

IMPLICATIONS OF USER GENERATED CONTENT ON FACEBOOK

Jayan Chirayath Kurian, Business Information Technology & Logistics, RMIT University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, jayan.kurian@rmit.edu.vn

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the implications (user benefits and costs) of user generated content posted by users on Facebook to individual users. Although motivations to use social networking sites are widely researched and published, studies on implications of information on social networking sites is sparse. Hence, this study addresses this gap by an interpretive analysis of user generated content posted by users on Facebook. Content posted by a selected number of users on Facebook is classified based on an information classification framework. Implications eventuating from the classified user generated content to individual users are established using thematic analysis. Findings indicate that Self presentation and relationship building are the major user benefits eventuating from basic user information, whereas loss of privacy, security risk, and identity theft are the major user costs. Users entail professional career development by posting information on user's education. Employment details of user entail benefits of professional career development and impression management. On the other hand, posting textual communication entails benefits of impression management, enjoyment, and relationship building, whereas costs include social conflict and emotional distress. Findings of this study add to the theory on implications of user generated content posted by users on Facebook.

Keywords: User generated content, Implications - user benefits and costs, thematic analysis, social networking sites, content analysis.

1 INTRODUCTION

Social Networking Sites (SNSs) are technological innovations that have proliferated into every walk of life (Ngai et al. 2015) and have been used for interpersonal communication and collaboration among users (Kane et al. 2014). User generated content is defined as those resources in the form of text, media, or metadata that are posted by users either intentionally or impulsively on SNSs (Kane et al. 2014; Shim et al. 2013). Individuals and communities co-create and share user generated content which are used in various situations such as terrorist attacks, product recall or café shooting incidents (Oh et al. 2013). Thus, a wide variety of user generated content is posted by users on SNSs, facilitating social interaction and communication among users (Richthammer et al. 2014).

Some of the types of information shared by users on SNSs include profile information (Nosko et al. 2010), professional information (Case et al. 2013) and social information (Kaplan & Haenlein 2010). According to Nosko et al. (2010), user profile content posted on SNSs was grouped into standard (name, gender), sensitive (message, photos), and potentially stigmatizing information (religious and political view) to examine identity threat (impersonation). According to Pempek et al. (2009) SNSs have also facilitated young adults to express themselves and create an online identity of their choice by sharing different types of personal information. Liu (2007) established that prestige and differentiation were the primary implications derived from the different types of interest shared by users on their profiles. According to Skeels & Grudin (2009), information on SNSs was used by users (for instance, software professionals) to locate expertise in a field. Users also share professional information such as project updates with colleagues and were motivated to connect with colleagues at a personal level and advance their career in an organisation (DiMicco et al. 2008). Disclosing profession related content lead to keeping in touch with colleagues, maintaining contact between distant employees, finding co-workers with expertise or project experience, and improve interpersonal communication among network connections (DiMicco & Millen 2007).

Disclosure of information in a social context facilitates social interaction (Lampinen et al. 2009). According to Peluchette and Karl (2008), drinking or alcohol-related photos or comments, party photos, comments left by friends, and inappropriate humour are the types of information that students wanted to keep away from potential employers. On the other hand, some users post cartoons on SNSs to criticise and influence a political decision making (Jocelyn & Gillian 2014). The types of questions asked, answers contributed, and the motivation to ask network connections instead of using web search engines were examined by Morris et al (2010) who suggested that users accomplish tasks seamlessly through social connections. Another study (Binder et al. 2009) suggests that criticism, anecdotes, rumors, and gossip resulted in the generation of online tension among users. One of the reasons for this tension is the unlimited flow of information that span across different groups on SNSs resulting in information reaching unintended recipients (Binder et al. 2009). In the context of posting information, Conole and Culver (2009) suggest that Hash tags are used to direct a posting to an individual or an event on social networking sites.

The above discussion entails that user benefits and costs of information on SNSs are extensive. Although motivations to use SNS are widely researched and published (Wilson et al. 2012; Ngai et al. 2015), studies on implications in terms of user benefits and costs eventuating from the various types of user generated content posted by users on SNS is sparse. Hence, the objective of this research is to explore the implications (user benefits and costs) eventuating from the different types of user generated content posted by users on SNSs. This is an exploratory study and Facebook is chosen in comparison with other SNSs due to the wide variety of user generated content posted by users on this public SNS (Wilson et al. 2012). Related work is introduced first followed by research objectives, methodology, methods of data collection and coding. Then, observations about background and types of user generated content posted by users are presented. This is followed by a discussion on results and implications to users. Limitations of the study and future work are discussed in the conclusion section.

