

Vol 6, No 1	2022	Halaman 016 - 025
--------------------	-------------	--------------------------

Student's communication privacy management on Facebook

Yayu Sriwartini

Universitas Nasional

yayu.sriwartini@civitas.unas.ac.id

Received: 02-12-2021, Revised: 05-02-2021, Acceptance: 10-02-2022

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to describe the management of communication privacy of Facebook users. The research used the Theory of Communication Privacy Management . The research approach was quantitative with a survey method. Data collection was carried out using questionnaires distributed online via google.doc from 9-16 March 2020 to around 304 samples of Students of Universitas Nasional who were active users of Facebook. The data were presented in a frequency distribution table and analysed by descriptive statistics. The result shows (1) most respondents were selective in publishing their personal data on Facebook. Only date of birth and religion were considered non-privacy; (2) In conveying certain information or messages through various features on Facebook, most of the respondents applied collective limitation, but still controlled the boundaries. It meant allowing others to view or read various posts, but limiting the active activities of others on their timeline; (3) female respondents expanded access restrictions more for others when they posted feelings of pleasure, happiness, upset, anger and satire. The development of access to privacy is caused by psychological factors and respondents' motivation. Overall, the results of the study indicate that there was a communication privacy management activity of respondents on their Facebook.

Keywords: Communication Privacy Management; Social Media; Facebook

INTRODUCTION

It is undeniable that communication is the most important activity in everyday life. By communicating, humans can convey various desires and hopes. Of course, communicating will be fun if we get a positive response from the our opponent of communication, and communication will be effective if delivered appropriately with the right form and communication media. Along with the development of technology, communication medias have also evolved. Starting from traditional media to internet-based digital media (online). Quoting Krisdyahayu's article (2018), in 2000 the development of the

internet began rapidly and prompted the birth of blogs, video sharing sites, and various social networking sites. In its development, social networking was known as social media. The first social networking media in the world that emerged was Friendster in 2002. Friendster was an application to build friendship relationships in cyberspace with a wide scope, namely the whole world. After the emergence of Friendster, the next social media were LinkedIn, MySpace (2003), Flickr (2004), Facebook (2004), Twitter (2006), Instagram (2010), Line (2011), Snapchat (2011) and TikTok (2016).

The presence of social media was well received by the international community. According to Pertiwi (2019) there were 3.5 trillion social media users worldwide in July 2019. Meanwhile in Indonesia, according to the research "We Are Social" in collaboration with Hootsuite, there were 150 million social media users. In Indonesia. Facebook was the most popular social media application in Indonesia with a penetration of 81 percent. Based on user demographics, most Facebook users were in the 18-34 year age group (Fauzan, 2019). And students were part of the most Facebook users.

It was undeniable that social media, including Facebook, had an impact on its users. Several studies had shown that many students spent their time using Facebook and became addicted (Algouzool, 2018; Saleh, Abdul, Ameen, 2017). In Indonesia, the level of addiction to using social media, including Facebook, was divided into low, medium, and high categories. Social media was able to "bewitch" its users to represent themselves and their personalities reflexively. Without being forced, users with various personality types revealed their true self. This was indicated by the various communication activities carried out either through status uploads, photos/images or videos.

Several research results showed the driving motives of people using Facebook, namely learning needs, socializing, and psychological needs (Toker and Baturay 2019); friendship motives were exhibitionism, entertainment, escape and time passing, social curiosity, relationship formation and relationship maintenance (Algouzool 2018). Social media could be likened to a diary for its users, especially for heavy users. For them, there was no day without using social media. It was proven that in Indonesia there were 150 million people who actively used social media, with an average usage time of 3 hours 26 minutes in 2019 (Arifin, 2019). Social media had become a means of expressing various things. In everyday life, we are often faced with various complexities of problems that confront us with the choice to openly tell others or cover it up. Indeed, on the one hand self-disclosure has a positive impact. According to Weaver, self-disclosure was very useful because it could improve the quality of communication between communicators, and could also increase accuracy in communicating. Self-disclosure involved the expression of very personal feelings. We could not only convey the message, but also could express how we felt about the delivery of the message (Weaver II, 1997).

However, as revealed by Devito (Devito, 2011), excessive self-disclosure could have negative impacts such as: personal and social rejection, material losses and intrapersonal difficulties. This opinion was proven by Levontin and Tov (2017) in their research. They suggested using online media anonymously if we wanted to open up as widely as possible, including telling negative things about ourselves. This aimed to disguise ourselves as well as see how other

people reacted to bad information about us. Likewise, research conducted by Lee, Gillatt and Miller (2019) on the effect of self-disclosure and online partners on intimacy and relationship satisfaction. The result showed that self-disclosure could damage romantic relationships.

