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ABSTRACT

Objective – The present study was designed to compare online self-disclosure between Polish and Indonesian Facebook users. We expected that Need for Popularity (NfP), Collective Self-Esteem (CSE), perceived network size and diversity, as well as controlling accessibility, will influence online self-disclosure in both countries. Furthermore, we examined the differences in privacy issues.

Methodology/Technique – Pearson’s correlation and hierarchical regression analysis were performed to address the differences of online self-disclosure regarding independent variables. An Independent t-test was conducted to compare the control of accessibility of profile information between the two countries. Chi-square analysis was carried out to observe the differences in perceived privacy. The sample of this study consisted of 280 Indonesians and 284 Poles.

Findings – Indonesians and Poles showed significantly different results when it comes to online self-disclosure, with consideration to psychological determinants. Poles exhibited a higher need to control the accessibility in their profile information, except for information on instant messaging accounts, which was deemed more sensitive for Indonesians. Poles showed a higher level of perceived privacy regarding almost all personal information on their profile page.

Novelty – It was very few articles discussing the comparison of the psychological determinants of online self-disclosure and privacy issues between Polish and Indonesian.

Type of Paper: Empirical research paper

Keywords: online self-disclosure, need for popularity, collective self-esteem, perceived privacy.

1. Introduction

The enormous popularity of Facebook has changed people’s attitude towards connecting with others, online privacy, and self-disclosure in online settings. By its very nature, social networking sites (SNS) provide an easy way for people to express themselves freely, with a
certain mode to control what they reveal to others (Suler, 2004). By providing the possibility to shape self-presentation before certain audiences, whether his/her would be a stranger or a close acquaintance, SNS make people less concerned about the drawbacks of personal disclosure (Christofides, Muise, & Desmarais, 2009).

Furthermore, the use of SNS is perceived as psychologically gratifying, especially when there are needs that cannot be fulfilled in face-to-face (FiF) encounters (Papacharisi, 2009; Suler, 2004); this includes self-esteem (Forest & Wood, 2012), popularity (Christofides et al., 2009; Utz, Tanis, & Vermeulen, 2012), or connecting with others (Baker, 2008).

The number of Indonesian Internet users has been growing rapidly for the last 10 years, and there were more than 70 million users in 2012 (APJII, 2013). Almost 90% of all online activities were spent on connecting with people with the use of SNS; most of the users chose Facebook as their SNS platform (APJII, 2013). The popularity of Facebook in the country makes Indonesia the largest Facebook user in South-East Asia, and the fourth in the world (Socialbakers, 2014).

Furthermore, utilising SNS is considered to be the most popular online activity in Poland, with more than 91% of Internet users having accounts on SNS. Poles count as the most numerous Facebook users in Central and Eastern Europe (Socialbakers, 2014) – Facebook has reached an 81% penetration rate in this country (Statista, 2014). The dominant motivation for Poles to use SNS is to stay in touch and talk with friends instead of meeting new people, posting live events, and/or sharing opinions (Gun, 2013, April 25).

This paper is a continuation of a previous cross-cultural study on online self-disclosure, conducted by Ardi and Maison (2014). Previous findings showed that online SD on Facebook is more closely associated with a need for popularity (NfP) than need to belong (NtB) (Ardi & Maison, 2014). Furthermore, Indonesian users displayed less positivity in online self-disclosure (SD), as well as less self-esteem compared to the Polish users (Ardi & Maison, 2014). The results were explained by different concepts of “self” in Polish and Indonesian cultures (Ardi & Maison, 2014). In collectivist cultures, such as Indonesian, the nature of “self” is more interdependent and context-dependent on social circumstances (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Tafarodi & Walters, 1999). In regard of those results, this study will employ the concept of collective self-esteem (CSE) to measure how an individual evaluates him/herself within the circumstances of a group he/she is a part of. The recent study took into consideration the gender balance composition of Facebook users, as well as several key factors, such as collective self-esteem (CSE), accessibility of profile information, perceived privacy, and perceived network size.

An understanding of these key factors may provide researchers with a better understanding both of patterns that exist in online disclosure behaviours, and of the motivation for media use, particularly in Indonesian and the Polish cultures. However, there are still only a few studies exploring online self-disclosure in either Indonesia or Poland. Most studies on SNS behaviour and online self-disclosure are conducted in North America, Western Europe, India, and some of the Eastern Asian countries, whereas Indonesia and Poland differ from other countries that are heavily engaged with SNS, especially when it comes to the type of culture.

Finally, this study may provide a deeper understanding of online disclosure, the concept of privacy, and motivation of people using SNS, all of which are perceived differently across cultures.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Internet behaviors of the Indonesians and Poles

Indonesia is one of the most collectivist cultures in the world (Hofstede, 2014a) emphasizing contact and togetherness (Andersen, 2007). Collectivistic cultures deal with a manifold of rules in social interaction to maintain conformity and harmony within groups (Mathews, 2000). Controlling disclosure and expression is a necessary social skill in regards of respecting social
norms, maintaining good social interaction, as well as avoiding public disagreement and unpleasant relationships with other people as well as authorities (Andersen, 2007; Mathews, 2000). On the other hand, the nature of Internet communication gives a certain degree of freedom to everybody to disclose more freely and openly (Suler, 2004).

Community and contact-based values of Indonesians might be observed by their activity while using social networking sites. Indonesia has been dubbed by certain media the “social media capital of the world”, with 384 tweets being sent every second (On Device Research, 2013, December 10).