2 RELATED WORK

Data types on social networking sites are classified into two types: system defined and user generated content (Richtammer et al. 2014). In our study, only user generated content is examined to establish its implications. Content under profile, profession and social categories are broadly classified under basic user information, user education, user employment, media rich communication and textual communication. Further, user information and user education are classified as personal information (Tow et al. 2010), whereas user employment is classified as professional information (Skeels & Grudin 2009). The media rich information and textual communication category which describes activities and events of network members as well as information that are important in a community are classified as social information (Yong & Quan-Haase 2009). A detailed review of different types of user generated content and an information classification framework of content on SNSs is described in one of my earlier papers (Kurian & Mohini 2014). The main theme upon which the information classification framework is built upon is concise or contextual meaning of the type of information posted by users on SNSs.

With respect to user benefits and costs, Self-presentation is the positive feeling an individual perceives after disclosing personal information which is in one's interest to a social group (Krasnova et al. 2010). Xu et al. (2010) suggest that relationship maintenance is the persistent communication between participants to maintain friendship in a social group. Impression management is a benefit to users which creates positive impressions about one among others and is accomplished by posting information on SNSs (DiMicco & Millen 2007). Information posted on SNSs acts as connection gateways among users, which facilitate the formation of new relationship among SNS users (Lo 2010). Enjoyment to users (Sledgianowski & Kulviwat 2008) and the ability to maintain social ties (Ellison et al. 2007) are some of the important benefits of posting information on SNSs. On the other hand, Identity Theft Resource Center (Foley & Nelson 2009) categorized identity theft as one of the major costs of posting information on SNSs, involving monetary and emotional cost. Information posted by users on SNS can also lead to social embarrassment (Hasib 2009). According to Hui et al. (2006) loss of privacy is another major cost for users and Krasnova et al. (2010) suggests perceived privacy risk as one of the significant costs of posting information on SNSs. Privacy issues also arise from unintentional posting of profile content and dissemination of this information by third parties (Boyd 2008).

A review of theories and models used in social media research has been discussed in the study of Ngai et al (2015) and the most prominent ones are Technology Acceptance Model, Social Identity Theory, Social Influence Theory, and Social Capital Theory. According to Tajfel and Turner (1979) identity has been studied from an individual perspective and it is also established that social interactions on SNSs facilitate identity creation of individuals (Simon 2008). On the other hand, Social Exchange Theory posits that participants in an interaction always consider rewards and costs eventuating from a social interaction (Homans 1958). According to Social Exchange Theory, rewards entail positive value and costs entail negative value to participants in a social interaction. However, studies that examined the implications (user benefits and costs) eventuating from user generated content posted by users on SNSs is scant. To limit the scope of this study, we consider only content that are in the form of text, posted by users on Facebook.

3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES & METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to establish the implications (user benefits and costs) eventuating from different types of user generated content posted by users on Facebook. The methodology used is content analysis which has been used to collect and analyse data from websites (Steininger et al. 2011) and Social Networking Sites (Shelton & Skalski 2014). The focus of this study is on public postings of a user to other users on Facebook. Follow up communications on a user's first level communication are not examined in this study which could be an avenue for future research. Content posted by ten

selected Facebook users was collected in December 2013, and then read and analysed. Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke 2006) is used to establish themes relevant to user benefits and costs. Being an exploratory study content posted by ten users are examined to find out the implications eventuating from the major types of user generated content posted by users on a public SNS (Facebook). It is also envisaged that user generated content identified in this study will generate implications to individuals if posted on the Web through other communication channels. The data collection and coding process are described next.

3.1 Data collection and Coding

To conduct an interpretive analysis of content, one of the primary criteria is to collect rich subjective information (Walsham & Sahay 1999). Only Facebook satisfied this criterion of rich content when compared with other SNSs (Nosko et al. 2010). An individual user account was created on Facebook (public social networking site) to collect data. Freely accessible data on 10 random user profiles was collected from Facebook based on diversity in users' profession (student, politician, actor, elderly, housewife, and senior/junior academic) which ensured maximum variation sampling (Ellsberg & Heise 2005). Further, to be selected, the minimum word count of all user posts in a given period of time was set at 350. On the other hand, network connections for a user were set at a minimum of 100, so that fake user profiles could be eliminated which ensured the credibility of posted content (Adikari & Dutta 2014). Thus, user profiles satisfying the above criteria, and content posted by users between April 2013 and December 2013 was collected. The raw user profile data was collected in a spreadsheet and to maintain anonymity of users, real names were replaced with user 1 through user 10. Collecting raw data in an Excel spreadsheet for pre-processing has been used in earlier research (Gordon et al. 2013) and hence we adopted the same approach for collecting and pre-processing raw data. The percentage of male profiles in the collected sample is 70% and female 30%. Since this study considers only text postings of users, images and videos were not collected for coding. The above description explaining "When", "How", "What", "Where" and "How much data" were collected for analysis ensure the rigour of research process (Sarker et al. 2013).

