"I ATE AN APPLE TODAY":

SUITABILITY OF FACEBOOK POSTS AND REACTIONS TO NORM

VIOLATIONS

Master's Thesis

Ville Välimäki

University of Jyväskylä

Department of Languages

English

December 2015

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Ville Välimäki	
Työn nimi – Title "I ATE AN APPLE TODAY" Suitability of Facebook posts and reactions to norm violations	
Oppiaine – Subject englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Joulukuu 2015	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 111 + 1 liite

Tiivistelmä – Abstract
Facebook on yksi maailman suosituimmista sosiaalisista verkostoitumissivuista. Käyttäjät esiintyvät Facebookissa pääsääntöisesti omilla nimillään, kirjoittavat lyhyitä tekstejä verkostolleen ja jakavat muuta materiaalia avoimesti. Facebookia ja sosiaalista mediaa on tutkittu paljon erilaisista näkökulmista, mutta Facebookiin kirjoituksen aiheista ei ole paljoa tutkimusta.

Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on selvittää mistä aiheista ihmiset kirjoitavat Facebookiin, mitä aiheita välttävät, mitä aiheita pitävät täysin sopimattomina ja miten he reagoivat epäsopiviin kirjoituksiin. Näitä kysymyksiä varten suoritettiin verkko-kysely, jossa kysyttiin avoimesti vastauksia näihin kysymyksiin. Vastaajia oli yhteensä 413 ja vastaukset kategorisoitiin käyttäen kvalitatiivista analyysiohjelmaa.

Yleisimmin vastaajat sanoivat kirjoittavansa omasta itsestään ja omasta elämästään. Tämän lisäksi laadullisesti hauskat kirjoitukset olivat erityisen suosittuja. Yksityisiä ja arkipäiväisiä kirjoituksia vältettiin, mikä viittaisi tarpeeseen kirjoittaa itsestä keskivertoisia seikkoja. Yksityisiä, arkipäiväisiä ja vihamielisiä kirjoituksia pidettiin myös sopimattomina kokonaisuudessaan, mutta useampi vastaaja vältti itse vastaavia aiheita, kuin odotti samaa muilta. Selvästi yleisin reaktio sopimattomaan kirjoitukseen oli asian sivuuttaminen, mutta myös tekstin tai käyttäjän piilottaminen, sekä verkosta poistaminen olivat yleisiä reaktioita. Facebookissa on siis vallitsevia normeja kirjoittamisesta, mutta ne nojaavat enemmän itsesäätelyyn ja sivuuttamiseen, kuin varsinaiseen toimeenpanoon.

Asiasanat – Keywords Social network sites, Facebook, online posting, qualitative analysis, Atlas.ti
Säilytyspaikka – Depository
Muita tietoja – Additional information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

Facebook is one of the most popular social network sites in the world. It enables people to connect with their friends, communicate with their peers, present themselves and share their life experiences easily and with a large audience. The social significance of Facebook and its value to social relationships has been studied to some extent (e.g. Jeong and McAndrew 2012, Yang and Brown 2012, Marichal 2012), but the actual content loaded into the online forum has not received as much scrutiny. The ways in which Facebook is used and to what means is often discussed (e.g. Georgalou 2014, Yang and Brown 2012), but the topics discussed within Facebook by its users is not. What is actually put up for show to be viewed by one's Friends? What is the content of Facebook?

As one may gather a vast number of Friends on one's Facebook page, it may be difficult to publish such information that is suitable for the entirety of one's audience within that group of contacts. Therefore, one must be careful about what one puts up to be viewed for the Facebook community. As suitable discretion is a difficult task, the possibility for a conflict is apparent. Since the platform is considered light and easy to use, it is unlikely all individuals would evaluate and define their desired audience in great detail every time they post something on Facebook. Therefore, one is bound to post something some of their audience frowns upon and one is bound to have one of their Friends post something they find inappropriate or annoying. But are there any topics or subjects that are generally found unsuitable for public? If there are social restrictions to what is suitable, what then is popular? If these topics are inappropriate, why are they discussed on Facebook?

As social norms are violated in one way or another, there is often some kind of response. As an individual notices a violation, they make a choice in what kind of action to take, whether to ignore or challenge the violation. In face to face interaction a lack of response is more perceivable, but in a social network site a lack of response is not necessarily conveyed to the original author, due to the asynchronous nature of the communication. Thus such a response may go unnoticed. What do people do, or do not do, in norm violation situations?

This study will look at what topics people find acceptable and unacceptable in semi-public presentation on Facebook. A questionnaire was performed and the responses analysed in order to find out how people view social norms, different topics and actions on Facebook. Quantitative data were extracted from the questionnaire and the contents are analysed more thoroughly by means of content analysis. What people think of different topics online as well as the ways of interaction and self-presentation are studied.

Wilson et al. (2012: 204) give three reasons for studying Facebook. Firstly, activities on Facebook leave an observable set of data to be studied on phenomena that have been difficult to study otherwise. Second, the popularity of Facebook makes it significant in its own right, in addition to it being able to create new social processes. Third, Facebook creates benefits and dangers to society, such as strengthening social ties and problems with privacy, in ways that have not existed before.

Previous research has studied norm violation on Facebook (McLauglin and Vitak 2012), but the topics and attitudes towards those topics have not been studied before. Detail is what this study brings to the existing field of social network site (SNS) research. This detail can be used by researchers, teachers, or public figures in order to determine what kind of topic creates a specific kind of response. The general public may be interested in what others think of different topics on SNSs and revise their own behaviour online. A normative framework can be identified if such a framework is present and the variety of attitudes can be recorded. If a specific form of conduct is generally expected, it can be determined.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter will discuss previous research on Facebook and social network sites. The goal of this section is to explain the phenomenon and introduce the reader to what is already known about the topic. First the evolution of social media is discussed, followed by introduction of social media, social network sites and Facebook. The section concluded by research and theory on social norms, Facebook research and social media norms.

2.1. From 'to the masses' to 'by the masses'

Previously, before the existence of tools enabling the participation of the masses, mass media had built a system where few producers created content for the consumption of the masses (Mandiberg 2012:1). As creating content became more and more accessible for the common person, the line between media producer and consumer started to blur. The selected few were no longer the only entity with the ability to create content for the consumption of others, but the common person was able to create something of his/her own without the need for large-scale financial or other investment. New forms of media have been created on the base of active user participation. (Mandiberg 2012: 1). In quite a small number of years, creating content for the consumption of many has changed from the privilege of a few trained professionals into a possibility for almost anyone.

Mandiberg (2012: 2) states that media participation is now part of media consumption. The various media entities that exist online now require user participation in order to continue existing. The audience must participate in order to gain anything from these sites. The sites, and organizations behind them, can not exist without the content produced by the users. (Mandiberg 2012: 1). As the origin of content has shifted from the few to the many, organizations and web sites have started to base their operations on this shift.

According to Mandiberg (2012: 2) this change in media does not have a specific name or definition, but many different definitions for different aspects of the phenomenon. A few of these terms are "user-generated content", "convergence culture", "participatory media" and "Web 2.0". Web 2.0 shall be explained more thoroughly below, as it explains the change in internet environments more comprehensively, and from it we shall go into more detailed descriptions of new media phenomena. As the phenomenon has no clear definition, I shall not explain all of the aspects of it, but rather take one route through which I shall access the framework that surrounds the more specific phenomenon analysed in this thesis.

2.2. Web 2.0

In order to study a phenomenon within social media, we must first be aware of what kind of environments can be called social media. Before describing social media per se, we must be aware of the surroundings within which it exists, that is to say the so called Web 2.0. The term has been used by Tim O'Reilly (2005a) to mark a difference between the "old web 1.0" and the "new web 2.0" forms of web applications. One key difference is the shift from web applications (programs) to platforms (environments) within internet use. Instead of trying to sell a software product to users, a web service is offered. However, the shift from application to platform requires other changes in structure as well.

