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Abstract

The question which is the most preferred type of documentary between linear and non-linear is discussed in the present study. In order to find out which is the preferred type we have created two documentaries one conventional and one interactive on same topic and we have presented them into two focus groups. The two focus groups reflected the viewing habits of digital natives who are people around the age of 18-25 and digital immigrants who are people above the age of 37. In this dissertation we clarify the viewing habits of the participants of both focus groups. With their answers, digital natives and digital immigrants, redefine the advantages and disadvantages of interactive video. Their responses give a clear precedence to conventional documentary due to the cinematic experience that it offers. Among the viewing habits of digital natives great importance is given into second screening and the on demand viewing. An important outcome of this research is the dispute of the advantages of interactive documentary.
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Introduction

How much do you know about web documentary? It is undeniable that you know the “traditional” documentary type which could be consumed through a mainstream platform, the Television or even through Internet especially YouTube. Nevertheless the new type of documentary the Interactive one constitutes an autonomous website. Have you ever wondered which the majority of people prefer? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each type or how the viewing habits of people change throughout the years?

This new trend in documentary production requires the user’s engagement. In the latest years many producers use interactivity in their productions, with the user engagement, the user is more focused while he/she is consuming the content and at the same time he/she is an active part of the story due to the ability to form the story, to navigate into the story as he/she wants and to choose his preferred ending on the story ending of the story of his/her opinion.

This thesis dissertation investigates the preferred type of documentary and the reasons why between the two focus groups testing them into two different generations. Also we will try to identify the viewing habits of two generations, digital natives and digital immigrants and determine the advantages and disadvantages of the web documentary.

First of all some characteristics of the traditional documentary will be discussed while we are explaining how the media landscape has been transformed and we are mentioning some terms in order to understand how the evolution from one type to the other was made. We end up in the interactive documentary and its characteristics.

One important feature which characterizes web documentary is the interactivity with the user that forms its uniqueness. In the second chapter we refer to four different types of interactivity which frame the web documentary. A comparison of two types of documentary will follow in the third chapter, by giving advantages and disadvantages of the interactive documentary.

Due to technology revolution our viewing habits have changed. As you can notice there is a huge gap in the way that young people consume media compared to the older ones. As Prensky noted we could call digital natives, young people who were born after 1982 and digital immigrants people who were born before 1982 and “Generation Z” or “I Generation” it is a term to describe the generation that is boned after 1994. Those terms will be explained
further in section four of this thesis dissertation while we mention the viewing habits of two generations.

In order to examine which type is more appealing to each generations we create two documentaries with the same topic, one interactive and one conventional which were tested into two different age groups 18-25 (digital natives) 35+ (digital immigrants). The methodology and the way we worked is presented in the fifth chapter.

An innovation of our project is that we present the production of the interactive documentary as a multimedia project step by step following the structure of a multimedia modeling (analysis, design, development, evaluation) which is presented in the sixth chapter.

Until now the researches about this topic were only focused at one age group, the digital natives. The innovation of this thesis is that we collect data from two age groups and we compare them. The results of the focus groups will be discussed in the seventh chapter where we answered our academic questions.

Finally we end up with the conclusions and tangible results and limitations of this research in the eighth and last chapter of this thesis.
1. From Linear to Non-Linear Documentary

1.1 Linear Documentary

Nowadays with the enrolment of technology in our lives many aspects of our daily life have changed, in this paper we will examine how the consumption of media by people has changed. Specifically we will focus on the documentary viewing which was transformed into an interactive experience between the viewer and the documentary with the help of technology. In our case the viewers can determine the narration with their own choices.

Defining the term documentary, the term first coined in 1926 by the man considered to be one of the fathers of documentary John Grierson. According to Grierson (1966) documentary is the “creative treatment of actuality”. Also Grierson highlights the process that is followed by a documentarist to weld various components, such as music, image, words, and sound, into an artefact to have functional and aesthetic appeal. The history of documentary from the late 40s until the late 80s is closely associated with the development of television (Kilborn and Izod 1997).

According to Kilborn and Izod (1997) documentary except from the socio – historical reality recording gives a form to the recorded material, sights and sounds, to be easily understood. Every frame is collected and placed to give a specific meaning, as a “documentary discourse”. Image and sound play an important role in the documentary film because they can give to a greater or lesser degree the meaning, they are products of a shaping intelligence (Kilborn and Izod 1997).

For Kilborn and Izod (1997) sometimes documentaries could not be more than a representation of events and issues of the real world. The main argument to engage the attention of their audience is that they present the world as it is but in Kilborn and Izod opinion documentaries can never be as objective as the audiences aspire. Except form the problem and solution documentaries are also perceived to present an argument or make a case but the evidence would be presented in a way that increase the likelihood of audience.

The way that we consider documentary nowadays changed a lot as we are able to consume documentary not only through television but also through the web even through social media. The web offered the on demand consumption which means you are able to consume the content of a documentary for example any time of the day you want. On demand consumption gaining more and more supporters because of the very fast life rhythms that our society
requires. This element put another factor according to the creation of documentary, except from the factor that documentaries are made for both media, television and the web, or even only for the web. The need for some interactivity showed up after the creation of documentaries for the web. The interactivity aims on a more user friendly experience and in a deeper and easier understanding of the content.

Even the way we learn has changed. The educational games are going to establish their existence into education and the students learning will be active and they will only be simple observers. The conventional learning makes them feel boredom easily. The documentary could characterize as teaching subject that is trying to absorb the new challenges by joining the game and the viewer to become instructive and interactive (Podara 2013).

The format of documentary changed between the years, now we are talking about multimedia projects, the combination of multiple media for example the combination of image, text, video, sound, interactive maps etc. According to Dimoulas (Dimoulas, 2015) the implementation of multiple media in one project which gives the opportunity to the viewer to create his/her own path of non – linear narration with the promoting interactivity types. In this way the stimulation of senses is achieved something that offers a rich media experience to the user (Podara 2013).

In this thesis dissertation with the term of linear documentary and the term conventional documentary we mean the same thing.

1.2. Transforming media landscape

Undoubtedly the technological evolution also affected the media landscape, nowadays we could talk about digitization of the newsroom, a rapid death of the newspaper and the rising establishment of the web form of news. The digitization of the newsroom started from the transition from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 and it is continuing to Web 2.5 – 3 and it is adapting to the “Internet of Thing” (Matsiola et al. 2015).

With Web 1.0 we refer to a term used to describe the very start of the World Wide Web were only static pages included. (Anon, 2018)The characteristics of Web 1.0 except from the static pages were also that the files were stored in files in different database; the content layout of the webpage was designed in the webpage often by misusing HTML elements such as tables. Also the user’s comments were saved in a guestbook and not directly to content pages,
additionally there were incompatibility problems between websites due to unsupported browsers and there were problems with the e-mailing of forms, it was not a direct process. *(Anon, 2018)*

The term Web 2.0 is defined as the second generation of the development of the World Wide Web which is combines concepts, trends, technologies and focuses on the user collaboration by sharing user generated content and give emphasis to the social character of the Web by embedding social media and offering interactive experience through blogs, wikis, forums a step bigger than just accessing information. *(Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 2012 Digital Edition)*

The access to information is more personalized and it is adapted in a multilevel such as mobility, location, content awareness. Users are able to produce huge amount of data, as a result there are needs of big storage capabilities and efficient content mechanisms. With the term semantic Web we mean the Web 3.0, very important features behind the story such as topic, empathy, meaning, are considered extremely expedient for both content understanding and media management purposes (i.e. opinion and sentiment recognition, content-based searching and retrieval, data summarization, visualization, interpretation, etc.). Thus intelligent Internet (Web 3.0 – Web 4.0) with smart processing algorithms is expected to integrate intelligent systems into semantic services *(Siapera, Veglis, 2012)*.

“Internet of Thing” combined with bigger storage capacity; with the help of cloud computing services and mobile cloud computing services aspire in advanced interconnection with all the electronic devices used in our daily life *(Dimoulas, Veglis and Kalliris, 2014)*. As a result of this rapid technological evolution, journalism could not be affected. New fields in digital journalism discovered and adopted in the journalistic processes such as drone journalism, data journalism, immersive journalism, multimedia journalism etc.

Journalistic process is used in our thesis dissertation for the creation of two types of documentaries in order to examine the viewing habits of two generations. Web documentary

---


could be considered as a part of digital journalism. The term “Digital Journalism” is used to describe the new fields that where adapted in journalism after the technology evolution. The informing of the public happens almost directly due to the ability that internet offers to go live or to publish on time and not to wait until the newscast. Also the public can be easily informed only through their mobile phone, at the same time “Digital Journalism” gave the opportunity to the public to have a unique experience through their information, as soon as journalistic practices embedded interactive technologies to give to the user an unforgettable experience and not just a dry transmission of information.

From one hand the new type of journalism passes the information faster, easier and in a unique experience, on the other hand there are some consequences that make the “Digital Journalism” weaker. One disadvantage is that cross check most of the time does not happen due to the race with the time at the publication part. The same product is published in different platforms and becomes impossible to control the expansion, in this way users are more susceptible to content forgery attacks, thus weakening the chances of thorough, versatile and unbiased informing (Katsaounidou, Dimoulas, 2018).

The rich media experience that new media offered is based on multimedia (combination of text, image, video, sound) and especially in the nonlinear storytelling techniques. At the same time it gave the ability to user to access the involved multimedia assets and create their own story or to choose the path to follow either in parallel (cross media publishing) or on transmedia concepts. Even though there are still problems due to different nonlinear navigation systems and the corresponding interactive technologies which can further create operating difficulties and lack of confidence to the average user (Dimoulas, 2015).

The evolution of technology and the invention of new types of journalism such as drone, data and robot journalism could be a threat to the human journalists especially for the computational and algorithmic thinking. Thus force human journalists to enrich their education with algorithmic and computational thinking but the most important advantage it is the ability of human journalists to write more appealing and humane news stories (Montal, Reich, 2016).

This new type of documentary behind the final product, in a theoretical perspective conclude terms like digital storytelling, multimedia, cross media publishing, terms that will be defined in the following paragraphs in order to understand the concept of the web documentary. One
of the main aspects of web documentary is the interactivity which will be explained and separated into categories in the following pages.

1.3. Terms and Definitions

To take it from the beginning, we are starting by explaining some terms as many theoreticians noted in order to understand the aspects, the possibilities and the aim of a web documentary. In the following section we define the terms of digital storytelling, cross media publishing, multimedia and finally web documentary while we present the main aspects and characteristics that a web documentary must have.

1.3.1. What is “Digital Storytelling?”

According to Couldry “Digital Storytelling” is a distribution of a novel which represents our world through different resources and shared infrastructure. Couldry mentioned that there are two “effects” through “Digital Storytelling” the first one is “mediation” and the second one is the “mediatization”. More specifically “mediatization” for Couldry is a transformation that could only be understood as a part of a wider transformation of social and cultural life through media from one direction to a common direction, with other words the “media logic” (the transformation of society by media) (Couldry, 2013).

Silverstone in 2002 defining the term “mediation” gave emphasis to the process that media symbolize the social life. According to Silverstone “mediation” helps us to understand how communication processes changed the social and cultural environment and the relationship between participants both individual and institutional environment. (Silverstone, 2002)

Mediation is a nonlinear process, more specifically it is a tow way work (media-work and must work) for the transformation that any future media could be produced and understood (Couldry, 2013).

Lambert in his book “Digital Storytelling” (2006) noted that the aim of digital storytelling is not to produce media for broadcast but to produce very powerful conversational media. According to Lambert digital storytelling is a technique that helps to understand better other generations, ethnicities, at the same time this technique helps in education to pass the message you want in an interesting way, through professional reflection and corporate communication.
At this point Couldry add that the aim of digital storytelling is the political change by making decisions to change the way we see an issue (Couldry, 2013).

Digital storytellers are not only journalists, creators of digital stories could be from simple citizens, by witnessing and recording events them with a camera, until employees who produce some digital content to present their idea or their work to the employer. The idea of digital storytelling where a person has a story and it is placed with other stories for exchange and reflection was formulated by Couldry in 2013 in his book “Digital Storytelling, media research and democracy”. In addition Couldry noted that we must see the digital storytelling as part of a more complex nonlinear process of “mediation” and not as the linear replaying of single media logic (Couldry, 2013).

1.3.2. Cross – Media Publishing definition

Digitization brought changes into the production of news, to the final product and to the dissemination to the end user. Digitization enabled the content to travel across different media and this resulted in the change of workflow in media organizations (Dimoulas, 2015). The news is produced once and adjusted for different publications channels. This procedure is called cross – media publishing. The cross media publishing gave the opportunity to media companies to expand their audience nevertheless each channel has its own characteristics and requires special information structures in order for the content to be produced.

Cross – media can be defined, according to Veglis, as the production of any content for more than one channel with the same media organization (Veglis et al., 2016). Usually cross – media involves some high level of audience interactivity, which interconnects the audiences’ experience across various channels. Another term used is “multiple media” indicating that the same content is delivered to end users in more than one medium. In other words “multi – channel publishing” is used to describe that the same content is published in various channels or media, more specifically the difference between the other terms is that it expands the concept from devices to content.

Finally the different channels for publishing do not represent different categories of technology or types of content but simply distinctive methods to publish news. The channels which are the means of dissemination of news by media companies around the world are: WWW, Webcasting, smartphones, tablets, e-mail, SMS, PDF, twitter, social networks and broadcasting (Veglis et al. 2016).
1.3.3. What is Multimedia?

In 1990 multimedia used to describe any combination of textual information, graphic art, sound, animation and video that is usually delivered by a computer. Between the years and the evolution of multimedia technology, authoring tools and the progress of associated creative culture, interactivity started to be considered as a key element of multimedia (Dimoulas, 2015).

According to Dimoulas the term multimedia refers to the multimodal presentation of information through the use of different media, such as text, images, animation, audio and video using many user interfaces and human machine interaction mechanisms. The term is usually attributed as content types, communication media, information and communication technology (ICT), infrastructures, equipment and systems that can be utilized at the production, consumption, implementation and distribution to the end user (Dimoulas, 2015).