The postings were initially read and analysed to get insights on the posts and types of user generated content. Each user post was examined and then coded with the relevant user generated content of the information classification framework for SNSs (Kurian & Mohini 2014). Lengthy user posts were read thoroughly and coded succinctly under relevant user generated content. After the first round of coding, clarifications that arose were discussed with another researcher who holds a research active university classification and specialised in social media research. This resulted in a second round of coding and a mutual agreement on coding was accomplished. In the following section, data analysis is described to examine the results for implications.

4 OBSERVATIONS

The broader categories of user generated content examined in this section are user information, user education, user employment, and textual communication. Each one of these along with sample user quotes is explained in the following section.

4.1 User Information

Self-presentation and relationship building are the major user benefit eventuating from user information. The types of user generated content in the user information category that entails self-presentation are Honors and Awards, Interest, Language Proficiency, Political view, Profile Picture, and Religious View whereas Contact Information, Marital Status, Name, Gender, Political View, and Religious View entails relationship building. On the other hand, major cost in the user information category is Privacy and Security Risk eventuating from Contact Information, Gender, Marital Status, Name, and Profile Picture. Another major cost is Identity Theft that eventuates from posting Birthday,

Contact Information, Name, and Profile Picture. Sample quotes of user information are presented below in Table 1.

User Generated Content	Example
Name	'User 8 - First Name Last Name in English (First name and last name written in the national language of a country)'
Honors and awards	'User 1 - man of the year by the sport fishing association'
Interest	'User 1 - Playing bass guitar'
Language Proficiency	'User 2 - An Asian Language and English'
Political View	'User 6 – anti-politicians'
Religious View	'User 2 – Buddhist'
Profile Picture	User 1 - A smiling face, user is in a professional outfit in a black suit without a tie
Contact Information	User 5 – Three mobile phone numbers

Table 1. Content in the User Information Category

Name is used to search users by first or last name (Adamic & Adar 2005), initials or partial names (Vosecky et al. 2009). Bilingual names are more appealing to local and global users of SNSs as well as to establish truthful user representation on SNSs (Lee & Barton 2011). Those users who have posted their middle name, pet name, nick name or short name in a language other than English have an extended benefit of increase in friend connections (Lampe et al. 2007). Thus, relationship building is a benefit eventuating from posting Name on SNSs. On the other hand, disclosing name might lead to profile cloning (Bilge et al. 2009). The costs associated with posting Name are privacy risk and identify theft. Analysis of honors and awards information indicates that users present accolades that they have received in their social life, as well as from other associations or entertainment industry. Thus, by posting such information users entail benefits of Self-presentation. Analysis of information on user interest indicates that users post information about the activities that they are involved in, some of them are personal, social, and family related, which entails benefits of Self-presentation. Analysis of data indicates that implication (user benefits) of posting language proficiency is self-presentation. Political and religious views are indicators of ideology (Pempek et al. 2009). Thus, relationship building and self-presentation are the benefits to users by posting political and religious view.

Analysis of profile pictures indicate that users are posting professional profile pictures, party pictures or pictures that are socialising in nature (DiMicco et al. 2008). By posting profile pictures users perceive a positive feeling about oneself among network connections. Hence, Self-presentation is a user benefit (Krasnova et al. 2010). Some users don't post their profile picture; instead they post general pictures (for instance, nature). Users posting their profile pictures entail Privacy and Security Risk, and Identify Theft which are user costs (Foley & Nelson 2009). Alternative SNSs contact information facilitates more network connections (Dwyer et al. 2007) whereas posting professional information leads to strong external networks (Skeels & Grudin 2009). Using personal online communication tools allow users to disaggregate the usage of SNSs and attract different community of users (Hargittai 2007). Using other online communication tools extend online network and increase communication with strangers (Lenhart & Madden 2007). Thus, relationship building is a user benefit from posting contact information. On the other hand, providing region reduces privacy, as strangers can identify user's physical location. Locating users based on region may result in abuse or physical assault (Taraszow et al. 2010). Moreover, sharing phone number might result in unwanted contact from strangers (Strater & Lipford 2008) and additional contact information provided can de-anonymize a user by combining information shared by users on different SNSs (Narayanan & Shmatikov 2009). Thus, costs associated with posting contact information are identity theft, privacy and security risk. By disclosing marital status, users intentionally reveal their social status to a

community (Morris et al. 2010). Further, matching online connections are facilitated by posting user status (Kalmijin 2003) which leads to relationship building. On the other hand, disclosing partner's name might lead to profile cloning (Bilge et al. 2009). Thus, Identity theft, Privacy and Security Risk are the user costs. By posting gender on SNSs profile, gender identity is revealed to facilitate friendship (Thelwall 2008). On the other hand, including gender facilitate stereotyped representation of masculinities and femineities (Carstensen 2009). Thus, relationship building is a benefit of posting gender whereas cost for users is Privacy and Security Risk. From the analysis, it is evident that majority of users include their day and month of their birthday, while some users include the year of their birthday as well. On the other hand, very few users include only their year of birthday. Revealing full birthday (day, month, and year) leads to identity theft (Strater & Lipford 2008). Thus the cost of posting birthday is identity theft.