In Web 2.0 environments the user is given power over the content, but simultaneously the users' input is utilised for the benefit of the service. For example, the search engine Google uses a link algorithm to filter and organize search results based on how the users on the web link different topics and sites on other sites. Blogs and bloggers create a vast amount of linkage data which can be used to specify valid and desired connections between different keywords and sites. Thus the users create the data, which is utilised by the service provider. *Wikipedia*, the free user built encyclopedia, on the other hand is entirely created by the users and thus gives even more control to them and therefore requires trust in the user community. This trust in the validity of the data input by the users is also a defining characteristic of Web 2.0. (O'Reilly 2005a). A summarised definition given by O'Reilly focuses on the peer participation and continuous updating of the services:

> Web 2.0 is the network as platform, spanning all connected devices; Web 2.0 applications are those that make the most of the intrinsic advantages of that platform: delivering software as a continually-updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from multiple sources, including individual users, while providing their own data and services in a form that allows remixing by others, creating network effects through an "architecture of participation," and going beyond the page metaphor of Web 1.0 to deliver rich user experiences. (O'Reilly 2005b, accessed 26 November, 2014)

In addition to providing data, users also submit their data to be mixed and edited by other users, thus giving them ability to co-operatively create more content to be accessed via the platform in question. The service provider (website) creates a forum for the users to submit content to be accessed and reused by other users.

Mandiberg (2012: 4) summarises O'Reilly's definition of Web 2.0 as "an upgraded computer-programming model that has enabled a set of participatory websites built on lightweight server-based applications that move rich data across platforms." Web 2.0 is a model of programming, instead of a particular program. It enables participation, without the requirement of desktop applications, but instead by utilising applications available through a server, within the web itself. There is no longer a need for a user to install programs on one's computer to access the service. Mandiberg's summary is brief and comprehensive.

Although O'Reilly's definition of Web 2.0 in itself resembles the idea of social media, it refers more to the surrounding web environment and modes of utilising the internet, than a specific medium. O'Reilly defines the way the general web usage has changed from provider-centralised applications to user-centralised platforms. These individual platforms then can be viewed as social media.

2.3. Social media

Social media has been defined as tools that "increase our ability to share, to co-operate, with one another, and to take collective action, all outside the framework of traditional institutional institutions and organizations" (Shirky 2008: 20-21, Fuchs 2014: 35). Social media is a tool for sharing, be it information, media content or opinions. Social media can be divided into different kinds of web services. Micro-blogging sites such as Twitter allow individuals to broadcast their ideas and attitudes in short, quickly read texts. Social network sites such as Facebook or Google+ have users create profiles for themselves and collect a network within that service. Content broadcast services such as Youtube or Imgur focus on the published content, be it video, audio or something else, and leave the user on the backstage. All of these sites can be defined as social media.

Another definition for social media is given by Leppänen et al.:

> We define social media broadly as online environments which enable social interaction (Baym, 2011; Fornäs et al., 2002) between participants either synchronously, with an ephemeral output (e.g. chat channels, 'shoutboxes'), or asynchronously, often with more long-lasting 'end-products' (e.g. blogs, web discussion forums; see e.g. Kytölä 2012a, 2012b). (Leppänen et al. 2013: 4)

This definition is significantly more practical, as it clearly defines what it is (online environments), what it does (enable social interaction) and how (either synchronously or asynchronously). Both kinds of definitions are vital to understanding the phenomenon, be it in practical terms or in a more grand social scheme.

In addition to the brief definition of social media, Leppänen et al. (2013: 4) give further characterisation for social media. They note that one aspect of social media is that it is usually not the only medium of interaction for its participants. That is to say, the social connections are not limited to the particular social media, but the same individuals may interact via other channels as well, be it face-to-face or otherwise. Another point mentioned is that the degree of interaction within communities may vary. Long-term interaction within a medium may form more stable social groups, whereas more short-term interaction, based on passing interests or time periods, is also common. However, both of these cases can "offer their participants deeply meaningful arenas for shared social practice as part of a participatory, active 'prosumer' (producer + consumer) culture." (Leppänen et al. 2013: 4). Although social media is not used as the only medium for interaction, be it long-term or short-term, social media acts as a tool for meaningful social interaction.

2.4. Social network sites

Social network sites have become one of the most popular web services in recent years, as for example Facebook states their monthly user group to be as large as 1.55 billion (Facebook Newsroom 2015). boyd and Ellison (2008: 210) state that while the technology and tools within different social network sites are quite similar, the communities within different sites are varied. In their later work they have defined social network sites as:

> a networked communication platform in which participants 1) have uniquely identifiable profiles that consist of user-supplied content, content provided by other users, and/or system-provided data; 2) can publicly articulate connections that can be viewed and traversed by others; and 3) can consume, produce, and/or interact with streams of user-generated content provided by their connections on the site (boyd and Ellison 2013:158).

Georgalou (2014: 3) adds the notion that social network sites are originally designed as self-report tools. SNSs are indeed quite diverse phenomena.

The focus of social network sites is not in creating new connections or networking, but in allowing users to make their network visible to others. Instead of networking, users communicate with their already existing social network (boyd and Ellison 2008: 211). This network is displayed on the users' profile page, which is the basic unit of SNSs. The profile contains information about the user, often age, geographical location, hobbies etc. and often also a profile picture. The visibility of this profile varies among different social network sites and can be adjusted by the user as well. (boyd and Ellison 2008: 211-213). The profile acts as the starting point of creating one's network within the service.

Once one has created their profile, they can start connecting it with other profiles and participate in other ways. The connection between profiles has different names varying from site to site, but the one used on Facebook is Friend. As the contact is not necessarily an actual friend, the term may be misleading. (boyd and Ellison 2008: 213). Therefore the capitalized "Friend" will be used for referring to the Facebook contact in this study as well. After connecting, most sites offer a possibility to comment on another's profile in some way, as well as a private messaging tool. In addition, some sites have photo-sharing, video-sharing or other tools available. (boyd and Ellison 2008: 213-214). Baym (2010: 111-112) notes that as other users are often able to post on one's page, tag pictures and otherwise contribute to creating one's online presence, one does not have complete control over the information available about them online. SNSs have a vast array of tools for communicating and participating within one's network.

Although social network sites are quite open to access, they are often directed towards a specific group. This group may be connected by geographical location, language, sexuality, religion or other identities (boyd and Ellison 2008: 214). Even if a site is not designed and directed towards a specific audience, it may become popular among a specific group, which may then assimilate the site into their own identity, as was for example with Orkut. (boyd and Ellison 2008: 214). Therefore, as many sites are used quite generally, some may be ethnically or otherwise more homogeneous.

2.5. What is Facebook

Facebook was founded in February 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg, Eduardo Saverin, Dustin Moskovitz, Andrew McCollum and Chris Hughes for Harvard University students and it began to grow rapidly from its first steps. As Facebook had expanded to other universities, it had reached 1 million users at the end of its founding year. At first, Facebook was restricted to university and college communities and later expanded to work communities. (Facebook Newsroom 20 November, 2015; Georgalou 2014: 57.) At that time Facebook was group-centric, that is to say it focused on networking within and between groups. Later, Facebook became more egocentric, which means that the interaction and social ties existed more between individuals or friends, and the significance of groups diminished. (Trottier 2012: 44-45.) Facebook opened up to everyone in September 2006, which led to even more rapid growth in the amount of users. In September 2015, Facebook reported 1.01 billion daily active users on average. (Facebook Newsroom.) Facebook has therefore grown into a gargantuan network of personal relationships.

These relationships are maintained through personal profiles on Facebook. Facebook works as a kind of a personal homepage, where the profile page is at the centre. One can add pictures, hobbies, occupation and other personal information on to the profile. Through these profiles users can identify and "Friend" each other and then share additional information to one another. Friending others is central to the use of Facebook, as most information and activities are often restricted to Friends only. However, many aspects of the profile may be available for public without the user's knowledge. One can also restrict the view and activity possibilities further, if one wishes. According to Yang and Brown (2012: 404-405) these activities are *electronic interaction*, *voyeurism*, *self-presentation* and *gaming,* which are performed through one's profile and mostly with friends. In essence, Facebook is a social network site that works as a network of user generated profiles, through which users interact with each other.