Defining the term multimedia according to many theoreticians is a system combining simultaneously different types of content that at least one of the media must be time depended or continuous. At the same time multimedia must offer some kind of independence due to the manipulation of the other media, for example to offer the ability of the reproduction of selected content. The manipulation of a multimedia system gives the ability to the user to interact with the media, one of the most important aspects of new multimedia (Dimoulas, 2015).

Another definition which is given for multimedia from Seth Gitner is that multimedia is a form of communication that serves our ears, our eyes and our minds simultaneously or in a quick succession. According to Gitner multimedia storytelling is a visual process to show rather than tell where the viewer’s engagement builds every time a unique plot point increases the tension.

Multimedia systems offer a unique experience to every user due to the ability of choosing what to consume. More specific multimedia system gives access to information that does not follow a linear and chronological route but there is a possibility of a nonlinear and non-chronological interchange from one media to another (Dimoulas, 2015).

Multimedia projects give great emphasis on the “User Experience” aspect which means that the content must be user friendly. The term also includes the easiest access to digital services via many channels and devices with the purpose to enhance the information experience at all
levels. UX concludes all aspects of the experiences, perception, reaction, behavior, for a user during the interaction with a product system, service environment or institution (Dimoulas, 2015).

1.3.4. What is a web documentary?

Web documentary is the evolution of digital conventional documentary. This new type of documentary embeds interactive media authoring and sharing technologies. According to Dimoulas et al (2015) interactive videos and hypermedia could be more appealing and easily shared from bigger range of ages and social groups. The invention of web documentary was a result of revolution of multimodal content production, sharing technologies, continues evolution of computing power and digital storage, production and distribution (Dimoulas et al. 2018).

The new type of nonfiction film production in common is called web documentary, it is also known as interactive documentary, cross media documentary and docuwebs and non-linear documentary (Odorico, 2011). In this thesis dissertation with the term non-linear documentary and web documentary we mean the same thing. Specifically those types of digital productions are complex internet platforms which recreate the value of “documentary”. Web documentaries characterized by the presence of distinctive recurring elements, including an intuitive menu, maps, timelines, video clips, hyperlinks and direct connections to social networks (Odorico, 2011).

The low cost of audiovisual equipment and the possibility to create audiovisual content only with your smart phone gave the ability to users to produce, consume and share content. Another factor that embedded with the help of technology, especially web 2.0, is the interaction between product and user. Audiovisual content is enhanced in functional and informative level such as participating in arousing interactive scenarios (Dimoulas et al. 2018).

Web content could separate into two different categories Page – Based – Media (PBM) and Time – Based – Media (TBM) combining spatial and spatiotemporal arrangement of different media entities. According to Veglis (Veglis et al 2016) this is called Multimodal – Media – Assets where multichannel audio and video, nonlinear photos and animations, titles, textual description are included. Both terms could be used, with TBM & MMA referring to linear and
nonlinear navigations also in sophisticated forms of creativity, storytelling and interaction (Dimoulas et al. 2018).

The term web documentary describes the body of documentary work which distributed through the internet and it is both multimedia and interactive. The name web documentary is used widely and suggested from the broadcasters the National Film Board of Canada (NFB) and France 24. Terms webdoc, interactive web documentary or non-linear documentary have the same meaning with the term web documentary.

The audience of a web documentary could read, watch, comment, share content, talk to others, fill a quiz, play, click, see interactive maps. The content and approach of the web documentary differ from the television documentary. The basic difference from television documentary is that the user plays a role in the presentation of documentary by choosing the order in which they access content. An important role in the order of the presentation of the web documentary by the user, has the interactivity which can have the user with the documentary by giving the opportunity to the user to choose a specific pathway or to create his/her own pathway through multiple choices they have (Nash, 2012).

The main difference of the conventional documentary and the documentary created into the web HTML5 is that the video coded into the web page enables a dynamic relationship to static and live web data (Dovey & Rose 2012). Through a hyperlink which allows a connection between a word and another location on the Internet such a connection can be made from a point within a video timeline or image. In this way the character of video changed into the context of the emerging semantic web from a media on the web to a media of the web for example semantic video, hypervideo, web – native video (Dovey & Rose 2012).

The moving environment, from conventional to web documentary, emerged the need of tools to facilitate creative work that takes advantages of these new affordances (Dovey & Rose 2012). Some tools for the creation of interactive documentary are Klynt, 3WDOC, KORSAKOW, Aurasma and others that will be reviewed in the following pages.

One of the most important aspects of web documentary is that it can be updated and enriches in order to agree with the current data and no to be obsoleted. The documentary which is made in HTML5 can be continually recontextualized, updated and amended, through content down in by automatic search engines and APLS (Dovey & Rose 2012).
In the following sentences there are the definitions about what a web documentary is from experts who works in the field for years:

*A type of content where as a viewer you cannot take a passive role, you must choose your own paths* – Maria Gemayel (Klynt)³

*A form of nonfiction storytelling or experience that gives the audience an active role* – Christopher Allen (UnionDocs)³

*It is not a genre; it is just another way of looking at documentary storytelling. There’s an evolution of documentary storytelling in which technology plays a big part* – Arnaud Dressen (Honkytonk Films)³

*The form offers new ways of considering the role of the storyteller in the world* – Katerina Cizek (Highrise)³

*How digital media looks at the world of reality through an artistic interpretation* – Hugues Sweeney (National Film Board of Canada)³

*Web documentaries are databases, structured collections of items that can be accessed and organized in various ways.* (Nash, 2014) ³

2. Interactivity in a web documentary

In this section, we will first explain the term of interactivity, where we have interactivity in our everyday life and why it is important in the web documentary. Then we will examine the forms of interactivity as researches of digital media field formulate. It is worth noting that one of the innovative characteristics of a web documentary is the interactivity that has between the users and the content of documentary. We have interactivity in our everyday life, in our communication, while we drive, shop etc., in everyday life usage interactivity means ‘reciprocity’, a process between agents in which they act and ‘have an effect on each other’ (Oxford University Press, 2010).

Interactivity in documentary has various forms but most of them describe the relation of user and documentary in different words what the user can do in the documentary content. According to Kate Nash in her article “Clicking on the World: Documentary Representation and Interactivity” (2014) formulate interactivity has three types, the first one is technological, the second is relational and the third is experiential. Specifically defining the term interactivity for the web documentary posed questions of what can audiences do in relation to documentary content, audiences are addressed and positioned and what do audiences experience. Finally it ends up with a new dimension of interactivity the “discourse” which makes us to consider the relationship between users’ actions and the voice of the documentary, exploring user agency and the rhetorical potential of interaction (Nash, 2014).

2.1. Interactivity – 4 types

Many theoreticians tried to define the term interactivity, Jensen made one of the greatest efforts to define the term focusing on four different concepts of interactivity (Jensen, 1998). The first type of interactivity according to Jensen is the transmissional interactivity where the user is able to choose content of one continuous flux that is taking place in a one-way communication system, thus you cannot go back. The second type is the consultational interactivity where the user has the ability to choose an already made content and it is available in a two way system that you can go back. The third type is the conversational interactivity where the communication is two dimensional and the user is able to create and share his/her own content using the back channel. The fourth and final category of interactivity is the registrational interactivity which gives the ability of recording information that describes the needs, the activities and the communication choices of users with the aim of sense and adaption (Dimoulas, 2013).
Another classification separates interactivity to four different types due to the level of interactivity. The low level of interactivity is when the development of the application is predefined and the user can affect only the speed of flux and/or the type of the presentation of information. The medium level of interactivity is when the user can choose from the available navigation choices as the creator designed it. High level of interactivity is when the user is able to get involved in the way of presenting information by asking questions, creating stimulations and getting information for action. Finally the very high level of interactivity is when the user is able to complete the application with new navigation paths, also there is the ability of importing information and comments. At the same time there is a possibility of recording the navigation settings and the visiting history (Dimoulas, 2013).

As many researches formulate the role of interactivity focus on the ability to shift the audience from passive to active engagement. Beattie suggests that interactivity help the user to understand more fully, deeply, the layers of the truth. Interactivity in a web doc includes the navigation of the user through the content, immersion in a virtual world or participation in a community and it can differ in a kind and a degree as well (Nash, 2012).

According to Richard (2006) interactivity is the relationship between the tools made available to users and the way in which they facilitate or constrain content generation both by making contribution possible or providing motivation for user contribution.

Richard proposed three types of interactivity, the first one is the consumer interactivity where content is fixed and user’s activity consists of interpreting evaluating or acting in an alternative domain. The second type of interactivity which was introduced by Richard in 2006 is the processor interactivity where users have some ability to contribute, even though the content and form of the contribution are fixed for example sending an email. Finally the third type of interactivity according to Richard is the generator interactivity, in which users occupy a space in which they can author content and or alter the environment, for example starting a new discussion thread.

Taking into consideration that interactivity is relevant with the web doc we must refer to three basic aspects: the control over the content, the ability to contribute and the framing of user contributions and the ability to form relationships and present one’s case. According to the form of interactivity Nash introduced the term of motivation, what the user has to do with the interactivity. Interactivity serves a number of functions in the web doc such as finding
information, learning the narrative, personalize the documentary, add content, playing with the image – interface.

Finally interactivity is considered as a representational strategy central to the production and consumption of the web doc. From the perspective of the producer interactivity could be considered as possible way to reach new audiences or to relate to the audience in different ways. From the other hand considering the web doc from a political perspective and placing it in a political and social context allows us to consider the political and interpersonal goals of the user.

In order to understand the concept of web doc the audio visual and non-fiction, a new media space the methods and concepts have been developed to provide some insights into this emerging form of documentary. This new type of documentary has transformed the traditional ways of studying and analyzing documentaries into problematic. From now on textual analysis cannot tell anything about documentary even though the engagement of the user with documentary text is something different from the traditional textual analysis and says much more about documentary and if it is successful. Web documentary uses structure interface and the user engagement is influenced by the way that information is structured and presented to the user. The structure of information has an impact on the way the user moves into the web doc.

Kate Nash introduces a new perspective of how we see the interactivity in web documentary. More specifically Nash suggests that we must separate the interactivity from participation in a web documentary. The voice of documentary changed relationships around documentary production and consumption and interactivity tent to result in polyvocality, also separates voice of audience as a voice of authorship and voice of social participation (Nash, 2014).

Interactive documentary as authorship reflects a confused voice of intentions of documentary makers and the perspectives of users. Authorship became a process of framing audience actions, inviting particular forms of engagement and positioning the audience in relation to the documentary content. The framing of interaction and participation therefore becomes critical to evaluating the social functions of interactive documentary (Nash, 2014).

In a web documentary a user can choose content in a process which users participate in meaning making, produce polyvocal unstable and contested hearings rather than fixed ones.
and creating politicized online and offline environments. The audience with their choices destabilizes and creates politicized environments (Nash, 2014).

User choices create unique audio–visual sequences giving them a different representation of reality. Corpentier (2013) noted the distinction between interaction and participation on the basis of power relations the decision making surrounding media product. Referring to interaction according to Corpentier, is a process involving mutual action where user interacts with a web documentary by choosing content from a database. Referring to participation we mean those practices involving decision making in the creation and use of media. Corpentier separates participation in two other categories, the participation in media which is the involvement of non-professionals in decision making about the program/platform and/or content production and participation through media which refers to the opportunities of individuals to engage in social debate through documentary (Nash, 2014).

Participation in media draws attention to the ability of participants to contribute to the documentary text and so captures the relationship between participation and representation thus impacts on the textual voice by providing the potential for user input that is either structural or content focused. Participation through media draws attention to documentary social dimension participants has the opportunity to share the documentary through various networks and they also have the ability to connect with others and have social voice acknowledged (Nash, 2014).
3. Web documentary: Setting the field – Comparing the two types

The new filed in digital media raises a lot of challenges to the producers and to the users too due to the important role in shaping culture. In order to understand the new opportunities that opened up by development of interactive technologies the “Digital Cultures Research Center” at the University of the West of England hasted a conference in March 2011 dedicated to the interactive documentary. At the conference key issues were raised from the discussion and in this part we will mention the issues that have risen in the participation part. Nick Cohen encourages the users to participate in the story while offering them a personal gain in order to express their feelings and to recognise and appeal the greater good. Cohen noted that was a participation inequality with only 1% of people crating content, 9% editing or modifying the content and 90% of audience view the content without actively contribution. Cohen ascertain the born digital watch as much television as older generation but this generation watches their favourite programmes on demand and on their computer rather than on a television set. Broadcasters in order to keep their audience interested commission multiplatform projects in which a television programme has an interactive counterpart (Aston, Gaudenzi, 2011).

Florian Thalhofer, the inventor of “Korsakov” (authoring tool for interactive video) and producer of “Planet Galata” (2011), made an important statement that interactivity can set up scenarios whilst at the same time release the author from forcing a specific point of view onto his audience. In contrast most documentary makers stated that the lack of authorial voice ultimately leads to a multitude of meaningless stories (Aston, Gaudenzi, 2011).

At the same time digital and participatory media offer new ways not only to represent reality but also to construct it, while affording new goals such as to position the audience in the place of a character. I – docs afford to present multiple points of view either form the perspective of the authorial voice or from the community of authors working collaboratively around a common theme and they can be used to present contested point of views allowing users to come to their own conclusions. Finally Aston (2008) stated that i-docs can offer more scope for in depth engagement with a set of complex ideas through the presentation of multiple entry points and simultaneous storylines (Aston, Gaudenzi, 2011).

*New media forms pose a fundamental challenge to the principle of narrative coherence, which is at the core of traditional documentary* (Whitelaw, 2002).
The first years of the invention of web documentary new questions came out about conventional documentaries practices and analysis about the effect of realism, its value of truth and about viewer position. The “fictional agreement” as Umberto Eco formulated is a contract between filmic text and its viewer, which has consequences in the construction of interaction, participation and contribution. For the case of web documentaries the interactivity is the element that creates a symbiotic relationship between viewer/user and technological conditions for the viewing experience (Odorico, 2011).

