

Media intergenerational cooperation/conflict

Ana Melro

Universidade de Aveiro
alrmelro@gmail.com

Lídia Oliveira da Silva

Universidade de Aveiro/CETAC.MEDIA
lidia@ua.pt

Resumo

Desde a sua apropriação, passando pela objetivação, incorporação e, finalmente, pela conversão (Silverstone, et al., 1992, pp. 47-52), são variadas as formas como os indivíduos pertencentes às diferentes gerações (nascidos em 1950, 1970 e 1990) eliminam as barreiras à utilização dos novos *media*. Rivoltella (2010a) apelida mesmo os jovens de geração de ecrã (2010a, p. 6). Quanto ao público sénior, Salovaara (2010), refere que há várias situações que os iniciam na procura dos meios de comunicação e informação (2010, pp. 803-804). Mas será que há verdadeiras diferenças?

Mas quais serão as dinâmicas de utilização dos novos *media* em três gerações distintas? No presente artigo, analisam-se os resultados dos *focus groups* realizados, no final do ano de 2011, a membros das três gerações sobre a utilização dos novos *media* (televisão, computador e telemóvel), tanto através da reunião de indivíduos da mesma geração (multigeracionalidade), como da interação de membros das diferentes gerações (intergeracionalidade) (Villar, 2007, p. 115-116).

Palavras-chave: Gerações de ecrã, relações intergeracionais, utilização e apropriação dos *media*, áreas rurais

Abstract

From its appropriation, passing through objectification, incorporation and, finally, conversion (Silverstone et al., 1992: 47-52) there are several ways that individuals belonging to different generations (born in the 1950's, 1970's and 1990's) eliminate the barriers which exist in the use of media. Rivoltella (2010a) denominates the youngsters as the "screen generation" (2010a: 6). Regarding seniors, Salovaara (2010) refers that there are several situations which trigger their search for information and communication technologies (2010: 803-804). But are there real differences?

What are the use dynamics of new media in three different generations? In this article, we present the results of focus groups applied to members of three generations in Portugal at the end of 2011 regarding the usage of new media (television, computer and mobile phones). Those focus groups promoted the discussion among individuals of the same generation (multigenerationality), as well as interaction between different generations (intergenerationality) (Villar, 2007: 115-116).

Keywords: Screen generations, intergenerational relationships, media usage and appropriation, rural areas

1. Introduction

Nowadays, the way everything changes at a frantic pace causes changes and adaptations in various ways of doing, knowing and even feeling. Almost none of the practices of the twentieth century and perhaps the beginning of the twenty-first century persist today (Kenski, 2003: 48). How did we watch television in the 50s, 70s and 90s? How important is this medium today in the family? What perceptions regarding internet and computer have today individuals born in the 50th generation? What are these media for in the 70s or 90s generations? What role has the mobile phone in the lives of individuals born in the three decades? What differences exist in the forms of play and work in three generations?

This study focuses on the analysis of media consumption in rural context. Since most Portuguese investigations gives relevance to empirical data collection in urban areas, this perspective was considered more appropriate to analyse the use of new media in a different way, i.e., trying to understand if the uses in Portuguese rural areas were intensive, or if technological changes and the integration of media went a bit unnoticed to residents in rural areas and, if so, to understand why. Is the rural in disadvantaged in terms of technology? What should be the use of media by three generations living in rural areas? How many hours a day? What importance do they attach to the media?

In discussion are three generations - those born in the 1950s, 1970s and 1990s - and the goal was to frame the emergence and explosion of media in Portugal in the years that happened. The television had its first emissions in 1956; computer became popular in Portugal in 1980, but there is information of the emergence of some models in the 70s and, finally mobile phone began to be used in the 90's, first some models exclusively for cars, but soon everyone felt the need to have one (especially after the popularization of pagers and marketing strategy of prepaid tariff) (Teixeira-Botelho, 2011).

The goals to be achieved in this article are quite large, given the complexity of the study, its amplitude and duration (2011-2013)¹. However, this article discusses the following:

- Understand the way new media/screens are used by three generations – born in the decades of the 50s, 70s and 90s.

- Study the uses of new media/screens in different contexts – labor/school, leisure and familiar.
- Understand the role of new media as promoting intergenerational cooperation and/or conflict.

The article is organized into four central parts: the **first** will focus in a brief theoretical framework dedicated to three central elements: the issue of rurality and the dissemination of media (television, computer and mobile phone) in the Portuguese context taking into account the 50s, 70s and 90s as landmarks for its inclusion in the daily dynamics.

In the **second part** central importance is given to the most important concept of the article: generations, particularly with regard to cooperation and/or conflict in the use and, more specifically, the sharing of different media under study. This part is especially important because it allows the connection to the exploration of another central concept in the research, screen generations. Thus, **part three** of the article is devoted to the analysis and relevance of this concept, and to what its implicit inter and multigenerational use of media concerns.