There are various ways one can use the online platform of Facebook. There is no clear consensus between researchers about the typology of Facebook activities, but here I will scrutinize the categories made by Yang and Brown (2012: 404-405), as they do represent the activities most commonly performed in an SNS setting. Electronic

interaction consists of posting, commenting and messaging on Facebook, with the intention to invoke a response or respond to another users' actions. Messaging is private, as it occurs directly between two or more users, but posting and commenting are more public, as by default they are visible to all Facebook users or all of one's friends. These public activities are a subject for voyeurism or the surveillance of other people's activities. Studies by Yang and Brown (2012: 404-405) have shown that users spend more time scrutinizing other people's profiles and activities than posting something themselves. Jeong and McAndrew (2012: 2364) found that women were more interested in the relationship status of others and are more inclined to keep tabs on other women than men were in keeping tabs on other men. According to Yang and Brown (2012: 405) self-presentation is mostly done implicitly. Instead of explicitly writing about who they are, users prefer to present themselves through pictures, friends lists and other activities. They also state that self-presentation in non-anonymous environments tend to be quite realistic, and this is emphasised when users anticipate offline interaction with their audience. Jeong and McAndrew (2012: 2360) argue that men advertise their own status, achievement and access to resources and seek attractiveness, youth and fertility, while women show the opposite, that is to say advertise their own attractiveness and seek status and achievement. Gaming, that is to say playing casual games within the SNS environment, was the last of Yang and Brown's marked activities. It was stated that gaming in general was connected with social inactivity, but as the study did not discuss Facebook gaming in particular, the validity of the statement in this context is tentative (Yang and Brown 2012: 405). These activities are performed in various degrees by various demographics for various reasons and so an average user can not be created with the available information. There are too many ways to use Facebook.

Georgalou (2014: 59-76) groups Facebook features into four different affordances, or ways "in which we understand elements of an environment in terms of their use" (Georgalou 2014: 59). These affordances are the affordance of participation, or creating a profile and adding information to it; the affordance of space, which includes e.g. the news feed, wall and timeline; the affordance of personal expression, which includes status updates and other posts; and the affordance of connection, or the ways more direct interpersonal communication (Georgalou 2014: 60-75). In terms of this thesis I am more interested in the affordance of space and personal expression, as they include the news feed and posting on Facebook, but we may give some attention to the

comments of the connection affordance.

The news feed is a constantly updating list of activities of one's network on Facebook. These activities range from status updates and other posts to events and birthdays (Georgalou 2014: 61). In addition, the news feed shows customized advertising and recommended articles from other actors. The wall and timeline are similar functions on a user's own profile page. The status update is a feature with which one can publish short passages of text on Facebook (Georgalou 2014: 64). This text appears on one's own wall, as well as on the news feed of their relevant contacts. Originally the status update was limited to only text and 420 characters, but in 2011 the limit was increased to 5000 characters and the ability to add pictures, videos and other content was included (Georgalou 2014: 64-65). In this thesis the feature is referred to as posts or posting. These post and other uploaded content as well can be commented on by other users, as well as "liked". One can "like" content on Facebook and thus show positive stance to the content, show interest etc., without having to write anything (Georgalou 2014: 69-70). The like-function is not crucial to this thesis in itself, but may be relevant if it is referred to in the responses to the questionnaire. Posting and the news feed, how they are used and why will be the focus of scrutiny.

According to Yang and Brown (2012: 405) a comprehensive list of motives for Facebook use has not been compiled. However, they have stated that Facebook is mostly used for maintaining existing relationships and creating new ones. In addition to this, enhancing one's reputation, avoiding loneliness, keeping tabs on other people and entertainment are reported objectives for using Facebook (ibid.). Jeong and McAndrew (2012: 2359-2360) have given similar reasons, but they supplement it by noting that parents join Facebook in order to monitor their children, but later engage in wider activities. They continue to argue that Facebook use is more about social interaction than self-presentation. One of the aims of this study is to reveal some of the motives for posting or refraining from posting on Facebook. As the study focuses on the subjects posted on Facebook, the motivational aspects are also studied from this perspective.

The entire business model for Facebook is based on gathering information about its users and commodifying that information for sale. However, instead of forcefully following and extracting this information, Facebook is based on the information

willingly shared by the users. This requires Facebook to create the kind of environment that promotes and encourages sharing as much as possible. Thus, Facebook has been made into a platform that enables, encourages and demands disclosure. (Marichal 2012: 33-34, 48).

The reasons for disclosing personal information online have been discussed at length. Ledbetter et al. (2011: 30) argue that self-disclosure and social connection influence online media use to a great extent. Appropriate self-disclosure can be beneficial for personal relationships and have positive social effects (Mazer et al. 2007: 12-15). In addition, it appears that sharing information is directly seen as a goal and requirement for participating in Facebook (Acquisti and Gross 2006: 54). Donath (2007: 231-232) states that people have a need to stay connected and aware of the permutations within their social network, and that SNSs help achieve this goal. Ellison et al. (2007: 1162-1164) identified multiple forms of social capital supported by SNS connections, which are also mentioned by Marichal (2012: 36). These are some of the subjects users seek from SNSs.

Facebook utilizes these aspects in order to nudge users to share more. As people are generally wary of sharing personal information with strangers, they wish to share it with their friends and in a safe environment (Marichal 2012: 37). One way in which Facebook attempts to make users disclose more information is through architecture, which makes disclosing information easier than not doing so (Marichal 2012: 38). For example, the default settings for Facebook guide towards openness as quite a large amount of information is made available for everyone and one must be aware of optional settings in order to change them. The users are given a choice, although non-informed one, but it guided towards greater disclosure. One example of this architecture is the newsfeed, which greatly reduced the cost of checking up on other peoples activities (Marichal 2012: 40-41). As previously one had to specifically access another's page in order to see their activities, with the newsfeed people are able to stay connected and aware of others activities with almost no cost. Thus, small and insignificant status updates turn into a vast mass of detailed information about one's connections, mutual knowledge which becomes significant (Marichal 2012: 40-41). Facebook nudges people to want to do what Facebook wants, share more.

2.6. Previous research on SNSs and Facebook

In 2008 boyd and Ellison (2008: 219-222) identified four main themes for research pertaining to social network sites. These themes are *impression management and friendship performance, networks and network structure, online/offline connections* and *privacy.*

As users are able to consciously create and modify representations of their self on social network sites, including Facebook, they create numerous possibilities to study impression management, self-presentation and friendship performance (boyd and Ellison 2008: 219). That is to say, as the profiles are made by the users, they can be viewed as complete tools for managing one's impression. Although most sites attempt to motivate their users to create authentic profiles and thus authentic representations of themselves, users are still able to deviate from this. Marwick (2005: 15, 23) had found that users apply different strategies in creating their profiles around the prescribed rules of authenticity, whereas boyd (2007: 153) argued that profiles could never be authentic as such. On the other hand, Donath and boyd (2004: 73) state that a public display of connection helps users verify identities of others on social network sites. As profiles on SNSs are usually created with people's real names, having a network of connected perceivable real people implicitly verifies the identity of the person. In addition, boyd (2006) brings attention to the notion that a user's list of Friends also creates the context and imagined audience for their profile and actions within the site. This context then affects and guides behavioural norms within the SNS. This statement is supported by Chambers (2013: 63). How users want to represent themselves and to whom is an important question in SNS research.

In addition to the imagined audience, that which the user presumes their content is visible to, the invisible audience is also an important concept. It refers to audiences that share the same space but are not visible, as well as those who read archives and otherwise find the content afterwards (boyd 2011:49). Without knowing one's audience, it is difficult to know what is appropriate for the social context and thus people often rely on imagined audiences to have an idea of the current context (boyd 2011: 50). Thus, the existence of invisible audiences force people to imagine and hypothesise their audience.