In some web documentaries the viewer has the opportunity to access the narration from a lot of different windows and follow any path he/she wants (changeable narration). Some other web documentaries are close web documentaries that do not let you follow your own path but they also have some kind of interactivity. The two types of documentaries have many similarities. The first web documentaries followed the structure and the logic of the conventional documentary even though there was one big difference that conform the navigation of the viewer in the platform. In most of the web documentaries there is an absence of a speaking narration which forms the context of the documentary and the viewer is addressed directly and the speech is limited for commentary, interviewing and instructor reasons (Odorico, 2011).

In web documentaries most of the time the interactive platform is organized in chapters or sections, this fact makes the platform easy to navigate. Additionally it uses variety of multimedia tools, embedding different types of media and platforms interlinking them (cross – media production) in order to make the user to participate in the story since he/she is able to choose what to consume even how to end the story. Web documentaries are more complex and specific than conventional documentaries due to the large variety of operations of documentary narrative form during experiencing the interactivity (watching videos, listening, sending and receiving information, taking part in a forum and physically interacting with the virtual environment).

Within this database, as Manovich (2001) asserts about the very first steps of the web documentary: ‘the audience can perform various operations on the database: view, navigate and search’ through an interface. A web documentary represents a cross-media product; it is a specific interlink in a net of mobile structures, layers and interfaces, which permits non-linear navigation at the user’s own chosen speed within a worldwide net of users in constant potential connection between each other (Manovich, 2001).
3.1. Advantages and Disadvantages of web documentary

Comparing the two types of documentary, the conventional and the non-linear documentary we noted specific advantages and disadvantages of the new type documentary. In the following paragraphs we will examine if advantages overweight the disadvantages, something that makes one type more preferable than the other. One of the aims of our research is to end up with a preferable type of documentary examining it with two focus groups.

At first the web documentary has the possibility to be more objective because it is a presentation of a realistic capturing of the reality by having a non-linear narrative structure. By presenting all the sides and examining them in depth, without presenting the opinion of the creator directing the narration where he/she wants, could be more objective than conventional documentaries. At the conventional documentary the narrator is placed by showing pieces of the reality which were selected by him. On the contrary in one web documentary the public has the control because it has the possibility to choose what to consume and as a result could get to their conclusions, so in this way the viewer becomes co-responsible in creating the truth (Podara, 2013).

The web docs have the potential to evolve continuously and could always be up to date in contrast with the conventional documentaries which stop updating until the time of the creation of the documentary. At the same time there is the fear until the documentary is published, probably the data has changed (Podara, 2013).

At the conventional documentaries the producer does not know his public, as a result he is creating a widely accepted documentary without emphasizing somewhere, to involve as much public as possible. At the web documentary there is not a limitation like this because the web doc is separated into thematic entities and the creator has the opportunity to emphasize on a subject but also to escape from the central axis. Thus the user could visit the site anytime he/she wants to watch something again or in depth (Podara, 2013).

According to Podara (Podara, 2013) the viewer – user at the web doc has greater learning potential. At the conventional documentary the viewer is passive and has got any control over the content. On the other hand at the web doc the viewer interacts physically and mentally and has more freedom by navigating alone according to his needs into the story. Many researches proposed that the viewer of the web doc could not be called as viewer but as view-ser, viewer and user at the same time due to the ability of managing the viewing platform (Daly, 2010).
Except from advantages, web documentaries have a lot of disadvantages too. The most common disadvantage is that they are complex in narrative and overly interactive without specific reason. This could tire the viewer and could make him abandon quickly the game of narration and participation. Web docs fail to keep the whole attention of the viewer. The various effects and multiple windows reduce the sense of viewing and the viewer could not fully absorb what he/she sees.

In addition web docs have bigger production cost form conventional documentaries although there are free creation platforms. Their usage requires a lot of time and a bigger production team is needed. The schedule is bigger due to the need of the creation of a website and the difficulty of funding.

Finally it is worth noting that even the web documentary is not at the very first steps consumers still trying to identify its characteristics and its style. Especially in Cyprus the number of people who are aware about web documentary is very low. As we noted above the advantages are more than disadvantages and the disadvantages are around the facts that a common formula for production and promotion technics was not found yet.

3.1.1 Tips for a good web documentary

Consequently for a successful web doc a right and careful choice of the subject so it fits into an online platform and at the same time offering to the viewers the experience of the personal exploration of the story but also the touring around different narration paths. Another important feature of a successful web doc is the social media where a good content could be shared through them and get more publicity. The more targeted is the public of a web doc the successful will become; also we have to take into consideration that the viewers are internet users. A clear structure of the begging of the web doc is what would keep the viewer until the end. The structural characteristics have to be clarified from the beginning because there is no possibility that they can change. Having good collaboration with experts; people who would upgrade the aesthetic structure, the artistic style, the user experience and finally to promote the documentary into different platforms, is the key of success.

Gitner gave some tips to follow in order to have a successful result in multimedia storytelling in journalism. The tips are about the story, except from multiple content types (such as photos, text, videos, graphics, statistics, data) you have to wireframe a story, to put together fiction and non-fiction stories. According to Gitner there is an alphabet of multimedia
storytelling in journalism that must be followed in order to have a successful non-linear documentary. The first factor you have to implement on your documentary starts with the first letter of alphabet A is ACTION for Gitner who explains that you have to start the story with a type if active moment in order to get the audience involved into the story. B is the BACKGROUND to introduce the main character of the story, to give a context to the story. C is the CLIMAX this is what the story has been building toward a conflict of larger proportion, this is the part that the story gets all the attention of the user. D is the DEVELOPMENT referring to the conflict in the story that is introduced in this part of the story. Finally E is ENDING the story is released and the viewer is satisfied that the story has ended (Gitner, 2016). This alphabet could be followed for every digital story in order to be successful.
4. Digital Natives and Digital Immigrants

In this thesis dissertation we will focus on two generations the Digital Natives and Digital Immigrants. In this particular section we will identify who they are and we will note their characteristics.

Prensky was the researcher who introduced the terms of Digital Natives and Digital Immigrants. According to Prensky Digital Immigrants and Digital Natives have many differences in the way that they consume media, use media and each of them have a different relationship with technology.

“Digital Immigrants” are people who were not born into widespread technological immersion, are people that were not born natively using ubiquitous and constantly available on demand technologies. “Digital Natives” are people who were born into technology; they rose into the edge of technology and they know how to use smart devices from their very young age.

The term used for the new generation of viewers is “digital natives” according to Prensky we can call “digital natives” people who born after 1982 who use the technology and internet connection for every step in their everyday life, they use the Web 2.0 as if it was in their natural environment (Prensky, 2001). Web 2.0 could be used as motivation in education and to put them in the process to create their knowledge rather than consuming it passively. They prefer active than passive learning and rely heavily on communication technologies to access information. The viewer is also a user (view-ser), because he/she can manage the viewing platform, edit content, share content, create content and interact with the creator.

People who were born between 1994 and 2010 are called Google Generation/ Generation Z/ iGeneration according to Tapscott (Tapscott, 2009). Generation Z is a subcategory of “digital natives” as Prensky determine them. Generation Z use the internet from Web 2.0 and after so they were born in the bloom of social media and they know that a user could be a producer too. This generation has much different learning and social attitude, they get bored easily, they are impatient, optical thinkers and multitaskers (Siemens, 2006). Post millennials prefer to be self-educated, they prefer to research themselves on a new topic of their choice rather than reading a full investigative article.

“Digital Immigrants” is a title given to people who were born from 1982 until 1974 that they grow up discovering the digital world and they would never leave behind the conventional consumption of media ( Friedrich et al, 2010). According to Prensky (2001) “digital
immigrants” are emotionally tied with the conventional media and has limited practical knowledge to use the new media. They learned how to adopt in the new environment and they know that they belong to the past, they learn how to use digital environment as they are learning a foreign language.

In our case we will use the terms as Presky determine them. We will use the term Digital Natives for people who were born after 1982 until today for ours convenience and the term Digital Immigrants for people who were born before 1982 until 1974. Specifically in our case people from the age of 18 until 25 will be called Digital Natives and people above the age of 35 will be called Digital Immigrants.

As we have mentioned above not only the viewing habits of each generation changed but also their learning habits. In this particular thesis we will examine how the viewing habits changed examining them by showing them two journalistic documentaries, one conventional and one interactive. Interactive documentary is a new type that it is used in journalism in the latest years. The documentary has also got an educational part of the art of cinematography that it was forced to change form and involve the viewer in the game, it combines education and entertainment and it becomes web and interactive.

Young adults nowadays prefer to get informed from online sources and not traditional media but according to Matsiola et al. (Matsiola et al, 2019) young audiences seem to prefer simpler structure of narration based on a single medium, like traditional journalism used to offer (Matsiola et al, 2019). The question what the young audiences prefer will be answered in the following pages.
5. How Digital Natives and Digital Immigrants consume media?

Examining viewing habits we found a survey which examining viewing habits of digital natives and digital immigrants while they were watching commercials. This survey gave some useful information for our research too. The survey was made by Brian J. King a master student in the University of Bowling Green State between 613 people who complete the survey until the end. The survey was distributed through email, in June 2009 (King. J. B., 2009)

The following bar chart is a screenshot from his survey, which shows the viewing modes of Digital Natives and Digital Immigrants. In our case the two categories online viewing and traditional TV are very useful because they could be comparable with ours results.
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*Figure 1. TV Viewing Modes for Digital Immigrants and Digital Natives – Double Bar Plot*  
Comparing Viewing Modes Utilized by Both Digital Immigrants (n=307) and Digital Natives (n=396)

Traditional TV viewing is the most used media for both groups. Digital Immigrants use the traditional TV up to 84% and Digital Natives up to 77.5%. The figure also shows that Digital Natives are more than twice as likely to use online viewing 57.2% for Digital Natives and 26.1% for Digital Immigrants.

Digital divide between Digital Natives and Digital Immigrants is proposed to be age based. Younger people have grown up in a digital environment where they have always been
familiar with technology like cable television, the Internet, laptop computers and mobile communications devices that were not known by previous generation when at the same stage of life.

Understanding the differences in behavior between the two groups may be of benefit to media creators. This effort could also form an interesting academic foundation to predict how emerging technologies might develop. The emerging technologies will rely on new approaches to present commercial media on a basis that is more adaptable to the interest of the viewers. In our case the question transformed regarding viewing habits in documentary viewing of Digital Natives and Digital Immigrants.

The above research proposed that Digital Natives would view less traditional TV and use more online viewing than Digital Immigrants (King, J. B., 2009). The study also found that Digital Immigrants were 8% more likely than Digital Natives to view traditional TV and Digital Natives were about 120% more likely to view media online than Digital Immigrants.

Digital Immigrants still have their accent although they are becoming more comfortable with the technologies because of their professions and the value of their free time. Digital Natives seem to be migrating onward to online viewing at a faster pace than the Digital Immigrants. (King, J. B., 2009).

Another survey that was made in the fourth quarter of 2016 in the United States by Statista and Business Insider shows how millennials and adults use electronic media. The following bar chart presents that the most used device for millennials is the smart phone and the TV follows without big deviation from the usage of smartphone. The third preferred media for millennials is the radio, fourth comes the TV-connected devices and the last media in millennials preference is the tablet. The highest figure in the following bar chart refers to adults who use the TV as preferred electronic media. The second device that adults use most is their smartphone but the figure is about the half of those who use the TV. About adults it is following the radio as third preferred media, the pc as fourth media, fifth are TV-connected devices and the last media is the tablet.
This survey was made three years ago, it is quite new and we use it here in order to have a grader context about the electronic media usage around the world. Those figures are reflected in our survey too. In the question “What platform do you use for your daily briefing” most of young people (18-25) answer that they prefer to use their smartphone and their PC (5/8) and the other they are informed by TV (3/8).

Comparing those results with Cypriot data, where our survey took place, we found a survey from Statistical Service of Cyprus which examined the use of Internet and information and communication technologies in households for 2018. The survey presents the internet connection possibility through any device between people from 16 years old until 74 years old. The survey found that 86.2% of households in Cyprus were connected to the Internet and 78.7% of households had at least one personal computer.
The 83.7% of people at the age 16-74 are frequent users of the Internet; they use the Internet at least once a week. Almost all (99.3%) young people (18-24) use the Internet once a week. A high percentage (94.9%) of people at the age 35-44 are frequent users of the Internet. On the other hand only 37.5% of older people (at the age of 65-74) use the Internet. People with high level of education use the Internet frequently (97.3%) than people with lower education level (53.8%).

They use the Internet especially for information searching about products and services (85.1%), for their involvement in social media (81.7%), for documentary watching from sharing services (80.8%), for communication through internet concluding image (74.4%) and for searching information about health (67.1%). The 87.5% of those who use the Internet had also smart phones in order to be connected in the Internet when they are not in the house or at work for example. The 16.7% use their laptops and the 11.5% use their tablet.

Image 3: Internet Consumption in Cyprus
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6. New Viewing Habits

Due to the rapid engagement of the internet in our everyday life the viewing conditions changed so fast that media creators, the market and consumers cannot adapt in such a fast change. The new generation take for granted the digital and interactive types of information. Media creators in order to gain younger audience, they have to reconsider the viewing practices of their audience. The above was the main reason that we choose to examine which type of viewing is more appealing in two different age groups and why.

We cannot deny that the viewing conditions changed because of the digitization of the news content, the spread of the internet and from the multitasking that happening from the side of the viewer. According to Barkhuus and Brown television viewing nowadays is not a one-side process but it is consisted of different devices such as tablets, mobiles and pcs (Barkhuus and Brown, 2009). Especially the new generation of viewers do not even know how to use the conventional type of information. Thus we can call the new generation of viewers digital – only consumer (Desjardins, 2015). In the following paragraphs we will examine how the viewing habits changed and the ones that have arisen.

The new generation of viewers was born in the digital age and they took for granted the use of social media and continuous internet connection, the possibility of sharing and production of content. This age group probably never used conventional types of information and they will never use, thus the conditions of media consumption transformed and the challenging question is how the new generation consume media content and how media creators have to form their content in order to took the attention of the new generation consumers/users who they would be also producers of media content.

