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Abstract
“iGen” (or Generation Z, or Post-Millennials) (Twenge, 2006, 2017; Rosen, Carrier, Cheever, 2010) identifies a generation of teenagers and children, born between 1995 and 2012, which, since childhood, uses digital devices for communication, entertainment, learning. Digital media affect every sphere of iGen’ers’ social and cultural experience and impact, therefore, also on the forms of film consumption.

In the post-media era, cinema consumption is part of a broader stream of media consumption, including online video, video games, TV series, videos shot with smartphones and other mobile devices and, in general, all that we can call ‘digital postcinema’.

Our paper intends to investigate a particular mode of film (and television) consumption: the second screen (De Francisci Morales, Shekhawat, 2013; Atkinson, 2014; Filho, Santos, 2015; Blake, 2017).

The term refers to the use of a second screen compared to the first screen (the screen on which the film is projected), in subordination or in synchronization or in a centrifugal function.

The goal of this paper is to explore the ways in which iGen’ers use the second screen, starting from three research questions:
A) How are mobile devices used to process symbolic meanings about movies and movie-going?
B) How does the smartphone compete with the film in contending the media user’s attention?
C) How is the use of the smartphone different when iGen’ers watch a film in movie theater and when they watch it at home?

We tried to answer these questions by collecting data through two focus groups made with high school students from the cities of Salerno and Benevento. The results presented highlight how the use of the second screen is a topic particularly interesting for contemporary Media Studies. On the one hand, in fact, through the paradigm of domestication, we can map concrete socio-cultural and media practices, linked to the second screen, through which iGen builds individual and collective identities, in the specific contexts in which Post-Millennials operate. On the other hand, the second screen represents a privileged observatory on the transformation of forms of hybridization between media, culture and society.
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I. iGen, Media Consumption and Sociocultural Practices

According to Judith Burnet\(^1\), after Mannheim’s first pioneering research\(^2\), in the social sciences, we can identify three approaches to the study of generations: the first approach conceives generational belonging as social agency; a second approach focuses on intergenerational correlations; the third approach produces conceptual maps based on the recurrent characteristics that distinguish the generations.

Some scholars\(^3\) have focused on the function of media and technological innovations as a push for generational change, while others have focused on cultural factors\(^4\).

However, for those born between 1980 and 1994, in particular, who are classified as belonging to Generation Y\(^5\) or Millennials\(^6\), technological change has led to significant transformations in consumption styles, lifestyles and social relationships. Thanks to the availability of widespread connections and mobile devices, the members of this generation have fully experienced the transition from analogue to digital media.

According to recent research (2015)\(^7\), Generation Y is distinguished by four fundamental socio-cultural characteristics: global dimension; active role in consumer choices; propensity to use mobile digital media; tendency to invest in identity building processes through social media. Millennials have grown up in a context of disaffection for politics, precariousness of work and the presentification of time horizons\(^8\). These phenomena encourage the prevalence of ludic and hedonistic consumption\(^9\). If the generation is conceived as a socio-anthropological construct, “marked by specific ‘indicators’ or ‘markers’ (common experiences, memorable facts, rituals and myths)\(^10\)”\(^10\), in the case of Generation Y, Fabris identifies these indicators in the definitive affirmation of the Internet and in the triumph of digital culture\(^11\).

It would seem that the transition from Generation Y to Generation Z (or iGen, or Post-Millennials), is marked by gradual changes but events such as 9/11\(^12\) and the 2008 global economic crisis, generate discontinuity among generations.

Twenge\(^13\) was the first to use the term “iGen”, while, according to Rosen, Carrier and Cheever\(^14\) iGen’ers encompass “multitasking skills, a virtual lifestyle, a penchant for cre-
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ating media content, and a brand new communication repertoire”\(^{15}\). On multitasking, Hayles\(^{16}\) points out that digital media stimulates the adoption of a hypervigilant framework, which includes the passage of attention between different tasks, the preference for multiple information flows, and the continuous search for a high level of stimulation through media.

