

AN INVESTIGATION ON THE EFFECTS OF PARENT FRIENDING ON SELF-
DISCLOSURE, PRIVACY SETTINGS, EDITING BEHAVIOR AND TOPIC
AVOIDANCE ON FACEBOOK

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF HAWAI'I IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

SPEECH

MAY 2011

By

Marjorie Ann Cabico

Thesis Committee:

Devan Rosen, Chairperson
Kelly Aune
Jang Kim

We certify that we have read this thesis, and that, in our opinion, it is in satisfactory scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Speech.

THESIS COMMITTEE

Chairperson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not be possible without the help from the following people.

For my mother, without her I would be lost.

Thanks to Dr. Kathryn Hoffmann for opening up a world of oddity and opportunity.

Without her I would not have attended graduate school, researched in Paris, nor met the most amazing students in my academic career. She has given me all I need to succeed and live my life to the fullest.

To Dr. Amy Hubbard for giving me no other options.

To Jennifer Sur, Risé Doi and Ashley Hanna, traveling companions and besties...

To best fiends and cheapshot artists that make living life worthwhile.

And to Cecilia Febrero, "you never, never leave your wingman."

To my thesis committee members, Dr. Kelly Aune and Dr. Jang Kim, thank you for your time and life lessons, without which I would have never finished.

To Dr. Devan Rosen, from start to finish you have always been a reminder of "the glass is half full." You believed I would finish even when I was sure I wouldn't. I will always be grateful for all that you've done for me.

ABSTRACT

Social networking sites (SNSs) have changed the way we communicate and keep in touch. While there is ongoing and existing research on SNSs, few have looked at the effects of having a parent in one's friend network. The current study looks to further explore the effects that parent friending on Facebook has on user's self-disclosure and impression management on their profile. It was hypothesized that user's who have a parent on Facebook would demonstrate a greater amount of editing behaviors, would be more likely use the privacy settings, and would decrease or withhold information. This study also posed several research questions regarding user's information sharing on Facebook. Two hundred and eleven participants completed an online survey examining Facebook usage, self-disclosure, parent presence in their friend network, and topic avoidance. Results did not support the proposed hypotheses but provided interesting insights into the research questions. Implications and directions for future research are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Social Networking Sites	2
Facebook.....	7
Impression Management, Self-Disclosure and Topic Avoidance	11
Impression management offline and online.....	11
Self-disclosure and Topic Avoidance.....	16
Chapter 2: Method	25
Participants	25
Procedures.....	25
Measures	26
Facebook Intensity Scale	26
Facebook Information Cache.....	27
Topic Avoidance Scale.....	28
Revised Self-Disclosure Scale.....	29
Chapter 3: Results.....	32
Hypotheses Tests	32
Research Questions.....	33
Chapter 4: Discussion.....	34
Limitations and Directions for Future Research.....	34
APPENDIX A: Consent Form.....	38

APPENDIX B: Facebook Questionnaire.....	39
APPENDIX C: Topic Avoidance Scale	46
APPENDIX D: Self-Disclosure Scale	49
APPENDIX E: Demographic Information	51
References.....	52

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The way we view, monitor, and maintain our relationships has changed with the rise and use of social network sites (SNSs). SNSs are forms of computer-mediated communication (CMC) that enable users to rapidly communicate with their social circle and receive feedback just as quickly. Christopherson (2006) states that CMC includes any interpersonal communication that occurs within the context of the Internet or intranet. Photos, links, likes, and relationship status are all pieces of information that can be viewed and discussed. Gosling, Gaddis, and Vazire (2007) explored online impressions from SNSs and their study suggests that an individual can effectively and accurately convey personality. The amount of information disclosed on SNSs is substantial; a user's profile incorporates many elements of the user's persona, and has the potential to become an accurate image of themselves that they put forward on the web. This presentation of the self may be in conflict with those in their network who know or view them in different contexts and situations, more specifically parents in the social network of their adult children.

MySpace, Bebo, Tumblr, and Facebook are SNSs that have attracted millions of users, many of whom have made visiting and interacting via these sites a part of their daily lives. Facebook, in particular, has attracted the attention of not only the general public but those in the academic field as well. Facebook's continued growth has made it fertile grounds for research in topics such as, concerns in privacy (Gross & Acquisti, 2005), impression management in regards to those in one's social network (Walther et al., 2008), and self-disclosure (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007). While research into

social networking sites have blossomed, little research has been done on the affect parents have on their children's self-disclosure and impression management on social networking sites. The current study looks to explore the impact that inviting or "friending" a parent has on one's self-disclosure on Facebook and how it affects impression management and privacy through the use of topic avoidance.

Social Networking Sites

Social networks are our connections with people. These connections provide a myriad of things from emotional and financial support to information about the world at large (Donath & boyd, 2004). Social networks have expanded from physical groups and contacts to contacts and groups of friends that are found online. The continued growth and interest in SNSs has made it an interesting subject for discussion and study. SNSs have attracted attention and followers since their introduction in the late 1990s. One of the first SNSs was SixDegrees.com, which launched in 1997 and allowed users to create profiles about themselves, list their friends and check their "friends" list. The features of SixDegrees.com were present in other sites but never combined; creating profiles with likes and dislikes was present on dating sites and Classmates.com allowed users to reconnect with high school or college acquaintances; it wasn't until later that users would be able to create profiles, add friends to their network list and actively search another user's profile and friend list (boyd & Ellison, 2008). After SixDegrees.com came the emergence of other SNSs, LiveJournal and AsianAvenue in 1999, Friendster in 2002, LinkedIn and MySpace in 2003, and Facebook in 2006 among others. The emergence and evolution of SNSs have led scholars to recognize distinct features of SNSs, which will be discussed below.

According to boyd and Ellison (2008) a SNS is described and defined as a:

Web-based services that allow individuals to (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system.

In their article, boyd and Ellison (2008) attempted to further clarify their definition by distinguishing ‘social network sites’ from ‘social networking sites’. For boyd and Ellison, the term ‘networking’ is specific to relationship initiation with strangers, which may not be the primary use on the sites; it also does not distinguish it from other sites.

In a response to boyd and Ellison’s (2008) article, Beer (2008) argues that the term ‘social network sites’ becomes too broad and ‘social networking sites’ is more distinctive and descriptive of the processes. Beer argues that networking *is* the main preoccupation of SNSs, whereas boyd and Ellison see ‘networking’ as limiting. Beer views ‘networking’ as describing a particular activity, the motivation to form and expand networks. From Beer’s perspective boyd and Ellison’s definition becomes so broad that it could encompass web applications such as, YouTube, where making and accumulating friendships is not the sole activity. Websites such as YouTube could be categorized as a folksonomy, whereas other web applications that could be categorized as ‘social network sites’ are wikis, folksonomies, and mashups, the broadness in the term ‘network’ creates an umbrella that covers too many categories (Beer, 2008).

Scholarly interest and investigation into SNSs requires specified language in order to categorize and eventually study and understand specific areas of SNSs, and SNSs in which the main purpose is ‘networking’ includes Facebook. For this current study “social networking sites” will be used because of its descriptive process.

While different SNSs have created different technical features unique to their own site, the foundation of SNSs is made up of visible profiles that display an articulated list of Friends who are also users of the system (boyd & Ellison, 2008). Donath and boyd (2004) also explored SNSs' public displays of connections and found that networking sites shared a similar model of interpersonal links-they are mutual, public, unnuanced, and decontextualised. According to their research SNS links are mutual, meaning if A shows B as a connection, then B has also agreed to show A as a connection, the links are public: they are permanently on display for others to see (differing for each site), the links are unnuanced: there is no distinction made between a close relative and a new acquaintance, and the links are decontextualised: there is no way of showing only a portion of one's network to some people. While some of these features have changed over the years due to privacy concerns and the evolution of SNSs, the public display of connection is still the reigning feature of SNSs.

SNSs use standardized profile templates that are filled in with a person's unique information. These profiles can be enhanced or customized according to the site. An individual is asked to fill out boxes containing questions that focus on but are not limited to, interest, hobbies, likes, dislikes, and in some cases relationship status. More sensitive personal information such as political views, sexual orientation, age, location, and birthday may also appear on a person's profile. It is also standard for individuals to have a profile picture. The profile picture may be used to identify the user to others in her or his network or users who may be searching for them.

The visibility of a profile varies from site to site and can usually be controlled by the user. Some sites have search engines that make the profile visible to others regardless

of whether or not the viewer has an account. Others, like LinkedIn, controls what a viewer may see based on whether she or he has a paid account (boyd & Ellison, 2008). SNSs such as MySpace allow the user to make their profile public or exclusive to their friends on the network.

After the initial set up of profile and visibility settings, users of SNSs are usually prompted to identify others in the system with which they have a relationship. The label for these relationships differs depending on the site, popular labels include, “Friends,” “Contacts,” and “Fans” (boyd & Ellison, 2008). As mentioned above, the term “Friend” can be misleading and does not mean friendship in the everyday vernacular sense, and the motivations behind friending others in the network is varied (boyd, 2006a). Being a friend on a SNS shows the connection one user has to another.

As mentioned above, the public display of connection is perhaps the most distinct and crucial element of the SNS. One’s public displays of connections show others who you know, who you are associated with and which, if any, organizations you may be involved with. Presenting one’s connections is a way of showing others that you are willing to risk your reputation and it also makes the profile user accountable for her actions online as well as offline (Donath & boyd, 2004). Repeated interactions with others creates a reputation around our identity that may be valuable and will likely influence the way we act to enhance our reputation (Donath & boyd, 2004).