Talking about viewing habits of course they change a lot, in previous years the end of the consuming process was the viewing (Cesar et al, 2009). Nowadays the viewer is treaded as the link of the production chain because he/she can choose what and when to consume, he/she can produce content too and share specific content from an integrated production (Podara et al., 2016). The new viewing habits consisted of specific characteristics, this categorization help us to understand better the viewing habits of the new generation and to produce content more appealing to young people and targeted at the needs of the public.
6.1. Second screening

The term is used to describe when someone is watching TV but at the same time uses a second device such as tablet, mobile or PC. According to (Cesar et al., 2009) the second screen enriches the viewing experience and creates more passionate viewers. The second screen is used to find additional information of the content or to comment with friend who is in a remote environment. Digital natives prefer written messages instead of voice messages because they are less intrusive to the viewing experience (Hess et al. 2011)

6.2. Video on demand

On demand is when you choose what to consume and when for example with internet media you are able to watch series or movies in a non-linear time, with breaks or in one time. In the conventional media you had to wait for the next episode for a week or the day after. Television remains the mass media of information and entertainment but enriched with other platforms such as smart TVs they use internet connection or you are able to create a Netflix account where you can watch media content on demand through television. Thus the mass viewing disappears as phenomenon (Podara et al. 2016)

6.3. Content sharing – Microblogging

With the Internet it is very easy to share content especially through social media. With social media everyone is able to share, comment, edit and create content. Content sharing is a communication process that happens after the viewing of content it could be synchronous at the same time or asynchronous after the end of the view (Podara et al. 2016)

6.4. Water cooler effect

Water cooler effect is called the felling of team viewing. This phenomenon requires that every person in the group saw the episode and they are informed about current developments so they can talk about it. This was happening especially in the conventional media because the episode for example is shown in a specific day and time. Nowadays the team viewing does not exist because viewing is on demand, users can watch the episode any time they want in a non-linear time and the conversation is shifted on social media and in public sphere. Additionally most of live broadcasts on television encourage the viewer to use their mobile phone in order to comment on social media especially on twitter with hashtags, a parallel process with the live streaming. This process increases user engagement (Podara et al. 2016)
6.5. Established viewing tactics

Except from the new viewing habits there are still the traditional viewing habits which are most adopted from the digital immigrants. Because of the established tactic of television viewing some viewers distracted from interactive applications and they do not use the ability of choosing the scene but they choose to consume passively as they are used to. Another established viewing habit is that viewer prefers to discuss about the media content directly with people in the same room (Podara et al. 2016).

The interesting part of our research is to define if this categorization in viewing habits exists in our multimedia production too or the consumption is affected by the age.

7. Multimedia Authoring Tools Review

In this section we review some web authoring tools which helps you to structure your multimedia project. Some are free and available on the web but some other you have to pay for the download.

7.1. Klynt

Klynt it is a desktop paid application but offers 14 days free trial, also there is a student version for about €50. This full-fledged tool developed by media innovator Arnaud Dressen and it is a semi – professional tool mainly employed to create interactive web documentaries. Its latest version Klynt 3.5 was released in October 2016 which gives more emphasis than ever before in interaction. To become a master, Klynt offers free tutorials. The full version of Klynt costs €500 which is suitable for companies without any limit on the projects you can create. The student version does not include the same aspects as the pro-version. Klynt’s website features a showcase of the most notable projects developed with the program. A very useful aspect that Klynt offers is that with a sotyboard which allows you to connect videos and create connection buttons from one video to the other. With the storyboard it is easier to understand the plot of the story and how to navigate in it. As a creator with the storyboard it is very clear to create a narrative story with a start, middle and an end.
7.2. StoryMap

Storymap is a mapping tool developed by the Northwestern University Knight Lab. A team of technologists and journalists that aims to innovate news media. Creating location-based narratives is becoming more and more common for journalists and storytellers at large and storymap is an agile tool that can help to do this. You are able to tell stories about each character and allows to users to zoom and find out more about the smallest details in the image. The program proposes to start with a general overview before zooming in on specific locations. For every location you could use a single slide and to use it in your narration. Also you can add metadata to each slide such as headline and description, media items such as YouTube videos, to create a smooth reading experience. The basic number of slide used is no more than 20 and no stories that jump around on the map. Storymap is an easy-to-use tool and at the same time allows its more technical minded users to bend it to their own needs. The drawback is that it is still a bit poor in terms of functionalities. New internet features for example the possibility to add more media in a single slide would make it even more compelling.

7.3. Aurasma

Aurasma it is an application where users use their smartphones or tablet’s camera to overlay media (videos, animation, 3D models, web pages) to “real world” images. It is a tool with a proven track record, lunched in 2011. The app has been used by major players such as Disney, Budweiser and Best western. It is very easy to set up your professional, free account and start producing content in a few minutes. Aurasma works particularly well when it comes to animate publicity material and this is also its main limit: given its marketing-penchant, it is difficult to imagine a use that goes beyond a campaign, being informative or commercial.

7.4. Wirewax

It is a desktop and free program, video evolved and a tool able to automatically make your videos interactive. It can make your videos interactive in four different ways. The easiest way is to create clickable hot-spots that open links, texts, images, or whatever else you want. Wirewax can also create branching video that allow the user to decide the path of the story a useful feature that is one of the storytelling trends today. With Wirewax you can set up 360 videos where the user can switch between different cameras and multi-stream alternatives where it is similarly possible to swipe different versions of the same video. Disney used
Wirewax to produce an interactive “making of” of the Jungle Book live action movie. Only the clickable hotspots are free to use. All the other features require you to cough up some money.

7.5. H5P

H5P is an open free source content framework based on Java Script. The aim of H5P is to make it easy for everyone to create, share and reuse interactive HTML5 content. The framework consists of a web based content editor, a website for sharing content types, plugins for existing CMS’s and a file format for building together HTML5 resources. The web editor is able to add and replace multimedia files and textual content. The editor also offers kind of editing capabilities and wysiwyg editing of the entire content type. The program consisted with a metadata file, a number of files providing feature and design for the content and a content folder where textual content is stored in JSON format and multimedia is stored as files or links to files on external sites. H5P offers primary support in its website H5P.org, where it hosts online manual for H5P and living repository for H5P information, documentation and forums.

7.6. KORSAKOW

Desktop software for creating browser-based dynamic documentaries invented in 2000 in Berlin by Frorian Thalhofer. Thalhofer began developing a software program to produce a documentary about alcohol consumption to accompany his Master thesis. The name of the program came from Korsakow syndrome an extreme alcoholism syndrome which affects the short-term memory and the compulsion of telling stories. With Korsakow you can create and interact with non-linear or database-driven narratives. For Pro version you have to pay €300 and it is also available in a student version. The new version of Korsakow is the version 6 which realized in October 2016 and it is exporting in HTML5.

7.7. 3WDoc

A web tool for the creation of interactive and rich-media stories in HTML5 format. It is online, it is free, it only needs an installation on your pc, and it is automatically updated and allows easy collaboration with friends and colleagues. It is free but if your needs are greater in terms of volume, number of users and additional features, there is a pricing system. Founders of 3WDoc are the founders of Hecude (the web agency behind 3WDoc) who have been working for more than ten years in the media industry. 3WDoc was created while founders
were searching for some connection between radio, press, web and television. Was developed with the help of jQuery and HTML5 and was the first application created in HTML5 for editing and publishing tailored for digital storytelling.

7.8. Word Press

At first it was created for the creation of blogs but today it is widely used as a content management system (CMS). It is an open source, it is user friendly and it uses PHP and MySQL. By buying a photography template in Word Press from those which give the full screen ability and the appearance of multiple photographs and videos you could create a rudimentary web doc without the cost of using professional software. It is very easy in use and you can find many tutorials on YouTube about how to manage Word Press.
8. Methodology

Our academic questions were three. The first one was about to define the preferred type of documentary for each generation. The second was to clarify the viewing habits of digital natives and digital immigrants and finally the third academic question was to determine the advantages and disadvantages of the web documentary in comparison with the conventional one.

In order to examine our academic questions we choose the qualitative research specifically the focus group method. Qualitative research is more used to understand the reasons that something happens in contrast to the quantitative research which gives numbers. The purpose of a qualitative research is to test the impact of an intervention on an outcome while controlling various factors that might influence that outcome. If you want to learn more about the opinion of a population a qualitative research is suitable. With a representable sample your outcomes would be close to the reality (Ronald et al., 2007).

According to Stake (Stake, 1995) there are three major differences between quantitative and qualitative research the first one is the distinction between explanation and understanding as the purpose of inquiry. The second one is the distinction between a personal and impersonal role of the researcher; and the third difference between qualitative and quantitative data is the distinction between knowledge discovered and knowledge constructed. The qualitative researcher relies on the participants to offer in-depth responses to questions about how they have constructed or understood their experience and at the same time gives the opportunity to participants to start a contestation about the topic and shared opinions and defense their beliefs (Ronald et al., 2007). The qualitative researcher will get much more information about a phenomenon, realizing that the major limitation of his/her research will be that the results will not be representable to a population because very few participants participate in studies offering so much depth of detail (Ronald et al., 2007).

There are different types of qualitative methodologies one of them is Content analysis which is quantitative and/or qualitative textual analysis that involves comparing, contrasting, and categorizing a set of data primarily to test hypotheses (Garfinkel, 1967). Another type of qualitative methodology is Conversation analysis which is a form of textual analysis that arose out of the sociological approach of ethnomethodology (Silverman, 1998) and discourse.
analysis which is a way for examining language as it is used in specific contexts (Foucault, 1972).

For qualitative researches there are specific methods of data collection especially producing data from individuals and/or groups utilizing structured, semi-structured, or unstructured questioning formats. Interviewing is used in combination with other types of data collection like focus groups, case studies, ethnography, and/or participant observation.

One way of collecting data in qualitative research is focus groups, which are group interviews (typically involving 5–12 people) that depends on the interaction between the group and the questions asked from the moderator. The main advantage for the researcher in conducting focus groups is the ability to observe a large amount of interaction among multiple participants on one or more topics in a limited amount of time. However, this could be also a disadvantage because there is a possibility that groupthink may threaten the dependability of the data, especially in situations where actual or perceived experts and non-experts are both included (Ronald et al., 2007).

According to Krueger focus group is defined as a group of people interacting, having common interests or common characteristic. The interaction between them it is controlled from one moderator who uses the group to export conclusions related to a specific topic (Krueger, 1988).

In a focus group people discuss, agree, disagree and changes opinions about a topic which it is set from the moderator while asking them questions. This tool is proper for researches who want to examine attitudes and perceptions of the new generation viewers about their viewing habits. Focus group method was developed after the Second World War as an evaluation method of radio listeners and proved helpful data to the social researches because you could examine why people have those specific beliefs. With this research tool we could have access to the norms of groups and get data that it is difficult to get from personal interviews. Also give the opportunity to the researches to examine how people interact to others beliefs and how they defense their opinion. It is a time consuming process and the moderator have to drive the discussion to essential outcomes and to be able to activate all the members of the group.

As we mention above in our thesis we used the focus group method. To be more specific at the end of July 2018 we created two different focus groups one with people of the age of 18
until 25. The number of people participated in this particular focus group was 8, two males and 6 females, those people where especially university students or graduated from a university in Cyprus, they live in Cyprus and most of them have interests in STEM subjects (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics). The second focus group was consisted of people with age above 35, they are teacher in secondary education and all of them were women. The number of people participated in the second focus group was 8 as the first focus group to keep the balance. Their interests were foreign languages, Greek philology, computing sciences, physics and political economy.

The questions asked were about their viewing habits, form what media they prefer to get informed, if they use a second screen while they are watching TV, if they share TV’s programs in social media, about the advantages and disadvantages of the interactive documentary, how the interactive documentary would be better, about the topic of the project and to make a comparison between two types of documentary.

With both focus groups we contacted two meetings; in total we had four meetings about one hour each. The first meeting was about to answer some general questions and the questions about their viewing habits. At the end of the first meeting we watched together a conventional documentary 20 minutes length. Until the second meeting interviewees had to watch at home the web documentary the counterpart of conventional one. In the second meeting we focused on comparative questions between conventional and web documentary. Finally were asked to answer which type they prefer and why.

In order to examine our academic questions we created two documentaries, the conventional one and the web one because we were not able to find an already made example with the same topic in the literature which we could use in ours research. Both documentaries have the same topic; the topic was “if young people are active in social and political subjects in the society”. Specifically we asked interviewees questions about the Cyprus problem, unemployment, education and politics. For the needs of documentary we interviewed four young people, three at the age of 23 and one at the age of 25 and one professor of the University of Cyprus to give his academic view on the topic. The conventional documentary has duration about 20 minutes and it follows a narration with a beginning, a middle and an ending.
The motive behind this journalistic research, that gave us two documentaries as a product, was a survey from Frederic University Cyprus which notes the very low participation rates of young people in politics. More specific the article refer to young people as apolitical, non-informed about the current affairs of the country, disappointed about their future and they blame politics about being a rotten system. At the same time the article blame young people about no revolting to change things. This article gave the trigger for further research in order to prove that young Greek-Cypriots are still interested in politics, they are informed and they want to change things for their better future. Another challenge about us was to make more young people interested about politics.

The spark was set up, more and more questions came to our minds for further research such as a comparison of the conventional type of documentary and the interactive, questions about in what degree the age affect the viewing of each type and if the subject is appropriate for an interactive documentary or a conventional documentary, how the viewing habits changed from conventional type to new media. A thought about a second focus group with people of older ages (35+) came to our mind to compare the viewing habits and if a non-linear documentary is appealing to those ages.

To sensitize more young people being interested about politics, was to come close to them by creating a video with new and synchronous media tactics which shows other young people like them to be informed and interested on current affairs.

In order to prove that young people are interested in politics we found four young people to share their opinion about issues of common interest. By sharing their opinion would be a motivation and an example to be imitated for other young people to start get involved in politics. Taking into consideration that we create documentaries about young people for young people, our target group was a young audience of the age 18-25. As a second audience could be people who are interested to listen what young people have to say, those people are teachers who are work with thousands of young people and every day they try to make them active members of society.

In order to be successful a multimedia project, an important step is to know your audience, your target group, the more specific audience the more specific site you have to design related to their age, their likes, dislikes, cultural vocabularies as well as specific levels of education.