Additionally to the effect of imagined and invisible audiences, the context is often indistinct in social network settings. Boyd (2011: 50-51) refers to this phenomenon as collapsed contexts. Maintaining a distinct context in an online setting is often impossible, as the boundaries of the space do not allow it. As the environment is public and audience invisible, it is often difficult to determine what a suitable context would be. Therefore, conflicts and awkward situations are difficult to avoid.

As the control over the context diminishes, the distinction between private and public also changes (boyd 2011: 49, 52). Communication that is meant for broad audiences changes and information that is originally meant for a small or no external audience may become public. These changes challenge people's sense of control, but although they adopt tools that greatly change their relationship to privacy, it does not mean they abandon privacy altogether (boyd 2011: 52). Private and public are experiencing a change and are no longer binary, but according to boyd (2011: 52) it is unlikely that the private would disappear. There is merely change and the result is unknown.

Social network sites enable researchers to tap into a vast pool of information regarding networks and networking practices. boyd and Ellison (2008: 220-221) discuss studies that examined millions of Facebook messages in order to understand Friending and messaging on Facebook, studies that identify different kinds of users that participate in creating the network; and studies that peer into the reasons for participating in particular sites. The networking and links between profiles pose a fruitful ground for studies.

As stated before, most social network sites focus on creating and maintaining online relationships with offline connections. Boyd and Ellison (2008: 221) also support this claim and cite numerous studies that argue that Facebook users search for their existing offline connections online, instead of "browsing" for strangers to connect with. In addition, boyd (2008: 125-126, 137-138) argues that SNSs are "networked publics" that allow communication beyond the restrictions of one's physical vicinity, which in turn allows previously connected individuals to stay connected from a long distance.

Privacy has been a popular subject of research on social network sites. Numerous threats have been identified and studied, including a study considering the possibility of reconstructing social security numbers based on the information on the sites (boyd and

Ellison 2008: 221-222). Acquisti and Gross (2006: 50-51) also argue that there is often no correlation between a user's reported attitudes towards privacy and their behaviour. That is to say, users often perceive privacy as important, but disclose private information quite openly nevertheless. In addition, in a survey performed by Dwyer et al. (2007) it was found that users have more trust towards Facebook than MySpace and thus would share more information on Facebook. Preibusch et al. (2007) have stated that the actions of one individual in an SNS environment has a direct effect on others he/she interacts with and as the conception of privacy varies from person to person, conflicts occur that the SNS does not have tools to solve. Privacy is indeed a crucial topic in SNS research and as people's attitude towards privacy has an effect on their online behaviour, it needs to be taken into account in terms of this study as well.

Social Norms and Predicting Behaviour

It is presumed that online behaviour is not completely haphazard and thus users would base their actions and reactions on some form of norm. As the respondents were directly asked about their actions and attitudes, some generalisations and norms may be discerned from the results. There generalisations are based on previous research.

In terms of predicting behaviour, the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) will give some insights into the subject. The theory

> "directly predicts individuals' behaviour from relevant intentions and uniquely predicts these intentions from relevant attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control." (Saeri et al. 2014: 353)

TPB has been used to study subjects such as consumer behaviour and health behaviour, as well as Facebook use among college students, partner-monitoring behaviour on Facebook and online privacy issues (Saeri et al. 2014: 353). It may be useful to apply the theory to the reported attitudes in this study, by predicting possible future behaviours based on the perceived norms and attitudes.

In addition to the theory of planned behaviour, norms are a good predictor of behaviour. According to Saeri et al. (2014: 354) subjective norms do not adequately predict behaviour, but injunctive norms, or what others approve and disapprove of, and

descriptive norms, or what others do, are more effective in this area. However, it is noted that these norms may be conflicted, as in terms of privacy protection others may have certain attitudes towards privacy, but still act discordingly. That is to say, users may report high concern towards privacy, but in practice utilize insufficient privacy behaviour. (Saeri et al. 2014: 354). As the data in this study and categories formed from it directly discuss these questions, content for injunctive and descriptive norms in SNS settings can be created.

Perceived risk and trust are also factors that may predict behaviour. Perceived risk of online activities has been connected with lesser service use and increased privacy protection (Saeri et al. 2014: 355). In addition, Youn and Hall (2008, as cited by Saeri et al 2014: 355) have stated that although online environments have risks, the illusion of personal contact may decrease perceived risk. Trust has been defined by Saeri et al. (2014: 355, as based on Cozby 1973) as "the willingness of one party to act or speak in such a manner that they are made more vulnerable to the other party." It is perceived that trusting individuals are also more trustworthy (Rotter 1980: 2) and thus self-disclosure can be noted as a way of creating trust. It is also noted that for example commercial organizations may receive trust, resulting in disclosure of private information (Mezger 2004). Foddy, Platow and Yamagishi (2009) state that individuals are more prone to trusting in-group individuals, even when the valence of the out-group individuals was more positive than the in-group individuals. That is to say, people seem to trust in-group people more, e.g. one's own list of Friends, even if the personal characteristics of the out-group people were more positive. Perceived risk and trust are factors that affect what people write online and thus they should be taken into account in terms of this study as well.

2.6.1. Facebook research

Sharing on Facebook

According to a study performed by McLauglin and Vitak (2012: 306) people use mainly two features for public interaction in Facebook: Wall posts and status updates. These are used to share information such as videos, links and short messages etc. to other individuals. Discussions and longer messages to individuals were communicated

through private messages (McLauglin and Vitak 2012: 306). There is indeed a specific function and role for the public sharing tools on Facebook.

Choi and Toma (2014) have studied social sharing on social network sites, including Facebook. Social sharing is defined as sharing an emotionally, positively or negatively, significant experience and the triggering event. Therefore, it is different from mundane sharing, such as reporting daily chores, that also often appears on social network sites. Social sharing has been shown to have significant impact on the sharing party's emotional well-being (Choi and Toma 2014: 530). Different interpersonal media, including social network sites, enable people to instantly share their experiences (Choi and Toma 2014: 530) and thus are useful tools for promoting social sharing.

As individuals usually feel the need to share their experiences soon after the experience, the media affordance of *accessibility* provided by various different media is important (Choi and Toma 2014: 531). Other additional media affordances that affect sharing are *message visibility, availability of nonverbal cues* and *intrusiveness,* all of which in relation to the shared experience affect which media to share with (Choi and Toma 2014: 531). Thus, different media is chosen for sharing different experiences.

As according to Choi and Toma (2014:532) recent studies have found that Facebook users share positive experiences publicly and privately in equal amounts, it was hypothesised in their study that non-intrusive and public media such as Facebook would be used for sharing intensively positive experiences. However, their results (2014: 538) found that in avoidance of boasting, sharing intensively positive experiences on Facebook was avoided and more mundane experiences were shared to a greater extent. Facebook is thus more of an everyday communication device, rather than a tool for sharing significant personal experiences.

Regardless of the intensity of experiences usually shared through Facebook, sharing more mundane experiences also taps into *capitalization*. Capitalization is the phenomenon of social sharing increasing the positive affect of positive experiences above the affect created by the experience itself (Choi and Toma 2014: 533). The study performed by Choi and Toma (2014: 539) found that capitalization occurred also on Facebook wall posts, where short comments and "Likes" were sufficient for capitalization as well. Thus, the perceivably shallow activities on Facebook promote

emotional well-being through capitalization as well.

In addition to positive effects of sharing on Facebook, negative effects occur as well. Thinking and talking about negative events can make them more memorable, rumination increases the intensity of the emotion and general expression of the event impedes distraction, which would help cope with the negative experience. (Choi and Toma 2014: 533, 539). Thus sharing negative experiences do not help cope with them, but instead hinder the ability to cope.