Along with a user’s reputation that is linked with her profile, users of an SNS can be seen in the context of their online social network, a context that can provide accountability. The visibility of mutual acquaintances can lead the user to rethink behavior that may mar her reputation, it is much easier to share with mutual

acquaintances a person's undesirable behavior and characteristics. Granovetter (1973) writes that information can be diffused through a larger number of people through the use of weak ties. The 'strength' of an interpersonal tie is defined as a combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding), and the reciprocal services, which characterize a tie. With this in mind, a strong tie may be a best friend or close relative while a weak tie may be an acquaintance or friend that one may not keep in constant contact with. Strong ties bring reliability to a user's profile while weak ties expands the scale and scope of the user's social network (Donath, 2008).

While strong ties can be direct routes of information between individuals and is usually a small, close-knit network, weak ties bridge individuals and may not be restricted to social cliques. SNSs, while catering to a large number of strong ties a person may have, is still subject to hold a substantial amount of weak ties an individual may foster. This means that a rumor or story told through mutual acquaintances (some whom are weak ties) will be more likely to spread to others outside of the tight, social, strong tie group which in turn can do more damage. Granovetter (1973) writes that the 'mortification' at having mutual friends discover one's poor behavior towards another friend is 'unbearable'. Having one's social network publicly displayed makes it easier for others to verify one's identity and also to let others know if one is behaving against social norms.

In addition to public displays of connection, most SNSs require bi-directional confirmation for Friendship and a link is established between the two. Friends are then able to communicate by sending messages to one another by posting on the person's

profile page or sending private messages. Features of posting and friendship visibility vary according to the site.

The amount of information and growing use of SNSs means that friending newly acquainted people and finding old connections is much easier than before, however, the information clusters and persona of a user may conflict with knowledge that a friend in the network may have of the user. While the public display of connections may keep users honest in their online presentations and offline actions, newly friended strong ties may see a side of a user that she may never have seen before. These conflicts of knowledge may not be substantial enough to endanger the relationship but it may cause the person to question her knowledge of the user or her place in the user's social network. More research needs to be done in this area, specifically in the conflict of image and knowledge between parents and their adult children. This issue will be addressed later in the thesis.

Facebook. Facebook is currently one of the more prominent social network sites. Established in 2004 in a Harvard dorm room, Facebook boasts more than 500 million active users with 50% of active users logging in on any given day. Facebook.com states that more than 30 billion pieces of content (web links, news stories, blog posts, notes, photo albums, etc.) are shared each month and the average user has 130 friends in the Facebook friend network. Facebook has a global reach with more than 70 translations of the site and 70% of its users outside the United States.

Facebook is popular with college students but with an increasing older demographic. Facebook's 35-54 year old group has grown by 276% in the beginning of 2009 (<http://www.istrategylabs.com/2009/01/2009-facebook-demographics-and->

statistics-report-276-growth-in-35-54-year-old-users/) with an older user group growing Facebook users are friending their parents or even grandparents.

Facebook, like other online social networking sites, provides a formatted Web page profile which an individual may put a substantial amount of personal information in response to questions that would let others get to know them (Walther, et al., 2008). A recent change in the layout of the Facebook profile page makes pictures and videos the main component of a user's profile. A row of recently "tagged" pictures (photos that are uploaded to Facebook and can be digitally associated with people in the picture) also lets others know what the user has been up to. Information about the user is also more concisely presented by focusing on specific details and facts about a person to give a quick summary of who a person is and what they have in common with other users.

Some questions that Facebook users can fill in include: relationship status, birth date, hometown, sexual orientation, quotes, religious views, physical address as well as email address, etc. which would be part of a user's profile. Facebook users may include information about various likes and dislikes as well as other information related to family, work or school. An interesting addition to Facebook's tools is a feature that allows individuals to "check in," posting her or his location on their profile. This check-in feature allows real-time location finding which adds a unique detail to a user's status.

In addition to an individual's own personal profile all users have a "wall" on their Facebook profiles where their friends are able to leave messages that others may see according to their discretion (privacy settings are customizable). Privacy settings range from "Everyone" to "Friends Only" and lists can be made to differentiate those in your friend network. Wall postings contain the friend's profile picture along with their text and

shows up in one's "newsfeed." A newsfeed is a list of real time activity occurring on Facebook within your friendship network.

In addition to the standard information that users share on their profile, Facebook allows users to update their status. A user can instantly and in real-time let their friendship network know how they feel, what they are doing, where they are, and whom they are with. Updated statuses, like most activity on Facebook, shows up on the newsfeed as well. These status updates could be used to create an online persona that can be managed, it also gives others in their friendship network a look into the user's daily life, something that may not be possible due to factors such as distance or state of the relationship.

As aforementioned, the definition of "friend" on a SNS may not fit the everyday vernacular definition of friendship. According to boyd (2006) a "friend" on a SNS can be considered an established intimate relationship to a simple acquaintance. This idea of online friending becomes confusing when researchers are examining a SNS Friend from a friend from offline (Beer, 2008). boyd & Ellison's (2008) research within the area of SNS friendships have created distinct categories of "offline" and "online" friendship. Beer (2008) contends that boyd & Ellison (2008) have drawn a distinction between SNS "friends" and everyday friends when in fact because of the increasing use and movement into the cultural mainstream the everyday friend is the SNS friend.

Beer has addressed the phenomena of having SNS friends associated with the "real" world. This would be a logical and reasonable next step to make within the studies and use of SNSs. The permeation of SNSs throughout society means SNSs are no longer viewed as restricted to an elite few. Facebook has crossed the boundaries of being an

online college-networking tool to being a globally used networking site that connects people, groups, companies, and organizations to each other. Beer (2008) correctly identifies that friends in Facebook's friend network are friends in an individual's social network, offline as well as online.

The distinction of an offline friend and an online friend is important to this study because of the change of roles Facebook friends undergo. A friended parent becomes privy to exclusive information that she or he may not be exposed to if not for being in their adult child's Facebook friend network. The parent becomes a peer to their adult child in the context of the SNS. The same goes for other friended individuals with a specified role in an individual's life, e.g. a pastor, doctor, or professor all become accessible to otherwise privileged information.

In addition to the role change of a parent, the adult child may be more aware or wary of information that is being shared on her or his Facebook page. Schwartz (2004) proposes that the Internet can serve as a tool to remove interpersonal barriers within families that encounter obstacles in open communication. The Internet would be an alternative vehicle for parents to communicate in a language and space that their children are more accustomed to. Chen, Goh, and Li (2009) address the potential power imbalance between parent and child when a parent must ask for permission to be their child's Facebook friend. Be that as it may, users who have a parent in their Facebook friend network may not necessarily want to share certain pieces of information with their parent. As such the following hypothesis is posed.

H1: Users who have their parent in their friend network would report using their privacy settings more than those without a parent in their friend network.

Impression Management, Self-disclosure and Topic Avoidance

It is becoming more common to use SNSs to disseminate information within our social network instead of picking up the telephone or text messaging those in our social networks, including what we've been up to or are planning. A picture of a fishing expedition or an outing at a local club can speak volumes about our activities, personality, and character. These selective bits of information we share or choose not to share about ourselves shape how others see us online. As discussed in the previous section, SNSs blur the relationships between those in a user's social network. A pastor, teacher, or parent may not necessarily share the same image of an individual as others in her network, blurring boundaries between certain individuals in one's friendship network.

Impression Management Offline and Online. By controlling the information we give to others we effectively engage in impression management. Goffman (1959) described impression management dramaturgically, likening people as actors on a stage performing to an audience. His work explains how people may engage in strategic activities "to convey an impression to others which it is in his interests to convey" (1959, p.4). Goffman conceptualized the presentation of self in everyday life as an ongoing process of information management. Further research into impression management defines it as the process that individuals use in an attempt to control or manipulate the reactions of others to images of themselves or their ideas (Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Schlenker & Pontari, 2000; Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981).

In addition to strategic activities that individuals may use, impression management tactics include ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification, supplication, and intimidation (Jones & Pittman, 1982). Ingratiation is a tactic in which an individual

seeks to be viewed as likeable by flattering or doing favors for others; self-promotion is when an individual seeks to be viewed as competent by touting their abilities and accomplishments; exemplification, a tactic by which an individual seeks to be viewed as dedicated by going above and beyond the call of duty; supplication is a tactic in which individuals seek to be viewed as needy by showing their weaknesses or broadcasting their limitations; lastly, intimidation is when an individual seeks to be viewed as intimidating by threatening or bullying others.

Expanding on earlier impression management research, Bolino and Turnley (2002) found that there are differences between genders' use of impression management tactics and differences in impression management tactics with high-self monitors and Machiavellianism types. Impression management and self-presentation research indicates the ongoing interest people have in how others judge and see them.

While there is a substantial amount of literature on impression management and self-presentation, there is growing literature regarding online impression management and self-presentation. A stream of research done by Walther and colleagues has focused on impression management and self-presentation online. Initially, studies suggested that impression and relational development might be hindered by the various differences of CMC as opposed to traditional face to face (FtF) interactions. However, the social information processing (SIP) theory of CMC (Walther, 1992) contends that without nonverbal cues, communicators adapt their relational behaviors to the remaining cues available in CMC such as content and linguistic strategies. Further research suggested that chronemic (Walther & Tidwell, 1995) and typographic cues (Walther & D'Addario, 2001) would also be a factor in SIP.

