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Adoption of social media platforms among adults in the United States

**Abstract:** Social media has evolved over the last decade to become an important driver for acquiring and spreading information in different domains such as business, entertainment, crisis management and politics. The aim of this paper is to analyze the social media activities of adults in the US in order to find the relevant social media with respect to age, gender, income and education. The analysis used a freely available dataset that contains information related to 2002 respondents from the U.S. and their social media activity. This paper shows that as age increases, social media use decreases. The opposite effect occurs with higher household income and education, as higher levels of both variables lead to increased social media use. Facebook and Instagram are the dominant social media in 2018 and 2019. Men are more active daily on YouTube than are women by more than 10%. YouTube use decreases as income increases. The information and data in this paper confirmed the research results of other studies that companies and marketers could improve their effectiveness on social media with respect to brand awareness, quality feedback, expansion and finding customers or employees.
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1. Introduction

Social media has evolved over the last decade to become an important driver for acquiring and spreading information in different domains, such as business, entertainment, science, crisis management and politics (Stieglitz et al. 2018). One reason for the popularity of social media is the opportunity to receive or create and share public messages at low costs. The growth of social media usage opens up new opportunities for analyzing several aspects of and patterns in communication. For example, social media data can be analyzed in order to gain insights into issues, trends, influential actors and other kinds of information (Stieglitz et al. 2018; Golder and Macy 2011). The term “Social Media Analytics” has gained a great deal of attention. It is defined as “an emerging interdisciplinary research field that aims on combining, extending, and adapting methods for analysis of social media data”(Zeng et al. 2010).

Since the rise of social media usage in the last decade, people have been seeking to gain information from the public as an additional information source to traditional media. We use the term social media to refer to “Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0”, where Web 2.0 means that “content and applications are no longer created and published by individuals, but instead are continuously modified by all users in a participatory and collaborative fashion”(Kaplan and Haenlein 2010b).

Many studies have touted the advantages that social media would bring to individuals and firms (Kaplan and Haenlein 2010a; Kumar et al. 2016; Sabate et al. 2014). For firms, this means that social media could improve marketing, public relations, customer service, product development, personnel decision-making, feedback and other business activities that rely on information exchanges and engagement with consumers and employees. Many of these advantages have materialized, thus resulting in almost 50% of all EU firms using at least one form of social media in 2017 (Eurostat, 2017b).

The emergence of social media platforms (e.g., Twitter and Facebook) has fundamentally altered the marketing landscape. Social media allows consumers to create and exchange user-generated content (UGC), thereby enabling them to connect with firms and other consumers. Consumers are no longer passive recipients of marketing messages, but rather they actively engage with firms and other consumers in order to share their own insights and to learn from others’ experiences (Chu and Kim 2011; Saboo, Kumar, and Ramani 2016).

Firms are surrounded by a multitude of social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Myspace, and LinkedIn) and spend significant resources understanding their social media’s ecology. Executives are under constant pressure to engage their audiences and motivate them to follow, like, or share their company’s marketing messages with their friends in an effort to influence consumer purchase decisions (Saboo, Kumar, and Ramani 2016). Brands such as Coca-Cola, Starbucks, Red Bull, and Converse each boast over 35 million fans on Facebook alone and spend significant organizational resources managing them. Firms have created specialized positions to handle their social media marketing. Social media, in fostering communication and connecting people and companies, represent ‘a vehicle for developing customer insights, accessing knowledge, cocreating ideas and concepts with users, and supporting new product launches’(Roberts, Piller, and Lüttgens 2016).

Among many types of organizations, enterprises are the most active users of social media analytics. Analyzing social media data in order to better understand why customers purchase a product or service plays an important role in sustaining competitive advantages (Lee 2018). Social media analytics equipped with advanced techniques have significantly affected a company’s ability to leverage otherwise unattainable social media intelligence. Enterprises can better understand customer behaviors by combining the intelligence that is acquired by social media platforms with traditional customer intelligence (Sigala and Chalkiti 2015). Social media can be defined as relatively cheap and easily accessible electronic tools that enable the sharing of and access to information, cooperation towards a common goal, or creation of new friendships or relations (Jue, Marr, and Kassotakis 2010).