In general, Facebook use has been found to have both positive and negative effects on well-being. Positive self-presentation and accumulation of Friends has been connected with better subjective well-being (Kim and Lee 2011, as cited by Choi and Toma 2014: 539) and examining one's own profile has been connected with better self-esteem (Toma 2013) as well as better self-affirmation (Toma and Hancock 2013:325). In turn, more time used on Facebook has been connected with poorer subjective well-being (Kross et al. 2013). Together with the results of Choi and Toma (2014) it can be said that Facebook can not be simply defined as helpful or harmful for well-being, but it has the capacity to enable either one.

A study performed by Yang and Brown (2012: 412) found two Facebook activities that were associated with college students' social adjustment. The first activity was electronic interaction, which was connected with better social adjustment and lesser loneliness. Peer interaction and connection through Facebook was argued to have a positive effect on social adjustment. In turn, it was noted as well that the results may have emerged from the already large pre-existing social circle, with which interaction would generate better social adjustment. The other Facebook activity, status updating, was connected with poorer social adjustment. According to the study performed by Manago et al. (2012: 374-375), expressing emotions and frustration venting are among the most common uses for status updates on Facebook. In addition, Moreno et al. (2011) stated that references to depression or depressed mood were also common among college students' status updates. Yang and Brown (2012: 412) argue that such negative posts would lower an individual's social attractiveness, thus together with the overlaying psychological state that promotes such posts would be reflected from status updating. However, as Yang and Brown (2012: 412) studied the motivations for using Facebook

as well, they found out that individuals who were not motivated to maintain relationships through Facebook were the ones who suffered from low social adjustment while actively using status updates. Individuals who were motivated to maintain relationships used status updates differently and were better socially adjusted (Yang and Brown 2012: 412). Thus, correlations can not directly be drawn from activity alone, but the motivations for using Facebook should be scrutinized as well.

2.6.2. Social media norms

As the interaction within social network sites such as Facebook is social interaction, social norms exist within the online environment as well. However, as these platforms have evolved at a tremendous speed, the social norms have not been able to keep up (McLauglin and Vitak 2012: 300), which has lead to conflicts as for example online information has hindered college applicants opportunities for admission (McLauglin and Vitak 2012: 299) and Facebook posts have lead to termination of employment (Chambers 2013: 76-77). Thus, there must be some norms in the online world as well.

One of the reasons for conflict may be the fact that many norms online are not written down, but are so called implicit norms. Therefore an individual might not be aware of the reigning social norms. However, McLauglin and Vitak (2012: 301) have noted that offline norms are carried over to anonymous online environments, and thus should be even more present in social network sites, where users appear on their own names. boyd (2008) however, has stated that as the spacial boundaries of interaction are obscured in SNSs and the interaction gains an audience, the norms should differ from those of offline interactions. In addition, social normativity is a polycentric phenomenon, which means that people tend to follow different norms on different occasions depending on the current situation (Stær 2014:66). This surely results in different norms in an SNS setting, as the environment is very different. Stær (2014:38-61) has studied linguistic normativity among Danish adolecents and concluded that they distinguish between different normative environments and apply different linguistic practices in an SNS environment. Thus it could be derived that they recognise a difference in the norms online and offline environments and they would behave differently in an online environment. However, the actual norms of social network sites are still somewhat obscure and difficult to determine.

McLauglin and Vitak (2012: 302) have divided violations into norm violations and expectancy violations. Norms violations are violations of common rules, and are always viewed negatively, whereas expectancy violations refer to unexpected behaviour, which can be either viewed as positive or negative, depending on the action, context, and the targets perception of the actor (McLauglin and Vitak 2012: 302). In addition, Chambers (2013: 66) noted that according to research, the gender of the actor affects the perception of the violation. She points out that respect or admiration was often directed towards men who were involved in sexual or alcoholic behaviour, whereas women in the same situation were more likely frowned upon. Both of these forms of violation should be taken into account when studying norms and behaviour.

McLauglin and Vitak (2012: 307-308) found that the most common norm violation was too many status updates, followed by too emotional status updates, which would be in correlation with the observation made by Yang and Brown (2012: 412). In contrast, Saeri et al. (2014: 363) point to the fact that Facebook has created an injunctive norm for disclosure, explicitly attempting to promote sharing more and in more detail. In addition, heated discussions, fights and overall private conversations performed in public were also identified as norm violations (McLauglin and Vitak 2012: 308). Expectancy violations were found to be positive, such as finding an unexpected common interest or the rekindling of a relationship (McLauglin and Vitak 2012: 308). It seems that in order to follow the norms, one should post sparingly and keep too personal topics to oneself.

The reactions to norm violations depend on the severity of the violation and the relationship between the interactors. Severe violations that threaten a person's self-presentational goals often lead to "Unfriending" the person, whereas lesser violations, such as that of posting too frequently, would often lead to just hiding the person from one's Facebook newsfeed, thus preventing posts by that person from appearing on one's newsfeed (McLauglin and Vitak 2012: 309). In case of negative expectancy violations, in case of mere acquaintances the reaction would most likely be inaction and monitoring of the situation, whereas if the violator is a close friend, the violation would more likely lead to a direct confrontation (McLauglin and Vitak 2012: 310). McLauglin and Vitak (2012: 312) summarize that if a violation threatened an individual's self-presentational goals, acquaintances would receive a reaction of withdrawal, whereas friends would

receive confrontation or conversation. This seems to be due to the norm of passivity among acquaintances in Facebook. Thus, in case the relationship is important enough, violations would receive reactions in more cases for the purpose of maintaining the relationship. Different violations from different people evoke different responses, ranging from Unfriending or hiding a profile to confronting the violator or merely ignoring the violation.

2.7. Summary and application

As with studying any other phenomenon, one must be familiar with Facebook in order to understand the significance of the results. It is important to note that Facebook along with other social network sites are a recent phenomenon and the ability to communicate to a large audience has not been so simple before and this change has had an effect on social relationships as well. What Facebook is and how it is used is the starting point of this study.

As interaction on Facebook is based on one's gathered network, it is important to keep in mind that statements made by individuals are based on their own network. Users connect with Friends and communicate using posting tools, comments and private messages. The networks are managed, new connections are made and existing ones are terminated, along with other actions performed. One's own newsfeed is managed and the content provided by other users is consumed and sometimes reacted upon. There is a multitude of different aspects to Facebook and not all can be studied simultaneously, thus also limiting this study to posting and reactions to posting.

The posts on Facebook and reactions to them may be guided by existing social norms, or may themselves lead to formation of new norms. As actions on Facebook are often visible to many people, widely reoccurring actions may lead to the acquisition of descriptive norms. As a large sample provides us with a more general opinion, injunctive norms may also be determinable from the results. In addition to attempting to determine the norms of conduct from the results, previous studies can be compared to the current results where applicable in order to enforce or question previous results.

The framework provided by previous research also provides us with tools to analyse the findings. For example previously studied motivations for different actions will be taken into account when discussing the results along with studying how they agree with the results. Previous studies can be used as a reference point in order to place the current study into perspective and they are the base on which the findings are built upon.

3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Facebook has been studied extensively before and the question of what people use Facebook for and how they react to norm violations have been asked before. However, an extensive study on the topics people post about and what they avoid has not been performed. In addition, previous studies have not been as exact in the contents of the posts as is aimed in this study. Taking into account previous studies and the researcher's interest, a set of research questions was formed.

The research questions for this study are as follows:

> Q1: What topics are common and considered suitable for public posting on Facebook?
> – What topics do people post about?
> – What topics are avoided?
>
> Q2: What reactions do deviation to these norms create?
> – Do people mind what others post publicly on Facebook?
> – How do people react to topics they find unacceptable?

Simply the question of what is suitable for public discussion and what is not is an interesting question in my opinion. I want to find out what people think about discussing different topics online, were it private or personal. The distinction between topics that are generally considered private and kept to oneself and topics considered suitable to be revealed to one's networks in indeed intriguing, as the distinction is not consistent throughout the population. That is to say, people have varying opinions on what is suitable for posting and thus studying the question is to determine what those are. My interest in the mind of people drives this study.