Furthermore, Walther's (1996) hyperpersonal model of CMC describes how CMC's technical capacities work with users' impression development intentions. Walther (1996) contends that dynamics in sender, receiver, channel, and feedback systems are affected by CMC traits, which encourage the expansion and potential exaggeration of impressions and relationships online. CMC allows senders to selectively self-present and receivers to idealize partners based on the circumstances or message elements. The CMC environment elevates editing, discretion, and convenience, allowing one's message composition to bypass distraction which leads to online self-presentation that is "more selective, malleable, and subject to self-censorship in CMC than it is in FtF interaction" (Walther, 1996, p. 20).

Tanis and Postmes (2003) used the differences of FtF impression management from online impression management in order to explain and define online impression management. Online impressions are managed by social cues that include one's network of friends or acquaintances. It is suggested that social cues may have a direct effect on the positivity of impression that people form of each other. Online impressions seem to be more positive according to Tanis and Postmes (2003) because they are more readily available.

Ellison, Heino, & Gibbs' (2006) research focused on self-presentation in the online dating environment, their work emphasizes the need for people to highlight positive attributes in order to initiate and form possible intimate and significant relationships with others. Their findings suggested that individuals stretched the truth in order to hide undesirable characteristics, such as posting a picture that hides unwanted physical characteristics, written self-descriptions allowed introverted individuals to

overcome social anxiety; and the asynchronous communication mode allowed users to edit and carefully create the most desirable persona. However, users of the dating site were careful not to be too deceptive, as users did not want to experience an unpleasant encounter offline (Ellison et al., 2006).

While impression management is sometimes synonymous with self-presentation because often an individual is trying to influence the perception of their image (Goffman, 1959), some researchers have attempted to distinguish between them. Schlenker (1980) defined impression management as the “attempt to control images that are project in real or imaged social interactions” and constrained *self-presentation* for instances in which the projected images are “self-relevant” (p.6). Although there are researchers that have distinguished between impression management and self-presentation, for the purposes of the current study both will be used interchangeably.

The formation of relationships with others not only requires self-presentation and impression management but the inevitable expression of self. Zhao et al. (2008) writes that in FtF interactions, identity is constructed under certain restrictions. Physical presence in social encounters prevents people from claiming identities that are inconsistent with the visible part of their physical characteristics (e.g., sex, race, and other physical features), and shared social background and personality attributes make it hard for a person to impersonate someone she is not. The construction of identity under the above circumstances would then involve the manipulation of physical settings (e.g., furniture and other decorative objects) and “personal front” (e.g., dress, language, and demeanor) to generate a desired impression on others (Zhao et al., 2008). With the Internet, identity construction changes; as the physical body is detached from the online

environment, it becomes possible for individuals to interact with others without the immediate display of their physical appearance. Anonymity coupled with the disembodied individual creates a new way to create an identity (Zhao et al., 2008).

While there are individuals that create new identities in various online communities that may differ greatly from their known identities, a SNS community is most often offline-based online relationships; these relationships are also termed “anchored relationships” (Zhao et al., 2008). These anchored relationships are not anonymous but rather “nonymous.” Facebook’s nonymous environment seems to result in Facebook users predominantly showing rather than telling who they are (Zhao et al., 2008).

Higgins (1987) writes about the descriptions of two “actual” selves—the kind of person an individual believes she actually is and the kind of person an individual believes others think she actually is. Higgins (1987) further writes about the three domains of self: the *actual self* (attributes an individual possesses), the *ideal self* (attributes an individual would ideally possess), and the *ought self* (attributes an individual ought to possess). In FtF interactions one could see how it would be harder to better express the ideal aspects of one’s self. If one is shy or finds it hard to articulate the best qualities of their personality, it shows through body language and speech. Bargh et al. (2002) found that in comparison to FtF interactions, Internet interactions allowed individuals to better express aspects of their true selves, aspects of themselves that they wanted to express but felt unable to. McKenna et al. (2002) investigated why those expressing their true selves on the Internet may do so more easily than in FtF interactions. The researchers believe that the Internet facilitates disclosures and expression that may be hard to express due to a

variety of reasons, from attractiveness to physical disadvantages such as stuttering. These disclosures may be made easier due to anonymity online and the lack of accountability in certain communities.

Additional research has been done on identity management and impression formation on SNSs (DiMicco & Millen, 2007; Kleck et al., 2007; Haferkamp & Krämer, 2009) suggesting that impression management, information management and identity formation are important parts in creating an ideal version of self that better reflects an individual, more so than she could do in FtF interactions.

This impression and information management is ongoing on Facebook, profiles are updated and wall posts are added or removed, controlling how the user is viewed in her network. Facebook users' omit and delete problematic comments and photos from their profile and may also ask friends to un-tag them from photos or to take photos off of their profile that may be embarrassing or compromising to their image. Half of Facebook users in Tufekci and Spence's (2007) survey reported the discovery of unwanted pictures posted by other people, linked to their own profiles.

Considering the research covered above, the following hypothesis is posed.

H2: Facebook users whom have a friended parent in their network will report more editing behavior than those who do not have a friended parent in their friendship network.

Self-disclosure and Topic Avoidance. Self-presentation is not the only thing involved with relationship formation. A wealth of research has been conducted to investigate the act of self-disclosure. Relationships strengthen and develop as the level of social penetration increases (Altman & Taylor, 1973). Social penetration is explored in

terms of disclosure. Previous work that has explored self-disclosure has found that self-disclosure is the “process of making the self known to others” (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958, p. 91). The basic parameters of self-disclosure are the quantity (breadth) and quality (depth) of personal information that an individual provides to another as well as the amount of time spent on each item of information (Jourard, 1971). Depth and breadth are a part of the process of social penetration. Relationships develop in a “gradual and orderly fashion from superficial to intimate levels of exchange as a function of both immediate and forecast outcomes” (Taylor & Altman, 1987, p. 259).

While self-disclosure can help us understand relationship development it can be affected by multiple factors such as, the duration of interaction, context, or culture. In general the duration of the interaction affects self-disclosure and the duration of the relationship also affects the level of self-disclosure. Generally, as the relationship develops, partners will begin to communicate about less superficial topics and more personal topics with more intimate levels of information (depth). As self-disclosure continues there is a penetration of another’s public identity to reach her/his core identity (Walther, 1993).

While the duration of the interaction is a factor that can affect self-disclosure, context can also affect self-disclosure. In most contexts people self-disclose high levels of intimate information to those close to them, the *stranger-on-the-train* phenomenon is a form of self-disclosure that includes private information shared with someone an individual has just met (Rubin, 1975). In this situation, a person may disclose personal and revealing information to a stranger whom she has just met without the intention of creating a lasting relationship.

Jourard (1958) discussed self-disclosure in terms of a healthy personality, “real self-being.” Allowing one’s real self to be known to at least one other “significant” other would be a requirement for a health personality. People feel closer to others as they disclose more intimate and personal information about themselves and expect their partners to do the same. Later, Jourard (1959) discovered a positive association between liking for another person and disclosure to that person and in 1964 he elaborated on the self-disclosure-mental-health relationship, and suggested that the relationship between the two variables is curvilinear. Too much disclosure and one may be perceived as occupied with one’s self, too little disclosure and one may be seen as maladjusted and unable to establish close relationships with others.

As more research was done, Jourard later restated (1971) that self-disclosure is “the act of making yourself manifest, showing yourself so others can perceive you” (p. 19). True self-disclosure occurred when a person lets others know what she truly felt and thought. Mann & Delon (1995) found that the reluctance of some patients to disclose repressed emotions and past traumas might contribute to development in hypertension. The ability to disclose bottled up emotions and thoughts may act as a catharsis that leads to improved physical health. Undeniably, self-disclosure as well as social interaction helps create important and lasting relationships.

When studied as a process, self-disclosure is often explained in terms of social exchange or role theory. According to social exchange theory, relationships move from nonintimate to intimate areas of exchange, intimate disclosures constructing a stronger relationship. The advancement of the exchange is determined by the past and potential rewards and costs of the exchange, people exchange non-intimate information that is

impersonal (low in depth) until they open up and exchange more intimate levels of information as they find their partners to be rewarding. This escalation of intimate knowledge exchange has a significant impact on relationship escalation and progress (Worth et al., 1969).

Rubin and Shenker (1978) investigated friendship, proximity, and self-disclosure; their findings suggest that friendship was more highly related to self-disclosure in intimate than in non-intimate topic areas and proximity was more highly related to disclosure in non-intimate than in intimate areas. Their study also led to a revised self-disclosure questionnaire, borrowing items from Jourard (1971) and Taylor and Altman (1968), as well as adding new items.

The relational process of getting to know others gradually has until recently been restricted within the area of FtF. Now, the Internet is another ideal setting in which self-disclosure is prominent. People may feel that they are protected by anonymity and that on the Internet “no one knows you are a dog,” to use an example from a popular New Yorker comic strip (Steiner, 1993). The idea of anonymity on the Internet has impacted the way we manage and communicate our image to others and even start romantic relationships (Gibbs et. al, 2008; Walther, 2007). As mentioned earlier, Bargh et al. (2002) postulate that individuals would like to present to others their “true selves” but due to social settings they have unexpressed qualities and interpersonal abilities that can manifest online because of the absence of physical “gating features” (referring to factors that may inhibit interaction because the communicator may feel awkward or the audience may feel uncomfortable) in text-based, non-FtF interactions. Relationships formed and maintained via the Internet may also be based on more substantial factors such as

interests, beliefs, and organization affiliations, as opposed to physical attractiveness alone.