On the other hand, according to Hofstede (2014b), Poland is a country that absorbs Western ideas, and incorporating individualistic values to its culture. But the historical background of Poland – a country that had spent almost half a century under communist rule, and where the Catholic Church still plays a big role in society – helping retain the country's collectivistic values to some degree (Boski, 2006). Therefore, even though the culture of Poland is considered to be individualistic, it is effectively a combination of collectivistic and individualistic values (Boski, 2006); and people in individualistic cultures are concerned with boundaries between private and public spaces (Andersen, 2007). They emphasized their value on space, privacy emotional expression, and personal choice (Andersen, 2007).

Poles use SNS dominantly to stay in touch with friends, specifically for connecting with old friends, and only just around 5% of them employed social media for meeting new people (Gun, 2013, 25 April). In addition, updating life events contributed less than 5%, as did sharing opinions (Gun, 2013, 25 April). A survey by PMR showed similar results, with 86% of Polish respondents reporting using social media to keep in touch with friends, followed by 13% who use SNS to make new acquaintances, while the rest chose to play online games and used social media for business purposes (Strzelczyk, 2012).

2.2. Online Self-disclosure

Self-disclosure (SD) is information or messages that make others know about the individual’s “self” (Wheeless and Grotz, 1976; Whitty & Joinson, 2009). The opposite of SD is secrecy and not expressing the self to others (Whitty & Joinson, 2009). Self-disclosure consists of several dimensions which are: frequency or intensity of the messages, the depth of the disclosure (or perceived intimacy of the message), and also valence – how someone would evaluate the positivity or negativity of the content of messages (Wheeless & Grotz, 1976).

A study by Joinson (2001) showed that people tend to exhibit higher frequency of disclosure in online settings instead of face-to-face (FtF) encounters due to the visual anonymity on internet communication. Tidwell and Walther (2002) also found that conversation in computer-mediated communication tend to make the individual braver in asking intimate and probing questions, while in FtF encounters conversations seem to be shallower. The higher intimacy of online conversations is believed to be caused by uncertainty-reducing behaviour (Tidwell & Walther, 2002). On the other hand, individuals who are more aware of the nature of social networking sites, especially in regard to privacy, tend to share less intimate content (Brandtzæg, Lüders, and Skjetne, 2010).

Furthermore, the physical absence in the context of internet communication makes individuals exhibit a higher degree of control of online self-presentation, thus users are able to control the valence of the information – either positive or negative. An individual who is dominantly driven by the motive to find closeness in social relations, tends to show more positive content, as well as more intention and honesty in SD (Rubin, Rubin, & Martin, 1993).

2.3. Need for Popularity

Need for popularity (NfP) is one of the most salient motives of SNS use (Utz, Tanis & Vermeulen, 2013; Christofides et al, 2009). According to a study by Zywica & Danowsky (2008), individuals tend to use Facebook as a medium to improve their self-image and fulfil
their need to be popular; this goes especially for those who feel less popular in FtF encounters. Furthermore, SNS users seem to observe others' attempts on gaining popularity on Facebook, but do not perceive their own actions as aimed at being more popular (Zywica & Danowsky, 2008).

Being popular requires certain traits that enable the individual to be positively accepted in his/her social network, and at the same time, attractive and salient (Debruyn & Van den Boom, 2005; Zywica and Danowski, 2008). Since popularity also entails the intent of social acceptance (Debruyn & Van den Boom, 2005), people are willing to disclose intimate information to gain such acceptance, as well as for the sake of upholding social relationships (Ellison, Steinfeld, and Lampe, 2007).

In addition, Zywica & Danowsky (2008) remarked that popular individuals were more likely to update their status more frequently and post new information on their walls more often. Graham et al. (2008) indicated that expressing negative emotions could have the benefit of attracting intimacy and attention of people with a bigger social ties to a given individual. Since being salient is an important trait for an individual who has the tendency for NfP, willingness to express negative emotions could be a path to fulfil that need.

These key concepts lead to the following hypothesis: **H1.** Higher need for popularity will increase the frequency (a) and intimacy (b) of online SD, but decrease its positivity (c) in both Indonesian and Polish users.

### 2.4. Control of Accessibility and Perceived Privacy

Privacy entails selective control related to accessibility toward “self” (Altman, 1975). The protection of personal information and accessibility are sensitive issues in the internet technology era because any information disclosed on the internet becomes recordable and traceable.

However, personal information has become the basic commodity of almost all online activities. The founder of Facebook, Mark Zuckerberg stated that privacy is not a social norm anymore. He claimed that people feel comforted by sharing all kinds of information with others, and are willing to do so (Johnson, 2010, 11 January).

Tufekci (2008) showed that the privacy concern in SNS could make individuals face the dilemma of withdrawal versus disclosure in online circumstances. A study by Utz and Krämer (2009) confirmed that high privacy protection leads to limited accessibility of the profile information for others. Moreover, perceived online privacy security will reduce the feeling of enjoyment of using SNS (Ernst, 2014).

Individuals with high privacy concerns tend to be controlling of their online accessibility; they are less likely to disclose intimate information (Brandtzæg, Lüders, and Skjetne, 2010), and influence the intent and the amount of personal disclosure online (Vitak, 2012). On the other hand, people exhibiting high narcissism, with a strong need for impression management, seemed not as controlling of their privacy settings (Utz & Krämer, 2009).