Lurking behaviors on social networking sites seem to be increasing. In addition, people are using social media news websites more frequently and at increasing rates (Warner-Søderholm et al. 2018; Sponcil and Gitimu, n.d.). This is a cause for concern since it is much easier for people to fall victim to online deception with the number of users who exist on social media and the ease of creating an account (Tsikerdekis and Zeadally 2014). Another problem that is associated with the heavy use of social media is how difficult it can be to decipher the difference between trustworthy and nontrustworthy information/websites (Warner-Søderholm et al. 2018).

While almost every user shares some information, the type of information that is shared is not equal but is determined by the personality traits of the users. Furthermore, the proportion of the population using cellphones for Internet access has increased from 85.8% to 90.1% (Zheng et al. 2016). It is clear that the use of social media has increased in last few years, but how does social media use differ across varying age, income or gender groups? Zheng’s study shows how males and females differ when posting pictures, which is closely connected to social media activity. For example, female users more often post a picture of their face than male users and both males and females post similar numbers of photos with family.

Individuals often use social media to seek and obtain social support (Steinfield, Ellison, and Lampe 2008; Wright et al. 2003); however, the nature of the support that is afforded by social media may vary according to the intensity of relationships. Several studies have suggested that the levels of social support are related to emotional closeness in social relationships and that the intensity of social media use is related to the degree of intimacy in relationships (Sutcliffe, Binder, and Dunbar 2018).This paper will focus on the following research questions.

RQ1: How are respondents/people currently active on social media?

RQ2: How do education, gender, age and income influence social media use and how can marketers use it?

The answers to these questions will help to understand the actual trends and future development of social media. Understanding the frequency of social media use across groups can be used by companies and their marketers to expand to other markets, find new customers, find new employees, improve their company’s image or get quality feedback on products or services.

There are also a few hypotheses in this paper connected to research questions. First is the hypothesis regarding if there is a significant difference in the usage of social media across different education levels or if education has no influence on social media activity. A similar hypothesis to the first is if household income significantly affects social media activity or it remains the same across all income groups.

2. Methods

2.1. Study design

The analysis in this report is based on telephone interviews that were conducted January 3-10, 2018. The national sample included 2002 adults who were 18 years of age or older and lived in one of the 50 U.S. states or the District of Columbia. (500 respondents were interviewed via a landline telephone, and 1,502 were interviewed via a cellphone, including 1,071 who had no landline telephone.) The survey was conducted by interviewers under the direction of ABT Associates, Inc. A combination of landline and cell phone random-digit-dialed samples were used, and both samples were provided by Survey Sampling International. The interviews were conducted in English and Spanish. The respondents in the landline sample were selected by randomly asking for the youngest adult male or female who is now at home. The interviews in the cell sample were conducted with the person who answered the phone if that person was an adult 18 years of age or older. The respondents were asked many questions that are not directly related to social media use and therefore these questions are not used in the paper. For detailed information about the Pew Research Center survey methodology, see the following link: <http://www.pewresearch.org/methodology/u-s-survey-research/>**.**

2.1. Study design

The data from the data set were first analyzed, and the variables that were not relevant for this article were removed. Then, we created tables of users for selected the social media, which are Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, and Snapchat. To answer the research questions, we mostly used tables that were divided by on the types of social media. For answering the hypotheses, we used statistical calculations that were conducted using specialized statistical software. For the statistical analysis, we used IBM SPSS statistical software, and the Pearson correlation coefficient was used to analyze the correlations. Another test that was used was the ANOVA (Analysis of variance), which was conducted in order to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in social media use between different age, household income or gender groups. For finding the differences between two groups, we used the Mann-Whitney and Kolmorgorov-Smirnov tests.

3. Results

Across the 2002 respondents, 458 use Twitter, 627 use Instagram, 1336 use Facebook, 451 use Snapchat and 1450 use YouTube. Only 365 respondents marked they do not use any of those. A total of 921 of the respondents are female and 1081 are male. All of the respondents are over 18 years old.

The first test is if there is any difference in the social media activity with respect to age. For this reason, the correlation between social media use and age was assessed. A strong negative correlation was detected when comparing age and social media use. A new variable “usage of social media” was created in order to represent these calculations. For example, if the respondent used only Facebook and YouTube, this variable will be 2. If respondent uses Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat, the variable will be 5. The correlation is -0,492, with N=1998, a significance level of 0,01 and a p-value of 0,000. As expected, the higher the age, the fewer social media that the respondent uses. Older people do not follow social media trends as much or they just stay on one of their favorite social media.

The next test is for finding the differences between education and social media presence. The ANOVA test provides unexpected results regarding the difference between education and respondents’ social media use. There is an increasing trend of using much social media when someone has more education. It could be said that higher education leads to more social media use. The result of a Bonferroni post hoc test is shown in the table below.