Research has asked the question of norms on Facebook before, but among the studies I have found, the results have been more general. As for example in the study by McLauglin and Vitak (2012), too frequent and too emotional posts were identified as

violations against the norms, but the researchers did not ask the question of what exactly is too emotional or private. My study will aim to find out if there are any taboo topics or similar. In addition, as the question of taboo topics is more specific, the respondents have an opportunity to connect different reactions to different topics, allowing us to see if there is difference in reaction to different topics in general. The data altogether will be more specific than the data used in previous studies reviewed above.

In addition, my study is entirely anonymous, in contrast with McLauglin and Vitak's study, which was performed via interview. I believe that a questionnaire performed anonymously and completely voluntarily will lead to more reliable results, allowing respondents to answer whatever they feel like, without the social pressure of trying to fit into certain norm themselves. According to Corey (1937), unnamed questionnaires have a higher chance to receive reports of unsuitable behaviour, although the difference between named and unnamed is small. In addition, Whelan (2007: 7) has stated that "low perceptions of confidentiality and higher levels of evaluation apprehension might contribute to an unwillingness to endorse socially undesirable behaviours". In accordance with these statements, it is presumed that the responses are quite accurate, but as the respondents perceptions determine the effect, complete certainty can not be established. It is presumed that the responses will include quite accurate reports of socially undesirable behaviour and attitudes as well.

The question about demographic effects on behaviour and attitudes has been asked before (e.g. Chambers 2013: 66). However, other data should also be taken into account when studying attitudes and behaviour in social network sites. If statistically significant gender differences are found, other correlations between different answers and attitudes should also be scrutinized in order to determine the underlining reason for these attitudes. The respondents are given free expression of opinion and thus the reason for gender differences apart from the mere gender may be found. In addition, the correlation between different attitudes is an interesting topic, as it may give some insight on human behaviour. What causes different opinions among people is an interesting question. However, it must be noted at this time that the resources for this study are limited and such cross-referential analysis may be too laborious to perform. Therefore proper demographic analysis can not be performed on this study, but the data will be available in case such need rises.

3.1. Data selection and collection

An online survey was performed by using a Webropol online survey form. The survey consisted of a total of 28 questions. Six of these were demographic questions (age, sex, education, occupation, nationality, language), six were multiple choice questions about Facebook use (e.g. How often do respondents log in or post on Facebook), 14 were open ended questions about Facebook use (e.g. What subjects do you post about on Facebook and why?) and two were open ended questions about the questionnaire (where respondents came across the questionnaire and feedback). I estimated that the questionnaire would take about 20 minutes to fill out, but respondents reported times that were shorter and longer.

The questionnaire was open for 8 days from Wednesday 10th of April to Wednesday 17th of April 2013. A link for the questionnaire was posted on the researcher's Facebook wall and a Facebook event was created to invite users to take the survey. Users were urged to share the link to their acquaintances. A snowballing effect was pursued. In addition, an invitation to the questionnaire was sent to various University of Jyväskylä mailing lists. Thus, the dominant method for reaching respondents was Facebook itself, with the addition of email mailing lists, as these were readily available and had a relatively long reach.

The questionnaire received a total of 413 responses. 5.4% of the respondents stated they do not use Facebook and therefore they are not suitable for this study. Various responses were not complete and there were some problems with demographic answers, as not all questions were always answered (e.g. when asked to state all of the schools one has completed, only the highest was often marked). Thus, when making demographic generalisations and comparisons, only the respondents who provided the relevant information could be included in those specific analysis. 2.2% of the respondents answered in Finnish. These answers are included in the analysis and results, as their content could be analysed, but are not presented as examples. One respondent answered in Swedish and due to linguistic limitations the contents could not be reliably analysed and thus the response is excluded from the results. The Facebook event had a reach of 780 users (780 users were invited to the event). The reach of the wall post or the email can not be reliably estimated, as information pertaining to the wall post is not available

and it is possible that the email did not pass through to all of the mailing lists it was sent. Of the remaining 390 respondents, 385 had reported where they found the questionnaire. 48.6% claimed they found the questionnaire through Facebook, 46.5 % said they found it through the e-mail lists, 2.9% had received an invitation through both Facebook and e-mail and 2.1% had gained knowledge of the questionnaire through other routes.

In addition to excluding the respondents who do not use Facebook, the general background of the respondents is scrutinized. As the respondents can be put into demographic groups, generalisations and possibly conclusions can be made based on these groups where relevant.. This filtering will require an overview of the respondents' background.

The original questionnaire had a broader set of questions than is required to answer the research questions of this thesis (visible in appendix 1.), as the research questions were decreased due to the large sample size and desired focus of the study. Therefore, some of the questions and the responses given to those questions will be excluded from the final analysis. These questions are those considering the privacy settings and commenting of posts on Facebook. The questions included in the analysis are those concerning the topics considered suitable or unsuitable for Facebook and the reactions to unsuitable posts. Although some questions are initially excluded from the analysis, if a requirement arises they may be used for further analysis of the findings.

As this study handles reported activity, it is essential to discuss the validity of the reports. Junco (2013: 626) states that when comparing reported activities to measured activities, people tend to over- or underestimate their activities in fields such as smoking, physical exercise and television-time. In his study concerning the relation between reported amount of Facebook use to monitored amount of Facebook use, Junco (2013: 629-630) found that the monitored group of students estimated their daily time on Facebook to be five times more than was monitored. He gave various possible reasons for this deviation, such as using Facebook on other than monitored devices and the Hawthorne effect, where the observed change their behaviour when they know they are observed. Although users overestimated their Facebook use, there was a correlation between reported use and monitored use. Users who reported using more time on

Facebook were actually more active using Facebook than those, who reported less Facebook use. Junco (2013: 629) also argues that if the volume of Facebook use is asked by giving predetermined choices and not open ended questions, the question itself may guide the answers. This study by Junco has provided a basic framework in light of which the responses can be studied in this paper.

Acquisti and Gross (2006) have also studied reported use of Facebook. They state that asking users directly about sharing personal information "is likely to generate responses biased by self-selection and fear of stigma" (ibid.: 48). Therefore their presumption was that asking directly about people's Facebook use will generate responses that somehow deviate from the real activity of the users. Therefore, reported activity would not be a valid target of study. However, when comparing the results from their questionnaire and monitored profiles, Acquisti and Gross (2006: 55) found that 77.84% had given completely accurate answers. Thus, it can be argued that reported activity represents actual activity quite well and conclusions can be made based on the reported data in this study as well.

3.2. Methods of analysis

This section discusses the methods and tools used for analysing the data received from the questionnaire. The primary methods discussed are content analysis and qualitative content analysis. The section is concluded with the introduction of the Atlas.ti software used for the categorisation process.

3.2.1 Content analysis

Krippendorff (1980: 21) has defined content analysis as "a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context". According to his later work (2013: 24-25) content analysis is a technique for analysis which is described as reliable and replicable with valid results. There are numerous definitions for the content inspected in content analysis. Some describe content to be contained in texts, some take content as property of the source of the text and some say content emerges in the process of a researcher analysing a text relative to a particular context. (Krippendorff 2013: 24-25). That is to say, content analysis is the study of what a

chosen text contains.

According to Krippendorff (2013:35), the framework of content analysis includes the text, research questions, the context within which to make sense of the text, analytical constructs, inferences and validating evidence. In addition to this framework, Krippendorff (2013: 45) states that content analysis is an unobtrusive technique, which means the researcher should avoid affecting the responses or the text with their own actions. Although in the present study the questionnaire and the questions within may be seen as obtrusive and in their own way limit the possible answers, the open endedness of most of the questions aim to allow the respondents answer freely, without the effect of the researcher as such. Direct answers to specific questions can not be obtained without some influence from the researcher, but directing the responses by question formation or other means was avoided.