---

and socioeconomic status. Also the storytelling has to be user-centred designed and a desirable, up to date design of the interface and logo are necessary characteristics to take into account for the structure of the website. This combination of target groups could not be more suitable for our academic questions too since we wanted to examine the viewing habits of two generations, the preferred type of each age group and finally to redefine the advantages and disadvantages of the web documentary.

In the following pages we present our project as a multimedia project. We explain each part, from analysis, to design, development and evaluation. For the needs of evaluation of a multimedia project, the project has to be evaluated by real users in order to fix technical and functional specifications. In order to have useful answers we contacted a questionnaire that was distributed through Facebook and answered by 19 random people the answers we got were on their own initiate. The questionnaire was made with the help of Google Forms and was made before the publication of the interactive documentary. At this questionnaire we asked people about the topic of our interactive documentary, if they would be willing to watch this kind of interactive documentary and we asked them about visual and functional characteristics of the project such as how the home page would look like, the thematic entities, the form of clickable labels etc.

For the needs of the creation of both documentaries we need the help of editing tools and audiovisual equipment. For the production of both documentaries we use two Cannon HDSLR cameras, a tripod and a lice microphone. For the editing part we first use the Adobe Premiere Pro 5 to cut the most important parts for the conventional documentary and then we cut for a second time the parts that we wanted to include in the interactive documentary. To have the final form of the project we edited the clips three times, one for the linear documentary and two for the non-linear.

In our case we choose Klynt to create our interactive documentary due to the easy management and the high degree of interactivity that you can adopt in your project. We bought the student version of Klynt which cost €50. For the creation of the website we had to buy a domain name and a web hosting space from godaddy.com. for the domain name we spent €13 and we paid €25 per 3 months to Godaddy.com to keep our files on the web. To upload the files from Klynt to our actual webpage we needed another program the Fillezila which we downloaded for free. In our case we choose to use Klynt because gives you the opportunity to connect many videos in any order you want, to create interactive buttons, to
import photos, videos, sounds and finally give you the opportunity to publish your project to the web.

The interviews were taken in a white shot outdoors in a park, we did not use any external light we had only the natural light. As a result of using only the natural light some shots are lighter and some other darker nevertheless we tried to make the shots to look the same in the editing procedure. Another problem of the outdoor filming was the sound where we had interferences from the wind or the sound of the street, something that we tried to limit in the editing procedure.

**Multimedia Authoring**

At this point we have to mention that in order to clarify the final structure of the web documentary we made lot of tests. At first in a single paper we tried to form the thematic entities, and then we edited the clips. We tried to make the first prototype using Klynt but something was missing. In our second try we edited the clips by thematic entities and then we create the second prototype of our project using Klynt. Also very helpful at this point of multimedia authoring very helpful was the questionnaire we mention above that was made through Google Forms, distributed through Facebook and answered by 19 random people. Those people were asked about users’ specification of the particular application for example one question was about choosing which first page they prefer. This process will be presented on the following pages at the subsection of Design & Development of the multimedia project (p. 56-61).
Image 4: This is a screenshot from the storymap of Klynt were we design our web documentary. This is the skeleton of our project and here you can understand the interconnections of pages.

The conventional documentary is uploaded on YouTube in the following link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9eTOTCPIOOc

Image 5: The first page of conventional documentary
Image 6: Interview 1

Image 7: Interview 2
You can find the web documentary in the following link: http://energoi.com/#HOME_-_INTRO
**Image 10: Interview section**

By clicking the plus button it drives you to this page where you can meet the interviewee.

**Image 11: At this point you can choose thematic entity to watch the particular video.**

This is the next page where you can choose thematic entity to watch. Also it gives you the ability to skip and watch the next interview.
9. Non-linear Documentary as a multimedia project

9.1. Analysis

The term multimedia resulted from the combination of multiple media in order to transmit a message as schematically as possible. It is a multimodal communication system which integrates and exploits all the basic modalities of content such as text, image and sound. Multimodal communication is more effective because it is closer to the direct humane communication. According to audio-visual production, follows three different production parts, the pre – production (that it contains the preparation and organization of the project), the production (the production and the main tasks of creating the content) and the post – production (the final editing and the managing until the dissemination of the content) (Dimoulas, 2015).

According to Dimoulas every multimedia project has its own planning, a step by step process which consisted of four main categories the analysis, the design, the development and the evaluation. This theoretical analysis and methodological approaches are necessary for the better understanding and organization of the technical procedure. The analysis part refers to the formulation of the idea, the review of related applications, audience and target group analysis, users’ specifications, media and content analysis, network and computational analysis, multimedia authoring tools exploration and the innovation of the specific project to the market (Dimoulas, 2015).

The design refers to the first design of the multimedia application which possibly needs to be designed two or three times in a low and high fidelity prototype authoring tools and the more realistic version of the application is designed in a real world implementation authoring tool. In the design part we have to specify the categories of the content, monitors, content – navigation and organization structures, validation specifications, multimedia editing tools and to make a timetable for the formulation of each process.

The development of the application is the actual production of the multimedia project including the code or the graphical interface that you may need to create with the help of a programmer and a graphic designer respectively. This step concludes with the collection processing and hardware configuration, the development of individual media tools, the writing of the title, the validation of functional application interface and tests for the
functionality of the application. The final step for the creation of a multimedia project is the evaluation where you test your application with real users and they suggest improvements. At this final step we evaluate the application, this is not the first evaluation because we make formative evaluation during development of quantitative and qualitative data and we have the feedback of special and targeted users (Dimoulas, 2015).

There are several ways to develop a multimedia project and different types of software development models such as structured models, iterative models and evolutionary models. In the traditional models (structured models) there is a linear process followed where with completion of each phase is marked the beginning of the next. An example of this category is the waterfall model which is used commonly. In iterative models there is a continuous process where the phases are performed cyclically, they are repeated until the process is completed. An example of this category is the RAD - Rapid Application Development and prototyping. Finally evolutionary models are combinations of different categories of development models, examples are the spiral model, the star model, (Component-Based Software Engineering – CBSE and LUCID (Logical User-Centered Interactive Design) (Dimoulas, 2015).

Every model follows the four basic steps, in our case we could tell that we followed the waterfall model, because we took the process step by step. Before moving to the next step we completed the previous step. As we mention previously for this model to continue to the next step we have to finish the previous step, without excluding the review procedures and indirect feedback. One of the disadvantages of the model is the disability of the clear and integrated description of each step from the begging of the project.

In our case the idea to examine how the new generation consumes media and if the new technologies are more appealing to the new generation, came to our minds while we were searching for similar projects related to consumption types of new media and how we could enrol interactivity in order to get the user involvement. To start a multimedia projects at first we had to search for related projects and applications that already exists. In our research we found other web documentaries either from professionals or from students that created them in order to examine related questions like ours. Some of the good examples are: “New Life” a web documentary about Lampsakos, a village in Asia Minor which after Asia Minor disaster the people rebuilt from zero their new life in different geographic coordinates. This web documentary was created from a Greek PhD student of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. The documentary contains a big number of small videos duration 2-3 minutes each and they
are separated into categories. The “New Life” web documentary it is one of those we get inspired either from the production or from the academic questions answered in the research.

Similar master theses were made about this topic from Aristotle University in Thessaloniki that we took like inspirations were: “Web documentary: Alternative creation ways, technologies and techniques”\(^6\) from Anna Petroullaki who presented some platforms for the production of the web documentary and end up with creation of an interactive documentary with the help of one platform presented. The other one was: “Non linear audiovisual storytelling technologies in the field of environmental awareness and sensitization”\(^7\) from Evaggelia Papadrgka a web documentary about Axios River in Greece and its wild life, with beautiful videos, amazing images, maps, real sounds, all this production is hosted in a web platform.

Some other related projects are: “Journey to the End of Coal”\(^8\) (2008) from French production company Honkeytonk, which is an interactive road movie that guides the audience to the depths of coal mines in China, where migrant workers risk their lives every day. The project contains hundreds of photographs, hours of real sound and video. The viewer has the opportunity to choose the path he/she want to follow, to ask questions to miners and are able to add information into the text.

Arte.tv’s Prison Valley (2010)\(^9\) is another good example of web documentary which explores the Fremont County, Colorado, where the local economy revolves around 13 prisons. The project created by the French journalist David Dufresne and photojournalist Phillipe Brault. Viewers of the web documentary are asked to sign in through Twitter, Facebook, or asked to make an account on the film's site in order experience the story. The storyline imitate a road trip, while is encouraging to learn more about the background, news, and other additional information about prisons in America.

---

\(^6\) Petroullaki A., 2013. Διαδικτυακό Ντοκιμαντέρ: Εναλλακτικοί Τρόποι Δημιουργίας του, Τεχνολογίες και Τεχνικές

\(^7\) Papadrgka E., 2016. Τεχνολογίες μη Γραμμικής Οπτικοακουστικής Αφήγησης στον Τομέα της Περιβαλλοντικής Ενημέρωσης και Ενασχητοποίησης

\(^8\) http://www.honkeytonk.fr/index.php/webdoc/

\(^9\) https://www.arte.tv/fr/
Another project is Welcome to Pine Point (2010)\(^\text{10}\) by Canadian media group The Goggles. The story of Pine Point mostly unfolds through the written word, as it was originally written as a book, but the documentary is a creative collage of material from and about Pine Point—a Canadian mining town that disappeared in the 1980s. This documentary revolves around memories and the objects that keep the town’s spirit alive.

Another example is Brèves de Trottoir (2010)\(^\text{11}\) by film director and journalist Olivier Lambert and photographer Thomas Salva. This platform is a collection of films and photography stills that help to tell the stories of “daily celebrities” in Paris.

Samuel Bollendorff a freelance press photographer dealt with web documentary and gave great examples for next generations. Bollendorff was born in 1974, studied art history in fine Arts School of Paris and has a master degree in photography in Lois Lumiere School. The first five years of his career started to collaborate with the Liberation newspaper, his main subject were stories about hospitals, prisons, school, police with a socially – inflected viewpoint on French institutions. His first web documentary was in late 2008 the “Journey to the end of the coal” with big success in France and all over the world. Other web documentaries from Bollendorff were “Nowhere safe”, “Papporteur de crise”, “Burn out – le Grand”, “La Parade web series” \(^\text{12}\). Samuels work is not limited to web documentaries only but he also dealt with big news stories, movies, books and exhibitions.

Sandra Gaudenzie, an interactive media professor at the London College of Media, suggests the separation of different levels of interactivity in web documentaries in order to classify the new forms of documentary. According to Gaudenzi, there are three different levels of interactivity that determine the type of documentary. The interactivity is either semi-closed where the user can browse but not change the content, semi-open where the user can participate but not change the structure of the interactive documentary, or completely open where the user and the interactive documentary constantly change and adapt to each other. There are cases where users can directly contribute to the story by uploading content, some others invites people around the world to interpret scenes of the original script and upload their videos to the site.

\(^{10}\) [http://interactive.nfb.ca/#/pinepoint](http://interactive.nfb.ca/#/pinepoint)

\(^{11}\) [https://france3-regions.francetvinfo.fr/paris-ile-de-france/brevesdetrottoirs/index.php/en#/home](https://france3-regions.francetvinfo.fr/paris-ile-de-france/brevesdetrottoirs/index.php/en#/home)

Additionally Guadenzie encourage users to think documentaries in specific modes: the conversational, the hypertext, the experiential and the participative, with each mode offering a different construction of reality (Aston and Gaudenzi, 2012). Thus enabling different modes of interactivity fostering audience participation and enriching the user experience. This theoretical approach raised other questions we wanted to answer according to the decree of interactivity.

In this step of analysis of the project at first we were thinking to create an interactive documentary for young people, about young people in order to examine how young people consume media nowadays. The documentary subject is to outline the concerns of young people focusing on four pillars politics, economy, unemployment and the Cyprus problem, in order to put it in a more general context to examine if young people are involved in politics or they are absurd. At first the target group was young people 18-25 years old, people who are students and trying to make their first steps to find a decent job and build a career. This age target group presupposes that viewers have excellent computer management knowledge, they consume media through computer and mobile phones and at a limited extent television, they use their mobile phones fluently too many hours of the day, they have active accounts in more than one social media and they are aware of new media technologies and new media consumption habits. At this point we have to clarify that our target group were people at the age of 18-25 and people above of the age of 35, more specifically people who are related with the education field.

As a multimedia project ours contains multiple types of media such as text, image, video, sound, linking buttons and navigation buttons. Our aim at first was to conclude as many types of media we could in order to increase the interactivity degree. The project is separated into five different categories in the home-page, it is separated according to interviewees. A second separation is according to thematic entity where the viewer could choose what to consume. What is included in this step is the investigation and evaluation of multimedia writing tools to choose the proper one for our project. Multimedia authoring tools give the opportunity to edit and organize features, to program features, to manage interactivity features, to perform tuning and playback features, deliver through many platforms and the ability to play it on internet.

There are different types of multimedia authoring tools such as card and page-based tools, icon-based event-driven tools, time-passed tools and web page authoring tools. Time based tools are best suited for messages with a beginning and an end. Some time-based tools
facilitate navigation and interactive control. Time based authoring tools in our case are suitable because they offer the interactivity factor where the user can control the web page. Also time-based authoring tools are suitable for creating animations and branching. On the other hand they are expensive, and require much time to learn how to use them fluently especially for the advanced features. In the following pages we present some multimedia authoring tools that we find useful for the specific project and we will explain what let us to choose one of them.

Except from the related applications review we contacted a questionnaire asking random people about the characteristics of the web documentary. In this questionnaire we asked people about the subject of the web documentary they are more appealing to consume, the pros that make the user consume pleasantly the web documentary etc. This process belongs to the analysis part of a multimedia project and more specifically to the formative evaluation of the project. The questionnaire was distributed through Facebook and answered by 19 random people the answers we got were on their own initiate. The questionnaire was made with the help of Google Forms and was made before the publication of the interactive documentary. At this questionnaire we asked people about the topic of our interactive documentary, if they would be willing to watch this kind of interactive documentary and we asked them about visual and functional characteristics of the project such as how the home page would look like, the thematic entities, the form of clickable labels etc. From the questionnaire replies we defined and shaped the appearance of the project before its publication.