From the above discussion and snapshot of basic user information posted above, it is understood that majority of user benefits are self-presentation (Krasnova et al. 2010) and relationship building (Krasnova et al. 2010) whereas loss of privacy, security risk and identity theft (Brooks & Anene 2012; Fogel & Nehmad 2009) are the major costs to users.

4.2 User Education

Users entail professional career development by posting details of user's education. The types of user generated content in user's education category that entails benefits of professional career development are Courses Taken, Graduation Year, Qualifications, and School Attended. Sample quotes of user education are presented below in Table 2.

User Generated Content	Example
Courses Taken	'User 2 - Statistics workshop'
Graduation Year	User 10 - duration of study and location
Qualifications	'User 10 – teaching certificate, IT certificate, bachelor degree in engineering'.
School Attended	User 10 –Name of the school, location (place and country) of the school

Table 2. Content in the User Education Category

Analysis of user education indicates that posting information about the courses that users have studied helps users in explicitly referring to the knowledge that users have gained by completing those courses. Thus posting information on courses undertaken leads to professional career development (Schaefer 2008). Users post information about when they received their professional qualifications as well as period of study and location, which entails benefits of professional career development. Publishing information about attainment date of qualifications is one of the ways to promote oneself and user's professional career development. Some users post information about different types of educational qualifications ranging from certificates to higher degrees that they have accomplished during education. Thus, professional career development is a user benefit from posting qualifications on SNSs (Schaefer 2008). By posting information about the schools attended for education, users are able to establish connections with peers who have studied in the same educational institution (Zywica & Danowski 2008). Posting detailed description of educational institutions, duration of study, and location of education institutions facilitates users to connect with peers, which entails professional career development. From the above discussion and snapshot of user education posted above, it is understood that majority of user benefit is professional career development (Schaefer 2008).

4.3 User Employment

Users entail professional career development and impression management by posting information on user's employment. The types of user generated content in user's employment that entail benefits of

professional career development are Job Description, Job Start Date, Positions held, and Professional Skills. On the other hand, Employer Information, Job Start Date, Positions held, and Professional Affiliations entail impression management. Sample quotes of user employment are presented below in Table 3.

User Generated Content	Example
Job Description	User 10 - Employment details
Job Start Date	User 1- Year when elected to the presidency of a congregation
Positions	'User 10- Lecturer and program director'
Professional Skills	'User 10 - Data analysis, Leadership, Writing'
Employer Information	User 7 - Employer name and location
Professional Affiliation	'User 2 - Supported club during the period of study'

Table 3. Content in the User Employment Category

Users post information about different types of job starting from earlier jobs till to-date which implies professional experience accomplished at different levels (DiMicco & Millen 2007). Thus, professional career development is a user benefit from posting job description. Users posting information on the year of professional accomplishments or employment duration facilitates users' future career plans. Such information will also communicate a positive impression about the user to other network connections. Thus, professional career development and impression management are the user benefits of posting job start date. Some users post information on their previous positions. Posting specific information on previous positions aid in advancing user's career when potential employer seeks for user's information on SNSs. Posting information about previous positions also create an impression about the user on network connections. Thus, professional career development and impression management are the user benefits eventuating from posting information on positions held by a user. Users also post information on the type of professional skills that they have accomplished which support users' future career progression. Potential employers may also seek information about users' professional accomplishments on SNSs. Thus, professional career development is a user benefit from posting professional skills on SNSs. Some users post information about the employer, and location of employment. In addition to such information, users also post details of different types of employers including private and non-governmental organisations. By posting employer information, users create an impression about themselves among network connections. Thus, impression management is a user benefit eventuating from posting employer information (Skeels & Grudin 2009). Some users post information on professional affiliations that was accomplished during user's education. Posting information on professional affiliation is one of the ways to share impression about oneself to network connections. Some users share activities undertaken as part of user's affiliation with a university club under professional affiliations. Thus, impression management is a user benefit of posting professional affiliations on SNSs. From the above discussion and snapshot of user employment posted above, it is understood that majority of user benefits are professional career development (Schaefer 2008) and impression management (DiMicco & Millen 2007).

4.4 Textual Communication

Users entail impression management, enjoyment and relationship building by posting textual communication on SNSs. The types of user generated content in the textual communication category that entails benefits of impression management are Announcement, Creative Writing, Criticism, Diaries, Greeting, Praise, Quotation, Recommendation, Self-Experience, Status Update, and Tags. User generated content that entails enjoyment are Criticism, Diaries, Praise, Random Thoughts, Recommendation, Self-Experience, Status Update, and Tags, whereas Creative Writing, Diaries, Greeting, Praise, Request, and Status Update entail relationship building. On the other hand, Criticism, Diaries, Opinion, Praise, Random Thoughts, Recommendation, Self-Experience, and Status Update

entail social conflict whereas Criticism, Diaries, Opinion, Random Thoughts, Self-Experience, and Status Update entail emotional distress. Sample quotes of textual communication are presented below in Table 4.