Regarding online socialization, iGen’ers “present themselves to the world with an ever-changing, always wired cyber identity”\(^ {17}\), posting digital objects related to various moments of everyday life. Identity building and peer relationships take place primarily on the Web. As for grassroots media content, iGen contributes to the total success of participatory cultures\(^ {18}\) and prosumerism\(^ {19}\).

Numerous studies, undertaken in different geographical areas\(^ {20}\) substantially confirm these iGen characteristics. However, the pace of technological innovation has led to decisive transformations, about the devices used and the platforms frequented by iGen’ers.

More recently, Twenge\(^ {21}\) identifies, in the massive diffusion of smartphones since 2011 and 2012, the main factor of cultural change. The possibility of using devices that enable connectivity wherever the user is located has changed every sphere of the Post-Millennials’ individual and social experience. In addition, iGen also prefers to ‘inhabit’ new social platforms, such as Instagram and Snapchat, abandoning others such as Facebook and Twitter, corresponding to the progressive extension of users to previous generations. As for the use of the Internet and social media, iGen (which includes, for Twenge, those born from 1995 to 2012), has acted as a forerunner of cultural change for the rest of society\(^ {22}\).

Twenge identifies 10 trends, which characterize iGen and contemporary culture:

In No Hurry (the extension of childhood into adolescence), Internet (how much time they are really spending on their phones – and what that has replaced), In person no more (the decline in in-person social interaction), Insecure (the sharp rise in mental health issues), Irreligious (the decline in religion), Insulated but not intrinsic (the interest in safety and the decline in civic involvement), Income insecurity (new attitudes toward work), Indefinite (new attitudes toward sex, relationships, and children), Inclusive (acceptance, equality, and free speech debates), and Independent (their political views)\(^ {23}\).

Twenge points out that cultural change is not only determined by technology, but also by business, political choices and cultural practices. However, thanks to hyper-connectivity, smartphones have become authentic media centres for iGen’ers. Many studies, even recent ones, confirm this interpretation\(^ {24}\).
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\(^{23}\) Twenge, *iGen*, 3.

2. SECOND SCREEN

The massive penetration of portable devices had produced a post-filmic era, where the actual filmic experience is part of a flow of media experiences, which includes all that we can find in contemporary digital entertainment. ‘iGeneration cinema’ is characterized by: [...] the consumption of moving image works across many different platforms with ever-declining distinction between television programmes, videos and movies; and viewers who are increasingly mobile and individual yet internet-connected, even in collective environments.25

Our paper aims to focus, in particular, on one of the cultural practices of the iGen’s digital spectatorship: the ‘second screen’, which is a term used to identify instances whereby mobile phones, smartphones, tablets or computers are used in synchronization and in subordination with a dominant ‘first screen’ experience [...] both synchronously and asynchronously.26

A second screen is used in ‘subordination’ to a first screen, when its use is intended to make the medial experience guaranteed by the first screen more complete, immersive and satisfying. An example is the screening of a film trailer on a smartphone before it is screened in a cinema.

‘Synchronization’ refers to cases in which the second screen is used simultaneously with the first screen: thanks to specific software that allows smartphones to automatically recognize content transmitted by the first screen (TV or cinema), a series of services and activities is activated (voting, social media pages, advertising, extra information, etc.). This type is particularly used for live TV shows.

Furthermore, we identify a third function of the second screen. In fact, we define the function of the second screen as centrifugal, when its use tends to divert the medial user’s attention away from the first screen, directing it to other activities.

The second screen primarily covers TV shows, for which specific apps are developed.27 The main activity among ‘connected viewers’ concerns how they occupy their time during commercials, that is, by mostly sharing comments and opinions with others in a social media experience.28 The second screen can refer to two types of engagements [...]. In socialization, the interaction is accomplished by means of engagements (such as comments, likes, retweets) on social networks (many times incorporated on the TV shows itself, sometimes not, but always dependent on its content). The immersion type of engagement refers to the deepening of TV contents [...].

two forms of engagement through second screen appear here as separate and independent actions, but must be understood, as it so often happens, as occurring at the same time

In the post-broadcast era, apps for second screen experiences tell us that television has been transformed into a social and interactive medium. We can define Social TV as “the interactions among other viewers and between viewers, the characters, and the producers of the show enabled by the second-screen practice”.