**Table 1**: ANOVA – Results of the Bonferroni post hoc test (Relationship between social media use and level of education. The answers “Don’t know” and “Refused” are not shown, and the mean difference for “Less than high school” comes from our own research).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Social media activity and the highest education level attained | | |
| High school incomplete (Grades 9-11 or Grade 12 with NO diploma) | **>** | Less than high school (Grades 1-8 or no formal schooling) |
| **Mean Difference: -,36007** |
| High school graduate (Grade 12 with diploma or GED certificate) | **>** | High school incomplete (Grades 9-11 or Grade 12 with NO diploma) |
| **Mean Difference: -0,77532** |
| Two-year associate degree from a college or university | **>** | High school graduate (Grade 12 with diploma or GED certificate) |
| **Mean Difference: -0,85041** |
| Some college but no degree (includes some community college) | **>** | Two-year associate degree from a college or university |
| **Mean Difference: -0,86941** |
| Some postgraduate or professional schooling, but no postgraduate degree (e.g., some graduate school) | **>** | Some college but no degree (includes some community college) |
| **Mean Difference: -1,11476** |
| Postgraduate or professional degree, including master's, doctorate, medical or law degree | **>** | Some postgraduate or professional schooling but no postgraduate degree (e.g., some graduate school) |
| **Mean Difference: -1,13018** |
| Four-year college or university degree/Bachelor's degree (e.g., BS, BA, AB) | **>** | Postgraduate or professional degree, including master's, doctorate, medical or law degree |
| **Mean Difference: -1,20205** |

As can be seen in table 1, the lowest social media activity is for respondents with “less than high school”. Then, the activity is higher but similar for the next three groups, which are “High school graduate (Grade 12 with diploma or GED certificate)”, “Two-year associate degree from a college or university” and “Some college but no degree (includes some community college)”. Other significant increases are in the group of “Some postgraduate or professional schooling, but no postgraduate degree (e.g., some graduate school)” and “Postgraduate or professional degree, including master's, doctorate, medical or law degree”, while “Four-year college or university degree/Bachelor's degree (e.g., BS, BA, AB)” had the highest social media use.

Another unexpected result was discovered when comparing social media use with respect to household income. There is a similar trend with those two variables, i.e., greater household income results in more social media use. However, it is not supported by the Bonferroni post hoc test because this test is too conservative, and statistical significance is only found for the “Less than $10,000” and “100,000 to under $150,000“ income groups, but the trend is visible across the 2002 respondents. The table below shows the means of social media use for the income categories.

**Figure 1**: Social media use with respect to income (own research).

When searching for differences between male and female social media use, the author tested the null hypothesis “The distribution is the same across men and women”. These groups differ when categorized again by age, but combined they are almost the same.

The following tables (tables 3 – 7 in appendix) describe the respondents who responded that they use the selected social media. 1336 respondents use Facebook. The table compares those users based on age, gender, income, and education with respect to the frequency of how often they use the selected social media. Each table addresses a different social media. With respect to the other social media, 1450 respondents use YouTube, 458 use Twitter, 627 use Instagram, and 451 use Snapchat.

There are also differences that are confirmed by the Bonferroni post hoc test with respect to marital status. Married individuals use fewer social media.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Facebook (N=1336)\*\*** | | | | |
|  | **Several times a day** | **About once a day** | **A few times a week** | **Every few weeks** | **Less often** |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-28 | 51,60% | 18,80% | 17,20% | 4,40% | 8,00% |
| 29-38 | 51,33% | 24,34% | 16,37% | 2,65% | 5,31% |
| 39-48 | 52,97% | 19,18% | 12,79% | 4,57% | 10,50% |
| 49-58 | 49,33% | 27,35% | 16,59% | 1,79% | 4,93% |
| 59+ | 40,98% | 23,71% | 22,16% | 5,67% | 7,47% |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 45,10% | 21,36% | 20,03% | 6,38% | 7,12% |
| Women | 51,37% | 24,39% | 15,09% | 3,05% | 5,64% |
| **Income\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| <$30,000 | 52,45% | 20,75% | 13,83% | 3,75% | 9,22% |
| $30,000-$49,999 | 49,49% | 25,25% | 18,69% | 3,54% | 3,03% |
| $50,000-$74,999 | 47,06% | 25,49% | 18,95% | 5,23% | 3,27% |
| $75,000+ | 45,39% | 23,46% | 20,39% | 6,14% | 4,61% |
| **Education\*\*\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| High school or less | 52,78% | 21,67% | 14,44% | 3,61% | 7,50% |
| Some college | 51,71% | 20,00% | 17,56% | 5,37% | 5,37% |
| College+ | 45,22% | 24,25% | 19,53% | 5,11% | 5,90% |

**Table 2**: Overview of Facebook users (own elaboration).

“Living with a partner” and have “Never been married”. “Never been married” is the group that uses social media the most, and the group of “Widowed” uses social media the least.