However, openness and visibility of communication in SNS led to online tensions (Binder, Howes, & Sutcliffe (2009). A study by Bronstein (2014) indicated that people controlled their disclosure of personal information to create a positive and socially acceptable impression of themselves on others. People tend to avoid disclosing highly personal and embarrassing information in order to protect their “self” (Bronstein, 2014); they only disclose sensitive information in a controlled manner (Bronstein, 2014). Following this idea, people who are concerned with privacy protection issues online tend to be looked upon in a rather positive manner.

Additionally, some differences in attitude towards privacy issues are observed between Indonesians and Poles. Indonesians who share collectivistic values (Hofstede, 2014a) emphasize contact in their relationship and have less appreciation towards privacy (Andersen,
These notions lead to the following hypothesis: H2. Higher control of accessibility of profile information will decrease the amount (a) and intimacy (b) of online SD, but will increase its positivity (c) for Indonesian and Polish users.

Additionally, a research question is put under consideration: RQ1. Since Indonesian users value togetherness and contact, to what extent does their control of accessibility and perceived privacy differ from that of the Polish users?

2.5. Collective Self-Esteem

People with low self-esteem tend to be less expressive due to their self-protectiveness (Baumeister, Tice, and Hutton, 1989). Gaucher et al. (2012) indicated that self-expression of people exhibiting low self-esteem could be heightened through specific interventions that would reduce anxiety related to social acceptance. Indeed, SNS provides a chance for individuals with low self-esteem to engage in self-promotional online activities (Mehdizadeh, 2010) in order to enrich their relationships, and that includes sharing various information (Forest & Wood, 2012). People with lower self-esteem are more likely to assume SNS are safe spaces for self-expression (Forest & Wood, 2012). In addition, people with lower self-esteem tend to show low positivity of disclosure compared to people with higher self-esteem (Forest & Wood, 2012).

Measurement of self-esteem has been often problematic when applied in a collective society, as self-esteem scales mostly measure individual aspects of the self-concept; therefore, people who come from collectivistic societies frequently get lower results than people from individualistic societies (Tafarodi & Walters, 1999). In individualistic society, individuals tend to be braver to judge or assess themselves positively (Diener & Diener, 1995) because the nature of the independent-self (Tafarodi & Walters, 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). On the other hand, in collectivistic societies self-concept is more contextual and depends on social circumstances (Tafarodi & Walters, 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

In a cross-cultural study by Ardi and Maison (2014), it was found that Indonesians tend to have a lower degree of self-esteem than the Polish. This in turn leads to the aspect of positivity of SD. Indonesians employ less positive disclosure than the Polish (Ardi & Maison, 2014). Such results could be predicted because of the different concepts of “self” between cultures. In collectivist cultures, confessing and disclosing positive aspect of “self” excessively could make others judge the person as maladaptive (Diener & Diener, 1995). In conclusion, for collectivist cultures, and especially so Eastern cultures, the self-esteem is considered to be interdependent and not self-construal (Tafarodi & Walters, 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Therefore, using by collective self-esteem measurements, this current study expect to achieve more precise results that would take into consideration the characteristics of the interdependent self-concept of the Indonesian culture, and the hierarchical individualistic culture found in the Polish society. However, self-concept of any individual is not solely based on selfhood separated from the group or social circumstances, but it is also based on how individual evaluate him/herself in the context of the group he/she belong (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992).

These explanations lead the hypotheses as follows: H3: People with lower collective self-esteem will show a higher frequency (a), higher intimacy, (b) and lesser positivity of SD (c) in both for Polish and Indonesian samples.

2.6. Perceived network size and diversity

As people are more likely to be socially acceptable and favourable to others while disclosing information in the network (Bronstein, 2014), users needed to employ more caution while using Facebook; this concerns avoiding undesired surveillance from particular friends or networks.
Therefore, multiple independent groups of friends on Facebook could be problematic, because users need to increase self-awareness and conformity to reduce harmful social surveillance and protect their social privacy (Brandtzæg, Lüders, and Skjetne’s, 2010). A study by Karahasanovic et al. (2009) concluded that users needed features with which they could select networks and friends within the community who could see the information disclosed on SNS. Moreover, the bigger and more diverse the networks, the more likely was the individuals would disclose “preferred” or more desirable content to protect themselves from the judgement of unwanted observers.

Furthermore, large and diverse networks in SNS could discourage individuals from disclosing the intimate content, due to of privacy-related concerns (Brandtzæg, Lüders, and Skjetne’s, 2010). A similar study conducted by Binder, Howes, & Sutcliffe (2009) showed that diversity of networks within SNS predicts online tensions; diversity heightens the visibility of online disclosure, which may lead to more complicated problems concerning privacy.

Although online tensions often arise due to network size and diversity (Binder, Howes, & Sutcliffe, 2009), but Facebook nowadays provides and develops features that enable the users to limit information disclosure to specific audiences more easily (Fung, 2014, April 8). Previously, Facebook management received numerous requests from users, asking to increase privacy settings, and to provide the option of controlling the visibility of information to particular users (Fung, 2014, April 8). Therefore, although users possess very diverse networks, they may optimize and manage their online visibility and disclosure to their only the desired and specific audiences.

However, Ellison, Steinfeld, and Lampe (2007) implied that networks within Facebook are also a source social capital, with which users might form, maintain, and intensify their relationships. Simultaneously, the establishment and maintenance of relationships require voluntary SD both intimately and intensively (Derlega, Winstead, and Greene, 2008). In addition, Vitak (2012) indicated that higher network size and diversity may increase the amount of disclosure, as it provides opportunities to share and interact with others within the network.

These concepts lead to the hypothesis below: H4. Users with more diverse and larger networks on SNS will show a higher amount (a), higher depth/intimacy (b) and higher positivity of online SD (c) for both Indonesians and Poles.