If the second screen refers primarily to watching TV, nothing excludes its extension to the filmic experience. According to the ‘experiential turn’ in the field of humanities, the discipline of Media Studies describes the relationship between users and media in terms of experience. Thus “filmic experience is arguably both that moment when images (and sounds) on a screen arrogantly engage our senses and also that moment when they trigger a comprehension that concerns, reflexively, what we are viewing and the very fact of viewing it.”

A classification of the second screen uses based on the type of interaction includes:

1) Human-Human (HH). The first category is about social actions, from human to human, such as commenting the program with a friend or sharing content with your social circles, and we name it social sharing. [...] Certainly this feature is [...] very useful to share thoughts and user-generated content (UGC) while watching TV. [...] 

2) Human-Machine (HM). The second, gamification and extras, includes interactive activities where the human is the main driver, while the machine awaits user input. Such activities include answering a trivia, but also checking the TV guide (as the need arises from the user). [...] 

3) Machine-Human (MH). Finally, the last category comprises activities where the machine is the driver and the human is the consumer, and we call it expanded experience. These activities include proposing content generated algorithmically without explicit user input, e.g., getting show recommendations, related news or factoids about the content of the program [...].

Regarding cinematic second screen experiences, Atkinson distinguishes two typologies based on factual-based content (behind-the-scenes), traceable to the human-machine interaction (HM), and fiction-based narrative enhancements and extensions, traceable to the machine-human interaction (MH). For the first type, with the establishment of the DVD format, “the behind-the-scenes form really became established as both a cultural form and a form of legitimate academic inquiry within off-screen and paratextual studies.” With the decline of the DVD, the use of additional content has moved online, to dedicated YouTube channels, official Facebook pages or other media controlled by majors producers. Blu-Ray allows for a special interaction strategy between first and
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36 Atkinson, Beyond the Screen, 79-94.
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second screens, in which “external sources of information and streams of data on the web [...] can be viewed during the viewing of the main feature film, through on-screen alerts such as hot spots which transpire at temporal moments, allowing the viewer to jump out of the narrative into an associated paratextual element”\textsuperscript{38}. Sometimes, the transition to the second screen takes place thanks to specific apps.

As for the second type, Atkinson offers a number of interesting examples. The development of iOS technologies allows us to develop more refined storytelling strategies for the involvement of viewers. For the film \textit{Looper} (2012), the production provided a MP3 track with the director’s commentary, thus inviting the audience to listen to it while watching the film at the cinema. The thriller \textit{App} (2013) “combines a feature film with a synchronizable smartphone app. Audiences are invited to download the accompanying app prior to entering the cinema and then encouraged to access the app in the auditorium itself”\textsuperscript{39}. Meanwhile, RIDES (2011) offers “a platform that simultaneously utilizes all of the audience members’ digital communication devices (computer, phone and tablet) within a single unified storytelling experience”\textsuperscript{40}.

Finally, there are apps such as Social Commentary, which allow us to insert comments during the film, thereby becoming a tool with which to perform the function of socializing film culture, which is typical of the HH model.

3. SOUTHERN ITALIAN IGEN, CINEMA AND SECOND SCREEN USES

There are relative few studies on cinematic second screen experiences. Moreover, Post-Millennials’ relationship with the cinematic second screen remains virtually unexplored. Therefore, we tried to investigate this research object, with particular reference to how the iGen socializes its relationship with the cinema through the use of the mobile phone.

The theoretical paradigm adopted is that of domestication\textsuperscript{41}, which, including in Italy\textsuperscript{42}, refers to the cultural uses through which media and technologies are integrated into daily routines.

We started with three fundamental research questions:

A) How are mobile devices used to process symbolic meanings about films and film-going?

B) How does the smartphone compete with the film in attracting the media user’s attention?

C) How is the use of the smartphone different when iGen’ers watch a film at the cinema and when they watch it at home?