\*Income is household income (not individual).

\*\* The sum of the age, gender, income or education groups is not equal to all respondents who marked that they use Facebook, YouTube, Snapchat, Twitter or Instagram because a few respondents refused to answer the age/gender/income/education questions and 6 respondents refused to answer the question about how often they use the selected social media.

\*\*\*Possible answers for education were “a) Less than high school (Grades 1-8 or no formal schooling); b) High school incomplete (Grades 9-11 or Grade 12 with NO diploma); c) High school graduate (Grade 12 with diploma or GED certificate); d) Some college, but no degree (includes some community college); e) Two-year associate’s degree from a college or university; f) Four-year college or university degree/Bachelor’s degree (e.g., BS, BA, AB); g) Some postgraduate or professional schooling, but no postgraduate degree (e.g., some graduate school); and h) Postgraduate or professional degree, including master’s, doctorate, medical or law degree (e.g., MA, MS, PhD, MD, JD)“. In the tables, a, b and c were used for “High school or less“; d and e were used for “Some college“; and f, g and h were used for “College+“.

In the table2 (and attachments), it can be seen that over 50% of the Facebook users in the 18-28, 29-38 and 39-48 age groups use this social media “Several times a day“. Women are 6% more active than men on Facebook in the case of “Several times a day and are 3% more active in case of “About once a day“.

In regard to YouTube, activity on this social media falls as age increases, being that 43.34% of the 18-28 age group and 13.86% of 59+ age group use it several times a day. Men are daily more active on YouTube than Women by more than 10%. YouTube activity also decreases as income increases, given that 36.36% of those with household incomes less than $30,000 and 19.92% of those with household incomes of $75,000+ use it several times a day.

Twitter activity seems to be similar in the 18-28, 29-38, 39-48 and 49-58 age groups, but there is increasing activity in regard to income. Approximately 22.12% of the less than $30,000 income group, 25.45% of the $50,000-$75,000 group and 31.55% of the higher than $75,000 group uses Twitter several times a day.

Instagram activity is mostly about posting photos, and it is clear that lower ages have higher Instagram activity. Approximately 54.5% of the 18-28 age group, 40.3% of the 29-38 age group, 30.10% of the 39-48 age group, 22.5% of the 49-58 age group and only 9.5% of the 59+ age group use it several times a day. Activity across gender, income and education groups are very similar with respect to using Instagram several times a day. Snapchat use is similar to Instagram use in that Snapchat use decreases substantially as age increases, and men and women use this social media similarly.

3. Discussion

This paper investigates the social media use of 2002 respondents in the United States. It has been shown that as age increases, the number of used social media decreases. As education and household income increase, social media use increases. This could be because people with higher household income have more free time and they spend it on social media or they are using them for work. Social media presence increases as education increases. This may be because more educated people desire more information and they try to find it on social media.

Further research could analyze more aspects that can influence social media activity such as smartphone/tablet/desktop users, birthplace, employment, television use, Internet speed or marital status. Why are women more active on Facebook and men more active on YouTube and Twitter? Why is the “several times a day” category smaller for YouTube and larger for Twitter? There are still many aspects that need further study.

There is power in social media. If someone can understand how social media works, how people use them and how often, the results would allow marketers and businesses to better target their campaigns, help start businesses, improve brand awareness, expand into other markets, increase the number of customers or obtain quality feedback. The increasing popularity of social media raises a number of questions regarding why we use social media so much and what aspects influence this activity. What about gender? What about education, income, age or social status? This paper tries to answer some of these questions using statistical analyses and by dividing overall social media use into the selected social media, which are Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, YouTube and Twitter. As expected, as age increased, social media use decreased. When testing whether education affects social media use, it has been shown that as education increases, social media activity increases, and this interesting trend can also be seen with household income. That is, the bigger that household income is, the more that social media is used. Overall, it could be said that people with high household incomes and high education use social media the most or at least most of the social media.