Therefore, in order not to go too far in self-disclosure, a social media user must be wise in organizing and managing his personal communication, because digital footprints could backfire on one's life. It was not surprising that the former Minister of Communication and Information of The Republic of Indonesia, Rudiantara, often reminded the younger generation to be able to manage their digital footprint by always commenting on social media and spreading good information (Manggala, 2018). Seeing this phenomenon, researcher were interested in researching and exploring how students' efforts to manage their personal communication on social media, especially on Facebook. Did they exercise control or not? Referring to the background of the problem, the research problem was formulated as follows: What was the description of student's communication privacy management on Facebook? The purpose of this study was to provide an overview of the communication privacy management of students on Facebook

The theory which was often abbreviated as CPM was included in the practical theory. Developed by Sandra Petronio and designed to address "everyday" issues. Petronio seemed that humans made choices and rules about what to say and what to keep from others based on "mental calculus" based on important criteria, such as culture, gender and context. He argued that these criteria included self-concept and consideration of others involved. For this reason, Petronio preferred to use the terms disclosure and private disclosure rather than using the terms self-disclosure in his theory (West & Turner, 2008; Littlejohn, Foss, Oetzel: 2017; Griffin, 2011).

Overall, this theory was a description of humans involved in a relationship, including the extent to which self and others were interrelated. The self and others were not only involved in the relationship, but disclosure was also related to the concept of privacy. According to Petronio and Caughlin, privacy can only be understood in the dialectical tension with the opening. If we opened everything, we will have no concept of privacy. On the other hand, if all the information was private, the idea of disclosure would not make sense. Only by pairing the two can these two concepts be defined. There were five basic assumptions of Communication Privacy Management Theory, namely (West & Turner, 2008; Littlejohn, Foss, Oetzel: 2017; Griffin, 2011):

1. Private Information. This refers to the process of telling and reflecting on the content of private information about other people and us. So according to Petronio, intimacy and self-disclosure were two different things.
2. Private Restrictions. It was a limitation of access to information. If the information was only for oneself, it was called a personal boundary, but when the private boundary was shared with others, the private boundary became a collective boundary. This information belongs to the existing relationship. These limitations can change according to age development.
3. Control and ownership. This assumption relied on the idea that people felt they had private information about themselves. As owners of this

information, they believed that they should be in a position to control who had access to this information.

4. Management system based on regulations. This system was a framework for understanding the decisions that people made about private information that depended on three processes of privacy rule management, namely: characteristics of privacy rules, coordination of boundaries and turbulence of boundaries.

4.1 Characteristics of privacy rules. It had two main features, namely:

4.1.1 Development, where the rules were guided by the criteria for people's decisions to disclose or conceal private information. CPM theory stated that there were five decision criteria used to develop privacy rules, including:

a. Criteria based on culture. These criteria depended on norms for privacy and openness within a culture.

b. Criteria based on gender. Referred to the differences that may arise between men and women in drawing the boundaries of their privacy (Petronio & Martin, 1986).

c. Motivational criteria. Referred to a person's motivation in doing self-disclosure.

d. Contextual criteria. Referred to certain contexts that influenced the decision to maintain or disclose privacy. According to Petronio, there were two contexts, namely (a) social environment and (b) physical background. The social environment related to special circumstances. While the physical environment related to the actual location, issues of crowds and physical space.

e. Criteria for risk-return ratio. That people evaluated risk versus benefit from opening or closing information.

4.1.2 Privacy rule attribute. Attributes can be divided into two ways, namely the way people got the rules, and the properties of the rules themselves. In general, this theory stated that people learned rules through the process of socialization or through negotiation with others to create new rules.

4.2 Boundary coordination

Boundary coordination was the process through which a decision was made and through which the individuals who were related both became owners of private information. Petronio observed that people regulated private information through rules that reduced boundary affinity, boundary ownership rights and boundary permeability. The explanation was as follows: First, boundary tied refer to the relationships that form boundary alliances between individuals. Second, ownership of boundaries, refer to the rights and privileges granted to co-owners of private information. For ownership of boundaries to be applied accurately, the rules must be clear. Third, Permeability of boundaries, refers to how much information can pass through existing boundaries. When access to private information was closed, the limitation was called a thick limitation. Meanwhile, when access was open, the limitation was called a thin limit.