To answer these questions, we interviewed high school students during two focus groups held in February 2018\textsuperscript{43}.

For a correct reading of the data, it is opportune to state that the sample refers to

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 83.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 87.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 91.
\textsuperscript{43} For the methodological aspects see 3.4.
high schools, which are mainly attended by middle-class students. In addition, we specify the role played by the geographical context that influences lifestyles and consumption choices of students: in this sense, it is important to clarify that Benevento is a city with about 60,000 inhabitants, in which its two multiplexes are located outside of the urban centre, while Salerno is a medium-to-large city, in which the cinemas are distributed between the centre and the periphery.

Preliminarily, we investigated the consumption and relevance of cinema. Among 20 subjects interviewed, five declared that they watch between 15 and 20 films a month, seven between 10 and 15, four between 5 and 10 and only three between 0 and 5. Although these data do not have any statistical value, they demonstrate a reasonable level of film consumption. The importance of cinema in the context of the iGeneration’s media consumption is confirmed by the latest report by Istat, according to which “especially young people up to 24 years go to the cinema: we pass from 75.3 percent of children between 6 and 10 years old to almost 85 percent of 18 and 19 year olds”\(^44\). Furthermore, the same report states that there is no significant gender difference among Post-Millennials: among young people aged 15-19, 87.1 per cent of girls go to the cinema, compared to 82.6 per cent in the case of their male peers. Two other interesting data on cinema consumption concern: 1) territorial distribution: in Southern Italy, 49.1 per cent of people over six years of age went to the cinema at least once in the previous year, compared with 57.5 per cent in Central Italy and 52.3 per cent in Northern Italy; 2) the difference between metropolitan and rural areas: cinema consumption is more widespread where infrastructural provision is greater, that is, in the municipalities of metropolitan areas (59.8 per cent) and their suburbs (57.6 per cent).

On cultural memory associated with films, some of the Post-Millennials’ responses confirm a film’s ability to incorporate personal memories and experiences:

“*Christmas Carol* reminds me of the Christmas period when I was a child, when we were more attached to the family, to the parents” (Diego, M17\(^45\)).

“I was a very shy girl, and, when they invited me to see this film, *300*, at a friend’s house, I remember it as the first outing with a group of friends, in which I tightened the link with the group” (Fabiola, 14F).

Equally interesting is the social role associated to filmgoing. Almost all the interviewees declared that they go to the cinema with friends. In some important exceptions, cinema is experienced as an opportunity to strengthen family or friendship ties through a sort of ritual film consumption:

“I usually go with my father because he gave me this passion for films” (Filippo, M16).

The second exploratory phase was briefly reserved for the importance attributed to the smartphone. We found a clear difference between the two groups interviewed. All the students from Salerno said they recognized the practical value of the smartphone, in terms of accessibility of information and the possibility of contact with the world, while indicating their preference for interpersonal communication. Students from Benevento, on the other hand, showed a remarkable propensity to conceive the smartphone as an


\(^{45}\) With the letters M / F we indicate the sex of the students interviewed, with the number their age.
essential medium for interaction with their peer group, entertainment, and recording individual and collective memories:

“I am very attached to my phone because there are all my things. I use it for photos, for music... and I use it too much” (Ester, F15).

One reason could be that, while the inhabitants from Salerno live in an urban environment, which offers them many opportunities to meet up in person, the iGen’ers from Benevento live far from each other and therefore they need their smartphone for organization and communicative purposes.

The interesting fact is that many of these students are aware of the dependency on smartphones, so much so that they recount episodes of ‘liberation’:

“I lost my cell phone while I was on holiday with my friends. But this event was liberating, because I detached myself from social media and this was a lot... how can I say? Almost formative” (Filippo, M16).

Therefore, respondents confirmed the iGen’s propensity for WhatsApp and Instagram, thus confirming a decline in the use of Facebook. The main reason given for this ‘retreat’ from Facebook concerns its ‘colonization’ by adults, whose choices regarding the advertising of intimate and private moments are not welcomed by teenagers.