While self-disclosure studies have focused on all types of relationships, from strangers to romantic partners, self-disclosure in parent-adolescent interaction is another relationship that has piqued interest in research fields.

Norrell (1984) focused on self-disclosure between adolescents and parents, findings suggested that the self-disclosure between parents and their children may change as a result of adolescent development, more pointedly due to cognitive and physical development and self-concept. Disclosure in families also seems to be reliant on maintaining a balance between family members. As children grow up their ideas and feelings may change and self-disclosure to parents may decrease as adolescents determine whether or not their new feelings and ideas are acceptable (Norrell, 1984). Other researchers have found that adolescents report that their mothers receive more disclosure from them than do their fathers (Dalusio, 1972; Jourard, 1971; Komarovsky, 1974; Rivenbark, 1971), children disclose increasingly more to peers during adolescence (Jourard, 1971; Komarovsky, 1974; Rivenbark, 1971; West and Zingle, 1969), and there seem to be sex differences in amount of disclosure and target of disclosure, although the specific effects are unclear (Jourard, 1971; Komarovsky, 1974).

Self-disclosure is the sharing of information, but it is also the managing of information as well. As mentioned above, parent and child disclosure is an integral part of family interaction. As children get older the type of information disclosed and the amount of information disclosed changed. The avoidance of certain topics may become another way of managing information and may also be tied to a child's changing identity.

Topic avoidance and self-disclosure are particularly important variables in shaping family communication.

Dialectical tensions between the forces of openness-closedness, connectedness-autonomy, and approach-avoidance incorporate the idea that some level of closedness or avoidance is characteristic of even the closest relationships (Guerrero & Afifi, 1995b). According to Guerrero & Afifi (1995b) commonly avoided topics included relationship norms, prior dating experience, negative behaviors, and conflict-inducing subject matter. The researchers are clear to point out the differences between topic avoidance and “secrets.” Secrets imply the hiding of information from others while others may fully know about the avoided topics. The reasons for avoiding certain topics are social appropriateness norms, self-protection, and relationship protection. Social appropriateness norms can be related to family and societal roles. Many may be brought up to think that sons go to their fathers to discuss certain issues and daughters go to their mothers. This idea demonstrates a need to approach the parent who is most likely to understand and empathize with one’s concerns, but also conforms to societal norms and who to seek out for certain discussions. Social appropriateness often works in the context of family roles. Topic avoidance may also be used in order to protect oneself; refraining from speaking about certain topics may avoid feelings of embarrassment and vulnerability. Topics may also be avoided so that the child does not get into trouble; the topic of sex may be a taboo subject and may bring up wrongful assumptions or accusations. Finally, one may avoid a topic in order to preserve the relationship. As children get older they may question their parent’s ideals or ideas, by avoiding a topic one avoids disagreement or confrontation.

In addition to investigating which topics adolescents avoided and for what reasons, Guerrero & Afifi's (1995a) research investigated topic avoidance in family relationships, specifically within child/parent and sibling relationships. Their findings suggest that adolescents and young adults avoid discussing negative life experiences and dating experiences more with parents and male targets than with siblings. Adolescents and young adults avoid discussing sexual matters with opposite-sex family members. Female dyads (daughter/mother, or between sisters) are least likely to avoid topics relating to relationship issues or friendships; and males avoid discussing relationship issues, negative life experiences, dating experiences, and friendships more than females. They also found that wanting to protect oneself was highly predictive of topic avoidance across all family relationships except for sister-sister relationships.

Golish (2000) found that adolescents' uses of topic avoidance were tied to feelings of satisfaction. The type of parenting style also influenced the use of topic avoidance, authoritative, permissive, and authoritarian. Parents who are authoritative are characterized as firm in their decisions, clear in their guidelines, high in monitoring, relatively demanding with children, but with the use of reasoning and an encouraged verbal give-and-take agreement. Parents who are permissive are receptive to their children but are less likely to punish their children are not demanding in their expectations, and are lower in the dimensions of control and maturity. Authoritarian parents are parents that are highly demanding, desire unquestioning obedience, do not offer rationales for decisions, offer less warmth, are more unresponsive to their children's needs, and the messages they send are unidirectional and aggressive in nature (Golish, 2000). Further findings by Golish (2000) showed that more authoritarian parenting

increased avoidance, whereas permissive and authoritative parenting decreased topic avoidance.

The research done on topic avoidance has been within the context of FtF communication, there is little to no research done on topic avoidance between parent and adult child on SNSs, however research has been done on children's Internet use within a family context.

Lee and Chae (2007) conducted a study on Korean children to examine whether their Internet usage contributes to the decline of family time and communication. They found that in Korea, approximately 95% of young people (6-19 years) use the Internet, and 92% of those that use the Internet do so at home. Further findings included children's average time per day they spent on the Internet (85 minutes), findings in gender differences with boys spending more time online than girls (boys: $M = 95.1$, $SD = 82.2$; girls: $M = 74.5$, $SD = 77.6$), however the difference was not statistically significant. Finally, Lee and Chae (2007) found that the total time using the Internet was related to perceived declines in family time but not related to family communication.

Further research regarding parental views about their children's Internet usage found that parents regard the Internet as the most developed technology that provided a broader view of the world and a means of gathering a considerable amount of information but were still wary of content of the Internet and effects it may have on psychological and physical aspects (Kabakci et al., 2008).

Although the above research into Internet influence on family dynamics is an invaluable base for future research, it does not specifically address the issue of parental

role change on SNSs. Therefore, the following hypothesis and research questions are posited.

H3: Users who have a parent in their friend network would be less likely to disclose information than those who do not have parents in their friend network.

R1: Do users avoid posting information when their mother and/or father are present in the individual's Facebook friend network?

R2: Does a Facebook user's gender of friended parent affect the reasons for topic avoidance?

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

A total of 230 participants from undergraduate speech classes in a large Pacific university and a smaller community college were asked to complete an online survey. Sixteen of the 230 participants failed to complete the survey; three indicated they were under the age of 18, leaving a total sample of 211 respondents; 111 females and 100 males. The mean age of the sample was 22 ($SD = 5.09$). See Appendix A for participant consent form.

Students completed a questionnaire containing four parts; an exploratory section was used to assess Facebook users usage and information disclosure, topic avoidance scale, revised self-disclosure scale, and a demographics section.

Procedures

The questionnaire was administered to students at a large Pacific region university as well as a smaller community college. The researcher visited classes on campus to recruit participants for the study. The questionnaire was available on a survey website tool surveymonkey.com. Participants were told that the study is on Facebook behavior and that the researcher is interested in people's use of Facebook and information sharing on Facebook. The participants were given extra credit or research credit at the discretion of their instructor; they were told that the study is anonymous, voluntary and the survey was available online.

Measures

Three instruments were administered to participants, and can be found in detail in Appendices B - E. Facebook usage and information disclosure was explored through a cache of fifty-eight exploratory items used to gather specific data about Facebook users information. Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe's (2007) Facebook intensity scale along with four exploratory self-reported assessments was included for further exploratory analysis. However, the current study did not utilize the Facebook intensity scale as planned. Topic avoidance was measured with Guerrero and Afifi (1995a) topic avoidance scale. The scale consists of 24-items using a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=Strong disagree to 7=Strongly agree) and identifies topics avoided in conversation and motives behind the topic avoidance. Self-disclosure was measured with Wheelless and Grotz (1976) 31-item revised self-disclosure scale. The measures are discussed in more detail below. The study collected information about demographic and other descriptive variables, including gender, age, and ethnicity.

Facebook Intensity Scale. The Facebook intensity scale created by Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe (2007) was used in order to obtain a better measure of Facebook usage than frequency or duration indices. This measure includes five, seven-point Likert-type scale attitudinal questions designed to tap the extent to which the participant was emotionally connected to Facebook and the extent to which Facebook is integrated into her daily activities. Response categories range from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree. Items such as "Facebook is part of my everyday activity" and "I would feel upset if Facebook shut down" are used to measure emotional connectedness to Facebook. This measure includes four self-reported assessments of Facebook behavior, designed to

measure the extent to which the participant is actively engaged in Facebook activities: the number of Facebook “friends,” the amount of time spent on Facebook on average in a day, the amount of time spent actively using Facebook in a day and how often is the profile updated. These four items were not included in the reliability of the scale and will be used for exploratory purposes in regards to Facebook usage and behavior. Reported scale reliability was $\alpha = .83$ (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007). Current scale reliability was $\alpha = .92$. See Appendix B for all scale items.

Facebook Usage and Information Cache: Ease of information disclosure. In order to investigate the type of information users are comfortable sharing on Facebook the questionnaire also contained categorical items that measured whether or not a participant shares particular information on Facebook. These items include statements such as “I have my political views on Facebook” and “I have my mobile phone number on my Facebook profile.” There are fifty-eight items in this section; each developed to explore the range of information that is being disclosed on Facebook.

Facebook user’s privacy settings were among the included items in the cache. Sample items include “What is your privacy setting for your ‘about me’ information on your Facebook profile?” “What is your privacy setting for your family and relationship information (family members, relationship status, interested in, and looking for) on your Facebook profile?” “What is your privacy settings for those who post on your wall?” Participants indicated their privacy settings from; “1-everyone”; “2-friends of friends”; and “3-only friends.”