Some of the answered questions were given in the above section (design and development) about the visual and functional characteristics of the web page. The other answered questions are following.
This question is about the characteristics of interactive documentary. The most common answer, of which characteristic an interactive documentary must have, is to be able to keep the interest of the viewer. In contrast the answer about the bigger degree of engagement of the user took the fewer votes. This answer helped us to understand that the topic of interactive documentary is what will keep the user gathered and not the interactivity which give the user engages. As creators many times we fall into the trap to achieve a greater degree of interactivity while in fact what the user needs is an interesting subject that will keep his attention.
This question is about what subject of an interactive documentary people are willing to watch. The most common answer was science and second comes the music and social content of an interactive documentary. This answer illustrates that people tend to consume what they are interested in. On the other hand, it is worth noting that subjects with social content would be preferably presented in a linear documentary and not in an interactive form. Thus, the success of an interactive documentary depends on a high degree at its subject and the interests of the consumers.
This question is about the advantages of an interactive documentary. The question was “What makes you to consume an interactive documentary instead of a conventional documentary?”. The most common answer was that they can watch it anytime and for as long as they want, without limitation of time or breaks for advertisements. Second comes the answer that I can consume only the part that I am interested in without watching the whole documentary. From their answers we can recognize the big advantage of non-linear documentary, on demand viewing and the ability to watch only the part they are interested in without losing time on watching the whole documentary. This is a big difference from young people and people of older ages and it is happening due to the busy schedule and the stressful timetable young people have to follow to cope with new rhythms of life.
9.2. Design and Development

As far as the design of the project is concerned, according to Dimoulas (Dimoulas, 2015) the subject of multimedia design is the understanding of the analysis result, in order to create a full development plan. Moreover, Dimoulas (Dimoulas, 2015) describes the organization of the multimedia project and the design of the multimedia product as two parallels but with great correlation means, because the conclusion and the results extracted from each other are feedback and ratification of the other. Referring to design we mean the design of the website, its thematic entities, the navigation structure of the website, the categorization of screens.

After the review of related projects and multimedia authoring tools it was time to design our web page. The first step was done we planned the interviews, recorded the interviews and edited them. The first thought was to separate the interviews in thematic entities according to the four main pillars which the project was based on the second thought was to separate interviews according to interviewees, each person to talk about every theme in one clip. We tried both separations to end up in a mixed separation. Finally we separated the project into five categories, five interviewees and a second separation about the four thematic entities. To make the project more interactive we put linking buttons where the user can jump from one thematic entity to another and from one interviewee to the other.

Moreover, one of the stages of a multimedia production is the Development stage that contains the multimedia application integration and the packaging delivery. Since we are not experts in writing software codes, the aim of this phase is to present all the material selection and processing from the perspective of a user experience (UX) designer.

9.2.1 Target Group Analysis

At this point of design and development we have to clarify our target group. As we have mention above the documentary at first was made about young people (at the age of 18-25) for young people in order to sensitize them and make them act and to start being interested about politics, economy, education and the national problem of their country. By showing them young people as them, being interested and have an in-depth opinion about those features, we give the message that they could be like them and they can start thinking differently. After we made the documentary we saw that this documentary could take advantage of older people, at the age of 35+, people involved in education or politics. Watching this documentary you can shape directly an opinion about what young people think
about politics, economy, education and the national problem of their country, so if you want to take advantage of it, as a teacher or politician you have to change thinks that are mentioned in the documentary as problematic. This documentary is suitable as well about people who have concerns about youth and politics in order to change things or those who just want to listen to the opinion of youth about politics.

9.2.2. Media and content analysis

Media and content analysis refers to the type of media used in a multimedia project. In our multimedia project the type of content was videos, photos, sound, text and linking buttons. The biggest part of the project was done by shooting and editing the interviews. By the time we decided how we will separate the thematic entities and what program we would use to create our project the next step was to publish the project.

9.2.3. Technical & functional specifications

The functional specification, according to Rory O’Connor refers to the process that “describes how a product will work entirely from the user’s perspective” (O’Connor, n.d.). More precisely, users do not care about the technical information of a product, for instance how it is implemented. On other hand, users care about the menus, the screens, the dialogs and more general about the practical features of a product (O’Connor, n.d.). In our case, we included different types of content, a “Home” page separated into five different parts, clickable labels; in every page we have the home button, the skip button and the next button. In one page we have a hyperlink interlinking the video into another platform for further information about an aspect.

Referring to the technical specifications according to Rory O’Connor” describes the internal implementation of the program” (O’Connor, n.d.). For instance, it refers to “data structures, relational database models, choice of programming languages and tools, algorithms, etc.” (O’Connor, n.d.). In our project the structure was defined by the editor program “Klynt” adapted in our needs and changes that we are able to do through the multimedia authoring tool. For the buttons we choose to use the yellow color because it shows hope, according to physiological researches, something that give the message that there is a hope to act and change things in those four pillars that the documentary is based on. Also for the question labels we use the gray color in order to make them visible as a harmonious combination.
9.2.4. Interface Analysis

The interface of both documentaries is a desktop interface. We decided to design our documentary in a desktop interface due its duration. The conventional documentary has a duration around 20 minutes duration something that means that you need to be a comfortable position to watch it, additionally it is better to watch on a big screen and not from your smartphone. Thus because the conventional was in a desktop format we should keep the same format for the interactive documentary as well. The reason we had to keep the same format was not to interfere with research due to other factor such as devices.

At this point we can say that the design and development part of our multimedia project was done in parallel because shootings were done at the beginning of the project with a simpler planning. For the design of the project we edited the clips and finalized the thematic entities, the multimedia tools we used, the types of content, we created navigation paths which a user could follow and we wrote the main title of the project.

In the questionnaire we mention above we asked also people about which structure of the documentary prefer by showing them screenshots about the two different screens. At the question was explained what the two screenshots was presented and the type of answer were to choose one of two images.
Image 15: Questionnaire about the visual and structural features of the web documentary

This image is a screenshot from the answered questionnaire about visual and structural features of the interactive documentary. The question asks about the formulation of questions at the documentary. The first choice has the whole question itself on the label and the second choice separate the answer in a whole thematic entity using labels, the question itself appears while the documentary is playing. The answer here reveals that people prefer the second option that is the categorization question. This makes us realize that people prefer smaller clickable labels for an interactive documentary.

Image 16: Questionnaire about the visual aspects of the first page of the web documentary

This question is about the “Home” page of the interactive documentary. The first option is a “Home” page divided into four parts, each part represents an interviewee and the professor who appear in the next pages. Each part is clickable but there is no description about what is following. The second option is a “Home” page divided into six parts, four interviewees, the professor and a small description about the particular interactive documentary. The answer here is the second option where there is a description of this interactive documentary and the viewer can see all interviewees on the first page.
This question is about the very first page of the interactive documentary. It asks if it would be useful to have a very first page with a small description about what it is going to follow and a second page where interviewees are located. The second option was on the first page and to have the five interviewees the description about the interactive documentary in one page. The answer was to have a very first page with a description and a second one only with interviewees. The answer was opposite from the previous questions. The answer in this question was to start with a description of the documentary in the “Home” page. Thus we did not apply the description in a separate page but we put it in the middle of the “Home” page with the five interviewees.

9.2.5. The User Experience

The user experience design according to Don Norman is the process of providing products with relevant experience to users (Interaction design foundation, n.d.). Besides, UX designers “will consider the Why, What and How of product use” (Interaction design foundation, n.d.). More precisely, the why involves the users’ motivations of adopting a product, the what describes the functionality of products”, what people can do with the products and last the how is related with the design and the accessibility (Interaction design foundation, n.d.).
According to Don Norman and Jakob Nielsen one of the most significant purposes of user experience is to fill all the customers’ needs without bothers (Norman & Nielsen, n.d.). After that, the simplicity and elegance can produce products that it is a joy to use (Norman & Nielsen, n.d.). The user experience serves not only the customers’ needs but also “in order to achieve high-quality user experience in a company's offerings there must be a seamless merging of the services of multiple disciplines, including engineering, marketing, graphical and industrial design, and interface design” (Norman & Nielsen, n.d.).
9.3. Evaluation

The aim of the project was to find the preferred type of documentary and the reason why it is the preferred type, to examine the viewing habits of two generations digital natives and digital immigrants and finally to determine the advantages and disadvantages of the web documentary. Our research method was the focus groups interview and at the same time we created two types of documentaries the conventional and the web documentary in order to examine them.

As a multimedia project needs to be tested in actual audience in order to find limitations about technical, visual and functional characteristics of the multimedia project. Evaluation is the last stage of a multimedia production. The evaluation of a multimedia project is very important because it examines the functionality and the usability of services (Dimoulas, 2015). According to the definition of usability ISO-9241, usability is the efficiency, and effectiveness is the satisfaction with which specified users achieve specified goals in particular environments (Dimoulas, 2015). As a result, specific objectives and user-friendly criteria have been identified that can be applied in the evaluation process, providing useful information (Dimoulas, 2015).

Furthermore, there are four evaluation categories methods: the inquiring, the prototyping, the inspection and the usability tests methods, which also determine the performance of a system (Dimoulas, 2015). More detailed, inquiring methods are accomplished with the help of questionnaires, interviews, polls, they may refer to experts or to average users and they can be applied to the initial stage of analysis and design or in the final stage of the product (Dimoulas, 2015).

Also, the prototyping methods focus on receiving feedback through ongoing evaluation in every development phase before the construction is completed (Dimoulas, 2015). Besides the fact that the evaluation needs printed materials, on paper with storyboarding, video prototyping or with other applications can be used (Dimoulas, 2015, p. 378).

The inspection methods are carried out by experts who analyze or evaluate the final or immediate prototype (Dimoulas, 2015, p. 378). This method is considered to be an easier one because external users are not required.
Besides, the usability testing methods are considered to be very important for the revision of the system. They can also take place in a laboratory or in the actual user environment and the results of them are measured (Dimoulas, 2015).

Also, there are two types of evaluation the formative and the summative. The formative refers to the evaluation and the guidance in the early phases of the analysis, design and development, serving all the project needs (Dimoulas, 2015, p. 377). The summative concerns to the final conclusive assignment with the aim to export conclusions of the whole project (Dimoulas, 2015).

The evaluation of the final project was made also with focus group method. More specifically we test our project by asking the participants of focus groups about the advantages of the web documentary and how it would be better. The test of tour application was made through real users and had the form of a discussion. The answers we get are discussed in the following pages but in general they prefer to embed an introductory paragraph or to change the structure of the web documentary.
10. Results & Discussion

As we have mentioned above our academic questions were three, the first was to identify the viewing habits of two generations digital natives and digital immigrants, the second was about to redefine the advantages and disadvantages of the web documentary and finally to find which type of documentary participants of the focus group prefer. In this section we will discuss about the answers participants gave us in order to answer our academic questions.

10.1. Viewing Habits of Digital Immigrants

Examining the viewing habits of digital immigrants and digital natives we have reliesed that they have many differences between them while consuming media.

The answers that we got about the relationship with the technology of people above the age of 35+ was 3/8 very good relationship and 5/8 answered just typical so as they need it for their job. In the question of how many hours you spend on the Internet per day 4/8 answered that they use the Internet only one hour per day and especially for communication through Skype, Viber, what’s up, with their children who do not live in Cyprus. 2/8 answered that they use Internet 2-3 hours per day especially for their work, or when they search something, or if they want to read about something. Only 2/8 use the Internet 5 hours per day and most of the time they search something for their jobs and only one hour per day to relax.

According to the usage of social media between people above the age of 35+, most of them (5/8) do not even have any account in any social media, 1/8 has an account but it is not active, and 2/8 have an account and they use it every day especially for relaxation, watching others posts and they do not upload their content. Referring to their information and which platform they prefer to get informed by, most of them answered that they get informed especially form television and radio (4/8), 2/8 get informed from Television and Internet, one from eight is being informed only form the Internet and one from eight is being informed only from television and not every day. They watch TV at least two hours per day and while they are watching TV do lot of things such as housework, cooking, or talking in the phone.

Their viewing habits of digital immigrants reflected in the next question of our focus groups. The question was about how they consume television content, most of the people at the age of 35+ and more specifically six out of eight answered that while they are watching TV are doing something else at the same time for example households, cooking.
“Almost every time I am watching TV I am also doing something else, either cooking, either households, the TV is open in the background”. C.P

In the question if they use a second screen while they are watching TV only two out of eight answered that they use a second screen especially because they are working with their laptops or they are searching for more information about the content of TV at this specific time that they are watching.

“Most of the times while I am watching TV i am also working in my laptop or I am talking with my daughter through Skype”. C.K

On the other hand only two of eight they answered that while they are watching TV are dedicated to it.

“From TV programs I only watch the News and when I am watch it I am dedicated to it” A.P

Most of the answers prove that the second screening effect is not followed by people of the age of 35+ something that we will see in the following paragraphs younger people use a second screen every time they watch TV.

Interviewees of the Digital Immigrants focus group (35+) in the question if they were using another screen while there were watching the interactive documentary answered: “No i did not use a second screen while I was watching the interactive documentary because I needed to engage fully in order to continue the viewing” C.P

In the case of digital immigrants we realize from the answers that we get, the viewing habit that it is followed by people above of the age of 35 is the “establish viewing habits”. As we mention above in the literature review, when referring to “establish viewing habits” we mean that people consume passively.

10.2. Viewing Habits of Digital Natives

The viewing habits of younger people who are between the ages of 18 until 25 were examined with the focus group method too.

The majority of young Cypriots from the age of 18 until 25, are informed through the Internet especially via smart phones which are extensions of their hands meaning that they use it all the time. It is also worth noting that 4/8 use the internet about five hours per day, 3/8 use the Internet more than seven hours per day and only 1/8 use the Internet three hours per day. They
watch TV one or two hours per day and while they are watching TV they use a second screen especially their smart phones. Not to forget to mention that all of the interviewees have accounts in at least one of social media and they are very active.