Furthermore, this study also explored significant predictors of online SD (amount, positivity, and intimacy) between Indonesian and Polish users. Thus, based on these variables, the following research question was constructed: RQ2. Taking into consideration NfP, CSE, perceived network size and diversity, and control of accessibility, how will the frequency (a), intimacy (b), and the positivity of content (c) in SD be affected for Indonesians and Poles?


3.1. Respondents and data collection

An online survey was conducted with the use of surveymonkey.com from June until September 2014. Invitations were sent to Facebook users, and using the snowball sampling procedure, distributed throughout the University of Airlangga Facebook groups in the Indonesian sample, and University of Warsaw Facebook groups in the Polish sample. Respondents were asked to forward the invitations to other friends who use Facebook.

The samples originally consisted of 338 Poles and 300 Indonesians; however, only 284 Poles and 280 Indonesians were confirmed as valid questionnaires for data analysis. The Polish sample consisted of 140 males and 144 females, while Indonesian respondents counted 140 males and 140 females. The mean age was 21.49 (σ=2.26) for Indonesians, and 25.82 (σ=5.73) for Poles.
All scales were translated from English to Indonesian and Polish using forward translation method.

Respondents gave self-reports about their online frequency of use (1 = more than once per day, 6 = once per month), and how long they have been using Facebook (1 = less than 3 months, 2 = 4-6 months, 3 = 7-12 months, 4 = 1-2 years, 5 = 2-4 years, 6 = more than 4 years). Indonesians were more likely to engage in Facebook activities more than twice per week (μ= 2.65, σ=1.70), and would on average have used Facebook for more than 4 years (μ= 5.64, σ=0.65); the Polish tended to go online once per day (μ= 1.54, σ=1.18), and reported having used Facebook for 2-4 years (μ= 4.95, σ=1.02).

The survey consisted of two sections: the first section provided a question concerning the participant’s mother tongue, as well as demographic questions; the second section consisted of behavioural and psychological scales. The demographic questions were also used to select the respondents who fulfill the criteria for the study. Respondents aged below 18 and above 40 were automatically discarded from the study. Respondents between 18-40 years old are considered to be early adult and around digital native generation age group (Prensky, 2001, September/October).

3.2. Measurement

The revised SD scale created by Wheeless and Grotz (1976) was used to measure 4 dimensions of online SD i.e.: amount (3 items, α = .83), positivity (3 items, α = .86), and intimacy (5 items, α= .86). Other scales used in this study included: 1) NFp scale (12 items, α = .93), created by Santor, Messervey and Kusumakar (2000) that assesses the tendency and desire to be popular among others; 2) Collective self-esteem scale (16 items, α = .79), created by Luftanen and Crocker (1992), which measures how individuals evaluate themselves in the context of groups/social networks to which they belong. All scales were measured with a 4-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree).

Perceived network size and diversity measurement (15 items, α = .85), created by McCarty et al (2001) and validated by Binder, Hoves, Sutcliffe (2009), was also employed in this study. This measurement comprised of 15 categories of network i.e. immediate, family, other birth family, family of spouse or significant other, best friends/confidantes, neighbours, people providing a service, etc. Respondents needed to assess with 5-point scale (1= nobody, 5 = many) in each category of the network.

Respondents were asked to provide their own estimation of the amount of control of accessibility to profile information, and perceived privacy. Both measurements have similar statements (14 items), and include name, address, relationship status, work profile, education profile, email, instant messaging account, relationship status, religion, political view, etc. To assess control of accessibility of profile information (α = .85), respondents were requested to choose one of these options [1] public, [2] limited, [3] private, or [4] not written for each item. Perceived privacy (α = .87) included the same items as control of accessibility of profile information, though the participants were only asked to choose between [1] private, and [2] non-private.

4. Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics and all interrelations between variables. Pearson's correlation (Table 1) served to answer the hypotheses one to four (H1, H2, H3, H4). The first research question (RQ1) was assessed using: 1) independent t-test comparing the dimension of accessibility control of profile information for each nation (Table 2); and 2) chi-square analysis comparing each dimension of perceived privacy between Indonesians and Poles (Table 3). Hierarchical regression analysis (Table 4) was performed to answer the second research question (RQ2).
As for H1, NfP was significantly and positively correlated to frequency (rind = .268, p < .01; rpol = .384, p < .01), and intimacy (rind = .300, p < .01; rpol = .343, p < .01) of online SD, but negatively correlated to positivity (rind = -.211, p < .01; rpol = -.321, p < .01) of online SD for both Indonesian and Polish users. Therefore, H1 was fully confirmed.

H2 was also fully supported, for both Indonesian and Polish users. The result showed that the more users control the accessibility of profile information, the more likely they are to disclose positive content (rind = .125, p < .05; rpol = .292, p < .01), but are less likely to disclose frequently (rind = -.228, p < .01; rpol = -.310, p < .01), and intimately (rind = -.201, p < .01; rpol = -.303, p < .01) on Facebook.

Regarding H3, this study found that Polish and Indonesian users who have lesser CSE disclosed less positive content (rind = .290, p < .01; rpol = .361, p < .01). Furthermore, the significant negative correlation between CSE and frequency of online SD was only found in Polish users, and not in Indonesian users (rind = -.067, p > .05; rpol = -.344, p < .01). As opposed to Indonesians, Polish users also indicated negative significant correlation in CSE and intimacy of online SD (rind = -.092, p > .05; rpol = -.254, p < .01). Thus, H3 was only partially supported.

