharing news with the aim of defending a political position in OASs would be seen as a less risky and aggressive practice, as it is not directed at specific groups, but at a more undefined and generic target. The context collapse would stimulate proselytizing, and not slow it down.

As an alternative explanation, CSSs are typically comprised of closer contacts, such as friends or family (Waterloo et al., 2018). Consequently, perhaps users expect their contacts in CSSs to exhibit closer ideologies than their contacts in OASs. This would imply that users understand that their closest contacts do not need convincing, as opposed to those less close to them.

The use of OASs for the dissemination of political arguments may partially explain the fatigue of a sector of social network users and their migration to CSSs where, as the study points out, this proselytizing content is shared to a lesser extent.

When contrasting the objective of the social power pursued and the topics of the news shared (RQ3), Reward is oriented towards soft news and Legitimization and Demonstration, towards hard news (table 10). This confirms that hard news is not shared to inform, but as an argument or tool for ideological combat. The friendlier facet of news sharing (Reward) is –on the contrary– pursued through soft news. Information away from controversial issues, such as politics, is more effective in fulfilling that rewarding objective, according to our results.

As for the evaluation of news and its relationship with social power (RQ4 and RQ5), this correlation occurs more with utilitarian than emotional assessments (tables 11-12). The exception is Identification, which is deeply embedded with positive affect. Likewise, our results observe that users share news that they consider useful to achieve almost all social power objectives. The only case in which this dimension of usefulness is not relevant is when the user wants to identify with the reader of his or her news item. In this case, positive affect becomes important, i.e., the user shares news that he/she has liked because he/she believes that his/her contact will feel the same way he/she does.

From another perspective, when the objective is to strengthen ties (bonding social capital), as occurs with Identification, affection for the news item is more relevant than its potential usefulness. If news sharing is understood as a kind of social reward (Emerson, 1987), as occurs with Reward, or the objective is to create new contacts (bridging social capital), then positive affect is more relevant as a social currency (Berger, 2014) than usefulness.

Thus, a link has been found between the intention to educate others, the perceived usefulness of the news, the OASs, and the preference for hard news. When users want to enlighten or indoctrinate their contacts, they choose to share in OASs hard news that they find useful.

As for the limitations of the study, it analyzes the experiences of users residing in only one country (Spain). Taking these results as a starting point, future studies could address the same subject in other European or Latin American countries to establish comparisons between them. Likewise, this work is based on a single methodology, the experience sampling method, as this is the first time this subject has been analyzed in Spain. Therefore, it is proposed that other research should use other types of techniques, such as focus groups with users of social media or in-depth interviews, to deepen and clarify the motives and relationships identified in our quantitative analysis.

This study has considered control variables related to sociodemographic aspects such as age, economic, and educational level. However, no attention has been paid to the influence of the gender of the user who shares news in networks, an issue that could also be addressed by other research.

Future studies could also investigate the use of CSSs to disseminate opinions deemed undesirable or unpopular. If the intention to defend and prescribe opinions is more common in OASs than in CSSs, this may imply that confirmation bias in news sharing (Shin & Thorson, 2017) is stronger in OASs. The Legitimation orientation of OASs would even dampen the role of the spiral of silence, as has already been noted to occur in Facebook (Chaudhry & Gruzd, 2019). On the other hand, it has been pointed out that bubble filters are not as relevant as previously thought in OASs' environments (Dubois & Blank, 2018). However, this phenomenon could be more intense in CSSs. That is, if users share less ideologically charged content on CSSs and self-censor what they interpret as controversial, the chances of them encountering news opposing their existing views may be lower. In other words, the role of the bubble filter and echo chambers, which are beginning to be questioned in the OAS environment, may be more prevalent in CSSs. In this regard, it is necessary to investigate the role of users' perception of heterogeneity and affinity of contacts and their relationship with news sharing.

FUNDING

Project *Consumo de noticias en medios sociales. Análisis de factores en la selección y difusión de contenidos mediáticos* (News consumption in social media. Analysis of factors in the selection and dissemination of media content) (CSO2017-86312-R) funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness (Mineco), the State Research Agency (AEI), and the European Regional Development Fund (Feder), within the 2017 call for grants for R&D&I projects corresponding to the State Program for Research, Development and Innovation Oriented to the Challenges of Society in the framework of the State Plan for Scientific and Technical Research and Innovation 2013-2016. <http://newssharing.es>