In general, post-Millennials demonstrate a strong ability to customize social media according to their needs:

“I use WhatsApp, when I want to say something to a friend of mine directly, because I can contact him directly. Instead I use Instagram to share some things about music, stories, post” (Lucia, F15).

On arriving at the heart of our investigation on the second screen, we tried to understand the privileged mode of film consumption in order to identify the distinction between “first screen” and the smartphone (second screen). The most widespread method is streaming, followed by satellite pay-TV. Downloading and the physical media (DVD, Blu-Ray) represent marginal modes. This investigation has allowed us to distinguish two different configurations of the second screen: one with respect to the vision of film at the cinema, the other with respect to domestic consumption.

This distinction between two second screen typologies was essential for the classification of its functions and uses.

3.1. Symbolic and sociocultural meanings of film and filmic experience

The first topic investigated concerns the use of the second screen to elaborate the symbolic and socio-cultural meanings of the film and the filmic experience. In this way, we can distinguish five functions of smartphone use of relevance to the second screen:

1) Informational function: The smartphone is used to consult paratextual materials (teasers, trailers, interviews with the actors, reviews) or to retrieve data essential to the interpretation of the plot:

“If there are doubts, I use the phone to get information, almost always on the cast” (Francesca, F17).
“Once it happened to me that the film was recommended by my friends and, because I had not read the plot, I looked for information online” (Debora, F14).

The informational function is the only use of the second screen attributable to the HM model. In our opinion, all other uses of the second screen are part of the HH model.

2) **Strengthening of emotional bonds**: This activity serves to convey an affection or an emotion related to the lived experience. The fundamental tool through which Post-Millennials pursue this purpose is the image, be it fixed or dynamic. In some cases, the intention is to strengthen a family bond:

“So, I took a scene in which Maurizio Mattioli spoke Roman dialect and sent it to my brother, because we had seen it the week before together and that scene made us particularly laugh. And so I wrote ‘Oh well, when you come home we’ll see it again’” (Filippo, M16).

In other cases, the aim is to recall and cement a friendly bond:

“Sometimes I sent a picture of the screen to a distant person, who maybe at that moment could have seen the movie with us” (Angelo, M17).

More frequently, iGen’ers use their smartphone to share cultural objects related to the film within groups of friends or classmates, especially within WhatsApp groups and through Instagram stories, sometimes in the form of a hint or a suggestion:

“At home, yes, I often use the phone and keep updated my friends who have the same taste. While I was watching *Ratatouille*, I share the post on Facebook, on the home page: ‘This film is so beautiful’. Then on WhatsApp I send to my friends a message such as ‘oh, see that movie, I loved it!’” (Pietro, M18).

“I posted on Instagram a photo of *Pulp Fiction* and I recommended it, it happened with many films by Quentin Tarantino, and many friends thanked me for recommending it” (Carlotta, F17).

“Recently I was watching this Disney movie, *Oceania*, with my cousin, and I sent a picture to the WhatsApp group with my friends, saying that I was seeing it and that they could like it” (Ester, F15).

Within the peer group, highly frequent playful second screen uses can be observed:

“We are tagged under some memes regarding *It* on Instagram, always to laugh together” (Marcella, F15).

“Once we were seeing *Coraline*, there was this character who is the same as our friend. So we shared memes of this character in our WhatsApp group for fun” (Enzo, M13).

Memes, GIFs and other types of images are also shared to reinforce collective memory:

“Sometimes I find images after a certain period of time from watching the movie, and I share them on WhatsApp with the friend with whom I saw the film” (Maria, F18).

On other occasions, the second screen satisfies the need to communicate particularly intense emotions related to the filmic experience:

“When I went to see *It*... and in practice, during a scene I was so scared that I posted it on
Instagram right away... and immediately I posted the story with the fact that I was so scared” (Debora, F14).

3) Diffusion of film cults: A residual position is occupied by the uses of the second screen for sharing intellectual, aesthetic or emotional passions about a film. In a single case, the sharing of online audiovisual materials concerns an aesthetic affection, almost a vague sort of cinephilia:

“When a film is visually beautiful, I make a little video of that piece and put it on Instagram stories, for example, in Sofia Coppola’s Marie Antoinette... I like to share things that I consider beautiful only aesthetically” (Francesca, F17).