The **fourth section** presents a brief description of the methodology used and focus mainly on the results and its discussion.

2. Related work

2.1. Socio-historical and cultural perspective of the integration of new media in Portuguese rural areas: in the 50s, 70s and 90s

Over the years, the Portuguese rural areas underwent profound changes: if agriculture was the predominant activity in the 50s/60s, since the end of the twentieth century it no longer is, which also led to a decrease in people dedicated to the land cultivation, indeed, the resident population began a migration process to urban areas, leaving rural ones a bit aged and thus deserted (CEE, 1988: 5-6).

Thinking about the technological innovations occurred in the beginning of the 50s, the memory that may arise associated with the media is the radio and the telephone, in fact,

these same technologies allowed and encouraged the development of television in the late 50s in Portugal, and of the mobile phone in the 90s (Williams, 1989 [1966]: 101).

In the early 70's, more specifically in 1974, the political event of April 25th stems social, cultural and economic changes that make the will to come back to Portugal grow. In addition, it was possible to observe a strong movement of the returnees, which are forced to return the former colonies. However, these population movements occurred to cities, where employment opportunities existed (CEE, 1988; Portela, 1997).

It was in the late '70s that the first computers appear in Portugal, first available only in the businesses and universities, but in the beginning of the 80s they began to arrive at some households with a smaller size and lower price.

In the 1990s the major changes were influenced mainly by technological developments, as well as its use by individuals. Using the explanation of Baptista (2011) to describe the rural that began to appear from the end of the last century, one can say that "Small towns and rural villages are still a family and birth rural, where the population continues to age and decline, but also occur new dynamics, habits and attitudes." (2011: 52).

The 90s decade were fruitful in the development and dissemination of technology. Televisions were transformed, as well as computers, and became more common. More and more households had at least two TV sets at the end of the decade (the percentage of homes with television was 91,3% in 1991 (Vieira, 2001: 55) and nearly 97% in 1999ⁱⁱ), and there were also laptops. In 1990, only 5% of Portuguese households own a computer, a percentage that increases to 31,4% in 1999ⁱⁱⁱ "and from this time is the explosion of the PC at home" (Roberto, 2010: 43), and in 2012 the percentage of personal computer holders was of 35,2 (Cardoso and Espanha, 2012).

For this study of media uses in rural areas, news headlines such as "One of the most advanced schools in the world is Portuguese"^{iv} and "Portuguese school among the world's most innovative"^v are hardly associated to the rural, but have gained special attention because they refer to that area. And this highlights a specific context: the school. But also in family Portela (1997) demonstrates the importance that media are gaining in rural areas, especially for children, says the author "at home is the escape in front of television, as often as they are authorized" (Portela, 1997: 6). According to OberCom statistics, about 32,3% of

respondents in the interior of Portugal, in 2009, use the internet, contrasting with 48,3% in Lisbon (Cardoso and Espanha, 2009).

For the technological development to be favoured in the interior regions of Portugal is necessary that a desire for their use exists, either in consumption practices, or in production ones (work or school). That the regions also develop their initiative and entrepreneurial capacity, however that can only be achieved if aided by technology and through the education for their use. Thus, we agree with Castells, which states that “technology per se does not solve social problems” (1999: 3).

Taking into account the access level, “the television (and we would say, the computer and the Internet) is available for new-borns right away in maternities and even the poorest families do not dispense them” (Portela, 1997: 7), However, the digital divide is evident in other aspects, “what is happening is that regions and firms that concentrate the most advanced production and management systems are increasingly attracting talent from around the world, while leaving aside a significant fraction of their own population whose educational level and cultural/technical skills do not fit the requirements of the new production system” (Castells, 1999: 3).

2.2. The concept of generations: an attempt of definition

The concept of generation assumes a central importance in the study that is being developed and those born in the 1950s, 1970s and 1990s are in evidence. Thus, generation includes here not only quantitative factors such as age or decade of birth, but also qualitative, as the feeling of belonging and sharing of common values among members of the same generation or its contrast (Mannheim, 1990 [1952]: 132-136). As stated by Scott (2010), “Generation (...) is more than age, because of its implications as social relations. It interferes simultaneously hierarchizing by generational differences and commiserating vertically and horizontally around relations of belonging familiar images in constant negotiation.” (2010: 252).

The choice of those generations for this research is related to the emergence of media and / or with the explosion of their use in Portugal. That said, there will be a brief approach to the generational concepts associated with media (for example, *e-generation* (Cardoso et al.,

2007), *digital generation* (Ponte, 2011), *net generation* (Simões and Gouveia, 2008), and others (Moura, 2009; Teixeira-Botelho, 2011; Rivoltella, 2010a)) and to the option of the concept of *screen generations* to this research.