User Generated Content	Example
Announcements	'We've got talent V. They will shine this Saturday!!!;'
Creative Writing	'User 1 – A story about two inseparable dogs (one was blind) wandering on the streets and later nursed back to health.'
Diaries	'User 9 - Those that have faced the pain of separation at the time of the Partition of our country .. the affection that existed with our neighbour, will undoubtedly have a tear in their eyes !!'.
Greetings	'User 4 - I want to thank the most excellent students of RBX (antilittering campaign) who treated me to cake for Teacher's Day! Thanks a lot guys!';
Praise	'User 7 – Thank you my dancing Queens for amazing dancing sessions, (and guys for Darts lesson) but above all BIG THANKS to 8 very talented finalists, amazing, surprising and touching performances and a great show last night!!!.'
Recommendation	'User 10 – Those who love drinking/eating while typing may consider getting one of this. A keyboard for those having several Bluetooth-enabled devices';
Status Update	'User 2 – Lunch with 2 colleagues at a Chinese restaurant'
Criticism	'User 1 - The transportation security administration spent too much money on behavior detection officers for the security screening of drugs or undeclared currency. But the service didn't catch any one involved in terrorism'.
Quotation	'User 9 - imagination is the highest kite that one can fly';
Self-Experience	'User 10 - Finally after 3 weeks of no Internet connection. Negative correlations between productivity and working hours'.
Tag	'User 2 tags another user - Eating dinner with a lecturer and his wife at a Korean restaurant in Melbourne'
Random Thoughts	'User 2 – Signal to upgrade from C-class to J-class perhaps?'
Request	'User 8 - Addressed to the Director of IT services, any chance of me getting this installed at my work desk, seems like an awesome productivity tool'
Opinion	'User 8 on a video on inflated animals – What if animals were round? I can't stop laughing watching this'.

Table 4. Content in the Textual Communication Category

Users post announcements in the form of encouraging peers and posting words of encouragement on SNSs implies impression management. Analysis of information on creative writing indicates that user post information in the form of a story and requests other network connections for their support which entails relationship building. Further, user also suggests that if other network connections are unable to extend their support now, they can consider extending their support in the future for others who are in need, which entails impression management. Thus, relationship building and impression management are the benefits eventuating from posting creating writing. User posting diaries on collaborating with colleagues on professional projects and remembering such joyful moments entails relationship building and enjoyment. User posting diaries on his social activities that lead to popularity entails impression management. On the other hand, posting information on systemic professional issues that worries a user entails emotional distress. User posting diaries on partition between two neighbouring countries may lead to social conflict among peers. Analysis of information on greetings indicates that users post greetings received on special events, which include names of those who gave gifts on such special occasions. Yet another example is a photo of biscuits made by a student and packed in a plastic container and presented as a gift to the user on teacher's day. Posting such information on SNSs entail impression management since it creates a positive impression about the user among network

connections. Casual inquiry about other network connections at the start of a day indicates a positive approach for relationship building. Praising participants of a social event implies enjoyment, whereas posting information on working with a legend in a profession entails impression management. User posting information on being with a group of talented professionals indicates relationship building. On the other hand, posting information on the talent of a participant by comparing with another participant in a competition entails social conflict. Posting recommendation about a new technology that is convenient for peers entails enjoyment for users. Posting information about a promotional clip of a university where the user has studied implies impression management. On the other hand, user posting information on sensitive social issues (unfaithfulness) entails social conflict.

User posting information on dining with peers entails relationship building, whereas posting information on celebrating a festival with family members entails enjoyment. Users also post information on night parties that they have attended. This leads to positive impression management for those who enjoy such events. Some users post information on SNSs that has unprofessional slangs which entails un-professional communication leading to social conflict. Some users post status update in anticipation of future events or actions which implies emotional distress. User posting sarcastic information on spending public's tax contribution for maintaining national security entails impression management. On the other hand, user posting information about mistreating toddlers in a child care centre, and his hatred towards those who are involved entails social conflict. User posting criticism about emotional setback of an academic due to management policies (for instance, allocating difficult students to him always) implies emotional distress. Some users post quotations relevant to his thoughts and the need to explore future opportunities entail impression management. Some other users posting information about a fabulous music competition, and about two candidates who have lost in the competition after performing to their best indicates impression management. Also, a user posting his joyful experience at a musical night entails enjoyment.