The study at hand will be mostly semantical content analysis. Semantical content analysis classifies signs according to their meanings, for example different topics discussed on Facebook. Semantical content analysis is divided into three segments. Designations analysis studies how often specific objects (groups, concepts etc.) are referred to, for example "politics" or "family". Attribution analysis studies how often certain characterizations are referred to, for example "private" or "mundane". Assertions analysis studies how often an object is classified as having certain attributes, for example politics as a private matter.   (Krippendorff 2013: 50). In this study the categories are labelled as semantic objects, attributes or a combination of these.

Krippendorff (2013: 99-101) defines different kinds of units of analysis, of which two will be used. Sampling units are parts of text which are included in the analysis. In this case it will be the whole set of answers given by the included respondents. That is to say, when defining the sampling units for this study, invalid sampling units (e.g. Non-users) are excluded. The other kind of unit is recording/coding unit. These units will include the different categories created and shared by the different answers to the questions. To ensure the naturalness of the units, they will be created during the analysis, whenever an answer will not fit an existing unit. This process will require categorical distinction (Krippendorff 2013: 106) between the answers. Every answer or notion within an answer that fits a category, will be included into that category by their

common terms. One category or unit may be referred in various ways and therefore different answers may be included in the same category, if the categorisation can be validated. A more detailed description of categorisation is presented under qualitative content analysis below. The coding units are created within the sampling units by categorical distinction.

The sampling is done by relevance sampling (Krippendorff 2013: 120-121) and the categories are created and answers coded into them by verbal designations (Krippendorff 2013: 133-134). That is to say, respondents are excluded if their answers are considered irrelevant to this study, e.g. people not using Facebook. In verbal designation categories are named and answers are coded to be included in said categories. As simple one word or one phrase categories are inadequate to explain complex meanings, the names of the categories are accompanied by brief explanations of the categories. As stated previously, the categories are created as the coding advances, for the purpose of avoiding forced inclusion of an answer into a premade category. This data-driven inductive process is explained below.

3.2.2. Qualitative content analysis

Schreier (2012: 1) defines qualitative content analysis as "a method for systematically describing the meaning of qualitative material." In qualitative content analysis, material is classified as instances of categories of a coding frame (Schreier 2012:1). According to Schreier (2012: 5-8) qualitative content analysis is systematic, flexible and it reduces data. Systematic in the sense that one examines all of their data, follows the same sequence of steps and is consistent in their analysis. Flexible in the sense that one creates their coding frame to fit their material, thus also providing valid results as the answers fit the questions. Qualitative content analysis reduces data in the sense that it focuses the analysis on selected aspects, instead of everything available in the data. These are the justifications given by Schreier (2012: 5-8) for using qualitative content analysis and they are agreed on for this study.

The coding frame mentioned earlier acts as the basis for the analysis. In the coding frame there is one or many main categories and within those categories exist subcategories. The material is then coded into these categories. Thus numerous different

answers can be fitted into different categories and therefore reducing the size of the data. The categories are created both deductively, based on what is already known, as well as inductively, based on what is found in the material. (Schreier 2012: 58-60) The coding is done manually and the coding frame and its categories are developed according to the material.

Schreier (2012: 71-78) identifies four different requirements for the coding frame. The first requirement of unidimensionality requires that each dimension (main category) captures only one aspect of the material (Schreier 2012: 72). This means that for example one main category should not include preferred topics for discussion online and the reason for that opinion. These aspects should be divided into their own categories. The second requirement of mutual exclusiveness means that the subcategories exclude one another (Schreier 2012: 75). That is to say, one segment of material may be assigned to only one subcategory. Therefore, if a segment would fit into two different subcategories, a new subcategory for the segment must be made or the segment must be put into only one of the existing subcategories. The third requirement of exhaustiveness requires for each unit to be assigned to a subcategory (Schreier 2012: 76). Therefore, no units of coding may be left unallocated. The fourth requirement of saturation requires for each subcategory to have at least one unit assigned to them (Schreier 2012: 77). No subcategory should stay empty. As this requirement is fulfilled by definition in data-driven (inductive) coding frame, in a deductive coding frame an empty subcategory also bears meaning. One should be aware if an empty subcategory is the result of insufficient material, or if meaning can be inferred from the result. Therefore, the requirement of saturation is in itself meaningless. (Schreier 2012: 77-78). These are the factors that should be kept in mind when designing the coding frame.

3.2.3. Atlas.ti and how it is used.

A qualitative data analysis software, Atlas.ti, will be used to categorize the responses. The program will allow responses and parts of responses to be put under different labels. These labels can also be gathered under different families (umbrella groups). The responses will be analysed and categorized manually, during which different categories will be created, based on what kind of responses are found. Thus, the categories can not be presented as of yet.

After the initial categorisation is made and analysed, the responses within the categories will be analysed. If all of the responses within a category are cohesive with one another, no further elaboration is required. If there are different sub-groups within a category, these sub-groups are named and elaborated on. The categories are not merely created and calculated, but their contents are also analysed.

As the data that can be directly exported from the Webropol system are not ideal for the requirements of the Atlas.ti program (answers are presented by question not by respondent), the data had to be exported manually. That is to say, all of the answers of each individual respondent are exported individually and combined thereafter. This will allow analysis and search for correlation between and within each respondents answers. The data will require sampling into a form applicable by the Atlas.ti program.

As the data can thus be analysed by respondent, it will be possible to search for correlations between responses. The effects of gender, age, occupation and different attitudes can be compared to other answers and thus possibly links between different factors can be determined. If correlations are found, it might be possible to make deductive generalisations based on the findings. Thus the content of the answers can be compared with each other.

4. ANALYSIS

This chapter will present the analysis and results of the study. First, the questions about Facebook use in general are analysed and the statistical significance of the results is determined. Then the open ended questions, the responses and the categories made from them are presented in the order asked in the questionnaire. Only light conclusions are made, as the majority of conclusions are presented in the discussion and conclusion chapters that follow the analysis.

4.1. General Facebook use

Two multiple choice questions were asked about the general use of Facebook: *How often do you log in to Facebook?* and *How often do you post on Facebook?* The choices were *Several times a day, Daily, Few times a week, Weekly, Monthly, Less* and *I don't use Facebook.* The non-users were located and excluded based on these questions. One

respondent did not answer the question about the frequency of logging in, but was included in the rest of the analysis due to demonstrating signs of using Facebook. In order to avoid gender binarism, the option "other" was available when reporting gender, but as only 3 of the respondents identified as some other gender than female or male, the sample size is not large enough to be analysed as a separate individual group. They are thus excluded from statistics divided by gender in order to permit statistical analysis. Their responses are show separately from the tables that are divided by gender.

The statistical significance (p-value) for the tables is calculated by using Pearson's chi-square test by utilising SPSS statistical analysis software. The limit of 0.05 was chosen for statistical significance, meaning that the results are statistically significant if the p-value is less than 0.05. Statistical significance does not equal importance, but signify that the results are not based on a sampling error. No more than 20% of counts should be less than five in order to provide good results. The results are show in tables below along with statistical significance, as well as possible conclusions based on the results.

Table 1. Frequency of logging in to Facebook divided by gender

Gender		
	Male	Female	Total
Several/day - Number % within gender	81 71.3%	194 71.1%	275 71.2%
Daily - Number % within gender	23 20.2%	65 23.9%	88 22.8%
Few times a week - Number % within gender	5 4.4%	8 2.9%	13 3.4%
Weekly - Number % within gender	0 0%	4 1.5%	4 1%
Monthly - Number % within gender	3 2.6%	0 0%	3 0.8%
Less - Number % within gender	2 1.8%	1 0.4%	3 0.8%
Total - Number **% within gender**	**114** **100%**	**272** **100%**	**386** **100%**

Pearson chi-square for the table is 11.809 (df = 5) resulting in a p-value of 0.038. Thus the difference in genders is statistically significant. The expected count in seven cells

(58.3%) are less than five and thus conclusions can not be made based on them. However, the difference between genders in logging in several times a day and daily are statistically significant, although not very large. Of the people who identified as neither male or female, one logs in several times a day, one logs in daily and one logs in weekly. According to these results, women would log in slightly more often than men, although definite generalisations can not be made.