In the notion of generation it is important to distinguish those living in the same time (contemporary), from those who are the same age (*'coevals'*), as claimed Eyerman and Turner (1998: 93). Indeed, for these authors, the concept of generation is still under construction, because it incorporates too many areas and includes many experiential variables. If, for the analysis of generations, we take in perspective cultural aspects, Eyerman and Turner (1998) gave an important contribution in this direction by proposing as fundamental the “collective memory” to understand individuals belonging to a particular generation. That is, when being integrated into a generation or *cohort*, people act in group, have homogeneous behaviors and are totally independent of other generations, share *habitus*, dispositions and culture (1998: 93).

In recent years, generational studies have focused their interest mainly into two groups: childhood/youth and the “third age”, for various reasons – that is not possible to enumerate here – the practices of the first ones (technological, isolation, school ...) and the way of living of the seconds ones (also isolation, but in this case, forced; poverty, increasing their life expectancy ...), but there is a gap in the middle generation, the designated adulthood. Domingues (2002) provides an explanation for this,

(...) those are exactly the tracks where the entrance into the labor market is not yet realized [children/youth] or the success has already taken place [“elderly”]. The worker citizen placed in the labor market and a father and a housewife married with children – i.e., young adults or middle-aged – had no problems that deserve to be studied with particular focus. (2002: 86).

It is also this gap that the present study intends to diminish, understand how the three generations relate and interact with each other and with the use of media, and how they do it alone. In this sense, we encounter theories of Gadamer (1960, pp. 307-12 cit. in (Domingues, 2002: 78)) and Mannheim (1928, cit. in ibidem, 2002). The first author incorporates the notion of “horizons fusion” to explain the relationship between different age groups of individuals and the understanding they make of their social experiences,

having as reference theirs and other generations' past and historical experiences, "not only coexist from different biological stages but also from different experiences and identities", what Mannheim names as "non-simultaneity of the simultaneous" (1952).

Thus, for the definition of generations multiple dimensions can be used, depending on the authors and respective theories, from the dominant area of study: familial, biological, social, cultural, legal and regulatory framework, the contrast with other generations, the identities which are formed. For the ongoing research interests mainly the appropriation of the nuclear family (and their descendants ramifications - grandparents, parents and children); from the *cohorts*, because we aim to approach the use of different media for individuals born in close moments; and how these individuals experience and can describe the use of media over the years.

We have presented the definition of the concept, however, to contextualize, it is assumed that the appropriation is achieved using micro and macrosocial particularities, i.e. the familial level, including the position of each person in a lineage (micro) (Bengtson & Achebaum, 1993 cit. by Walker and Fong, 2010: 425), and the age and years of birth (macro), i.e., the macrosocial specificities attributed to family relationships are crossed with macrosocial intergenerational relations (Walker and Fong, 2010: 426).

3. Screen generations: media usage and appropriation by three generations, in rural areas of Portugal

The widespread use of technology provided by the internet in the 90s led to the appearance of several concepts, attributed either to the technology itself, but also to the generation of use and other variables, as the geographic one. In the study developed by Radford and Connaway (2007), the authors decided to appropriate the designation of *Urban Screenagers* to refer to young people aged between 12 and 18 years (2007). The magazine of the newspaper Expresso, of February 6th, 1999 (No. 1371), nicknamed the young as *generation Internet*, concept that is later appropriated by Simões and Gouveia (2008) with a slight change, the *Net Generations* is the concrete term. According to the authors, "Students that belong to Net Generation have been exposed to digital technologies in mostly all parts of their lives, which has influenced the way they establish personal relationships" (2008: 4).

Teixeira-Botelho (2011) believes that those born between the 90 and 2000 are the *Generation Extreme* for making use of everything (mobile phones, smartphones, computers, social networking, internet, etc.) in an intense way (2011). Twenge (2006), in turn, believes that young Americans are part of *Generation Me*, a concept appropriated by Tom Wolfe, who defined the youth of the 70s as looking for a permanent self-satisfaction, the “self” is more important than everything else (2006).

Buckingham (2006) speaks of the net generation and Ponte (2011) shows the existence of a *digital generation* that, in comparison with the baby boomers, the first one is more alive and is more related to technological change, while the second would be the designated as a *television generation* (2011: 34). Moura (2009) develops a research project designated as *mobile generation*, having as a reference the *thumb generation* concept previously used by Howard Rheingold (Moura, 2009: 59). The author also uses the concepts of the *hippie generation* and *generation bit* to designate parents and children, respectively, differentiating them in terms of practices and use of new media.

If for Prensky the distinction between natives and digital immigrants (Prensky, 2001a; Prensky, 2001b) no longer makes sense, to speak of *digital wisdom*, through which the technology is used wisely, appropriating of suitable knowledge for such use to be the most profitable possible (2009), for White and Cornu (2011) the establishment of two categories/generations of users (*visitors* and *residents*) continues to be appropriate, because there are differences in the way each one sees and assimilates the internet, visitors regard it as a shed where they keep the tools to treat the garden, when they need to do some action, go to the shed and seek the best tool for this purpose, while residents understand internet as a building or park where they can easily find their friends or coworkers (White and Cornu, 2011). This utilitarian view is opposed to social vision of the utilization of the Internet and therefore the media.