On the other hand, user posting information about how productivity decreases with extended working hours entails negative impression management. User posting information about her children deleting what has been posted by the user on SNSs implies emotional distress, and social conflict. Three different types of tags are used by users and they are user tag (User 2 - Eating dinner with a lecturer and his wife at a Korean restaurant in Melbourne), location or event tag, and emotion tag. User tagging on social gathering with professional colleagues, family, or friends, entails impression management, and enjoyment. User posting random thoughts about his perception of upgrading from a grade to the next level entails impression management. User posting random thoughts on happiness in life entails enjoyment whereas thoughts about the need to live every day to its best rather than being worried about the future entails emotional distress. User posting random thoughts on why evacuation policies are applicable only to people inside a building entails social conflict. By posting a request, user shows gratitude to an actor who has recently passed away which entails impression management. Another user request on how to keep your colleagues away from disturbing at work entails negative impression management. User's opinion after watching funny videos entails enjoyment. Another opinion on road safety during an upcoming weekend entails relationship building and impression management. On the other hand, user's opinion on the need to conduct group prayers for self-control among public entails social conflict. From the above discussion and snapshot of textual communication posted above, it is understood that majority of user benefits are Impression Management (DiMicco & Millen 2007), Enjoyment (Krasnova et al. 2010) and Relationship Building (Krasnova et al. 2010), whereas major user costs are Social Conflict (Koroleva et al. 2011) and Emotional Distress (Patchin & Hinduja 2010).

5 DISCUSSION

Analysis of data indicates that self-presentation and relationship building are the major user benefits eventuating from user information, whereas loss of privacy, security risk, and identity theft are the major user costs. Users entail professional career development by posting information on users' education. Users' employment information entails benefits of professional career development and

impression management. Major user benefits of posting textual communication are impression management, enjoyment, and relationship building, whereas major user costs are social conflict and emotional distress. Thus, the implications eventuating from the basic classification of user generated content under user information, user education, user employment, and textual communication are established.

With respect to research implications, users accomplish social interactions on SNSs by posting information in two modes: profile information and activity information (Zhang et al. 2010). Identity construction eventuating from posting information on SNSs is further established by Hum et al. (2011) in their study on Facebook profile photos. On the other hand, according to Zhao et al. (2008) explicit identity on SNSs is constructed by posting basic profile information, whereas implicit identity is constructed by posting user interactions with network connections. Thus, by posting information or joining groups on SNSs, users establish social identity (Pempek et al. 2009). Moreover, according to Stern and Taylor (2007) identity construction is one of the key implications that envisage users to post or restrict information on SNSs. Thus, users post information to construct an identity on SNSs which concur with the findings of self-presentation (Krasnova et al. 2010) and impression management (DiMicco & Millen 2007) in this study.

On the other hand, Social Exchange Theory posits that participants in an interaction always consider rewards and costs eventuating from a social interaction (Homans 1958). This is in consensus with the finding of enjoyment (textual communication category) in this study. Another finding is that relationship building is one of the major implications of posting user generated content on Facebook. This finding concurs with the study of Shin and Hall (2012) on Social Exchange Theory which posits that relationship between social actors in an online community lead to rewards and costs. Thus, rewards and costs of social interactions proposed by Social Exchange Theory concur with the findings of relationship building and enjoyment on social networking sites.

A limitation of this study is that the data collected and analysed are publicly disclosed information on Facebook which is a public social networking site. It is anticipated that certain information (for instance, gossip) may be more widely posted in private conversations among network members, which may be accomplished after necessary ethics approval and consent is sought from network connections. This will be an avenue for future work. It is also envisaged that user generated content identified in this study will generate implications to individuals if posted on the Web through other communication channels.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This study establishes the implications eventuating from the types of user generated content posted by users on Facebook. User posts were coded into categories of user information, user education, user employment, and textual communication. This classification is based on one of my previous studies (Kurian & Mohini, 2014) which establish a framework for classification of user generated content on social networking sites. This study has been conducted based on data collected from Facebook. Hence, a similar study on other social networking sites (LinkedIn) will establish the significance of posting user generated content from a professional context. Finally, reconfirming the implications of user generated content directly from researchers and practitioners via interviews will complement the findings of this study. This will also explain to users the types of content that will generate negative ramifications, so that social networking sites can be used as a beneficial tool, reducing its harmful implications.

References

- Adamic, L. and Adar, E. (2005). How to search a social network. *Social Networks*, 27 (3), 187–203.
- Adikari, S. and Dutta, K (2014). Identifying Fake Profiles in LinkedIn. *Proceedings of the Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems, AISeL*.