Additional items on editing behaviors were included. Sample items include: “I delete comments others post on my Facebook wall when the comment is on drinking”

“Have you ever asked someone on Facebook to untag or delete a photo or video of you?”
“I un-tag or delete photos that others post of me on Facebook when the photo is of me with my significant other.” Participants answered categorically with a “yes,” “no,” and “not applicable” selection. See Appendix C for all items.

Topic Avoidance Scale. Guerrero and Afifi (1995a) developed measures to examine the topics that are avoided as well as the motives for avoidance. They established eight topics avoided in conversation, which subsequently collapsed into five dimensions comprised of eight-items. Five topics avoided in conversation include: (1) relationship issues/norms (relationships rules and expectations), (2) dating experiences (past and current romantic experiences), (3) negative life-experiences (failures, traumatic experiences and face threatening behavior), (4) sexual experiences (discussing past or present sexual behavior and preferences), (5) friendships (feelings for and about past and current friends). Reported scale reliabilities for two of the five topics are $\alpha = .83$ (relationship issues/norms), and $\alpha = .78$ (negative life-experiences). Previous reliability analysis could not be done on the remaining topic avoidance items because they were measured by a single-item. Interitem reliability has been measured reflecting the five topics avoided at $\alpha = .93$ (Guerrero & Afifi, 1995b). For the current study items were modified for clarity and relevance. Single-item measures were reworded and another item was added. Sample items include: “I avoid posting past romantic relationships and dates on my Facebook.” and “I avoid posting content on present romantic relationships and dates on my Facebook.” The original wording of “past/present romantic relationships and dates” was reworded for clarity and was then used for reliability measures within the subscales. For the purpose of this study relationship issues/norms (relationships rules and

expectations) items were not included because the researcher felt that the items would not be relevant within the Facebook setting. Current scale reliabilities are $\alpha = .93$ (dating experience), $\alpha = .84$ (negative life-experiences), $\alpha = .95$ (sexual experiences) and $\alpha = .90$ (friendships). Current inter-item reliability for this study has been measured reflecting the five topics avoided at $\alpha = .92$.

The second measure characterized four motives to engage in topic avoidance these include: (1) self-protection (desire to avoid vulnerability), (2) relationship protection (avoid doing harm to the relationship), (3) partner unresponsiveness (fear that discussant would be uninvolved), and (4) social inappropriateness (discussion of the topic would be unsuitable). These four motives are cast into a 12-item measure.

Guerrero and Afifi (1995a) found differing reliabilities for the reasons of topic avoidance when the target of the conversation was a mother (self-protection, $\alpha = .73$; relationship protection, $\alpha = .80$; and partner unresponsiveness, $\alpha = .77$) in comparison to a father (self-protection, $\alpha = .76$; relationship protection, $\alpha = .86$; and partner unresponsiveness, $\alpha = .78$). Previous reliability could not be computed for the single-item social appropriateness subscale. Current scale reliability was $\alpha = .86$ (self-protection), $\alpha = .82$ (relationship protection) and $\alpha = .85$ (partner unresponsiveness). Current scale reliabilities did differ when the target of the conversation was a mother (self-protection, $\alpha = .88$; relationship protection, $\alpha = .86$; and partner unresponsiveness, $\alpha = .88$) in comparison to a father (self-protection, $\alpha = .83$; relationship protection, $\alpha = .70$; and partner unresponsiveness, $\alpha = .78$).

Revised Self-Disclosure Scale. Wheelless and Grotz (1976) developed a topic-free multidimensional measure of self-disclosure, the Revised Self-Disclosure Scale (RSDS),

to improve on measures of self-disclosure (i.e., Self-Disclosure Inventory [Jourard & Lasakow, 1958]). They conceptualized self-disclosure as “any message about the self that a person communicates to another” (Wheless & Grotz, 1976, p. 338).

This scale consists of 31-items on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The scale contained five subscales—intended disclosure (i.e., “When I reveal my feelings about myself, I consciously intend to do so”), amount (i.e., “I do not often talk about myself”), positive-negative (i.e., “I usually disclose positive things about myself” and “On the whole, my disclosures about myself are more negative than positive”), control of depth (i.e., “I feel that I sometimes do *not* control my self-disclosure of personal or intimate things I tell about myself”), and honestly-accuracy (i.e. “I am not always honest in my self-disclosures”). For the future studies and to gather additional data another dimension was added to the scale. “On Facebook” and “In Face to Face Interactions” were columns that were added to allow subjects to measure self-disclosure in both settings.

Wheless (1978) reported the following reliabilities for the RSDS dimensions as: intent $\alpha = .85$; amount $\alpha = .88$; positive/negativeness $\alpha = .91$; depth $\alpha = .84$; and honesty $\alpha = .87$, respectively. Additional studies have reported coefficient alphas ranging from .81 to .91 (Stacks & Stone, 1984; Wheless, Nesser, McCroskey, 1986) and research employing this scale (i.e. Wheless, 1978; Wheless & Grotz, 1976; Wheless et al., 1986) also maintains both the content and the construct validity of the scales. Current scale reliabilities for self-disclosure on Facebook are intent $\alpha = .87$; amount $\alpha = .65$; positive/negativeness $\alpha = .76$; depth $\alpha = .86$; and honesty $\alpha = .79$.

The wording of each scale was altered to fit the purposes of the Facebook study. As designed by Wheelless and Grotz (1976) four items of the amount, positive/negative, and honesty/accuracy scale was reverse coded before data analysis was begun.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Hypotheses Tests

The first hypothesis stated that users who have their parent in their friend network would report using their privacy settings more than those without a parent in their friend network. An independent samples t-test was used to compare privacy-setting usage between Facebook users with parents in their friend network and Facebook users without parents in their friend network. T-test results revealed no statistically significant effects between Facebook users with parents in their network using their privacy settings ($M=2.52$, $SD=.66$) more than Facebook users without parents in their friend network, ($M=2.68$, $SD=.60$), $t(220) = -1.82$. It is interesting to note that the t-test shows almost a statistically significant result in the wrong direction. Facebook users with parents in their friend network were using the lowest privacy setting (1-everyone).

The second hypothesis posed that Facebook users whom have a friended parent in their network ($M=2.00$, $SD=2.30$) will report more editing behavior than those who do not have a friended parent in their friendship network ($M=1.59$, $SD=2.34$). An independent samples t-test revealed no statistically significant effects between the editing behavior of those with parents in their Facebook friend network and those without parents in their Facebook friend network, $t(220) = 1.28$.

The third hypothesis asserted is that users who have a parent in their friend network would be less likely to disclose information than those who do not have parents in their friend network. An independent samples t-test revealed no statistically significant effects between self-disclosure intent ($M=5.21$, $SD=1.43$), $t(208) = -.81$; self-disclosure

amount, ($M=3.44$, $SD=.99$), $t(208) = -.74$; self-disclosure positive/negativeness, ($M=5.00$, $SD=1.05$), $t(208) = 1.46$; self-disclosure depth, ($M=3.10$, $SD=1.28$), $t(208) = .32$; and self-disclosure honesty, ($M=4.60$, $SD=.77$), $t(208) = .47$, between Facebook users with parents in their friend network and Facebook users without parents in their friend network, self-disclosure intent ($M=5.37$, $SD=1.29$), $t(208) = -.81$; self-disclosure amount, ($M=3.54$, $SD=.92$), $t(208) = -.74$; self-disclosure positive/negativeness, ($M=4.79$, $SD=.99$), $t(208) = 1.46$; self-disclosure depth, ($M=3.04$, $SD=1.34$), $t(208) = .32$; and self-disclosure honesty, ($M=4.55$, $SD=.76$), $t(208) = .47$.

Research Questions

Research question 1 explored whether users avoided posting information when their mother or father was present in the individual's Facebook friend network. An independent samples t-test was used and results showed no statistically significant effects between topic avoidance and the presence of a mother in an individual's Facebook friend network when it was related to relationship avoidance, ($M=4.58$, $SD=1.97$), $t(134) = -.49$; avoidance to topics of failure ($M=4.85$, $SD=1.85$), $t(134) = -1.83$; avoidance to topics relating to sex ($M=5.71$, $SD=1.73$), $t(134) = -.92$; and avoidance to topics relating to friendship, ($M=4.28$, $SD=1.95$), $t(134) = .08$. There were no statistically significant effects between topic avoidance and the presence of a father in an individual's Facebook friend network, when it was related to relationship avoidance, ($M=4.78$, $SD=2.32$), $t(134) = -.49$; avoidance to topics of failure ($M=5.50$, $SD=1.81$), $t(134) = -1.83$; avoidance to topics relating to sex ($M=6.03$, $SD=1.89$), $t(134) = -.92$; and avoidance to topics relating to friendship, ($M=4.25$, $SD=2.10$), $t(134) = .08$.

The second research question asked if a Facebook gender of friended parent affected reasons for topic avoidance. An independent samples t-test was used and the results revealed no statistically significant effects between motives of topic avoidance and the gender of present parent (mother or father) in an individual's Facebook friend network. Having a mother in one's Facebook friend network did not have statistically significant results in topic avoidance motivation for self-protection ($M=4.32$, $SD=1.91$), $t(134) = -1.08$; relationship protection ($M=4.01$, $SD=2.08$), $t(134) = -.20$; and partner unresponsiveness ($M=3.77$, $SD=1.89$), $t(134) = -.75$. Having a father in one's Facebook friend network did not have statistically significant results in topic avoidance motivation for self-protection ($M=4.72$, $SD=1.86$), $t(134) = -1.08$; relationship protection ($M=4.08$, $SD=1.94$), $t(134) = -.20$; and partner unresponsiveness ($M=4.05$, $SD=1.80$), $t(134) = -.75$.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

This study was designed to explore the effects on information disclosure, privacy setting usage, and editing behavior when parents are included in the Facebook friend network. Findings from this study make several important contributions to the literature on topic avoidance in parent-child relationships, self-disclosure and impression management on SNSs, and also provide a cache of user Facebook data. This investigation also addresses novel theoretical questions about the process of impression formation and influence of different variables in that process.