Still regarding this perspective of media associated to the concept of generation, Henry Jenkins talks about *Transmedia Generation*^{vi} setting aside of the concepts of *Digital Generation*, *Generation.com*, or even *Digital Natives*. For the author this is a generation that correlates information from multiple communication channels, therefor the word transmedia means through various means. A generation with greater control over the

media, that creates blogs, shares content in social networks and still will continue to need the traditional media. A generation more participatory, which communicates in network and is mobilized politically.

Closer to the study presented here is the appointment of Rivoltella, which says that "(...) we speak of a "screen generation" marked by the fact of being in relation with a variety of screens and marked by the important presence of the mobile phone."^{vii} (2010a: 6), i.e. the way young people live in contact with screens, in particular by the presence of mobile phone makes them screen generation. The concept of *e-generation* (Cardoso et al., 2007) is another one attributed to the youngsters and children, born in the decades of 90 and 2000.

For Pinto (2005), Lipovetsky (2010), Rivoltella (2010b) and Frau-Meigs (2011) we live in a screen(s) society, we are screen(s) individuals. Other authors (Ponte, 2011; Rivoltella, 2010a; Simões and Gouveia, 2008) further believe that the massive use of different media is characteristic of a particular generation, however, in this study it is assumed that contact with the media (TV, computer and mobile phone) is performed with greater or lesser frequency, in all of them (the three generations which are to be analyzed), follow from this the use of the term generations and not generation. This usage also occurs not only when individuals are in a particular context, for example, the computer at work, or the television in the familiar space, it is present across all contexts, as indicated by Agger (2011) in the study about smartphone usage and how work is carried everywhere via the mobile device; Thompson (1998) in relation to social interactions in the context that we have established in informal context, leisure context, and Frau-Meigs (2011) with regard to the role of different media in the family.

It is not considered that the use of different concepts (*mobile generation*, *hippie* and *bit*) to designate different generations is appropriate, because the position of the research is to standardize individuals' activities belonging to generations having as a point of convergence the screen, the way media are used, having as intermediate screen(s), requires that it (they) take an essential character, building up with it(they) a relationship of intimacy, seduction and second skin, even though the use is set so dissimilar between different generations and the media in question (computer, phone and television).

Despite the diversity of studies analyzed, all of them show some shortcomings as its scope, namely, the lack of studies which focus on the intermediate generations, i.e. those considered in this study as the parents or adults. This led to further motivate the research that was conducted *Generation screen in rural areas* as a way to fill these gaps and to contribute to a groundbreaking study.

3.1. Inter and multigenerational relationships established in the use of new media

It was evident that it is important not only age or year of birth for the definition of generation, but also the family relationships, especially nuclear and extended family (Scott, 2010: 255), not only for the definition of some authors (Scott, 2010; Mead, 1970) the concept of generation, but also for the study to be developed, since interest to understand the uses and appropriations of new media, but also the way those uses take place in the family and the type of learning that has been performed. In this sense, Scott (2010) states that the authority of the older generations (adults and seniors) is placed a little in the background, especially with regard to the use of technologies, tools that the younger generations will have more knowledge and transmit prior to the first ones designated as post-figurative cultures (2010: 256-257). However, Mead (1970) defines this post-figurative culture as three generations being in permanent contact, despite the immutability of the culture of the older generations (1970: 116).

The definition of generation for this research also reflects about intergenerationality, defined by Villar (2007) as “the involvement of members of two or more generations in activities that could potentially make them aware of different perspectives (generational).” (2007: 115), but also multigenerationality, i.e., “the way of sharing activities and characteristics between generations, but an interaction or influence between them does not necessarily exists.” (2007: 116).

One can understand then that it's not the concern individuals solo but in constant interaction, belonging to a specific generation, and their use of media, as well as the sharing and learning made between generations, especially grandparents, parents and children, as stated Eisenstadt (1976 [1956]) “the process of maturation of several biological qualities

inherent to an individual is slow and depends largely on the constant interaction and learning with others.”^{viii} (1976 [1956]: 5).

4. Empirical data analysis and discussion: focus groups

Four focus groups were conducted in the town of Ponte de Lima, situated in north of Portugal, an option that was related to the demographic characteristics of the municipality, in particular, the total resident population of 43,498 inhabitants, and the population density of 135.8 inhabitants per square kilometre., distributed by 51 parishes, which allowed the sample selected to be easily found and belonged to one of the sixteen parishes considered rural.

The focus groups conducted were: three unigenerational with individuals from each generation being study (generation of the 50s: five individuals; generations of the 70s: nine individuals, and generation of the 90s: seven participants) and one multigenerational with eight participants belonging to each one of the generations.