REFERENCES

- An, J., Quercia, D., Cha, M., Gummadi, K., & Crowcroft, J. (2014). Sharing political news: the balancing act of intimacy and socialization in selective exposure. *EPJ Data Science*, 3(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-014-0012-2>
- Berger, J. (2014). Word of mouth and interpersonal communication: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 24(4), 586–607. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.05.002>
- Boczkowski, P. J., Matassi, M., & Mitchelstein, E. (2018). How Young Users Deal With Multiple Platforms: The Role of Meaning-Making in Social Media Repertoires. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 23(5), 245–259. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmy012>
- Chaudhry, I. & Gruzd, A. (2019). Expressing and Challenging Racist Discourse on Facebook: How Social Media Weaken the “Spiral of Silence” Theory. *Policy & Internet*, 12(1), 88-108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.197>
- Dubois, E. & Blank, G. (2018). The echo chamber is overstated: the moderating effect of political interest and diverse media. *Information, Communication & Society*, 21(5), 729–745. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1428656>
- Duffy, A. & Ling, R. (2019). The Gift of News: Phatic News Sharing on Social Media for Social Cohesion. *Journalism Studies*, 21(1)1, 72-87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2019.1627900>
- Emerson, R. M. (1987). Toward a theory of value in social exchange. In K. Cook (Ed.), *Social Exchange Theory*. SAGE.
- French Jr., J. R. P. & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). University of Michigan.
- Gil-López, T., Shen, C., Benefield, G. A., Palomares, N. A., Kosinski, M., & Stillwell, D. (2018). One Size Fits All: Context Collapse, Self-Presentation Strategies and Language Styles on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 23(3), 127–145. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmy006>

- Gil De Zúñiga, H., Diehl, T., Huber, B., & Liu, J. (2017). Personality Traits and Social Media Use in 20 Countries: How Personality Relates to Frequency of Social Media Use, Social Media News Use, and Social Media Use for Social Interaction. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 20(9), 540–542. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2017.0295>
- Goncalves, J., Kostakos, V., & Venkatanathan, J. (2013). Narrowcasting in social media: Effects and perceptions. In *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining, ASONAM 2013* (pp. 502–509). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2492517.2492570>
- Guess, A., Nagler, J., & Tucker, J. (2019). Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. *Science Advances*, 5(1), eaau4586. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aau4586>
- Hasell, A. & Weeks, B. E. (2016). Partisan Provocation: The Role of Partisan News Use and Emotional Responses in Political Information Sharing in Social Media. *Human Communication Research*, 42(4), 641–661. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12092>
- Holton, A. E., Coddington, M., Lewis, S. C., & Zúñiga, H. G. de. (2015). Reciprocity and the News: The Role of Personal and Social Media Reciprocity in News Creation and Consumption. *International Journal of Communication*, 9, 2526-2547. Retrieved from <http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/3598>
- Hossain, M. A., Dwivedi, Y. K., Chan, C., Standing, C., & Olanrewaju, A. S. (2018). Sharing political content in online social media: A planned and unplanned behaviour approach. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 20(3), 485-501. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-017-9820-9>
- Houston, J. B., McKinney, M. S., Thorson, E., Hawthorne, J., Wolfgang, J. D., & Swasy, A. (2018). The twitterization of journalism: User perceptions of news tweets. *Journalism*, 21(5), 614–632. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884918764454>
- Johnson, B. K. & Ranzini, G. (2018). Click here to look clever: Self-presentation via selective sharing of music and film on social media. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 82, 148–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.01.008>
- Kalogeropoulos, A., Negredo, S., Picone, I., & Nielsen, R. K. (2017). Who Shares and Comments on News?: A Cross-National Comparative Analysis of Online and Social Media Participation. *Social Media + Society*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117735754>
- Kalsnes, B. & Larsson, A. O. (2019). Facebook News Use During the 2017 Norwegian Elections—Assessing the Influence of Hyperpartisan News. *Journalism Practice*, 15(2), 209-225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2019.1704426>
- Karapanos, E., Teixeira, P., & Gouveia, R. (2016). Need fulfillment and experiences on social media: A case on Facebook and WhatsApp. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 55, 888–897. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHB.2015.10.015>
- Katz, E. (1959). Mass communications research and the study of popular culture: An editorial note on a possible future for this journal. *Studies in Public Communication*, 2, 1–6. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/165
- Kilgo, D. K., Harlow, S., García-Perdomo, V., & Salaverría, R. (2018). A new sensation? An international exploration of sensationalism and social media recommendations in online news publications. *Journalism*, 19(11), 1497–1516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884916683549>