In the question if while they are watching TV they are using their mobile phone 6/8 answer of course we use our mobile phone while we are watching TV. They use their mobile phone to talk with friends not about the showing TV program but for other topics, or they play games on their mobile phone or they scroll down in social media (Instagram, Facebook). This is happening throughout the viewing period and not only when the TV has ads. More specifically a girl answers that “With a frequency of every ten minutes I will look at my mobile phone regardless of what TV it is showing at that time”. E.S.

It is worth noting that in the question if you use a second screen while watching the interactive documentary most of the young interviewees answered: “Yes but in limited time because the documentary needed my engagement in order to continue viewing.”. So the requirement of user engagement is not as binding factor as they do not deal with something else at the same time.

They noted that they do not have the need to comment on a TV program with their friends except from something that would be interesting for both of them. Also they noted that they are not willing to share TV programs in their social media accounts but they would share a TV program in direct message with someone who knew that they have in common interests.

It is clear that younger people adopt the second screening effect while consuming media and it is very common between them. Second screening refers to the usage of a second device while something is showing on another device. Moreover content sharing-microblogging (to share, comment, edit content) and the water cooler (team viewing) effect are not adopted from the participants of this focus group. At the same time “establish viewing habits are not adopted from younger people because they do a lot of other things while consuming something than consuming passively the content showing.

Finally it is worth noting that the “video on demand” is adopted from both focus groups, especially when it is something that they are interested in and they prefer to consume it when they want and as long as they want. Another reason that they prefer to consume video on demand is that they can skip ads.
10.3. Advantages and Disadvantages of web documentary

Starting with an ascertainment, the web documentary is something very new in the Cypriot society and most of the people do not know how it works, the concept and the possibilities of a web documentary. Only 3/8 of young interviewees and only 2/8 of older participants of focus groups they have watched something similar before our meeting. After the viewing of the web documentary by their own they noted that this type of documentary has many pros and cons, some they disagree about those specific pros and cons and an interesting conversation started.

Most of the people noted that watching only the part that you are interested in is an advantage of the web documentary but from the other hand there were answers with the opposite opinion such as: “Being able to isolate only what you want to see in my opinion is not a privilege for the web documentary because the one who is interested in the subject will watch all of it and all thematic entities due to the interrelated and social character of the project.” M.A

From one point of view, if we talk about social issues it is a fact that we have to examine them through different perspectives and examine different factors that led to this result. In our case the purpose of the project was to outline the view of young people on various issues such as society, politics, education, and the Cyprus problem. The four factors played a big role in order to understand why young people are not interested in those issues anymore and if someone wants to understand why and examine the problem in depth he/she has to watch it all. By watching the whole documentary they could form a spherical outline of the young Cypriots beliefs. On the other hand no one can deny that if someone wants to watch only one piece that he/she is interested in, can do it much more easily than in conventional documentary. So the ability that a web documentary gives us to consume only the parts that we are interested in it is undoubtedly an advantage.

M.A continues saying: “If someone is really interested about the subject he would watch the whole interactive and the whole conventional documentary, someone who is not interested would not watch at all”. A huge factor of the success of the documentary is the subject. You have to create a documentary that people want to watch therefore you have to outline you target group.

Another advantage of this categorization of the web documentary is that “If you miss something and you want to watch it again it is much easier to find it in the web documentary,
due to the categorization, than in the conventional documentary. Especially if we are talking about a conventional documentary which is shown on TV you could not listen something that you missed.” E.S.

Undoubtedly it is an advantage of the web documentary that it is uploaded in the web and it is a whole website that you can visit any time and as many times as you want. On the other hand we had answers like: “In my opinion the ability that a web documentary gives you to watch it anytime you want is not an advantage because nowadays you can go back and in TVs program and watch what you missed. Except from that most of the content of TV is uploaded on YouTube so you can find the conventional documentary online too”. This is partly right, yes you can go back and watch what you missed but only if you have cable TV and for a limited time. So the possibility to watch it any time you want is still an advantage of the web documentary. It is true that most of the content of TVs program is uploaded on YouTube and this is related to cross media publishing and hybrid media logic, of course channel owners realized that a second market of YouTube is also profitable.

An important outcome from the conversation of the focus group was the following statement: “In the web documentary the content is solid and most of the questions are not edited in the montage in contrast in the conventional documentary the answers of interviewees are edited to serve the flow of the story so that the story has a beginning, a middle and an end”. M.P

This is a true statement, in the conventional documentary we edit the answers and keep only the important part so that our story has a flow and is consisted with the voice narration. According to web documentary the content was also edited but we tried to keep the whole answer for each question cutting only repetitions and mistakes. Also if one answer was suitable in a thematic entity but was an answer of another question we put it together with the appropriate thematic entity. We tried to give a clear image of what interviewees believe because the voice narration is missing which gives a context to the story.

The same question was put to the other age group (35+) about the advantages and disadvantages of the interactive documentary and about the absence of narrative voice. Most of the answers agree with the answers of the other age group. Some of them noted that the categorization of interactive documentary is an advantage because you can consume only the part that you are interested. On the other hand we had some voices that pointed out the fragmented and incomplete opinion formation.
“I prefer the interactive documentary due to the advantage of consuming what you want. The conventional documentary is boring for me, for example me as a teacher I watched only the part of education something that will happened in real life and I will not even search for the conventional one” J.P

“The categorization of interactive documentary gives you the opportunity to create your own conclusions without the guidance of a narrative voice” A.T

As we have mention above in both focus groups there were voices noting that consuming only the part that you are interested is not an advantage.

“Consuming only a part of the story it is not an advantage for me because you are probably going to form an incomplete opinion. The thematic entities are interconnected and you have to watch them all in order to create a spherical opinion about the topic. If I watched only the interactive documentary, the part that I am interested in, I would quickly get the answers I wanted and I would not listen to the rest in order to take a holistic view of the subject something that is required to form a complete view about a topic.” C.K

The next question was about the narrator’s narrative voice which gives a context to the conventional documentary. The narrative voice keeps the flow of the story in order to have a beginning, middle and an end. One of the aspects of the web documentary is the absence of the narrative voice. In the question if the absence of the narrative voice is an advantage or disadvantage of the web documentary, most of young interviewees answer that it is a disadvantage because the story has no context and it gives the impression that it is five independent stories. Also the young interviewees noted that they did not understand the reason of making of the web documentary due to the absence of the context.

“According to the absence of the voice narration in the web documentary, it would be good to have at least one text describing the concept of what you are going to watch, who are the ones who are talking and why they are telling us their opinion”. I.T

In the first page of the web documentary there is a small description saying that “Four young Cypriots, who are politically active, share their opinion for politics, economics, education and the Cyprus problem. Demetris Trimithiotis, a professor in the University of Cyprus, gives his answers to the questions.” It is true that the description is incomplete and this does not dare the viewer to watch the content.
“The absence of the narrative voice which gives you the context for me is a disadvantage because you do not understand the reason of making this documentary in contrast in the conventional documentary there is an explanation of the cause and thus the story has a flow with a beginning, middle and an end” S.S.

“For me the absence of the narrative voice it is a disadvantage. In my opinion it would be good to have the creator’s voice that make the research, in this way the web documentary would be friendlier to the user and more humane. Now it is just a sterile snapshot of views.” A.O

On the other hand we had only one interviewee saying that the absence of voice is not a problem for the web documentary he stated that: “The absence of the narrative voice is not a problem about me because the categorization is on point and the questions are written in bottom left of the page, so the voice is replaced with the proper text in order to understand the reason of making the web documentary and what they talk about in the specific part.” E.S

With the proper categorization and the written questions beyond the documentary you can understand what they are talking about. Also by writing a text while a documentary is playing we embedded more than two senses of the user, (listening, reading and watching) and this enforced the user to give more emphasis on the documentary and what it is saying than the conventional documentary which you have to watch and listen only. In this way it is very easy to get distracted.

Additionally the aim of the web documentary is to give a clear preview of the subject and not to describe the cause of making the subject. In the characteristics of web documentary the absence of narrative voice is undeniable and none of the web documentary examples that we gave in the previous pages has a narrative voice giving the context of the story. Most of interviewees believe that the absence of narrative voice is a disadvantage because they are not used to this type of documentary. By embedding a voice narration to the web documentary would be like adopting the conventional logic.

According to the question of the absence of the narrative voice the answers of the second focus group (35+) do not differ from the answers of the first focus group (18-25) as we had answers like, the absence of the narrative voice is a disadvantage and on the other hand we had answers like the absence of the narrative voice is not a problem.
As most interviewees note “It would be good to have a narrative voice or some kind of introduction to the topic and a final comment about the research beyond the documentary to not be so dry, infertile and without a context” C.K

The narrative voice is a factor that will attract or repel the user respectively as an interviewee noted: “The narrator’s voice is one of the factors that will attract you or not to watch the documentary and if it is absent the only factor that could attract you to watch the documentary is the topic” T.P

This statement refers to obsolete forms of viewing especially for the conventional documentaries in contrast here we examine the new viewing habits and if something would change during the viewing process to attract the viewer and am referring to the interactivity that the web documentary offers. Nevertheless it is a true and on point statement.

On the other side of the coin there are less voices telling that the absence of the narrative voice it is an advantage.

“With the proper questions that appear on the screen, the narrative voice is not needed” A.T

Both focus groups noted the importance of the absence of the narrative voice which is the freedom of creating their own conclusions without the influence of one voice. “In my opinion the absence of a narrative voice is an advantage because the viewer is free to create his/her own conclusions and to perceive the content as he wants without being guided from a voice to make a definite conclusion. J.P

After the conversation between interviewees that started after the question about the advantages and disadvantages of the web documentary, came up into the conclusion that one who wants to deepen into the subject would prefer to watch the interactive documentary where the content is almost unedited. This one who wants to just outline the opinion of young people would prefer to watch the conventional documentary where the content is edited to fix with the flow of the story.

More specifically participants agreed that the web documentary is more objective, it gives you more learning potential and it is easy to find it on the web and consume it as you want. On the other hand they believe that consuming only what you want is a disadvantage because you would not have a spherical view of the problem and your conclusions will be fragmented.
Finally they agreed that web documentary it is not emphasizing somewhere and it has a broad thematic range and broad audience.

**10.4. The preferred documentary**

Finally it is clear that even young people from 18 until 25 years, people who are familiar with technology and the new factor of the engagement game, prefer the conventional documentary, the traditional digital story. More specifically only 3/8 would prefer to consume the interactive content and 5/8 would prefer the conventional documentary. This is reflected in their answers: “Personally I believe that the interactive documentary is sterilized, on the contrary in the conventional documentary with the narration voice separating the thematic entities and switching images which surround the interviews, prepare the user about what will follow and at the same time it relaxes the user. It is good to have an introduction before each interview. The conventional documentary has a continuous flow and I do not have to click anywhere, this relaxes me more and I am willing to watch it. It gives me the cinematic experience and I prefer it. With all of these clicks you don’t know what to choose even the categorization is very clear. The conventional is more relaxing because you don’t have to decide what to consume, the story is ready and you just lay back and watch.”. P.K.

As we have expected the same have happened in the second focus group (35+) all of the interviewees preferred the conventional documentary and only one of them the interactive documentary. Most of them agreed with the statement that the conventional is a completed story with a beginning a middle and an end. Using the context you are able to understand the whole story behind the documentary and it is easier to create your own conclusions as they note. Digital immigrants agreed with digital natives in the part of cinematic experience that the conventional documentary offers. Concluding that the most important factor that makes the conventional documentary the most preferred is the cinematic experience it offers without having the user engagement by pressing various buttons in order to continue viewing. As we can notice people are stacked into the “ley back and watch” logic concerning documentary consumption something that does not let this new type of documentary to grow.

“Clicking a lot of buttons in order to continue viewing I did not like it, in my free time I want to relax and to watch something pleasant, I prefer to lie back and watch something without thinking what to click next” C.A
At this statement it is important that the interviewee noted the cinematic experience that conventional documentary offers, which is connected directly with movies, documentaries, entertainment documentaries. The conventional documentary gives you this cinematic experience but on the other hand the interactive documentary requires user engagement in a continuous basis in order to continue viewing the documentary. In the interactive in every three minutes or less you have to make a choice about what to see next so it does not offer you the cinematic experience. As the research showed people need this cinematic experience because they consume this type of content in their free hours where they want to relax. This observation is reflected in the following statement too.

“I get bored in the interactive documentary watching some people just talking on the contrary on the conventional documentary there was a flow, a narration that make you understand the cause of the documentary, changing images that relaxes you from the continuous narration”. I.T.

At this point it is useful to note that the second screening effect is clearly a digital natives effect something that it is not happening in older ages not because digital native are easily bored but because they have a different relationship with their mobile phones. Digital natives are more active in social media and they use much more messaging apps than digital immigrants and they want to always be connected to their social life and friends something that it is not happening for the digital natives who avoid the digital social life or they are not so depended on it. Nevertheless as far as digital immigrants are concerned not using a second screen while viewing does not mean that we have the attention of the user but that his interests are not concluding the mobile phone. The equivalent of second screening for digital immigrants could be considered the doing of housework while they are watching TV especially in previous years. As we have mention above digital immigrants today also use their mobile phones while they are watching TV but especially for communication through phone calls apps.

Finally in the question “Which one of two types of documentary would recommend to someone to watch?” the answer of all the interviewees from 18-25 focus group was “It depends on who I am going to recommend this documentary to” meaning if I would recommend it to someone in my age I would suggest the interactive, if I would advocate it to someone who is older I would mentioned the conventional. Also if someone was interested in
the subject I would recommend the interactive documentary with the solid content, if someone wanted to outline a quick opinion I would propose the conventional documentary.

The second focus group of 35+ in the same question, “which one would you recommend to someone to watch” all of them answered the conventional one except from one who would recommend the interactive one something that reflects their preferences.

10.5. How the web documentary would be better?

Finally we asked them another question about how the web documentary would be better in order to consume it more pleasantly. This question could also be a part of the Evaluation of the multimedia project and help us to make it better for the user.