Since the main purpose of focus groups is to put in discussion various individuals around one or more topics, that was precisely what was intended with its implementation in this study, putting in interaction individuals belonging to three generations, observe how they respond to each one of the statements which emerge regarding the use of media and analyze what is still divergent and convergent in members of the same generation. From here, it was even possible to obtain relevant statements that would help in building the questionnaire survey. The focus groups were supported by a script, with six groups of questions, they were recorded and filmed and lasted approximately 90 minutes.

In the later stage of the focus groups we have made content analysis and used NVivo 8 software. The first analysis provided information for the construction of an initial grid regarding the transcriptions, the grid included the main categories found. NVivo 8 helped in the process of coding and categorization of the main concepts, through the indexation of text transcripts. As the transcripts were being analyzed, trees of categories and relations between them were created, so it was possible to make comparisons between the different categories and generations.

We present content analysis results separated by some of the created dimensions: *perceptions regarding media; contexts of use of the media; ways of using the media (alone or accompanied) and intergenerational share/usage; the way media are used in rural areas (in comparison to the urban areas); and social relations*. Those dimensions were created as a result of the answers given by the participants and the main research goals.

With regard to the *perceptions regarding media*, it was observed that there is a difference when the analysis is done by comparison of generations, the generation of the 50s and the 70s typically present a more nostalgic in remembering the past view, while generation of the 90s only has present the way everything occurs today, there are no place to comparative perceptions^{ix}.

[Television] *was a surprise to the people of rural areas who had not so much knowledge, I still remember going to the grocery store or to the local café that exist in Sá to watch television. [...] Our generation reflects itself on television, isn't it!*
(FM50_61)

Today I do not see myself without a computer, do not see myself doing things by hand.
(RL70_36)

Regarding the *contexts of use of the media*, in the extracts it was possible to observe the issue of continuity between contexts, the lack of boundaries between what is defined as leisure, family and work/school space. Note that some of the actors, in a strategy of protection against the permeability of contexts, turn off the media they identify with work at night. In addition, there is also the aspect of using three media (TV, computer, and mobile phone) in a logic of multitasking and with a sense of obligation, i. e., it's quite unthinkable to go on vacation without mobile phone, for instance, and it is important (and sometimes necessary) to be fully connected.

It is unthinkable now go anywhere and do not carry a mobile phone. [...] Even on vacation. (CC70_41)

Yes, I'm watching TV, I'm working in the computer and I'm texting. (JC90_16)

Two more categories were created and analyzed: *ways of using media (alone or accompanied)* and *intergenerational share/usage*. We conclude that cooperative relations

are more frequent when help is needed to solve a problem with the media, but when it means using at the same time opinions are different:

Sometimes I ask [for help of people from other generations], if I have difficulties.
(HV50_53)

What I've learned regarding using the computer was by myself, the times that I need help I ask João [son] [...] (CC70_41)

[When I have difficulties in using media, I ask] my sister because she is three years older than me and already knows more about using technologies than me and sometimes I ask her. (MV90_13)

[Watching television] is always a struggle because of the channel choice, but only when we are all in the living room. (NAI90_16)

Most of the time [I use the media] alone. [...] Except the television that most time is always in family. (MV90_13)

The previous dimensions were quite important to understand the cooperation/conflict relations between generations in two ways: when it comes to share media or even to share problems that some individuals face when working with media. Moments of privacy and isolation are sought when some phone calls or text messages are answered, and conflicts may occur if those privacy moments are not respected. However, more social moments are looked for when it comes to watch a TV movie for instance.

In the way media are used in rural areas (in comparison to the urban ones) not all participants considered that there were clear differences, both in terms of number of usage hours, or regarding the access to media (information, advertising, possibility of purchase). However, a few respondents mention the slower access to the internet, or the need to travel to nearby towns to have more and better opportunities.

For example, people from urban areas use more the computer. (JCL50_55)

They [people residing in urban areas] are more attached to the computer and all that, are more closed. (NAn90_12)

One critic pointed out by almost all participants was the way *social relations* occur nowadays, despite the media allow shorten distances, also allow a certain complacency that permits for a person to be at home and have access to everything that goes on outside, perhaps the dichotomy virtual-present makes more and more sense, but not only with a negative slope, but also positive, it is possible to reach more people who are distant in time and space.

[...] now we no longer chat, because one is next to a phone, another is across the computer (IL50_54)

[...] in the past, even for studying, to do homework [...] a group was going there [to the library], today that doesn't happen, today the kids hardly go to the library [...] It is very easy to have information, only a single click and they have almost all the information. (RC70_35)

[Social relations] really change, because, for example to talk to a girl, we no longer have the courage my father had to go talk to her. (JC90_16)

Giving attention to quantitative results, we present on table 1 how the categorization and subcategorization was processed, the sources of which withdrew the excerpts of the focus groups and the references found in these excerpts in that category.