In another single case, the second screen serves to convey a passion for an actor:

“Once I took a selfie first and a selfie after the movie with an ‘in love’ emoticon. The movie was The Place... yes... I was with a friend and both of them like the actor in the movie. Then I post these selfies through an Instagram story” (Carlotta, F17).

4) Narcissism and attestation of experience: In particular, the selfie almost acts as a ‘grip’ on the real. iGen’ers definitely take possession of the meaning of actions, especially when they share and process them through a personal use of media such as Instagram and WhatsApp.

Regarding the filmic experience, the selfie confirms that film-going is a group experience, which reinforces the bond between its members:

“I remember once in a while that they were all the guys in the group and we took the picture to remember that we went to the cinema to see that movie. This photo was not shared but was used as a profile image of our WhatsApp group” (Filippo, M16).

But, above all, the selfie communicates activities outside the friendly group:

“We take pictures in front of the cinema, not in the hall. Let’s say, we do it to make it clear where we are, where we went, maybe that day. Then if we go somewhere else I put the picture of that place” (Chiara, F16).

In other cases, the selfie responds to a narcissistic need. Adolescents use the second screen to recount their individual filmic experience, attracting ‘likes’ or other forms of interest from their personal audience:

“I take a selfie to show that I’m going to see this movie. Then, if you ask me what the film is about, I’ll tell you. For example, Me before you. I put the kiss scene, which is very famous, and all my friends who did not go to see this movie asked me what he was talking about, what it was like, what aroused...” (Dalila, F14).

Moreover, it is common, among iGen’ers, to use the photo as a rapid tool of communication, which more or less replaces extensive portions of text:

“Sometimes, in the group of friends, someone asks ‘what are you doing?’ and I send a picture of what I’m doing and it happened also at the cinema. I take a picture of me with the popcorn, I send the photo of the ticket, as an answer” (Francesca, F17).
5) *Debate and critical judgement:* On a residual basis, the second screen is also used to provoke a debate around the film:

“We went to school to see *Intouchables* and, on the school’s Facebook page, some began to comment ‘that sucks, this movie!’ and so I wrote... It was a film mainly aimed at boys of the eighth grade... and I observed... that the film was not suitable for us... that year we were in the first grade, but, for the topics dealt with, that film was for older kids. There was a series of comments and discussions” (Filippo, M16).

Equally, residual is the use of the second screen to express short critical judgements about a film, through circumscribed media environments, such as WhatsApp groups, or through larger environments, such as profiles or Facebook pages of film enthusiasts.

It should be noted that some of these uses of the second screen can be traced to Social TV. Studies on Social TV are increasingly numerous, while, over time, the phenomenon has reached the point where it can be said to represent a lasting practice of contemporary audiences. Some scholars have explored the motivations that push users to interact with other users and media content. In the reduced space of this essay, we can make two observations about the difference between the second screen during filmic experience and Social TV. First, the serialization of TV shows helps to strengthen the sense of belonging to a community of fans, as demonstrated by various researchers. In this sense, we can state that the use of a second screen favours the exchange of emotions (especially during live broadcasts) and is closely connected to the social and cultural dynamics of fandom. This interpretation is supported by various studies on the proliferation of media cults related to TV shows.

Second, we want to highlight the nature of social media as ‘third places’, which are halfway between the public and private dimensions. The variety of users’ discurs-
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sive practices translates into a sort of mass “art of conversation”\(^{51}\). Unlike the filmic experience, in the case of Social TV, due to the large volume of interactions, the user’s ‘grassroots’ production on social platforms (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, etc.) is traced and becomes a business opportunity for broadcasters and advertisers. In this way, secondary screening activities during TV shows are analysed with more advanced tools and methodologies, which allow for more precise information on these practices to be gathered. However, it should be observed that most of the studies on Social TV and the activities of profiling mainly refer to adults and, therefore, are not concentrated on the iGeneration.