From the 2002 respondents, only 365 indicated that they do not use any of the selected social media. Across the age, gender, income and education groups for Facebook users (N=1336), a majority of users indicated that they use Facebook “Several times a day”. The results from this dataset show that Facebook users are 50.68% male and 49.32% female.

Activity on YouTube (N=1450) differs from Facebook with respect to users who use YouTube as “A few times a week”. Furthermore, 56,71% of YouTube users are male and 43,29% are female. Men use YouTube slightly more than Women. Overall, in the case of YouTube, with respect to age, gender, income and education, the majority of YouTube users use it “A few times a week“. Twitter (N=458) users are similarly distributed among “Several times a day”, “About once a day” and “A few times a week”. With respect to Twitter users, 55.7% are men and 44.3% are women. The last studied social media is Instagram, which is composed of 49.52% men and 50.48% women.

It is likely that the popularity of social media will continue to increase and, in the coming years, there will be more users who use those social media several times a day since users will be accustomed to them. The data and information in this study are valuable for marketers and companies who want to use the power of social media all around the world, but especially in the USA.

In comparison to other continents, according to the statistics portal Statista.com, North America has the largest social media activity worldwide. With respect to the percentage of the global population using Facebook by region, North America leads with 72.4%. It is followed by Latin America and the Caribbean with 57.3%, Australia with 48.1%, Europe with 41.7%, and the Middle East with 34.6%. In Asia and Africa, the number is below 15%. For comparison, Instagram is among Europe's fastest growing social networks in 2018 and 2019. Russia, Turkey and the United Kingdom were all ranked among the top countries worldwide with respect to having the most Instagram users.

CONCLUSION

There are many benefits of social media for companies, organizations and their brands. When companies try to increase brand awareness, they should target users on Instagram and Facebook. It is shown in the table “Overview of Instagram users” that approximately 50% of Instagram users who are 18-38 years old use Instagram several times a day. In case of the table “Overview of Facebook users“, this number is even higher. Conversely, Snapchat and Twitter do not work in the same manner. Similar advice could be applied when companies want to increase their website traffic. In the case that the age of ideal customer is approximately 30 or higher, companies should market on YouTube and Twitter since the activity of those age groups are higher on those two social media.

The overall conclusion is that Facebook and Instagram are the dominant social media in 2018/2019 and that companies should focus their marketing mainly on those networks if they want boost sales, promote content, go viral, learn more about their customers or keep an eye on the competition.
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Appendix Overview of users

**Table 3** Overview of Facebook users (own elaboration).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **YouTube (N=1450)\*\*** | | | | |
|  | **Several times a day** | **About once a day** | **A few times a week** | **Every few weeks** | **Less often** |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-28 | 43,34% | 19,45% | 27,99% | 5,80% | 3,41% |
| 29-38 | 32,13% | 18,07% | 37,35% | 7,23% | 5,22% |
| 39-48 | 30,09% | 19,91% | 30,97% | 11,95% | 7,08% |
| 49-58 | 17,48% | 12,60% | 39,02% | 17,48% | 13,41% |
| 59+ | 13,86% | 14,11% | 38,12% | 17,82% | 16,09% |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 30,49% | 18,54% | 33,17% | 10,49% | 7,32% |
| Women | 20,77% | 14,22% | 36,58% | 15,18% | 13,26% |
| **Income\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| <$30,000 | 36,36% | 17,61% | 28,41% | 8,81% | 8,81% |
| $30,000-$49,999 | 30,88% | 14,71% | 32,84% | 11,76% | 9,80% |
| $50,000-$74,999 | 22,86% | 16,00% | 37,71% | 14,29% | 9,14% |
| $75,000+ | 19,92% | 17,24% | 38,51% | 14,75% | 9,58% |
| **Education\*\*\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| High school or less | 35,10% | 15,40% | 29,55% | 8,84% | 11,11% |
| Some college | 32,87% | 15,74% | 32,87% | 9,72% | 8,80% |
| College+ | 20,38% | 17,51% | 37,53% | 14,99% | 9,59% |