Table 1 – Focus groups analysis using NVivo 8

Name	Sub-category	Sub-category 2	Reference
Context			0
	<i>Place</i>	Familial	4
		Labour-school	16
		Leisure	5
	<i>Day time</i>	Morning	1
		Afternoon	6
		Night	4
Generations	<i>Cooperation-Conflict</i>		35
	<i>Memories of the past</i>	Computer	4
		Television	13

	<i>Family relationships</i>		29
	<i>Intergenerational relationships</i>		4
Media-Screens	<i>Use frequency</i>	Computer	9
		Mobile phone	7
		Television	7
	<i>Used media</i>	Computer	4
		Mobile phone	5
		Television	6
	<i>Media Preferences</i>	Computer	10
		Mobile phone	13
		Television	8
Social networks			24
Rural	<i>Rural-Urban</i>		20

Source: provided by the author.

Of the most mentioned categories in focus groups we should point the reference to cooperation and conflict relations in the use of media (35 references), in the same way that memories of the past have had some relevance in terms of reference by the participants, particularly in the television concerns (thirteen times).

In generations category is also important to mention the subcategory family relationships, to which the references made are in 29 excerpts (here has their relevance the television, element of reunion of family members, recognized by all generations).

Finally, it is worth mention the opposition between rural and urban. Although some authors argue that there should be a real dichotomy between what is considered rural and urban areas (Cimadevilla, 2010; Figueiredo, 2011) for the focus groups' participants there are some differences in how you access to technology (already mentioned in the excerpts). And in this table we can see that this opposition was mentioned 20 times.

Table 2 – Relationships between categories

From	Relationship	To	Reference
1950	Implies	Television	10

1970	Implies	Computer	16
1990	Implies	Mobile phone	29
Used media	Consequence	Social networks	53
Used media	Increases	Generation Cooperation-Conflict	64
Used media	Increases	Intergenerational relationships	33
Used media	Increases	Family relationships	58

Source: provided by the author.

From the relationships created between categories the purpose was to obtain meaningful information to answer the questions asked and starting to realize that the objectives of the investigation could be completed. Table 2 shows the results of the relations created.

So, starting with the differences in media usage across generations (1950, 1970 and 1990) it can be seen that television was mentioned 10 times by the generation of 50s, being this references made often because of its preference of use; the computer was mention 16 times by the participants of the 70s generation, mostly because of work necessity and in the 90s the mobile phone is mentioned 29 times as a result of the most used media.

The relations of cooperation and conflict when crossed with the use of media have 64 references, which is consistent with the number of references to the same category in Table 1. In the same way, family relations are made 58 references.

Conducting the focus group and respective analysis allowed us to have an insight into the fundamental categories and take into account the continuity of research held by questionnaire survey at national level (Portugal, including the islands).

5. Conclusions

With the research we tried to contribute with something original, that gives new reflections on the theme of media and their contexts of appropriation, whether referring to generational context, social or regional. Indeed, compared to the first, the concept of generation is often used in investigations already carried in its singular form, something that already is considered as having contributed, since we consider that the use of new media is a multigenerational phenomenon and often intergenerational, losing some sense the use of the concept in its singular way and gaining a new meaning its plural character.

The first conclusion is related to the transparency of screens, to the (easy) way screens meshed in the lives of individuals, so that the activities for which it is necessary to use new media are already carried out without being aware of their presence, and this is an essential feature for the development and expansion of any new technology. As Weiser claimed, in 1991, "The most profound technologies are those that disappear. They weave themselves into the fabric of everyday life until they are indistinguishable from it." (1991: 3).

Media are present in everyday life, whether in work or school activities, whether in leisure or family, one cannot think of a day when the mail is not consulted, a call is not answered, or a television program is not watched - sometimes we even combine the three at the same time. This may not be considered a disadvantage, but only if one takes into account the purposes for which such tasks are carried out and what it is being neglected with the use of media.

This presence causes often that its use is held in contact with members of other generations, watching TV with the family, for example, asking for help to solve a problem with any of the technologies. Thus, despite social relations suffer a decrease, especially in the generations of the 90's, intergenerational relations are mentioned by participants as having increased, being even listed as preferred media that allow this interaction, such as television.

According to what was possible to obtain from focus groups, daily appropriation of screens is present in all generations. It is not more specific to generation of the 90s, as some authors claim (De Smedt and Geeroms, 2006; Teixeira-Botelho, 2011), but it is certain that there is a predisposition for members born in the 90s to have a closer connection with all media, even with television. However, when they are asked to choose the preferred one, television is selected by the members of the generation of the 50s and 70s, while the ones born in the 90s prefer the mobile phone and the computer.

Living in rural areas has some recognized advantages by almost all participants, since they all agree to have the opportunity to spend more time to play outside – the specific situation of the generation of the 90s - and be able to disconnect at the end of the day and week - for the generation of the 50s and 70s. But they also agree that access is different compared to those living in urban areas, particularly in terms of quality (better network coverage) and access to technology at different times (the news come to urban areas earlier).