- Bilge, L., et al. (2009). All Your Contacts Are Belong to Us: Automated Identity Theft Attacks on Social Networks. Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on World Wide Web, ACM.
- Binder, J., et al. (2009). The problem of conflicting social spheres: effects of network structure on experienced tension in social network sites. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, ACM.
- Boyd, D.M. and Ellison, N.B. (2008). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210–230.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Brooks, L. and Anene, V. (2012). Information Disclosure and Generational Differences in Social Network Sites. Proceedings of the Americas Conference on Information Systems, AISeL.
- Carstensen, T. (2009). Gender Trouble in Web 2.0. Gender Relations in Social Network Sites, Wikis and Weblogs. *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology*, 1(1), 106–127.
- Case, T., et al. (2013). “A linkedin analysis of career paths of information systems alumni.”, *Journal of the Southern Association for Information Systems* 1(1): 1-15.
- Conole, G. and Culver, J. (2009). Cloudworks: Social networking for learning design. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 25(5), 763-782.
- DiMicco, J.M. and Millen, D.R. (2007). Identity Management: Multiple Presentations of Self in Facebook. Proceedings of the 2007 International ACM Conference on Supporting Group Work, ACM.
- DiMicco, J., Millen, D.R., Geyer, W., Dugan, C., Brownholtz, B. and Muller, M. (2008). Motivations for social networking at work. Proceedings of the 2008 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work, ACM.
- Dwyer, C., Hiltz, S.R. and Passerini, K. (2007). Trust and privacy concern within social networking sites: A comparison of Facebook and MySpace. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Americas Conference on Information Systems, AISeL.
- Ellison N.B., et al. (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.
- Ellsberg, M. and Heise, L. (2005). Researching violence against women: a practical guide for researchers and activists. World Health Organization, Washington DC.
- Fogel, J. and Nehmad, E. (2009). Internet Social Network Communities: Risk Taking, Trust, and Privacy Concerns. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25 (1), 153–160.
- Gordon, S., et al. (2013). “Case-Based Research in Information Systems: Gaps and Trends.”, *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application* 14(2): 47–68.
- Hargittai, E. (2007). Whose Space? Differences Among Users and Non-Users of Social Network Sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13 (1), 276–297.
- Hasib, A.A. (2009). Threats of Online Social Networks. *IJCSNS International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, 9(11), 1-10.
- Homans, G.C. (1958). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606.
- Hui, K.L., et al. (2006). “The Value of Privacy Assurance: An Exploratory Field Experiment.”, *Management Information Systems Quarterly* 31(1):19-33.
- Hum, N.J., et al. (2011). “A picture is worth a thousand words: A content analysis of Facebook profile photographs.”, *Computers in Human Behavior* 27 (5): 1828–1833.
- Jocelyn, C. and Gillian, O. (2014). Yes Minister: Satire in Information Systems Research. Proceedings of the European Conference on Information Systems, AISeL.
- Kalmijn, M. (2003). Shared friendship networks and the life course: an analysis of survey data on married and cohabiting couples. *Social Networks*, 25 (3), 231–249.
- Kane, G.C., et al. (2014). “What’s Different About Social Media Networks? A Framework and Research Agenda.”, *Management Information Systems Quarterly* 38(1): 275–304.
- Kaplan, A.M. and Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons*, 53 (1), 59–68.

- Koroleva, K., et al. (2011). Generation Facebook – A Cognitive Calculus Model of Teenage User Behavior on Social Network Sites. Proceedings of the Americas Conference on Information Systems, AISEL.
- Krasnova, H., et al. (2010). “Online social networks: why we disclose.”, *Journal of Information Technology* 25 (2) : 109–125.
- Kurian, J. and Singh, M. (2014). A framework for analysing types of user information on social networking sites. Australasian Conference on Information Systems, AISEL.
- Lampe, C.A.C., et al. (2007). A Familiar Face(Book): Profile Elements As Signals in an Online Social Network. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, ACM.
- Lampinen, A., et al. (2009). All My People Right Here, Right Now: Management of Group Co-presence on a Social Networking Site. Proceedings of the ACM 2009 International Conference on Supporting Group Work, ACM.
- Lee, C.K.M. and Barton, D. (2011). Constructing Glocal Identities Through Multilingual Writing Practices on Flickr.com. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 5 (1), 39–59.
- Lenhart, A. and Madden, M. (2007). Teens, Privacy and Online Social Networks: How Teens Manage Their Online Identities and Personal Information in the Age of MySpace, Pew/Internet & American Life Project, Washington DC.
- Liu, H. (2007). Social Network Profiles as Taste Performances. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13 (1), 252–275.
- Lo, J. (2010). Privacy Concern, Locus of Control, and Salience in a Trust-Risk Model of Information Disclosure on Social networking sites. Proceedings of 16th Americas Conference on Information Systems, AISEL.
- Morris, M.R., et al. (2010). What Do People Ask Their Social Networks, and Why?: A Survey Study of Status Message Q&A Behavior. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, ACM.
- Narayanan, A. and Shmatikov, V. (2009). De-anonymizing Social Networks. Proceedings of the 2009 30th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, IEEE.
- Ngai, E.W.T., et al. (2015). “Social media research: Theories, constructs, and conceptual frameworks.”, *International Journal of Information Management* 35 (1) : 33–44.
- Nosko, A., et al. (2010). “All about me: Disclosure in online social networking profiles: The case of FACEBOOK.”, *Computers in Human Behavior* 26 (3) : 406–418.
- Oh, O., et al. (2013). “Community Intelligence and Social Media Services: A Rumor Theoretic Analysis of Tweets During Social Crises.”, *Management Information Systems Quarterly* 37 (2) : 407–426.
- Patchin, J.W. and Hinduja, S. (2010). Changes in adolescent online social networking behaviors from 2006 to 2009. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26 (6), 1818–1821.
- Peluchette, J. And Karl, K. (2008). Social Networking Profiles: An Examination of Student Attitudes Regarding Use and Appropriateness of Content. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11 (1), 95–97.
- Pempek, T.A., et al. (2009). “College students’ social networking experiences on Facebook.”, *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 30 (3) : 227–238.
- Richthammer, C., et al. (2014). “Taxonomy of social network data types.”, *EURASIP Journal on Information Security* 2014 (1) : 1–17.
- Sarker, S., et al. (2013). “Guest Editorial: Qualitative Studies in Information Systems: A Critical Review and Some Guiding Principles.”, *Management Information Systems Quarterly* 37 (4): iii–xviii.
- Schäfer, C. (2008). Motivations and usage patterns on social network sites. The 16th European Conference on Information Systems, Galway, AISEL.
- Shelton, A.K. and Skalski, P. (2014). Blinded by the light: Illuminating the dark side of social network use through content analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 33 (1), 339–348.
- Shim, J.P., et al. (2013). “Social Networking and Social Media in the United States, South Korea, and China.”, *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 33 (1) : 485–496.