4.3. Boundary Turbulence

Boundary turbulence arose when the rules for coordinating boundaries were unclear, or when people's expectations for privacy management conflict

with one another. The people involved can experience what Petronio calls turbulence. CPM theory argued that when individuals experienced boundary turbulence, they will try to make adjustments so that they can reduce turbulence and achieve coordination. Boundary turbulence can occur due to a number of different boundaries, among them when an information disclosure attempts to invite another within the boundaries of privacy, but the other person resists the attempt.

5. Dialectic of Management. Management dialectics focused on the tensions between the desire to disclose private information and the desire to conceal it.

METHODOLOGY

The research approach chosen was quantitative and descriptive. The reason was because researcher wanted to get an overview of the percentage of communication privacy management of active users of digital media in communicating, especially through Facebook. While the method used was a survey, namely research using questionnaires as the main instrument for collecting data obtained from samples, the results could be generalized to the population (Newman, 2011; Cresswell, 2014). This study only described the percentage distribution of Facebook user communication privacy management among students.

The research population was Facebook users among students of Universitas National, Jakarta. This population was infinite. Therefore, the sampling technique was accidental sampling. The sampling process was carried out via the internet with the google form facility which was distributed to several classes at the National University for approximately 1 week, 9-16 March 2020 and managed to capture 304 respondents who had and used Facebook. Respondents were consisted of 143 women (47%) and 161 men (53%). The respondents of this study were dominated by students aged 19 years with 106 people (34.9%), the second highest was 20 years old with 79 people (26%) and 44 people (14.5%) were 18 years old. Then in fourth place were students with the age of 21 years, totaling 35 people (11.5%). There were 13 students aged 22 years (4.3%). There are 24 students in the range of 23-37 years old (5.9%). Some of them, 76 people, were also workers.

In collecting data, the researcher used google.doc to speed up and assist in calculating percentage accuracy. The data was presented in the form of a single table. Meanwhile, in analysing the data, the researcher calculated the percentage of each communication privacy management actions carried out by the respondents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Private Information

Table 1: Personal information on FB page profile

Self-information	Published		Unpublished	
	f	%	f	%
Educational status	92	30,3%	212	69,7%
Private e-mail	149	49,0%	155	51,0%
Personal contact number	83	27,3%	221	62,7%

Home address	66	21,7%	238	78,3%
The date of birth	261	85,9%	43	14,1%
Religion	181	59,5%	123	40,5%
Organizational affiliation	67	22,0%	237	78,0%
Self-skills	63	20,7%	241	79,3%
Self—status	61	20,1%	243	79,9%
Family members	70	23,0%	234	77,0%
Nickname	84	27,4%	220	72,4%

Table 1 shows that there were nine (9) person's information that was considered private by respondents so that most respondents choose not to publish it on FB, including information about self-status (79.9%), self-skills (79.3%), residential address (78.3%), organizational affiliation (78.0%), family members (77.0%), nickname (72.4), educational status (69.7%), personal contact number (62.7%) and personal email (51.0%). While the self-information published by most of the respondents were date of birth (85.9%) and religion (59.5%). It could be concluded that respondents prefer to remember their birth date and religious identity rather than personal skills that can actually bridge respondents with certain job or business opportunities. Home addresses, contact numbers and emails were not published for the reason of avoiding abuse from certain individuals.

Private restrictions and ownership controls

Table 2: Respondent's FB Feature Settings


Features of respondent's FB	Access Restrictions				
	Myself	Family	Certain Friends	Friends on FB	General Public
 Timeline	1,6%	0,3%	10,2%	49,3%	38,5%
Viewers of comments on the timeline	1,4%	0,0%	12,2%	53,3%	33,2%
Likes and comments	1,3%	0,0%	11,8%	53,6%	33,2%
Friend request	1,3%	0,0%	23,0%	12,8%	62,8%
Friends list access	6,6%	0,0%	10,9%	41,1%	41,4%
Writing in the timeline of respondents	26%	0,7%	14,8%	38,8%	19,7%
Other people's posts on respondent timeline	13,8%	0,0%	15,8%	42,8%	27,6%
Posts tagged on respondents	7,9%	0,3%	21,4%	43,8%	26,6%
Photo of respondent with family	2,6%	1,3%	14,8%	27,3%	27,6%
Photo of respondents with friends	1,0%	0,3%	11,5%	40,46%	32,24%
Photo of respondents having entertainment	1,3%	0,7%	11,8%	38,82%	25,0%

table 2 showed that in general most of the respondents did not apply personal restriction when publishing something on their Facebook. On the other hand, respondents actually opened up space for many people to be able to access information on their Facebook. It could be seen from how the respondents set some of the features used to communicate something. The data in the table also showed that ownership control was not tight. By sharing access to information for friends who had FB and the general public, it showed that most respondents tended to apply collective boundaries.