3.2. *Competition and multitasking*

As previously stated, it is essential to make a distinction between the cases in which the first screen is a cinema screen and the cases in which it is a home screen (PC, tablet, TV). This distinction allows us to explore the second and third topics of our research, closely intertwined with each other: attracting media users’ attention and the difference between the uses of the second screen at the cinema and at home.

In general, we observed a reluctance to admit the use of mobile phones during screenings at the cinema. This denial may be attributed to the social sanction, traditionally reserved, within the socio-cultural contexts explored, to those who use the mobile phone in a particular public space, such as the cinema. This sanction derives essentially from the fact that, for any form of film consumption in the cinema to be deemed acceptable, it must align with certain dimensions of spectatorship: silence, hypomotility, darkness. iGen’ers themselves underline their respect for these conditions:

“I do not understand who uses the phone during the whole movie: why do not they watch the movie? For me this is not polite behavior” (Dario, M15).

“The moment I see that at the cinema there are many people interested in watching the film, I do not consider polite to use the phone to call, to chat, to send messages. It can annoy the brightness, the noise...” (Maria, F18).

Even if the Post-Millennials declare that the mobile phone is in ‘silent’ mode, it still provides a source of media flows alternative to the film. Even if they decide not to use a smartphone, Post-Millennials still feel the temptation to consult this second screen alternative source of information.

“When I have the connection turned on, I’m tempted to take my smartphone, especially when I hear the phone vibrating in my pocket. But I try to avoid” (Luca, M16).

“But, for example, if before entering the movie theater, I was having a particularly interesting conversation with a person... Then later, during the film, surely, I was not completely concentrated and in any case I sometimes wondered ‘maybe he answered’. My attention was not completely focused on the film” (Maria, F18).

This ‘respect’ for traditional forms of film consumption in the cinema obviously influences second screen uses. At the cinema, we can talk about potential, virtual multitask-

ing, more than real: respect for cultural and social codes implies that the second screen is only activated or in an emergency, or when the film completely fails to capture the viewer’s attention. Competition for the viewer’s attention, in this case, is oriented towards the prevalence of the first screen.

It is significant that users tend to find justifications when their attention goes from the first screen (the film) to the second screen (the smartphone).

“It happened that while I was watching a movie I was chatting with a friend of mine ... I was arguing with a friend of mine and at the same time I was watching the movie. But at that moment it was more important to solve the problem with my friend” (Diego, M17).

Only a few admit that, when they are in the cinema, they also use their smartphones for specific activities.

“When I realize that the film has reached a point that bores me, I take the phone. Even in the auditorium, though I admit this is rude behavior. I go to Instagram or check messages... sometimes I listen to music with headphones” (Fabiola, F14).

Meanwhile, the home environment, being more comfortable, allows for a more relaxed use of the smartphone, whose consultation often diverts energy and attention away from watching the film:

“When I’m at home, I use the smartphone quite frequently, either to reply to messages or to do anything else, whether I like the movie or not, and when I watch movies at home, I stop lending attention to the film, if I do not care, and I start to reply to the messages or I go on Instagram or, if the film did not take me at all, I also go shopping online” (Maria, F18).

At home, the competition between first and second screen seems to be much more ferocious. The film must try to win the attention of the spectator, who always has their smartphone to hand, as well as the infinite possibilities of media consumption that it can offer:

“If I’m at home and I do not like the movie, I start picking up the phone and I lose myself, I look at Instagram stories or I follow the famous people, I start looking for things, I do not even remember the movie I was seeing... If I like the film and there is an important situation to follow with the phone, but it must be really important, for example if something suddenly happened to my friends, I choose the phone” (Marcella, F15).

Some features of the domestic film experience (for example, the ability to control film playback) affect the greater propensity to use the second screen in multitasking mode, because the user thinks s/he can easily recover the information that is eventually lost, while dedicating himself/herself to the second screen.

“All the fact that at home, you can stop the film, and especially when you look at it from a phone, the message arrives and you, let’s say, go immediately to respond by blocking the film” (Francesca, F17).