In this study, having parents in one's network does not significantly increase the privacy setting usage on Facebook. Nor does having a parent in one's network significantly decrease disclosing information on Facebook than those whom do not have a parent on Facebook. The results from the research questions also reveal that parents in one's Facebook friend network (no matter the gender) does not affect topic avoidance.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The current study has several important limitations. First, a larger sample size of participants with parents in their friendship network would help strengthen findings.

Secondly, Facebook index questions were categorical questions.

Furthermore, the use of convenience sampling limits the extent of the generalizability of the finding beyond the current sample used. However, college students were purposively used in this study because the beginnings of Facebook and current users are of the younger college-attending generation. Lastly, self-report data was used.

The current study provides an attempt at further understanding how SNSs users manage their information and image online within a mixed social network, especially when parental figures are involved. This study provides understanding of variables at one point in time. However, due to the magnitude of the subject and all the encompassing variables, this study can only provide a base for future research. Marginally statistically significant data related to hypothesis one is in accordance with previous studies on parenting styles (Golish, 2000). Parents who use SNSs such as Facebook may have a better, more open relationship with their child, their child may not feel the need to increase their privacy setting usage due to her parent being in her Facebook friend network. In addition, Howe and Strauss' (2003) study focused on the generation gap between Millennials (those born after 1982) and their parents. They found that the gap is narrowing; more than two thirds of the millennial children surveyed indicated that their parents were in involved or active in their lives and that it was easy to communicate with their parents.

Accordingly, with the generational gap between Millennials and their parents narrowing further research in sense of belonging in family, group identification in family and the perception of parents as friends should be investigated. There is also a multiplexity of information and communication that is being shared on Facebook. Within the communication of families information may be categorized in different ways. Innocuous information that is usually shared in the household may be the same information that is being shared on Facebook.

Another aspect that needs to be explored is voluntary parental friending versus parental friending out of guilt or necessity is something that was not considered when this

project first started. As stated above, parents who share a more open communicative relationship with their children may experience Facebook friending differently than parents who demand to be friended by their children.

In addition to voluntary parental friending, future research from the aspect of parent Facebook users who friend their children should be studied. Adult or teenaged children may not actively seek their parent out on Facebook, parents, however, may be more inclined to find family members, especially their children, for a variety of reasons. Karl & Peluchette (2011) explored friending of parents, bosses and professors. Their research suggests that students have the most positive reactions to friend requests from their mother or boss. A parent's interaction with their child on Facebook is something that should be considered, and that this study did not explore. Parents in a child's Facebook friend network who do not make themselves "visible" or do not constantly, if at all, interact with their child, may be forgotten. The forgetting of having a parent in your friend network may create a more "natural" environment in which the child may be able to act like their true selves without the worry of a supervising parent.

The constant changing of Facebook's functionality and offerings, as well as new SNSs emerging, make continuous and frequent studies invaluable to this area. Findings from this study are potentially useful for parents, educators, and counselors. Parents can foster a better understanding of a child's identity, interests, and social network through the use Facebook and children could also use Facebook to broach sensitive subjects that may not be grappled with in FtF interactions. This study is a small sampling of what can be done in the study of Facebook.

While Facebook's privacy concerns may always be front and center, the users of Facebook continue to vary, as does the purposes of use. Further research can be done to include parenting styles, culture, parent's education, family religious affiliation, as well as parent's age as suggested by the research done by Howe and Strauss (2003). Research into Facebook's influence on the parent-child relationship has already piqued interest in academic circles. Chen et al.'s (2009) study found that Facebook increased intimacy due to a deeper mutual trust, a smaller intergenerational gap, equality and a lacking of enforcing behavior from parents. It seems that the cues-filtered-out approach indeed assists in having users overcome communication barriers found in FtF interactions.

Many more novel SNSs are becoming widely used. Yelp, an online city guide that helps people find eateries and other service based businesses based on the reviews written by Yelp users has seemingly become an important tool for businesses and patrons alike. Yelp uses what could be described as almost a game-like atmosphere, where Yelp users "check-in" to businesses in order to become the "Duke" or "Dutchess" of the establishment, publicly telling others which places they frequent the most. Yelp also tells users how far in distance they are with other friends in the same state or city if their Yelp friends have checked into an establishment.

Twitter, created in 2006, can be described as a SNS and microblogging website that allows one to answer the question, "what are you doing?" (www.tweeternet.com). Tweeting, for some, has infiltrated their lives more so than Facebook. With Twitter, one does not expect to be answered, tagged, or "liked." Tweeting can be self-serving, cathartic and less worrisome in terms of broadcasting to an established friend network.

Future researches may be able to tease out and categorize the types of information that Facebook users' posts contain. The possibility of categorizing various posts and information shared may also be expanded to inquire about Facebook users accounts in other SNSs. Perhaps Facebook users have different venues of expressing various types of information, they may even have multiple Facebook accounts that could coincide with their varying selves. With the omnipresence of Twitter, it may be possible that Facebook users are tweeting more personal and intimate pieces of information because the reciprocity of information sharing is not assumed on Twitter.

The scope and magnitude of research on new as well as established SNSs are almost inexhaustible. Just as quickly as research is being done, it becomes obsolete. SNSs are ever changing in purpose and use. Questions as to how does SNSs affect businesses, how does the younger generation get their news, how do SNSs help social causes, all these need answers and research in order to understand the importance and shift in the way we share information. With the recent social, environmental and political upheavals that have used SNSs to disseminate information, ideas, and opinions there is more work to be done to understand how communication is being reached and received through otherwise unheard speed and technology. With such an open forum to express ideas and spread news, there will be the need for researchers to assess, explain, and investigate how different generations share information and if generational gaps in viewpoints are converging.

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM

Agreement to Participate in Facebook Study
Primary Investigator: Marjorie Cabico
(808) 956-4194
cabico@hawaii.edu

This research project is being conducted as a component to fulfill the requirement for a master's in Speech. The purpose of this study is to determine how people use the social networking website, Facebook.

Participation in this project will involve an online survey. In the survey you will be asked to respond to questions assessing how you use Facebook and general aspects of behavior and personality. Data from questionnaires will be summarized and compared. Completion of this questionnaire will take approximately twenty minutes.

The investigator believes there is little or no risk in participating in this research project.

Participating in this research may be of no direct benefit to you. It is believed, however, that the results from this project will help further understanding of social networking in society.

Research data will be confidential to the extent allowed by law. Agencies with research oversight, such as the UH Committee on Human Studies, have the authority to review research data. All research records will be stored in a locked file in the primary investigators office for the duration of the research project. All other research records will be destroyed upon completion of the project.

If you have any questions regarding this research project, please contact Marjorie Cabico at (808) 956-4194 or cabico@hawaii.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may call the UH Committee on Human Studies (808) 956-5007, write to 1960 East-West Rd. Biomedical Bldg, B-104, Honolulu, HI 96822, or send an email to uhirb@hawaii.edu.

[Proceeding to the next page will constitute consent]

APPENDIX B

Facebook Questionnaire

1. Do you have any other social networking service? (i.e. MySpace, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc.)

Yes

No

Please list other networking services: _____

The rest of the questionnaire requires you to have your Facebook profile open, please open your Facebook profile in order to answer the questions.

2. Facebook is part of my everyday activity.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I feel out of touch when I haven't logged on to my Facebook profile for a day or two.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Facebook has become part of my daily routine.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I feel I am part of the Facebook community.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I would feel upset if Facebook shut down.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. On a typical day how many hours are you logged in on Facebook? _____

7a. On a typical day how many hours are you actively using Facebook? _____

8. How often do you update (post on your wall, add pictures, use applications, etc.) your profile on Facebook? _____

9. How long have you had your Facebook account?

_____ *years* _____ *months*

10. Do you use your real name on Facebook?

Yes *No*

11. How many total Facebook friends do you have as of today? _____

12. How many photos of yourself do you have (include photos you are tagged in) on Facebook? Number is located under profile picture _____

13. How many videos of yourself (include videos you were tagged in) do you have on Facebook? Number is located under profile picture _____

Facebook allows its users to add information in narrative boxes. We want to know what information you are willing to share on your Facebook profile.