As mentioned, the research has another step that is the application of questionnaires at a national level, so we want to obtain results that can demonstrate and complement these initial findings. However, it is considered that these are of great interest given their extensive character in terms of variables comprising the study: generations, new media and rural areas.

6. References

- AGGER, B. (2011): "iTime: Labor and life in a smartphone era". *Time & Society*, 20, pp. 119-136.
- BAILEY, A. & NGWENYAMA, O. (2010): "Bridging the Generation Gap in ICT Use: Interrogating Identity, Technology and Interactions in Community Telecenters". *Information Technology for Development*, 16, pp. 62 - 82.
- BAPTISTA, F. O. (2011): "Os Contornos do Rural". In: Figueiredo, E. (ed.) *O Rural Plural - olhar o presente, imaginar o futuro*. Castro Verde: 100Luz, pp. 49-58.
- BUCKINGHAM, D. (2006): "Is there a digital generation?" In: Buckingham, D. and Willett, R. (eds) *Digital Generations: Children, Young People and New Media*. New Jersey: LEA, pp. 1-17.
- CARDOSO, G. & ESPANHA, R. (2009): *A Internet em Portugal 2009*. Lisboa: OberCom.
- CARDOSO, G. & ESPANHA, R. (2012): *Sociedade em Rede. A Internet em Portugal 2012*. Lisboa: OberCom.
- CARDOSO, G., ESPANHA, R. & LAPA, T. (2007): *E-Generation: Os Usos de Media pelas Crianças e Jovens em Portugal*. Lisboa: CIES-ISCTE.
- CARDOSO, G., ESPANHA, R., MENDONÇA, S., et al. (2012): *A apropriação dos telemóveis na Sociedade em Rede*. Lisboa: OberCom.
- CARDOSO, G., VIEIRA, J. & MENDONÇA, S. (2011): *Ecrãs em Rede. Televisão. Tendências e Prospectivas*. Lisboa: OberCom.
- CASTELLS, M. (1999): *Information Technology, Globalization and Social Development*. United Nations.
- CEE (1988): *The Future of Rural Society. Commission communication transmitted to the Council and to the European Parliament*. Bruxelas: CEE.
- CIMADEVILLA, G. (2010): "La cuestión rurbana: apuntes para una entrada comunicacional". *Intercom - Revista Brasileira de Ciências da Comunicação*, 33, pp. 73-85.

- DE SMEDT, T. & GEEROMS, C. C. (2006): *A European Research Project: The Appropriation of New Media by Youth*. Belgium.
- DOMINGUES, J. (2002): "Gerações, modernidade e subjetividade coletiva". *Tempo Social*, 14, pp. 67-89.
- EISENSTADT, S. N. (1976 [1956]): *De Geração a Geração*, São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva.
- EYERMAN, R. & TURNER, B. S. (1998): "Outline of a Theory of Generations". *European Journal of Social Theory*, 1, pp. 91-106.
- FIGUEIREDO, E. (2011): "Introdução: Um rural cheio de futuros?" In: Figueiredo, E. (ed.) *O Rural Plural - olhar o presente, imaginar o futuro*. 1ª ed. Castro Verde: 100 Luz, pp. 13-46.
- FRAU-MEIGS, D. (2011): *Penser la société de l'écran. Dispositifs et usages*, Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle.
- JONES, C., RAMANAU, R., CROSS, S., et al. (2010): "Net generation or Digital Natives: Is there a distinct new generation entering university?" *Computers & Education*, 54, pp. 722-732.
- KENSKI, V. M. (2003). Aprendizagem Mediada pela Tecnologia. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, 4(10), 47-56.
- LEVINSON, P. (1998 [1997]): *A Arma Suave - História Natural e Futuro da Revolução da Informação*, Lisboa: Editorial Bizâncio.
- LIPOVETSKY, J. (2010): *O Ecrã Global. Cultura mediática e cinema na era hipermoderna*, Lisboa: Edições 70.
- MANNHEIM, K. (1952): "The problem of generations". In: Mannheim, K. (ed.) *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 276-322.
- MANNHEIM, K. (1990 [1952]): "O Problema das Gerações". In: Mannheim, K. (ed) *Sociologia do Conhecimento*. Porto: Rés, pp. 115-176.
- MEAD, M. (1970): *Conflito de Gerações*, Lisboa: Publicações Dom Quixote.
- MOURA, A. (2009): "Geração Móvel: um ambiente de aprendizagem suportado por tecnologias móveis para a "Geração Polegar"". *VI Conferência Internacional de TIC na Educação*. Braga: Universidade do Minho, pp. 49-77.
- PINTO, M. (2005): "A busca da comunicação na sociedade multi-ecrãs: perspectiva ecológica". *Comunicar*, pp. 259-264.
- PONTE, C. (2011): "Uma geração digital? A influência familiar na experiência mediática de adolescentes". *Sociologia. Problemas e Práticas*, pp. 31-50.