Lastly, it seems important to add that the function of the second screen as a distraction device’ has also been formulated in the context of studies on Social TV.
3.3. Conclusions

The second screen represents a highly interesting media practice and, in our opinion, useful when investigating the socio-cultural profile of iGen. The research that we have undertaken has led to a partial and non-generalizable results, which, nevertheless, can be a starting point for further investigations. However, we can draw some conclusions on the uses of the second screen among the Post-Millennials. From the point of view of the symbolic re-elaboration of the film and the filmic experience, iGen’ers seem able to exploit the second screen in an autonomous and advanced way, for a plurality of ends (information, strengthening of emotional bonds, diffusion of film cults, attestation of experience, debate and critical judgement). We can say that, to a large extent, the domestication of the second screen by iGen’ers seems to have been completed.

Even more noteworthy is the situation regarding the relationship between the first and second screen, both in the cinema and at home. The initial findings that emerged from the focus groups would seem to deny a structural attitude to multitasking among Post-Millennials. In fact, compared to film consumption in the auditorium, iGen’ers adhere to traditional cultural and social codes, declaring themselves in favour of the minimal use of the smartphone during screenings. While recognizing the potential transformation of the filmic experience in the cinema in a multitasking experience, as a result of the ‘temptations’ of the infinite media paths accessible via a smartphone, they experience the film in a perceptually and cognitively totalizing way, leaving other media in the background. However, we must point out that these data should be verified by other research in order to determine how much they are linked to the social, economic and cultural extraction of the analysed sample (middle to upper class students coming from two ‘Liceo Classico’ high schools), and to the specificity of the geographical contexts (medium to large cities in Southern Italy).

Meanwhile, in the home environment, Post-Millennials are freer to move between different media opportunities, capitalizing on every possible experience via the second screen. As a consequence of this freedom to wander between different screens and media environments, the film is not at the centre and thus must continuously negotiate with the viewer ‘shares’ of attention to be subtracted from the second screen (smartphone).

At this point, an important clarification is needed. For all the uses of the second screen related to the symbolic reworking of both the film and the filmic experience, we can speak of smartphone use in terms of subordination (synchronous or non-synchronous) with respect to the centrality of the first screen. However, there is a second mode of operation for the second screen, which we can define as ‘centrifugal’ compared to the first screen. This mode is found during the viewing of films at the cinema or, more often, at home, when the use of the second screen pushes the viewer to allocate attention ‘shares’ to activities not connected to the film.

Finally, the temporary conclusions of our research, primarily focused on the HH model, should be used for comparison purposes in further investigations, involving methodologies other than the focus group and dedicated to HM and MH models, in order to gain a better understanding of the uses of the second screen in specific social, cultural and geographical contexts.
3.4. **Methodology**

After a comparison of the most suitable approaches to investigate the object of the research, we have opted for qualitative research methods. The information-gathering tool chosen for the research was a non-directive interview aimed at two groups of high school students during two focus group sessions. The choice of the non-directive interview was made to give voice directly to iGen’ers, in order to obtain more integrated information in the context of use and, at the same time, verify forms of self-awareness among the sample compared to the media uses of the second screen. The interviews were conducted according to the principles of the hermeneutical approach, in which the criterion of the interview is the centrality of the interviewee, with the interviewer mainly performs a maieutic function. The interview questions was not conceived as a fixed sequence of questions, but as a guide for the interviewer in the process of his/her communicative interaction with the interviewee. Obviously, to avoid excessive digressions or, worse still, the failure to detect information of importance for the research, as interviewers, we have carried out, on the basis of the guide trace, the appropriate probing activities informed by the guide track.

Each focus group consisted of 10 students (one male and one female for each year of high school), chosen from those who visited a cinema at least once in the last three months and have a smartphone connected to the Web.

Finally, the responses that were considered relevant for analysis were coded using an open-coding approach and inductive classification procedures. The reliability of the procedures was controlled through the ‘intercoder reliability check’ procedure: two analysts classified and interpreted the various responses on their own and then shared the results of this process in order to arrive at shared classifications and interpretations.
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