The following questions relate to the information found under the “info” tab on your Facebook profile

Basic Info

- | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|
| 1. I have indicated my sex on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 2. I have my birth date on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 3. I have the current city I live in on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |

- | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 4. I have the name of my hometown on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 5. I have indicated my home neighborhood on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 6. I have listed my family members on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 7. I have indicated my relationship status on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 8. I have indicated whom I am interested in. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 9. I have indicated what I am “looking for” on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 10. I have my political views on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 11. I have my religious views on Facebook. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| 12. I list my activities on my profile. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |

How many lines are in this narrative box? (If you answered “no” to the statement above please put “0”)

- | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 13. I list my interests on my profile. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|--|------------|-----------|

How many lines are in this narrative box? (If you answered “no” to the statement above please put “0”)

- | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 14. I share a list of my favorite music on my profile. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|--|------------|-----------|

How many lines are in this narrative box? (If you answered “no” to the statement above please put “0”)

- | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 15. I list my favorite television shows on my profile. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|--|------------|-----------|

How many lines are in this narrative box? (If you answered “no” to the statement above please put “0”)

- | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 16. I list my favorite movies on my profile. | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|--|------------|-----------|

How many lines are in this narrative box? (If you answered “no” to the statement above please put “0”)

17. I list my favorite books on my profile. *Yes* *No*
How many lines are in this narrative box? (If you answered “no” to the statement above please put “0”) _____

18. I list my favorite quotes on my profile. *Yes* *No*
How many lines are in this narrative box? (If you answered “no” to the statement above please put “0”) _____

19. I have written information in the “about me” section for my profile.
Yes *No*
How many lines are in this narrative box? (If you answered “no” to the statement above please put “0”) _____

Contact Info

- 20. I have my email on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*
- 21. I have my IM screen names on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*
- 22. I have my mobile phone number on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*
- 23. I have my land line phone number on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*
- 24. I have my home address on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*
- 25. I have my business address on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*
- 26. I have my city/town on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*
- 27. I have my neighborhood on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*
- 28. I have my zip code on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*
- 29. I have my website on my Facebook profile. *Yes* *No*

Education and work

- 30. I listed my college/university on my profile. *Yes* *No*
- 31. I have my major or specified area listed on my profile. *Yes* *No*
- 32. I have my high school listed on my profile. *Yes* *No*
- 33. I have my employer listed on my profile. *Yes* *No*

Facebook Info

1. Have you ever asked someone on Facebook to untag or delete a photo or video of you?

Yes No

2. I delete comments others post on my Facebook wall

...when the comment is about drinking.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
...when the comment is about my romantic relationship.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
...when the comment is about my job.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
...when the comment is about my family.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
...when the comment is about school.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
...when the comment is sexual.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Other (please specify)

2a. Why did you delete the comments stated above? _____

3. I un-tag or delete photos that others post of me on Facebook.

...when the photos is of me drinking or around alcohol.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
...when the photo is of me with my significant other.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
...when the photo is related to my job.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
...when the photo is of me with a member of my family.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>
...when the photo is related to school.	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Other (please specify)

3a. Why did you delete or untag yourself from the photos stated above? _____

Privacy

4. I have made different categories for my friends on Facebook (i.e. work, school, church, etc.) in order to manage my information. *Yes No N/A*

Privacy Settings

5. What is your privacy setting for your “about me” information on your Facebook profile?

Everyone Friends of Friends Only Friends Custom

6. What is your privacy setting for your personal information (interests, activities, favorites) on your Facebook profile?

Everyone Friends of Friends Only Friends Custom

7. What is your privacy setting for your birth day on your Facebook profile?

Everyone *Friends of Friends* *Only Friends* *Custom*

8. What is your privacy setting for your religious and political views on your Facebook profile?

Everyone *Friends of Friends* *Only Friends* *Custom*

9. What is your privacy setting for your family and relationship information (family members, relationship status, interested in, and looking for) on your Facebook profile?

Everyone *Friends of Friends* *Only Friends* *Custom*

10. What is your privacy setting for your education and work information on your Facebook profile?

Everyone *Friends of Friends* *Only Friends* *Custom*

11. What is your privacy setting for your photos and videos (includes photos and videos you've been tagged in) on your Facebook profile?

Everyone *Friends of Friends* *Only Friends* *Custom*

12. What is your privacy setting for your photo albums on your Facebook profile?

Everyone *Friends of Friends* *Only Friends* *Custom*

13. What is your privacy setting for your posts (status updates, links, notes, photos and videos you post)?

Everyone *Friends of Friends* *Only Friends* *Custom*

14. What is your privacy setting for those who post on your wall?

Everyone *Friends of Friends* *Only Friends* *Custom*

15. What is your privacy setting for the comments on the posts you create?

Everyone *Friends of Friends* *Only Friends* *Custom*

FB Family

1. I am Facebook friends with my sibling(s). *Yes* *No* *N/A*

If no, please explain why not. _____

2. I am Facebook friends with my extended family. *Yes* *No* *N/A*

If no, please explain why not. _____

3. I am Facebook friends with my mom (or equivalent). *Yes* *No* *N/A*

If yes, who requested to be friends? *My mom* *Me*

If no, please explain why not. _____

4. I am Facebook friends with my dad (or equivalent). *Yes* *No* *N/A*

If yes, who requested to be friends? *My dad* *Me*

If no, please explain why not. _____

APPENDIX C

Topic Avoidance Scale

For this section please answer the questions as if you have friended your parent on Facebook, regardless if this is true or not. Please indicate which parent you have friended.

Parent: Mother Father Other (please specify)_____

1. I avoid posting information on past romantic relationships and dates on my Facebook.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I avoid posting content on present romantic relationships and dates on my Facebook.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I avoid posting about past negative personal experiences, including traumatic events and face-threatening behaviors.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I avoid posting about failures, such as doing poorly in a class or being fired from a job.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I avoid posting content on past sexual behavior and preferences on my Facebook.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I avoid posting content on present sexual behavior and preferences on my Facebook.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I avoid posting information discussing current friendships with others.

<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>disagree</i>	<i>neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>agree</i>	<i>strongly agree</i>		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. I avoid posting information discussing how I feel about current friends.

<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>disagree</i>	<i>neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>agree</i>	<i>strongly agree</i>		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the reasons for avoiding the topics stated above. Still keeping in mind that you have your parent (as indicated above) as a friend on Facebook.

1. It would leave me too vulnerable.

<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>disagree</i>	<i>neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>agree</i>	<i>strongly agree</i>		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. I would be embarrassed to disclose that information.

<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>disagree</i>	<i>neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>agree</i>	<i>strongly agree</i>		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. My parent will judge me.

<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>disagree</i>	<i>neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>agree</i>	<i>strongly agree</i>		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. I prefer not to replay negative experiences.

<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>disagree</i>	<i>neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>agree</i>	<i>strongly agree</i>		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. Disclosure could lead to conflict.

<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>disagree</i>	<i>neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>agree</i>	<i>strongly agree</i>
--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------	--------------	-----------------------

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. It might ruin our relationship.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. It might make my parent angry.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. My parent will probably be unresponsive.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. My parent lacks knowledge relevant to my problem.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. My parent would view the issue as trivial.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. It would be futile to talk to my parent.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. It would be socially inappropriate to discuss this topic.

Strongly disagree *disagree* *neither agree nor disagree* *agree* *strongly agree*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX D

Self-Disclosure Scale

Directions: In this section please read each statement and using the drop down menu, indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with each statement provided.

		On Facebook		In Face to Face Interaction				
		Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree		
1.	When I wish, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	When I am self-disclosing, I am consciously aware of what I am revealing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	When I reveal my feelings about myself, I consciously intend to do so.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Only infrequently do I express my personal beliefs and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	I often talk about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	I often discuss my feelings about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	I usually talk about myself for fairly long periods at a time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	My statements of my feelings are usually brief.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	I do not often talk about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	I often reveal more undesirable things about myself than desirable things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	I normally “express” my good feelings about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	On the whole, my disclosures about myself are more negative than positive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	I usually disclose positive things about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	I normally reveal “bad” feelings I have about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	On the whole, my disclosures about myself are more positive than negative.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18.	I usually disclose negative things about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	Once I get started, my self-disclosures last a long time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	I intimately disclose who I really am, openly and fully in my conversation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	I feel that I sometimes do <i>not</i> control my self-disclosure of personal intimate things I tell about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	I often disclose intimate, personal things about myself without hesitation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	Once I get started, I intimately and fully reveal myself in my self-disclosures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	I am not always honest in my self-disclosures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	I always feel completely sincere when I reveal my own feelings and experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	I am often not confident that my expressions of my own feelings, emotions, and experiences are true reflections of myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	My self-disclosures are completely accurate reflections of who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	I do not always feel completely sincere when I reveal my own feelings, emotions, behaviors or experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	My statements about my feelings, emotions, and experiences are always accurate self-perceptions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	I am always honest in my self-disclosures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	I cannot reveal myself when I want to because I do not know myself thoroughly enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX E

Demographic Information

1. Which of the following **BEST** describes your ethnic or racial background? (Please mark only one response)

- Caucasian Chinese Mixed (without Hawaiian) Japanese
- Filipino Korean Hispanic Samoan
- Hawaiian or Part Hawaiian African American or of African descent

Other (please specify) _____

2. To what extent do you identify with your ethnic or racial background?

- | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| Very little | | | | | | | Very Much |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |

3. Which of the following best describes the cultural background you most identify with? (please mark only **one** response)

- Mainland U.S. Japanese Korean Filipino
- Chinese Pacific Island African-American
- Local Hawaiian Hispanic Other (please specify) _____

4. To what extent do you identify with this cultural background?

- | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| Very little | | | | | | | Very Much |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |

5. Age: _____

6. Gender that you most associate with: Female: _____ Male: _____

7. Were you born in the USA? Yes: _____ No: _____

8. What is your native language? English: _____ Other (please specify): _____

9. Mother's educational background

- less than high-school degree college graduate
- high-school graduate graduate, medical, law school
- some college, but no degree n/a

10. Father's educational background

- less than high-school degree college graduate
- high-school graduate graduate, medical, law school
- some college, but no degree n/a

References

- Afifi, W. A. & Guerrero, L. K. (2000). Motivations underlying topic avoidance in close relationships. In S. Petronio (Ed.), *Balancing the secrets of private disclosures* (pp. 165-180).
- Altman, I. & Taylor, D. (1973). *Social Penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Archer, R. L. (1980). Self-disclosure. *The Self in Social Psychology*, 183-205.
- Bargh, J. A. & McKenna, K. Y. A. (2004). The Internet and social life. *Annual Reviews Psychology*, 55, 573-590.
- Bargh, J. A., McKenna, K. Y. A., & Fitzsimons, G. M. (2002). Can you see the real me? Activation and expression of the “true self” on the Internet. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(1). 33-48.
- Beer, D. (2008). Social network(ing) sites...revisiting the story so far: A response to dana boyd & Nicole Ellison. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 516-529.
- Bolino, M. & Turnley, W. (2002). More than one way to make an impression: Exploring Profiles of Impression Management. *Journal of Management*, 29(2), 141-160.
- boyd, d. & Ellison, N. B. (2008). Social networking sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 210-230.
- Caughlin, J.P. & Afifi, T.D. (2004). When is topic avoidance unsatisfying? Examining moderators of the association between avoidance and dissatisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, 30(4). 479-513.