**Table 4**: Overview of Twitter users (own elaboration).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Twitter (N=458)\*\*** | | | | |
|  | **Several times a day** | **About once a day** | **A few times a week** | **Every few weeks** | **Less often** |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-28 | 31,97% | 26,23% | 19,67% | 10,66% | 11,48% |
| 29-38 | 25,97% | 18,18% | 23,38% | 16,88% | 15,58% |
| 39-48 | 26,58% | 13,92% | 34,18% | 7,59% | 17,72% |
| 49-58 | 29,11% | 20,25% | 17,72% | 16,46% | 16,46% |
| 59+ | 17,20% | 13,98% | 31,18% | 17,20% | 20,43% |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 29,53% | 20,08% | 23,62% | 11,02% | 15,75% |
| Women | 22,28% | 18,32% | 26,73% | 16,34% | 16,34% |
| **Income\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| <$30,000 | 22,12% | 20,19% | 24,04% | 14,42% | 19,23% |
| $30,000-$49,999 | 20,37% | 18,52% | 29,63% | 12,96% | 18,52% |
| $50,000-$74,999 | 25,45% | 21,82% | 23,64% | 14,55% | 14,55% |
| $75,000+ | 31,55% | 17,11% | 25,67% | 11,76% | 13,90% |
| **Education\*\*\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| High school or less | 21,36% | 18,45% | 31,07% | 13,59% | 15,53% |
| Some college | 33,33% | 22,67% | 25,33% | 9,33% | 9,33% |
| College+ | 26,26% | 18,71% | 22,66% | 14,39% | 17,99% |

**Table 5**: Overview of Instagram users (own elaboration).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Instagram (N=627)\*\*** | | | | |
|  | **Several times a day** | **About once a day** | **A few times a week** | **Every few weeks** | **Less often** |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-28 | 54,50% | 25,00% | 9,50% | 2,50% | 8,50% |
| 29-38 | 40,32% | 25,00% | 20,97% | 7,26% | 6,45% |
| 39-48 | 30,10% | 15,53% | 24,27% | 14,56% | 15,53% |
| 49-58 | 22,50% | 18,75% | 37,50% | 15,00% | 6,25% |
| 59+ | 9,52% | 17,14% | 42,86% | 15,24% | 15,24% |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 36,69% | 21,43% | 21,75% | 11,36% | 8,77% |
| Women | 35,35% | 20,70% | 26,11% | 7,01% | 10,83% |
| **Income\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| <$30,000 | 34,23% | 19,46% | 24,83% | 6,04% | 15,44% |
| $30,000-$49,999 | 42,11% | 18,95% | 25,26% | 9,47% | 4,21% |
| $50,000-$74,999 | 39,71% | 23,53% | 17,65% | 8,82% | 10,29% |
| $75,000+ | 32,33% | 22,84% | 23,71% | 12,93% | 8,19% |
| **Education\*\*\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| High school or less | 36,31% | 17,26% | 22,02% | 8,33% | 16,07% |
| Some college | 43,96% | 23,08% | 23,08% | 6,59% | 3,30% |
| College+ | 33,70% | 22,19% | 24,93% | 10,14% | 9,04% |

**Table 6:** Overview of Snapchat users (own elaboration).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Snapchat (N=451)\*\*** | | | | |
|  | **Several times a day** | **About once a day** | **A few times a week** | **Every few weeks** | **Less often** |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-28 | 64,68% | 14,22% | 11,93% | 1,83% | 7,34% |
| 29-38 | 34,52% | 19,05% | 32,14% | 5,95% | 8,33% |
| 39-48 | 30,19% | 16,98% | 26,42% | 15,09% | 11,32% |
| 49-58 | 19,05% | 9,52% | 40,48% | 9,52% | 21,43% |
| 59+ | 15,38% | 10,26% | 30,77% | 20,51% | 23,08% |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 45,29% | 17,04% | 20,63% | 7,17% | 9,87% |
| Women | 45,05% | 13,06% | 23,87% | 5,86% | 12,16% |
| **Income\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| <$30,000 | 50,00% | 14,15% | 18,87% | 3,77% | 13,21% |
| $30,000-$49,999 | 52,00% | 13,33% | 25,33% | 5,33% | 4,00% |
| $50,000-$74,999 | 35,42% | 20,83% | 22,92% | 10,42% | 10,42% |
| $75,000+ | 40,67% | 14,67% | 26,00% | 6,67% | 12,00% |
| **Education\*\*\*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| High school or less | 56,52% | 10,87% | 18,84% | 3,62% | 10,14% |
| Some college | 61,25% | 11,25% | 12,50% | 0,00% | 15,00% |
| College+ | 32,31% | 18,78% | 27,51% | 10,48% | 10,92% |
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