- Kim, E. & Ihm, J. (2019). More Than Virality: Online Sharing of Controversial News With Activated Audience. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 97(1), 118-140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699019836950>
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S. & Kleinman, S. B. (2012). Preelection Selective Exposure. *Communication Research*, 39(2), 170-193. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650211400597>
- Kubey, R., Larson, R., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). Experience Sampling Method Applications to Communication Research Questions. *Journal of Communication*, 46(2), 99-120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1996.tb01476.x>
- Kümpel, A. S. (2019). The Issue Takes It All? *Digital Journalism*, 7(2), 165-186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2018.1465831>
- Larsson, A. O. (2019). Winning and losing on Social Media-Comparing viral political posts across platforms. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 7(2), 165-186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jnr.490380513>
- Lee, C. S. & Ma, L. (2012). News sharing in social media: The effect of gratifications and prior experience. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(2), 331-339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.10.002>
- Liu, D. & Campbell, W. K. (2017). The Big Five personality traits, Big Two metatraits and social media: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 70, 229-240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.08.004>
- Lottridge, D. & Bentley, F. R. (2018). Let's Hate Together. How People Share News in Messaging, Social, and Public Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '18* (paper n. 60). ACM Press. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173634>
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A Radical View*. McMillan.
- Marwick, A. E. & boyd, d. (2011). I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society*, 13(1), 114-133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444810365313>
- Noguera-Vivo, J. M. (2018). You get what you give: Sharing as a new radical challenge for journalism. *Communication & Society*, 31(4), 147-158. <https://doi.org/10.15581/003.31.4.147-158>
- Oeldorf-Hirsch, A. & Sundar, S. S. (2015). Posting, commenting, and tagging: Effects of sharing news stories on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 44, 240-249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.024>
- Orellana-Rodriguez, C. & Keane, M. T. (2018). Attention to news and its dissemination on Twitter: A survey. *Computer Science Review*, 29, 74-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COSREV.2018.07.001>
- Ross, C., Orr, E. S., Sisic, M., Arseneault, J. M., Simmering, M. G., & Orr, R. R. (2009). Personality and motivations associated with Facebook use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25(2), 578-586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHB.2008.12.024>
- Segado-Boj, F., Díaz-Campo, J., Fernández-Gómez, E., & Chaparro-Domínguez, M.-Á. (2019). Spanish academics and social networking sites: Use, non-use, and the perceived advantages and drawbacks of Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, ResearchGate, and Academia.edu. *First Monday*, 24(5). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v24i5.7296>

- Segado-Boj, F., Díaz-Campo, J., & Quevedo-Redondo, R. (2019). Influence of the 'News finds me' Perception on News Sharing and News Consumption on Social Media. *Communication Today*, 10(2), 90–104. Retrieved from <https://www.communicationtoday.sk/wp-content/uploads/07.-SEGADO-BOJ-et-al.-%E2%80%93CT-2-2019.pdf>
- Shin, J. & Thorson, K. (2017). Partisan Selective Sharing: The Biased Diffusion of Fact-Checking Messages on Social Media. *Journal of Communication*, 67(2), 233–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12284>
- Swart, J., Peters, C., & Broersma, M. (2018). Shedding light on the dark social: The connective role of news and journalism in social media communities. *New Media & Society*, 20(11), 4329–4345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818772063>
- Thompson, N., Wang, X., & Daya, P. (2019). Determinants of News Sharing Behavior on Social Media. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 60(6), 593–601. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2019.1566803>
- Waterloo, S. F., Baumgartner, S. E., Peter, J., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2018). Norms of online expressions of emotion: Comparing Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and WhatsApp. *New Media and Society*, 20(5), 1813–1831. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817707349>
- Winter, S., Metzger, M. J., & Flanagin, A. J. (2016). Selective Use of News Cues: A Multiple-Motive Perspective on Information Selection in Social Media Environments. *Journal of Communication*, 66(4), 669–693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12241>
- Witschge, T., Anderson, C., Domingo, D., & Hermida, A. (2018). Dealing with the mess (we made): Unraveling hybridity, normativity, and complexity in journalism studies. *Journalism*, 20(5), 651–659. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884918760669>
- Yang, C. (2016). Instagram Use, Loneliness, and Social Comparison Orientation: Interact and Browse on Social Media, But Don't Compare. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 19(12), 703–708. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2016.0201>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

FRANCISCO SEGADO-BOJ, Ph.D., assistant professor at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. He is accredited as tenure university professor (since 2014) and has 12 years of research experience (2004-2009, 2010-2015). He codirects the research group History and Structure of Communication and Entertainment. His line of work covers digital journalism, social media, and scholarly communication. He has published more than thirty articles in JCR or Scopus journals such as Telematics & Informatics, Journal of Scholarly Publishing, or Comunicar.

* *The author has been working full-time at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid since November 2019.*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7750-3755>

MARÍA-ÁNGELES CHAPARRO-DOMÍNGUEZ, Ph.D., assistant professor at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. She has the accreditation of tenure university professor from ANECA and a six-year research period (2009-2014) recognized by the CNEAI. She has been a visiting researcher at the SINTEF center in Oslo (Norway) and has published about thirty articles in journals such as Journalism Practice, Global Media and Communication, Young, or Nordicom Review. She has participated in four publicly funded R&D&i projects.

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7571-388X>