- Chen, V.H., Goh, T. & Li, W. (2009). Welcome to Facebook: How Facebook Influences Parent-Child Relationship. *Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*.
Retrieved from GoogleScholar on February 18, 2011.
http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&q=welcome+to+facebook%3A+how+facebook+influences+parent-child+relationship&btnG=Search&as_sdt=1%2C5&as_ylo=&as_vis=0.
- Christopherson, K. M. (2006). The positive and negative implications of anonymity in Internet social interactions: “On the Internet, nobody knows you’re a dog.” *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23, 3038-3056.
- Collins, N. L. & Miller, L. C. (1994). Self-disclosure and liking: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 457-475.
- D’Amico, M. L. (1998, December 7). Internet has become a necessity, U.S. poll shows. *CNNinteractive* [Internet magazine], p. 1. Retrieved January 26, 2010 from the World Wide Web:
<http://www.cnn.com/TECH/computing/9812/07/neednet.idg/index.html>
- Dailey, R. M. & Palomares, N. A. (2004). Strategic topic avoidance: An investigation of topic avoidance frequency, strategies used, and relational correlates. *Communication Monographs*, 71(4), 471-496.
- Dalusio, V. E. (1972). Self-disclosure and perception of that self-disclosure between parents and their teenage children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University.
- Dindia, K., Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Kenny, D. (1997). Self-disclosure in spouse and stranger interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 23(3), 388-412.

- Donath, J. (2008). Signals in social supernets. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 231-251.
- Donath, J. & boyd, d. m. (2004). Public displays of connection. *BT Technology Journal*, 22(4), 71-82.
- Ellison, N. B., Heino, R., & Gibbs, J. (2006). Managing impressions online: Self-presentation processes in the online dating environment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(2). 415-441.
- Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook “friends:” Social capital and college students’ use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4). 1143-1168.
- Gibbs, J. L., Ellison, N. B., & Heino, R. D. (2006). Self-presentation in online personal: The role of anticipated future interaction, self-disclosure, and perceived success in Internet dating. *Communication Research*, 33, 152-177.
- Golish, T. D. (2000). Is openness always better?: Exploring the role of topic avoidance, satisfaction, and parenting styles of stepparents. *Communication Quarterly*, 48(2), 137-158.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380.
- Guerrero, L. K. & Afifi, W. A. (1995a). Some things are better left unsaid: Topic avoidance in family relationships. *Communication Quarterly*, 43, 276-296.
- Guerrero, L. K. & Afifi, W. A. (1995b). What parents don’t know: Topic avoidance in parent-child relationships. In T.J. Socha & G. H. Stamp (Eds.), *Parents, children*,

- and communication: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 219-246). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Haferkamp, N. & Krämer, N. (2009). Creating a digital self: Impression management and impression formation on social network sites. Duisburg, Germany: University of Duisburg–Essen, Department of Social Psychology, Media and Communication
- Harper, V. B. & Harper, E. J. (2006). Understanding student self-disclosure typology through blogging. In M. Whitty & A. N. Joinson (Ed.), *Truth, lies, and trust on the Internet* (pp. 9-18). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Herring, S. C. (2002). Computer mediated communication on the Internet. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, 36(1), 109-168.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 319-340.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2003). *Millennials go to college: Strategies for a new generation on campus*. Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars.
- Joinson, A. (2001). Self-disclosure in computer-mediated communication: The role of self-awareness and visual anonymity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 177-192.
- Jones, E. E. & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self*. Vol. 1, 231-262. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jourard, S. M. (1959). Self-disclosure and other-cathexis. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59(3), 428-431.

- Jourard, S. M. (1971). *Self-Disclosure: An Experimental Analysis of the Transparent Self*, Wiley, New York.
- Jourard, S. M. & Lasakow, P. (1958). Some factor in self-disclosure. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 56(1), 91-98.
- Kabakci, I., Odabasi, H. F., & Coklar, A. N. (2008). Parents' views about the Internet use of their children. *International Journal of Education and Information Technologies*, 4(2), 248-255.
- Karl, K. & Peluchette, J.V. (2011). "Friending" professors, parents and bosses: A Facebook connection conundrum. *Journal of Education for Business*, 86(4), 214-222.
- Komarovsky, M. (1974). Patterns of self-disclosure of male undergraduates. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 36(4), 677-686.
- Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T. & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, 53(9), 1017-1031.
- Lee, S. J. & Chae, Y. G. (2007). Children's internet use in a family context: Influence on family relationships and parental mediation. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 10(5), 640-644.
- Mann, S. J. & Delon, M. (1995). Improved hypertension control after disclosure of decades-old trauma. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 57(5), 501-505.
- Mazur, M. A., Jerney-Davis, M. A., Kim, I. , Kim, R. K., Ko, L. , Rogers, J. & Takeuchi, L. (2004). "Discussing Taboo Topics on Television: The Relationship between Topic Avoidance and Parental Mediation" *Paper presented at the annual meeting*

of the International Communication Association, New Orleans Sheraton, New Orleans, LA Online <.PDF>. 2009-05-26 from

http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p113065_index.html

- Mazur, M. A. & Hubbard, A. S. E. (2004). "Is there something I should know?": Topic avoidant responses in parent-adolescent communication. *Communication Reports*, 17(1), 27-37.
- McKenna, K. Y. A. & Bargh, J. A. (2000). Plan 9 from cyberspace: The implications of the Internet for personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(1), 57-75.
- McKenna, K. Y. A., Green, A. S., & Gleason, M. E. J. (2002). Relationship formation on the Internet: What's the big attraction? *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(1), 9-31.
- Norrell, J. E. (1984). Self-disclosure: Implications for the Study of Parent-Adolescent Interaction. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 13(2), 163-178.
- Parks, M. R. & Floyd, K. (1996). Making friends in Cyberspace. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 46(1). 80-96.
- Rivenbark, W. H. (1971). Self-disclosure patterns among adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, 28, 35-42.
- Rubin, Z. (1975). Disclosing oneself to a stranger: Reciprocity and its limits. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11. 1155-1180.
- Rubin, Z. & Shenker, S. (1978). Friendship, proximity, and self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality*, 46(1), 1-22.
- Schlenker, B.R. (1980). *Impression Management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Schwartz, J. (2004). That parent-child conversation is becoming instant and online. *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 18, 2011 from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- Shaw, L. H. & Gant, L. M. (2002). In defense of the Internet: The relationship between Internet communication and depression, loneliness, self-esteem, and perceived social support. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 5, 157-171.
- Steiner, P. (1993). On the Internet, no one knows you're a dog. *The New Yorker*, 5.
- Tanis, M. & Postmes, T. (2003). Social cues and impression formation in CMC. *Journal of Communication*, 53(4), 676-693.
- Taylor, D. & Altman, I. (1987). Communication in interpersonal relationships: Social penetration process. In M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Interpersonal Processes: New Directions in Communication Research* (pp. 257-277). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tufekci, Z. & Spence, K. L. (2007). *Emerging gendered behavior on social network sites: Negotiating between the pull of the social and the fear of the stalker*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.
- Walther, J. B. (1992). Interpersonal effects in computer-mediated interaction: A relational perspective. *Communication Research*, 19, 52-90.
- Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research*, 23, 3-44.
- Walther, J. B. & D'Addario, K. P. (2001). The impacts of emoticons in message interpretation in computer-mediated communication. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19, 50-88.

- Walther, J. B. & Tidwell, L. C. (1995). Nonverbal cues in computer-mediated communication, and the effect of chronemics on relational communication. *Journal of Organizational Computing, 5*, 355-378.
- Walther, J. B., Van Der Heide, B., Kim, S. Y., Westerman, D., & Tong, S. T. (2008). The role of friends' appearance and behavior on evaluations of individuals on Facebook: Are we known by the company we keep? *Human Communication Research, 34*(1), 28-48.
- Wellman, B. (2004). The three ages of Internet studies: Ten, five and zero years ago. *New Media and Society, 6*, 123-129.
- Wheless, L. R. (1978). A follow-up study of the relationships among trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. *Human Communication Research, 4*(2), 143-157.
- Wheless, L. R. & Grotz, J. (1976). Conceptualization and measurement of reported self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research, 2*, 338-346.
- Worthy, M., Gary, A. L. & Kahn, G. M. (1969). Self-disclosure as an exchange process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13*. 59-63.
- Yates, S. J. (1997). Gender, identity and CMC. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 13*(4). 281-290.
- Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*, 1816-1836.