Indonesians have on average 1285 friends (σ=962.86) in their Facebook networks, while the Polish – 305 friends (σ=343.07). Both of Indonesian and Polish users showed that the more diverse and larger the perceived network, the more likely the users are to disclose frequently (rind = .226, p < .01; rpol = .209, p < .01) and intimately on Facebook (rind = .198, p < .01; rpol = .214, p < .01). In addition, the correlation between the perceived diversity and the size of network and positivity of online SD, was negatively significant only for the Polish users (rind = -.044, p > .05; rpol = -.185, p < .01). Interestingly, for Polish users the correlations between perceived network and positive content in online SD showed a different direction than indicated in the hypothesis. Therefore, H4 was only partially supported.

As for RQ1a, the Polish and Indonesian users showed significant differences when controlling the accessibility of information of their workplace (t (562) = -4.94; p < .001, d = -.41), educational history (t (562) = -6.41; p < .001, d = -.54), birthday (t (562) = -3.75; p < .001, d = -.31), email address (t (562) = -3.14; p < .01, d = -.26), instant messaging accounts (t (562) = 3.03; p < .01, d = .25), hobby (t (562) = -2.67; p < .01, d = -.22), profession (t (562) = -7.18; p < .001, d = -.61), interest in specific gender (t (562) = 7.99; p < .001, d = -.67), religion, and family members (t (562) = -4.43; p < .001, d = -.37). On the other hand, Poles and Indonesians showed no significant differences in controlling their accessibility of information on their living location (t (562) = .253; p > .05, d = .02), telephone number (t (562) = 1.77; p > .05, d = .16), relationship status (t (562) = -.712; p > .05, d = -.06), and political views (t (562) = -.66; p < .001, d = -.06).
Table 1. Summary of the means, standard deviation, and intercorrelation of the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>NfP</th>
<th>Control of Accessibility</th>
<th>CSE</th>
<th>Perceived Network</th>
<th>Frequency of SD</th>
<th>Positivity of SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indo</td>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>Indo</td>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>Indo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NfP</td>
<td>1.97 (.44)</td>
<td>1.61 (.57)</td>
<td>1.79 (.54)</td>
<td>1.61 (.57)</td>
<td>1.79 (.54)</td>
<td>1.61 (.57)</td>
<td>1.79 (.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of accessibility</td>
<td>2.22 (.61)</td>
<td>2.55 (.66)</td>
<td>2.39 (.65)</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.237**</td>
<td>-.247**</td>
<td>-.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>2.87 (.27)</td>
<td>2.79 (.36)</td>
<td>2.82 (.32)</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.091*</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Network</td>
<td>3.09 (.51)</td>
<td>2.48 (.54)</td>
<td>2.78 (.61)</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.129*</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>-.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of SD</td>
<td>2.08 (.49)</td>
<td>1.61 (.6)</td>
<td>1.84 (.62)</td>
<td>.268**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>-.228**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity of SD</td>
<td>2.96 (.49)</td>
<td>3.34 (.62)</td>
<td>3.15 (.59)</td>
<td>-.211**</td>
<td>-.321**</td>
<td>-.358**</td>
<td>.125**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy of SD</td>
<td>2.03 (.53)</td>
<td>1.69 (.60)</td>
<td>1.86 (.59)</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>-.201**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Indo = Indonesian
Pol = Polish
All = Overall
### Table 2. Summary of independent t-test for control accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of control of accessibility</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean (SD) Indonesian</th>
<th>Mean (SD) Polish</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>effect size r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1.98 (1.22)</td>
<td>2.46 (1.12)</td>
<td>-4.94</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational history</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1.50 (.83)</td>
<td>1.98 (.93)</td>
<td>-6.41</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1.8 (.94)</td>
<td>2.07 (.81)</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place (live location)</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.10 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.08 (.93)</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>3.12 (1.02)</td>
<td>2.97 (.88)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.39 (1.11)</td>
<td>2.65 (.85)</td>
<td>-3.14</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant messaging account</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.84 (1.15)</td>
<td>2.58 (.89)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.45 (1.26)</td>
<td>2.52 (1.11)</td>
<td>-.712</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.09 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.35 (1.07)</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1.95 (1.22)</td>
<td>2.67 (1.14)</td>
<td>-7.18</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in specific gender</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.05 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.86 (1.16)</td>
<td>-7.99</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1.73 (1.11)</td>
<td>2.98 (1.15)</td>
<td>-13.22</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political view</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>3 (1.29)</td>
<td>3.07 (1.11)</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family member</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.09 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.5 (1.03)</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Summary of chi square analyses for perceived privacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of perceived privacy</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>private</th>
<th>Nonprivate</th>
<th>X^2</th>
<th>Φ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>69 (24.6%)</td>
<td>211 (75.4%)</td>
<td>57.51***</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>159 (56%)</td>
<td>125 (44%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational history</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>52 (18.6%)</td>
<td>228 (81.4%)</td>
<td>43.43***</td>
<td>-2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>126 (44.4%)</td>
<td>158 (55.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>136 (48.6%)</td>
<td>144 (51.4%)</td>
<td>20.99***</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>192 (67.6%)</td>
<td>92 (32.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place (Live location)</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>176 (62.9%)</td>
<td>104 (37.1%)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>196 (69%)</td>
<td>88 (31%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>253 (90.4%)</td>
<td>27 (9.6%)</td>
<td>6.43*</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>272 (95.8%)</td>
<td>12 (4.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>182 (65%)</td>
<td>98 (35%)</td>
<td>27.33***</td>
<td>-.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>239 (84.2%)</td>
<td>45 (15.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td>Frequency β</td>
<td>Positivity β</td>
<td>Intimacy β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NfP</td>
<td>0.253***</td>
<td>-0.197***</td>
<td>0.257***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Accessibility</td>
<td>-0.174***</td>
<td>0.137***</td>
<td>-0.170***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>-0.201***</td>
<td>0.296***</td>
<td>-0.156***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived network</td>
<td>0.201***</td>
<td>-0.135**</td>
<td>0.194***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>0.182***</td>
<td>-0.199***</td>
<td>0.084#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta r square</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F for change in R²</td>
<td>19.460***</td>
<td>21.627***</td>
<td>3.705*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA result (F)</td>
<td>58.472***</td>
<td>45.713***</td>
<td>39.222***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