Control Limitation

Table 3 : Limit Control

✚ Access control	Yes		No	
	f	%	f	%
Allowing others to share various posts on their timeline	63	20,7%	241	79,3%
Hide certain comments in their timeline	85	28,1%	219	71,1%
Adding others to tag	94	30,9%	210	69,1%
Review before sharing tagged info	236	77,6%	68	22,4%
Allowing others to share stories on their timeline	191	62,8%	113	37,2%
Allow others to share photos on their timeline	147	48,4%	157	51,6%
Publish its whereabouts	88	28,9%	216	71,1%
Restrict people from seeing certain posts	186	61,2%	118	38,8%
Block certain friends	156	51,3%	148	48,7%
Restrict video submissions from other people	185	60,9%	119	39,1%
Block friend requests from specific people	196	64,5%	108	35,5%

Table 3 illustrates the existence of boundary control carried out by respondents. Strict control was demonstrated by: (1) Not allowing others to share the variety of posts on their timeline; (2) Didn't want to tag other people; (3) Reviewing any information tagged by others before it was distributed; (4) did not allow others to share photos on their timeline; (5) Did not publish its location; (6) Restricting people from viewing certain posts on their timeline; (7) blocking certain friends; (8) Restricting video submissions from other people; (8) and blocking friend requests from certain people. However, respondents did not restrict access to those who want to comment on their posts. Respondents also still allowed others to share certain stories on their timeline.

Privacy development

In communication privacy management theory, privacy development was part of a rules-based management system. At least there were several factors that make a person develop (more openly or tightly closed)

information, namely cultural factor, gender, motivation, contextual, and risk-to-profit ratio. The results of the study showed the development of respondents' privacy in the following cases:

- a) Posted happy feelings. Most of the respondents (61.8%) admitted to posting their happy feelings on FB through words (44.41%). This finding was corroborated by Prawitasari's research (2016: 278) on Emotions Through Non-verbal Communication. According to her, expressions of anger, sadness, fear and joy could be expressed in words. In expressing their happy feelings, most of the respondents in this study carried out the development of privacy. This could be seen from 131 people (43.1%) letting their posts be seen by all their friends on FB, even 69 people (22.7%) gave access to the general public. Only 44 people (14.5%) narrowed their access. Then, based on gender, almost 79% of privacy developments were carried out by women. This was in line with the research results of Cartensen, Gottman, & Lavenson (Paramitha & Suarya, 2019) which showed that women were more aggressive and emotionally expressive both positively and negatively. Women will express feelings of happiness, joy and feelings of anger and sadness than men. This meant that women were easier to open up than men when posting happy feelings. Women were more expressive than men. Then based on age, the average respondent who developed their privacy in the public sphere was between 18-21 years old, as much as 89.8%. According to Heppel (Kurniawan & Hasanat, 2017), the younger generation tended to be more expressive, bold and straightforward in the process of communication and social interaction.
- b) Posted feeling upset or angry. Most of the respondents (173 people or 56.9%) chose to post it on FB. Of that number, as many as 43.55% of respondents consisted of women and open the access restrictions for all friends on FB and outside FB. While the remaining 13.35% were men who developed the access restrictions only for all FB friends, but not for the public.
- c) Posted satire. As many as 58.6% of respondents did not like posting satire to someone on FB. However, as many as 118 people (41.4%) still liked to do it. Of the 118 people who posted satire, most of them were women and were driven by feelings of irritation, venting emotions and wanting to criticize. The result of this study indicated that female respondents were more likely to developed the access to these negative feelings broadly than male respondents. As stated by Broverman, et al (Nurhayati, 2016) psychologically, women were very emotional, very subjective, and did not hide their emotions at all. In addition, the average female respondents had a motive to release annoyance so that her heart feels relieved when posting feelings of annoyance, anger or satire to someone on FB.