- Shin, S. and Hall, D. (2012). How Do Social Networking Sites Users Become Loyal? A Social Exchange Perspective. Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Systems, AISeL.
- Simon, B. (2008). Identity in Modern Society: A Social Psychological Perspective. Wiley, NJ.
- Skeels, M.M. and Grudin, J. (2009). When Social Networks Cross Boundaries: A Case Study of Workplace Use of Facebook and LinkedIn. Proceedings of the ACM 2009 International Conference on Supporting Group Work, ACM.
- Sledgianowski, D. and Kulviwat, S. (2008). Social Network Sites: Antecedents of User Adoption and Usage. Proceedings of 14th Americas Conference on Information Systems, AISeL.
- Steininger, D., et al. (2011). A Systemizing Research Framework for Web 2.0. Proceedings of the European Conference on Information Systems, AISeL.
- Stern, L.A. and Taylor, K. (2007). Social networking on Facebook. Journal of Communication, Speech, & Theatre Association of North Dakota, 20 (1), 9–20.
- Strater, K. and Lipford, H.R. (2008). Strategies and Struggles with Privacy in an Online Social Networking Community. Proceedings of the 22Nd British HCI Group Annual Conference on People and Computers: Culture, Creativity, Interaction, British Computer Society.
- Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Brooks/Cole, Monterey, CA.
- Taraszow, T., et al. (2010). “Disclosure of personal and contact information by young people in social networking sites: An analysis using Facebook profiles as an example.”, International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics, 6 (1) : 81–101.
- Thelwall, M. (2008). Social networks, gender, and friending: An analysis of MySpace member profiles. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 59 (8), 1321–1330.
- Vosecky, J., et al. (2009). User identification across multiple social networks. First International Conference on Networked Digital Technologies, IEEE.
- Walsham, G. and Sahay, S. (1999). GIS for District-level Administration in India: Problems and Opportunities. Management Information Systems Quarterly, 23 (1), 39–65.
- Wilson, R.E., et al. (2012). “A Review of Facebook Research in the Social Sciences.”, Perspectives on Psychological Science 7 (3) : 203–220.
- Xu, H., et al. (2010). Information Disclosure and Social networking sites: From the Case of Facebook News Feed Controversy to a Theoretical Understanding. Proceedings of the 16th Americas conference on Information Systems, AISeL.
- Young, A.L, and Quan-Haase, A. (2009). Information Revelation and Internet Privacy Concerns on Social Network Sites: A Case Study of Facebook. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Communities and Technologies, ACM.
- Zhang, S., et al. (2010). “Social Identity in Facebook Community Life.”, International Journal of Virtual Communities and Social Networking 2 (4): 64-76.
- Zhao, S., et al. (2008). “Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships.”, Computers in Human Behavior 24 (5) : 1816–1836.
- Zywica, J. and Danowski, J. (2008). The Faces of Facebookers: Investigating Social Enhancement and Social Compensation Hypotheses; Predicting Facebook™ and Offline Popularity from Sociability and Self-Esteem, and Mapping the Meanings of Popularity with Semantic Networks. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14 (1), 1–34.