Table 4. Summary of hierarchical regression analyses
As shown in Table 2, the Polish appeared to control the access to their email address, profession, interest in specific gender, religion, and family members on private mode; meanwhile, the same set of information was just limited to friends for Indonesians. Furthermore, although workplace, educational history, birthday, and hobby were more likely to have limited access to friends for both the Polish and Indonesians, Poles in general seemed to exhibit higher control compared to Indonesians. Indonesian users in turn regarded the information about instant messaging accounts as more private, as compared to the Polish. As for information on telephone numbers and political views, both Indonesians and Poles were more likely to set it on private mode. But for the living location and relationship status, both nations were more likely to limit access to just friends.

The results of analysis following RQ1b indicate that Indonesians (N=280) and Poles (N=284) indicated no significant differences of perceived privacy in the dimensions of living location (df=1, $\chi^2 = 2.38$, $p > .05$ $\phi = -.065$), and instant messaging accounts (df=1, $\chi^2 = 1.61$, $p > .05$ $\phi = -.053$). There were significant differences of perceived privacy between Indonesians and Poles in regard to the information on the workplace (df=1, $\chi^2 = 57.51$, $p < .001$, $\phi = -.319$), educational history (df=1, $\chi^2 = 43.43$, $p < .001$, $\phi = -.278$), birthday (df=1, $\chi^2 = 20.99$, $p < .001$, $\phi = -.193$), telephone number (df=1, $\chi^2 = 6.43$, $p < .05$ $\phi = -.107$), email address (df=1, $\chi^2 = 27.33$, $p < .001$, $\phi = -.220$), relationship status (df=1, $\chi^2 = 10.81$, $p < .01$, $\phi = -.138$), hobby (df=1, $\chi^2 = 48.03$, $p < .001$ $\phi = -.292$), profession (df=1, $\chi^2 = 71.51$, $p < .001$ $\phi = -.356$), interest in specific gender (df=1, $\chi^2 = 116.86$, $p < .001$, $\phi = -.455$), religion (df=1, $\chi^2 = 110.89$, $p < .001$ $\phi = -.443$), political views (df=1, $\chi^2 = 53.97$, $p < .001$ $\phi = -.309$), and family members (df=1, $\chi^2 = 30.03$, $p < .001$ $\phi = -.231$).

As shown in Table 3, Indonesians were less likely than Poles to consider as private information: workplace (Indonesia = 24.6%, Polish = 56%), educational history (Indonesia = 18.6%, Polish = 44.4%), birthday (Indonesia = 48.6%, Polish = 67.6%), telephone number (Indonesia = 90.4%, Polish = 95.8%), email address (Indonesia = 65%, Polish = 84.2%), relationship status (Indonesia = 57.5%, Polish = 70.8%), hobby (Indonesia = 18.2%, Polish = 45.4%), profession (Indonesia = 16.4%, Polish = 50%), interest in specific gender (Indonesia = 31.8%, Polish = 77.1%), religion (Indonesia = 30%, Polish = 74.3%), political views (Indonesia = 44.3%, Polish = 74.6%), and family members (Indonesia = 49.3%, Polish = 71.8%).

Indonesians considered their workplace (75.4%) and educational history (81.4%), birthday (51.4%), hobby (81.8%), profession (83.6%), interest in specific gender (68.2%), religion (70%), political views (55.7%), and family members (50.7%), as non-private information; Poles regarded those as private information. Furthermore, Indonesians and Poles showed a similar level of perceived privacy of information concerning their living location (Indonesia = 62.9%, Polish = 69%), and instant messaging accounts (Indonesia = 62.1%, Polish = 67.3%).

In regard to RQ2, adding nationality (with Indonesian as the dummy variable) in the model increased $R^2$ for all dependent variables. Being Indonesian had positive effects on frequency ($\beta = .182$, $p < .001$), and a marginal influence on intimacy ($\beta = .084$, $p < .08$), but had a negative effect on the positivity of content ($\beta = -.199$, $p < .001$).