- PORTELA, J. (1997): "O meio rural em Portugal: entre o ontem e o amanhã". *Seminário Internacional A Revitalização do Mundo Rural e o Ordenamento do Território*. Lisboa: Centro de Estudos para o Desenvolvimento Regional e Local, pp. 1-24.
- PRENSKY, M. (2001a): "Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants Part 1". *On the Horizon* 9, pp. 1-6.
- PRENSKY, M. (2001b): "Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants Part 2: Do They Really Think Differently?" *On the Horizon* 9, pp. 1-6.
- PRENSKY, M. (2009): "H. Sapiens Digital: From Digital Immigrants and Digital Natives to Digital Wisdom". *Innovate*, 5.
- RADFORD, M. & CONNAWAY, L. (2007): "Expect the Unexpected: Urban Screenagers' Communication and Information-seeking Preferences." *Urban Communication: Creating Sites for Connection and Action*. Texas: Gumpert, Gary Drucker, Susan, pp. 1-39.
- RIVOLTELLA, P. (2010a): "La screen generation: media, culture e compiti dell'educazione". *Cittadini in Crescita*, pp. 5-9.
- RIVOLTELLA, P. (2010b): "A sociedade multi-ecrãs. Das recomendações educativas à nova mídia-educação". *Educação on-line*.
- ROBERTO, J. (2010): "Anos 1990-1999. As novas tecnologias". In: Visão/Expresso (ed.) *Os nossos anos*. Lisboa: Planeta DeAgostini.
- SALOVAARA, A, LEHMUSKALLIO, A, HEDMAN, L., et al. (2010): "Information technologies and transitions in the lives of 55-65-year-olds: The case of colliding life interests". *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 68, pp. 803-821.
- SCOTT, P. (2010): "Gerações e famílias: Polissemia, mudanças históricas e mobilidade". *Revista Sociedade e Estado*, 25, pp. 251-284.
- SILVERSTONE, R., HIRSCH, E. & MORLEY, D. (1992): "Tecnologías de la información y de la comunicación y la economía moral de la familia". In: Silverstone, R. & Hirsch, E. (eds.) *Los efectos de la nueva comunicación*. Barcelona: Editorial Bosch, pp. 39-57.
- SIMÕES, L. & GOUVEIA, L. (2008): "Geração Net, Web 2.0 e ensino superior". In: Freitas, E. & Tuna, S. (eds.) *Cadernos de Estudos Mediáticos*. Porto: Universidade Fernando Pessoa, pp. 21-32.
- TEIXEIRA-BOTELHO, I. (2011): *Geração Extreme*, Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- THOMPSON, J. (1998): *A mídia e a modernidade: uma teoria social da mídia*, Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.
- TWENGE, J. (2006): *Generation me: why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled - and more miserable - than ever before*, New York: Free Press.

- VIEIRA, J. (2001): “Crónica em imagens 1990-2000”. In: Vieira, J. (ed.) *Portugal Século XX*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores.
- VILLAR, F. (2007): “Intergenerational or Multigenerational? A Question of Nuance”. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 5, pp. 115-117.
- WALKER, A. & FONG, F. (2010): “Relations between the generations: uniting the macro and the micro”. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 8, pp. 425-430.
- WEISER, M. (1991): “The Computer for the 21st Century”. *Mobile Computing and Communications Review*, 3, pp. 3-11.
- WHITE, D. S. & CORNU, A. L. (2011): “Visitors and Residents: A new typology for online engagement”. *First Monday*, 16.
- WILLIAMS, N. (1989 [1966]): *1939/1959. Cronologia Enciclopédica do Mundo Moderno*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores.

ⁱ This article is embedded in the investigation *Screen generations in rural areas*, that took place within the Ph.D. in Information and Communication in Digital Platforms (Doctoral Program in conjunction with the University of Aveiro and University of Porto), whose final results were presented in July, 2013, to University of Aveiro.

ⁱⁱ <http://www.pordata.pt/Portugal/Ambiente+de+Consulta/Tabela>, accessed September 12, 2012.

ⁱⁱⁱ <http://www.marktest.com/wap/a/n/id~109c.aspx>, accessed September 12, 2012.

^{iv} <http://visao.sapo.pt/uma-das-escolas-mais-avancadas-do-mundo-e-portuguesa=f547669>, accessed September 12, 2012.

^v <http://boasnoticias.clix.pt/noticia.php?noticia=8491>, accessed September 12, 2012.

^{vi} http://henryjenkins.org/2010/03/transmedia_generation.html, accessed September 12, 2012.

^{vii} Translation provided by the author.

^{viii} Translation provided by the author.

^{ix} At the end of each excerpt is presented the identification of their interlocutor. Identification is the first letter of first and last name of the participant, then the generation to which he/she belongs, followed by their age by the time the focus groups were conducted.