CONCLUSION

From the result of the study, it could be concluded that:

Most respondents were selective in publishing their personal data on Facebook. Only date of birth and religion were considered non-privacy. In conveying certain information or messages through various features on Facebook, most of the respondents applied collective boundaries, but still controlled the boundaries. That means allowing others to view or read various

posts, but limiting the active activity of others on their timeline. In addition, female respondents expanded access restrictions more for others when they posted feelings of pleasure, happiness, upset, anger and satire. The development of access to privacy is caused by psychological factors and respondents' motivation. Overall, the result of the study indicated that respondents performed communication privacy management on their Facebook. However, needs to be further research that describes in detail the forms of attributes, coordination and boundary turbulence that occur or are carried out by Facebook users.

REFERENCES

- Algouzool, B. 2018. The impact of motives for Facebook use on Facebook addiction among ordinary users in Jordan. *International Journal of Social Psychiatri* 64 (6): 528-535
- Arifin, C. 2019. Pengguna Sosial Media di Indonesia Keempat di Dunia. Diakses tanggal 12 Nopember 2021. <<https://www.tribunnews.com/techno/2019/06/19/pengguna-sosial-media-di-indonesia-terbesar-keempat-di-dunia>>
- Creswell, J.W. 2014. *Research Design: Qualitative and qualitative Approaches*. Sage Publication, Inc
- Devito, J. A. 2011. *Komunikasi Antarmanusia*; edisi Kelima. Jakarta: Karisma Publishing Group
- Fauzan, R. 2019. Pengguna Facebook dan Instagram Di Indonesia Terbanyak Keempat Dunia. Diakses tanggal 12 Nopember 2021. <<https://teknologi.bisnis.com/read/20190625/84/937640/pengguna-facebook-dan-instagram-di-indonesia-terbanyak-keempat-dunia>>
- Griffin, EM. 2011. *A first look at Communication Theory: 8th edition..* McGraw Hill
- Krisdyahayu, M.R. 2018. Sejarah Internet dan Perkembangan Media Sosial di Indonesia, dari Friendster hingga Snapchat. Diakses tanggal 12 Nopember 2021. <www.kompasiana.com>
- Lee, J; O. Gillath dan A. Miller. 2019. Effects of self- and partner's online disclosure on relationship intimacy and satisfaction. *Plos.One Collection: Emerging Therapies in mental health*
- Kurniawan, A.P & N.U. Hanasat. 2017. Perbedaan Ekspresi Emosi pada Tingkat Generasi Suku Jawa di Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Psikologi* 34 (1): 1-17
- Levontin, L & E.Y. Tov. 2017. Negative Self-Disclosure on the Web: The Role of Guilt Relief. *Front. Psychol.* 8:1068. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01068
- Littlejohn, S.W., K.Foss., J.G. Oetzel. 2017. *Theories of Human Communication: 11th ed.* Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc
- Manggala, A. 2018. Dua Menteri Paparkan Hasil Pembangunan. Diakses tanggal 13 Nopember 2021. <<https://mediaindonesia.com/ekonomi/174308/dua-menteri-paparkan-hasil-pembangunan>>
- Nasrullah, R. 2015. *Media Sosial: Perspektif Komunikasi, Budaya dan Siosioteknologi*. Bandung: Ramaja Rosdakarya
- Neuman, W. L. 2011. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Pearson Education, Inc
- Nurhayati, E. 2016. Memahami Psikologis Perempuan: Integrasi & Intercomplementer Perspektif Psikologi dan Islam. *Batusangkar International Conference*: 245-258
- Paramitha, N.K.P & Suarya, L.M.K.S (2018). Peran Komunikasi Interpersonal Dan Ekspresi Emosi Terhadap Kepuasan Perkawinan Pada Perempuan Di Usia Dewasa Madya. *Jurnal Psikologi Udayana*. (S.I) : 16-28
- Pertiwi, W.N. 2019. Facebook Menjadi Medsos yang Paling Digemari di Indonesia. Diakses tanggal 12 Nopember <www.tekno.kompas.com>.
- Prawitasari, J.E. 2016. Mengenal Emosi Melalui Komunikasi Non verbal. *Buletin Psikologi*
- M-Saleh, H.M., Z. Kh. Abdul., and AA. Ameen. 2017. The Effect of Facebook on Academic Performance for Undergraduate Students at Charmo University. *International Journal of computer and technology* 16 (2): 7596-7602

- Toker, S and M.H.Bartuary. 2019. What foresees college students' tendency to use facebook for diverse educational purposes?. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 16 (9)
- Weaver II, R.L. 1997. *Understanding Interpersonal Communication* (7th ed.). Harper Collins College Publishers
- West, R dan L.H. Turner. 2008. *Pengantar Teori Komunikasi: Analisis dan Aplikasi*, Edisi Ke-3. Jakarta: PT. Salemba Humanika