Regardless to nationality, Table 4 showed that NfP strongly predicted frequency ($\beta = .253$, $p < .001$), positivity of content ($\beta = -.197$, $p < .001$), and intimacy ($\beta = .257$, $p < .001$) of online SD. The control of accessibility also was negatively related to frequency ($\beta = -.174$, $p < .001$), and intimacy ($\beta = -.170$, $p < .001$), but was also positively related to positivity of content ($\beta = .137$, $p < .001$) of online SD for all users. CSE negatively predicted frequency ($\beta = -.201$, $p < .001$), intimacy ($\beta = -.156$, $p < .001$), but it positively influenced positivity of content ($\beta = .296$, $p < .001$). In addition, perceived network size and diversity significantly predicted frequency ($\beta = .201$, $p < .001$), and intimacy ($\beta = .194$, $p < .001$), but negatively predicted positivity ($\beta = -.135$, $p < .01$) of online SD.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

NfP is the strongest predictor for frequency, positivity, or intimacy in online SD for both Indonesian and Polish users. This result confirms the findings of the previous studies that
popularity tendency was strongly related to the disclosure feeling (Utz, Tanis & Vermeulen, 2012) and frequency of expression on Facebook (Zywica & Danowsky, 2008; Ardi & Maison, 2014). Furthermore, it was found that people with higher NfP tend to disclose less positive content. A possible explanation is that expressing negativity to a certain degree might draw attention, especially within larger networks (Graham et al., 2008), and could make individuals appear as more salient compared to others.

Furthermore, controlling the accessibility of profile information was strongly related to the pattern of individual disclosure in terms of frequency, positivity, and intimacy, for both Indonesian and Polish users. This result also seems to be in line with that of the previous studies, indicating that individuals who show the need for higher privacy control tend to disclose less frequently (Vitak, 2012), and less intimately (Brandtzæg, Luders, and Skjetne, 2010). Bronstein (2014) also suggested that people were more likely to present themselves in a positive light on their networks by controlling their manner of expression. As for Bronstein’s (2014) claim, we assume that an individual who tends to control his/her personal profile also seems to display positivity of online SD to create a good and positive impression and avoid embarrassment.

Interestingly, CSE influences the frequency and intimacy of online SD only for Polish users. The strong correlations on those factors could be caused by how Poles perceive Facebook as a place to satisfy their needs for self-esteem and social interaction. People with lower CSE may see Facebook as the right place to express themselves either frequently or intimately in order to strengthen their relationships with others. Additionally, the absence of non verbal cues on SNS could encourage braver expression (Joinson, 2001). On the other hand, people with higher CSE presumably fulfill their need of expression during FtF encounters or otherwise deem Facebook not the right medium to express themselves intimately and frequently.

Insignificant correlations between CSE and online SD (in the dimension of frequency and intimacy) for Indonesian users might be related to how Indonesians with lower self-esteem perceives Facebook only as a safe space for connecting with others, and not a place where they could express themselves frequently or intimately. Similarly, Forest and Wood (2012) suggested that people with lower self-esteem do not seem to be using Facebook more frequently than people with higher self-esteem. Individuals with lower self-esteem appeared to use Facebook to receive attention and support without disturbing others with overwhelming disclosure of feelings and thoughts (Forest & Wood, 2012).

However, the association between the CSE with frequency and intimacy of online SD needs further investigation, particularly regarding how people with high CSE perceive social media, like Facebook, as places they could use to gratify their social psychological needs.

Nevertheless, there is a similar pattern between Indonesian and Polish users where CSE is strongly and positively linked to sharing positive content in online SD. This also confirms the results of previous studies indicating that individuals with low self-esteem tend to disclose less positive content compared to individuals with higher self-esteem (Forest & Wood, 2012). Forest and Wood (2012) found that individuals with low self-esteem were more likely to disclose sadness, anger, frustration, anxiety, fear, irritability, and less happiness, less excitement, and less gratitude than people with higher self-esteem.

Furthermore, this study found that perceived network size and diversity predicts the frequency and intimacy of online SD for both Indonesian and Polish users. Vitak’s study (2012) also indicated that the existence of an audience positively predicted the amount of disclosure. Although wider networks could be a problem for privacy, SNS provide people with easy and quick ways to broadcast information, interact with others, and maintain relationships with a wider array of people.

On the other hand, the current study indicated that larger diversity and size of the network led to a significant increase of intimacy of online SD. This result is in contrast to the previous study conducted by Binder, Howes, & Sutcliffe (2009) which showed that network size has a negative effect on intimacy of SD. There seems to be a certain amount of tension during disclosure in larger and more diverse networks (Binder, Howes & Sutcliffe, 2009), but Ellison, Steinfeld and Lampe (2007) suggested that it may be caused the fact that Facebook use is
strongly concerned with the maintenance and creation of social capital. Moreover, Facebook has lately enhanced its privacy settings, with which the users are able to choose specific audiences that can see any information revealed. Therefore, even with larger and more diverse the networks, users have the possibility to choose their appropriate audience among their friends by controlling the information accessibility of each disclosure. In contrast, less diverse and sizeable networks presumably limit the users to disclose intimately and frequently to just the appropriate audiences.

Disclosure in controlled, carefully selected network could also explain how positivity of online SD was negatively correlated to the perceived network size and diversity for Polish users. A more diverse and larger networks should provide the users with the possibility of negative expression toward the appropriately selected audience only. On the other hand, the less diverse and less sizeable the network, the more probable it is that the users will express themselves in a favourable and desirable way, mostly due to limited network options for reception of a given expression. However, expressing negativity to inappropriate people can be problematic for users, as Binder, Howes and Sutcliffe (2009) suggested, as having family as part of the network could possibly be the cause of online tensions.