Responses vary but the most common answer was about having a different categorization for example instead of a separation according to people, a separation according to thematic entities would be more useful. Most of the interviewees answered that an introduction to the topic is missing and would be useful for understanding that an academic research that was the cause of our research is behind this project. For example if we embedded an introductory documentary, or an introductory page writing the purpose and the causation of the project, or even a background voice giving the context of the project, our project would have more consistency. Another interesting answer that we got was to limit the categories in total.

“Perhaps a limitation of categories would be useful because in this current form the project is like a power point, four categories from five interviewees we have twenty combinations to follow.” P.K

This statement was noted twice, from focus groups, something that noted the need of a cinematic experience while people are consuming digital content, something that we will explain in the following pages.

The categorization according to thematic entities was made for the conventional documentary so we decided to separate the interviews in a different way, according to interviewees. By this separation we give emphasis that the answers are personal opinions of each interviewee and at the same time we give the opportunity to meet each person and make the project more humane. According to the limitation of the categories, we separate each interview according to person and then according to thematic entity, with an easy navigation. If we limited the categories it would be like we adopted a TV’s documentary mentality, with a result of having
two similar products. According to Nick Ware “The reason of the slow development of webdocs is the belief of most of the commissioning editors that the internet is the second in-line viewing platform, after the TV”. This means that most of the creators of web docs create a documentary based on TV’s viewing conditions and a documentary absolutely for the web. As a result we have a similar product but in two different platforms, something that refers to the cross media publishing logic.

On the other hand, “Many clicks are redundant and confusing to the user/viewer. The consistency of the project is the one that takes precedence over the interaction” according to Almeida A., Alvelos H.

It is true that many clicks confused the user who does not know what to choose even with a clear structure as in our case. (Pinhanez C et al, 2001)

In our case, the belief of embedding interactivity and create projects that need the user’s engagement, as the new media tactics require, creating a user experience based on video games in order to make the project more appealing and more interesting for the user, it seems to be the big loser as everything shows that interviewees prefer the traditional documentary.

At the question if the topic of the project is an important feature to watch it or not, five out of eight people were willing to watch some parts of the interactive documentary and if it drew their attention they would watch the whole documentary. The other three people noted that if the subject of the documentary was not of their interest they would not watch it at all. From this answer we understand that the topic of the documentary is of high importance but other characteristic could keep the user in the site for a long time. Especially in an interactive documentary the creator is good to invest into features that keep the story interesting, such as to import a story map where is suitable, or to have a background narration while a graphic video is playing on the screen, without forgetting that the consistency of the story is the most important feature for a user to watch the whole story. A good consistency of the story and the proper degree of interactivity is the golden combination of having a successful interactive documentary.

The main reason that more people prefer to consume the conventional documentary is due to the cinematic experience that it offers. Most of the people prefer to lie back and consume content without thinking what to watch next.
11. Conclusions

To sum up in our research we created two documentaries one conventional and one interactive with the same topic, those two documentaries were tested in two focus groups with basic differentiation the age. The first focus group consisted of young people at the age of 18-25 which represents digital natives and the second one consisted of people above the age of 35+ which represent the digital immigrants. Thus our results have a dual role to play, on the one hand the questions help us to understand better features of interactive documentary and how people see them, and on the other hand we analyse the viewing habits of digital natives and digital immigrants. At the same time we end up with one preferred type of documentary and we realised the reason why this specific type is the preferred for both age groups.

Summing up according to our research the viewing habits of two age groups have lots of differences in the way the consume media and in the way they use their mobile phones. First of all people who are above the age of 35 are not connected on the internet as many hours as younger people. Both generations are doing something else at the same time when are consuming media. Digital Natives use a second screen and Digital Immigrants they do the housework. Also both generations consume media on demand, if they are interested in something they prefer to watch it on the web than at the showing hours.

Digital natives they seem to be not willing to share content but they did it as they noted at least once. Also they do not feel the need to consume at the same time with their friend and they cannot consume content passively. According to Digital Immigrants most of the time they consume content passively and they are focused to it.

The general and most important conclusion is that both age groups preferred the conventional type of documentary due to the cinematic experience that it offers. While people are consuming digital content they want to lie back and just watch without thinking of what to click in order to continue viewing. This conclusion confirms the statement of less clicking more watching that we have mention above.

Referring to advantages and disadvantages of the interactive documentary most of the interviewees noted that consuming only the part that you are interested in is an advantage but some others noted that it is not an advantage because partly consuming means that you will create a partly opinion about the topic. In order to create an integrated opinion about a topic you have to examine all sections and subsections especially in our projects which are
interconnected. At the beginning of the project the partly consumption for us was definitely an advantage but after the contact with focus groups second thoughts came to us if it is still an advantage. In my opinion the partly viewing is still an advantage of the interactive documentary because this is an opportunity that only happens with interactive documentary and in no other type of documentary. However because our topic has a social character and most of social subjects are interconnected with other factors, reasons and topics perhaps the partly viewing is not suitable for this kind of topic.

Another important conclusion that came up is that digital natives noted that the content of interactive documentary is solid and almost unedited. Digital natives underline this feature and highlight that someone who wants to deep in the topic would watch the interactive documentary instead of conventional which offers a quick and spherical image and not a deep and clear image of the topic as the interactive one. Undeniable another advantage of interactive documentary noted is the on demand viewing, the ability to consume it anytime you watch as long you want, also it is easy to reach it and manage it.

As noted, one disadvantage of interactive documentary and one advantage of conventional is that the conventional documentary could be consumed by people of any age due to the showing platform used. Interactive documentary for example could not be reached from people of older ages because they probably do not have a smart device of a personal computer.

A big discussion was set up about the absence of narrative voice in the interactive documentary. Some of the interviewees noted that the absence is a disadvantage of the interactive documentary because the context of the story is missing and they did not understand the reason of making the documentary and the story behind it. Also they underline that with the absence of the narrative voice the documentary is infertile, dry, alienated and impersonal. On the other hand we had some voices saying that the absence of narrative voice is not a problem because the questions that appear and the categorization with thematic entities is very clear. Narrative voice as an introduction is not one of characteristics of interactive documentaries without meaning that our project does not need any kind of introduction. Perhaps it would be better to use a further introductory paragraph or an introductory video for the beginning of the interactive documentary. This could be considered as a limitation of our project.
Finally we ended up with the question of how the interactive documentary would be more appealing to watch it more pleasantly and the answers we got reminded the conventional type of documentary for example the limitation of categories in order to click less or a different categorization edits that would make the interactive similar to the conventional documentary. This observation highlights the ignorance of people about this new type of documentary which is making its first steps in Cypriot society.

Undeniable our project has limitations which affect the results we got. The first limitation of our research could be the number of participants of the focus group. The audience we tested our documentary on was very small in number in order to get objective conclusions.

According to the production of both documentaries, if we had better equipment or a specialist to technical things the result would be more professional. Despite these with the available equipment we had this result. Maybe in a further research approach we will fix the technical things and contact a bigger focus group.

Another interesting question about further research will be if the social and politics subject could be attributed with non – linearity. In our case we did not focused on documentaries as journalistic and social process but as a research item in order to get the results we wanted.

For further research an interesting question would be how digital natives learn, in this thesis we did not have the time to examine how the learning habits changed. Also a limitation of this research could be that we did not check if by showing the documentaries to the focus groups has changed their minds and started to get involved with politics something that was the main purpose of the creation of documentaries. A research question about that could be if the non-linear documentary helps to the learning potential.

Finally both documentaries could be tested and improved in order to have more impact especially in young ages. In a small limit we tried to create documentaries about young people for young people in order to sensitize them in topics such as politics. With further enrichment and the proper research behind it specific documentaries could accomplish the first target.
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Appendix

Focus Groups Questions 18-25

1. From which platform do you prefer to be informed?
   - 4 from mobile
   - 3 from mobile and TV
   - 1 from PC
2. How many hour do you use the Internet per day?
   - 2 -> 7h
   - 1 -> 7h+
   - 2 ->3-4h
   - 2->5h
   - 1->2h
3. While you are watching TV are you using a second screen at the same time?
   - 6 -> YES
   - 2 -> NO
   - For playing games or chatting with friends in social media
4. When you are watching something on TV do you feel the need to comment it with your friends?
   - 5 -> NO
   - 2 -> If it is something very interesting yes
5. Would you share a TV program on social media?
   - 5 -> NO
   - 2 -> If it is something very interesting yes
6. Have you ever before consumed something interactive that need the user engagement in order to continue viewing?
   - 3/8 YES
7. In your opinion which are the advantages and disadvantages of the Web Documentary? The absent of narrative voice is it advantage of disadvantage in your opinion?
   - Consuming only the part you are interested of course it is an advantage. Also I have the feeling that in the web documentary the clips are not edited. According to the absent of the narrative voice it would be good to have an introductory text or video in order to understand the context.
- A disadvantage of conventional video is that if you missed something it is difficult to go back and find what you missed. In the web documentary if you missed something it is very easy to find what you missed because it is separated into categories.

- In my opinion the web documentary it is more interesting because you can find what you want to hear easy. In my opinion the absent of narrative voice is a disadvantage because without it the story is solid and has no context. Consuming only the part you are interested in of course it is an advantage.

- After consuming both documentaries my conclusion is that if somebody wants to focus on the topic will consume the interactive one and this is because the clips on the interactive are unedited but if somebody wants to consume a story with a start, a middle and an end or just to create a general opinion on the topic will consume the conventional one.

- Consuming only a part in my opinion it is not an advantage because as a social topic the categories and subcategories are interconnected and if you want to create a spherical view of the topic you have to consume them all.

- The on demand viewing that the web documentary offers it is not an advantage for my because if you have cable TV you are able to go back and watch what you missed also most of the TV’s content is uploaded on YouTube so you can watch it anytime you want and as long as you want.

- In my opinion conventional documentary is more useful because more people of all ages groups are able to consume it, for example people of older ages would face difficulties while consuming the web documentary because they are not familiar in using similar platforms.

- Interactive documentary in my opinion is solid but the conventional one with the narrative voice, the changing images and the music keep your interest. The conventional documentary is more relaxing.

8. While you were watching the web documentary you used a second screen?
   - 7/8 NO
   - 1/8 Yes but not too much because in order to continue viewing you have to click buttons and needs your attention.

9. How the web documentary would be better?
   - In my opinion with a different categorization would be better. If it was separated into thematic entities instead of peoples would be better.
   - If you have an introductory paragraph or an introductory video explaining what will follow and the reason of making of this video it would be helpful.
   - If the categories were less it would be more relaxing to the user to consume it.

10. If you have to recommend one type of documentary to someone which type would you recommend and why?
- It depends to who I would recommend the documentary, if he/she was a young people I
  would recommend the web if he/she was older people I would recommend the
  conventional one in order not to have difficulties like using the platform.

11. After consuming both documentaries which type do you prefer?
- 5 conventional
- 3 web
- I prefer the conventional one because it is more relaxed, probably I would consume this
  content in my free time when I want to relax, I prefer to lay back and just watch not
  thinking what to click next in order to continue viewing
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12. How you would characterize your relationship with technology?
   - 4/8 typical
   - 4/8 good, I use it especially in my job

13. Do you have a social media account?
   - 4/8 they don’t have
   - 3/8 they have but they are not very active
   - 1/8 has Facebook and use it every day in her free time

14. How many hours do you use the Internet?
   - 6/8 2-3 hours per day
   - 2/8 1-2 hours per day especially for my job

15. Do you use the Internet as a teaching method? Do you recommend to the students to use it at home?
   - I encourage students to use it in the class in order to find some answers or do some exercises
   - Usually I show some videos in the classroom as an example to the days lesson and I recommend to students to find similar videos at home and we watched it together at the next lesson
   - Sometimes I put them homework that needs the internet in order to answer it and I recommend to them some educational sites
   - I recommend to the students some sites in order to read more about what we said in the classroom

16. From which platform do you prefer to be informed?
   - 4/8 TV & Radio
   - 3/8 TV & Radio & Internet
   - 1/8 Only Internet

17. While you are watching TV are you doing something else at the same time?
   - Most of the time while I watch TV I am doing the housework or cooking
   - Usually when I work on my laptop I have the TV open in the background
   - When I watch TV I am chatting in viber with my daughter
   - From TV’s programs I only watch the news and I am truly focus on it
   - When I watch something on TV I usually search it in my mobile phone in order to learn more about it

18. Have you ever before consumed something interactive that need the user engagement in order to continue viewing?
19. In your opinion which are the advantages and disadvantages of the Web Documentary? The absent of narrative voice is it advantage of disadvantage in your opinion?
- Of course consuming only the part you are interested in without consuming the whole video it is an advantage. For example we as teachers we are interested in the part of education and critical thinking and so we consume only this part.
- Personally I prefer to consume the web documentary. Conventional for me it is boring
- It is very interesting that it is separated into thematic entities and people at the same time and you do not need the narrative voice in order to drive you into the story
- In my opinion if you consume only the web documentary you could create fragmented opinion because it is not obligated to watch the whole video. In order to create a spherical opinion about the topic you have to examine all the aspects. So in my opinion choosing what to consume it is a disadvantage and I prefer to consume the conventional documentary. If I was consuming the web documentary I would have very quickly the answers I wanted and I would never watched the whale video
- According to the absent of narrative voice for me it is not a problem because the questions are writer at the bottom of the screen
- It would be good if you have an introductory paragraph or a final statement, now it is solid and has no context
- For me the absent of narrative voice it is an advantage because you let the user free to create his own conclusions without directing the user to one specific conclusion
- The narrative voice it an element that that could be attractive to the user to consume so in my opinion the web documentary would be more attractive with a narrative voice in the background

20. How the web documentary would be better?
- I like it as it is, the thematic entities are very good separated in my opinion because it is easy to consume only what you want
- Maybe with fewer categories and less clicks would be more useful. Maybe if it was separated into thematic entities instead of people would be easier to the user to consume the whole documentary

21. If you have to recommend one type of documentary to someone which type would you recommend and why?
- I would recommend the one that I like the most (only one prefer the web documentary the other preferred the conventional)

22. After consuming both documentaries which type do you prefer?
- 1/8 web
- 7/8 conventional
- I prefer the conventional one because it is more relaxed, probably I would consume this content in my free time when I want to relax, I prefer to lay back and just watch not thinking what to click next in order to continue viewing