It is not easy to explain the non-significant relationship of disclosing the positive content and perceived network size and diversity for Indonesian users. However, this could be related to the value of intimacy-seeking and interdependent self-construal of Indonesians. The community-based society of Indonesia puts emphasis on the closeness of relationships, social acceptance, and intimacy. The “self” concept of collectivistic societies is interdependent and relies on social context (Gudykunst et al, 1996; Tafarodi & Walters, 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The motive for intimacy seeking, as well as theirs and interdependent self-construal, may prompt Indonesians to acknowledge the characteristics of certain networks more than their sizes before disclosing any positive or negative content. In particular networks, people could express negativity to attract the attention of others and enhance the intimacy (Graham et al, 2008). On the other hand, less positivity of disclosure on certain networks could also be problematic, as individuals will grow to be disliked by the members of the network. Individuals tend to avoid sharing negative content which could be seen as maladaptive by others (Sommers, 1984).

The patterns of disclosing the positive content on SNS for Indonesians require further exploration, especially in regard to the characteristics of particular networks in which Indonesians will express positive or negative content. Any further studies should take into consideration the self-presentation and impression management as important factors to in negative or positive expression within certain networks.

Poles seemed to generally execute higher control of accessibility in almost every aspect of profile information. Consistently, Poles also perceived almost all aspects of information as private. This finding is probably due to Western influences, which emphasise privacy as a value (Andersen, 2007).

Interestingly, Indonesians indicated more control over disclosing information on instant messaging accounts. The overall results of perceived privacy showed there was no significant difference between Polish and Indonesian users in considering information on instant messaging accounts to be private. Thus, this result for Indonesian may be related to their collectivist culture and its interdependent self-construals, which puts high emphasis on the social context of communication (Gudykunst et al, 1996). Instant messaging is a synchronous dyadic communication which is often used by users to gain clarity through verbal communication. People in individualistic cultures, with a lower need for context in communication, are usually more inclined to talk directly and to be more concerned with clarity of expression in conversations (Gudykunst et al, 1996). The immediate nature of dyadic communication could lead to discomfort for the Indonesians if it is initiated by inappropriate parties and/or unexpected. Considering how broad the networks of Indonesian users on Facebook are, it seems that Indonesians perceived putting information on instant messaging accounts publicly as a risky behaviour. However, people with interdependent self-construal living in collectivistic cultures are more likely to prefer indirect messages in communication
(Gudykunst et al., 1996), which would only have the intended meaning in the context of environmental or situational cues of a given culture (Andersen, 2007).

It is interesting to see how the disclosure differs between Indonesians and Poles by looking at the patterns of relationships between NfP, control of accessibility, CSE, and perceived network size and diversity in hierarchical regression. Considering those factors, Indonesians indicated significantly higher frequency of disclosure on Facebook and slightly more intimacy compared to Poles. The higher frequency and intimacy of SD for Indonesians could indicate the excessive activity of Indonesian users while using social media to connect with others. Results of several surveys indicated that Indonesians are extensive users of all manners of social media (On Device Research, 2013, December 10).

Furthermore, Indonesians also belong to a collectivistic culture, which is more likely to foster emotional display in order to maintain relationships and harmony (Andersen, 2007); privacy is less valued than in individualistic societies, like the Polish. Although people in collectivistic cultures have numerous rules pertaining to social interaction, the visual anonymity could prompt disinhibition to a degree (Suler, 2004) and at the same time grant individuals more control over self-presentation (Walther, 2007), all the while facilitating the desired relationships by disclosing relevant information frequently and intimately.

On the other hand, Indonesians demonstrated less positivity in online SD compared to Poles. According to Graham et al. (2008), expressing negative emotion is associated with greater network and greater intimacy. Expressing negative emotions in appropriate situations, contexts, and within certain networks, could promote the development and maintenance of communal relationships (Graham et al., 2008). This study found that Indonesians had on average a greater number of friends and more diverse networks. Therefore the community-based culture of Indonesia, which values intimacy and contact with others, is presumed to actually encourage users from this country to disclose less positive content in order to attract and establish relationships.

On the other hand, Polish values belong to the realm of Western, individualistic cultures. Western people mostly possess an independent self-construal, as opposed to Eastern cultures. Western values promote feeling good and positive about self, and possession of such qualities indicates the mental adjustment (Diener & Diener, 1995). However, expressing negative emotions is often considered to be less popular and less likeable (Sommers, 1984). Therefore, this might explain why Poles showed a higher degree of positivity in online SD as compared to Indonesia.

There are several limitations to this study that could be addressed in future research. Firstly, the current study only assesses the perceived size of networks within SNS by averaging the response from the whole network categories. The study lacks the in-depth analysis of network characteristics, which would indicate whether the ties within networks are strong or weak.

Secondly, how the users maintain and manage the relationship online in each network was also not included in the study. Analysing those factors could help understand why people disclose more intimately, frequently, and positively in some networks but not others.

Third, this study only included NfP as an indicator for people’s motivation for disclosing on Facebook. There could in fact be other needs that motivate people to disclose information online. According to Uses and Gratification theory, people are motivated for using SNS to fulfil mediated needs and interpersonal needs (Papacharisi, 2009). Further studies would thus have to consider: 1) mediated needs such as social surveillance, information seeking, and/or entertainment, 2) interpersonal needs such as social support and social interaction, or even 3) experimenting with identity, to get a more complete picture of how people disclose in SNS. Taking into account mediated needs could also provide information on how people with high CSE utilise SNS.

Finally, the last issue concerns how people with needs for either low- and high-context communication interact in SNS. Analysis of this issue in further studies could provide a clearer explanation of different patterns and strategies in disclosing information in SNS.
To summarise, this study contributes to the field by providing an in-depth analysis of privacy patterns and online disclosure in SNS, especially considering the different values and the patterns in social media usage for Polish and Indonesian users; as the use of those two countries in research is quite rare, the results of the current study may serve as a model for comparison to other countries and cultures.
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