Table 2. Frequency of posting on Facebook divided by gender

	Gender		
	Male	Female	Total
Several/day - Number % within gender	9 7.9%	8 2.9%	17 4.4%
Daily - Number % within gender	12 10.5%	20 7.3%	32 8.2%
Few times a week - Number % within gender	33 31.8%	64 23.4%	97 25.1%
Weekly - Number % within gender	21 18.4%	59 21.6%	80 20.7%
Monthly - Number % within gender	22 19.3%	70 25.6%	92 23.6%
Less - Number % within gender	17 14.9%	52 19%	69 17.8%
Total - Number **% within gender**	**114** **100%**	**273** **100%**	**387** **100%**

Pearson chi-square for the table is 9.008 (df = 5) resulting in a p-value of 0.109. Thus the results are not statistically significant. It is not possible to determine if the gender differences are based on a sampling error. Of the people who identified as neither male or female, one posts a few times a week, one posts weekly and one posts less.

Table 3. Frequency of logging in to Facebook divided by age group

Age						
	18-21	22-29	30-39	40-49	50 (+)	Total
Several/day - Number % within age	52 77.6%	184 69.4%	29 67.4%	8 88.9%	3 60%	276 71%
Daily - Number % within age	11 16.4%	66 24.9%	11 25.6%	1 11%	0 0%	89 22.9%
Few times a week - Number % within age	1 1.5%	8 3%	1 2.3%	0 0%	2 40%	12 3.1%
Weekly - Number % within age	2 3%	2 0.8%	1 2.3%	0 0%	0 0%	5 1.3%
Monthly - Number % within age	1 1.5%	2 0.8%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3 0.8%
Less - Number % within age	0 0%	2 0.8%	1 2.3%	0 0%	0 0%	3 0.8%
Total - Number **% within age**	**67** **100%**	**264** **100%**	**43** **100%**	**9** **100%**	**5** **100%**	**388** **100%**

Pearson chi-square for the table is 33.008 (df = 20) resulting in a p-value of 0.34. Thus the differences based on age are statistically significant. The expected count in 22 cells (73.3%) are less than five and thus conclusions can not be made based on them. Thus for example conclusions can not be made based on the age group 50+. However, it can be generally seen that younger people tend to log in more often than older people.

Table 4. Frequency of posting on Facebook divided by age group

Age						
	18-21	22-29	30-39	40-49	50 (+)	Total
Several/day - Number % within age	1 1.5%	10 3.8%	3 7%	3 33.3%	2 40%	19 4.9%
Daily - Number % within age	2 3%	19 7.2%	10 23.3%	1 11%	0 0%	32 8.2%
Few times a week - Number % within age	17 25.4%	66 24.9%	12 27.9%	2 22.2%	1 20%	98 25.2%
Weekly - Number % within age	11 16.4%	62 23.4%	4 9.3%	1 11.1%	1 20%	79 20.3%
Monthly - Number % within age	19 28.4%	61 23%	9 20.9%	2 22.2%	0 0%	91 23.4%
Less - Number % within age	17 25.4%	47 17.7%	5 11.6%	0 0%	1 20%	70 18%
Total - Number **% within age**	**67** **100%**	**265** **100%**	**43** **100%**	**9** **100%**	**5** **100%**	**389** **100%**

Pearson chi-square for the table is 56.624 (df = 20) resulting in a p-value of 0.00. Thus the differences based on age are statistically significant. The expected count in 15 cells (50%) are less than five and thus conclusions can not be made based on them. The most frequent posters seem to be people in age groups 30-39 and 22-29. It is difficult to make other conclusions as the number in many of the cells is quite small.

When comparing the different tables, it can be seen that the frequency of logging in is much higher than the frequency of posting on Facebook. This result is consistent with the findings of Yang and Brown (2012: 404-405), as people tend to view other's profiles more than post content themselves. It can be confirmed that adding content is not the main focus of Facebook use, but users spend more time on consuming content produced by others. As continuous content production is not expected, users presumably pay attention to what they post about. This question and the attitudes to posts are discussed in the following sections.

4.2. Coding and analysis of qualitative data

The respondents were asked open ended questions about their posting on Facebook, as well as their attitudes towards the posting of other users. The answers of each respondent was read and the content was coded into different categories. The respondents were asked what subjects they post about, what subjects they avoid, what subject they avoid but others may post about, and their reactions to unsuitable subjects and ways of posting. The categories were created inductively, based on what emerged from the data. It should be noted that this practice also results in a large number of very small categories, as individual respondents have given responses that are not shared by others. A more deductive approach would have resulted in fewer categories and possibly easier analysis, but in order to ensure the integrity of the results, inductive categorisation was favoured and forcing responses into categories was avoided. The categories were then allocated into more general themes in order to ease analysis and reporting, but meaning can not be deduced from the allocation to themes. The first time a category is introduced, it is also reported whether the category is a semantic subject or topic easily named, an attribute which characterises what is posted or a combination of these. Categories and their content will be presented in the context of the questions asked in the following segments. The examples will be complete answers to a question or part of the answer and the part allocated into the respective category is emphasised by use of bold if it is considered separate from the rest of the example. If only a part of an answer is presented in the example, the existence of more text is marked with a space and bracketed three dots […] on either side of the quote. This is to reduce the volume of text presented in any given example and thus make the example more clear.

4.3. Subjects posted on Facebook

The respondents were asked the question "What subjects do you post about on Facebook?". There were 386 responses to this question, 3 of which contained no information. There were answers given in the form of a list of subjects, as can be seen from example (1). These can be categorised from a semantical point of view. Attributional categorisation can also be made based on longer elaborations of matters, contents and attitudes, as can be seen from example (2). The examples presented by category also contain statements that are included into categories not explained in the

same segment. This is to allow some context for the statement, while preserving coherent order of analysis.

> (1) education, music, movies, sport, relationships, my life, what I do with my friends, my feelings. My post are about fun. I think that what makes me happy may also make someone else happy.
> (2) Nothing special really... and it happens rarely. Last time I complained about some people's profile pictures: they change them too often (why the hell do you take pictures of your face several times a week?) and they are often in black and white (that 'effect' is getting really over used... are they trying to be artistic or something?).

Theme 1. About self

This theme consists of the categories that included subjects about the respondents own lives directly. This includes their actions, accomplishments, thoughts, feelings, hobbies, work etc. Matters of family, friends or other relations were not included in this theme due to them not being matters of the self as a person.

Table 5. Subjects posted on Facebook. Theme 1. About self

Category	Number
Own life	151
Own life (significant)	89
Own feelings/thoughts	42
Studies	28
Travel	22
Hobbies	21
Work	20
Location	14
Mundane	7
Own opinion	7
Travel pictures	5
Sports training	5
Accomplishments	5
Complaint	4
Teaching	3
Bragging	2
Pride	2
Own blog	2

Own life (negative)	1
Drinking	1
Health	1
Trying something new	1
Announcements	1
Attention seeking	1

The largest category in this theme was *own life* (semantic). This includes statements that quite generally state that the respondent posts about his/her own life, without giving much elaboration or definition on what kind of matters he/she posts about.

> (3) My daily/funny happenings, whats happening in my life.
> (4) I write about nice **things that happen in my life**, such as travelling, having fun with friends, success at school. Sometimes I post about me being sick or if something funny has happened. I try to post things that my friends would consider interesting, but sometimes I post about things that are important to me at that moment, but no one actually cares about.

There were responses where it was merely stated the person writes about their own life, as is with example (3). However, there were also answers that had longer explanations, such as example (4), but still stated the respondent posts about their own life. This single category was the largest category of answers to the question about what people post about. This is probably due to Facebook being considered an outlet to express oneself and to communicate about oneself to one's social network.

The second largest category in this theme was *own life (significant)* (semantic/attribute). The content included in this category was distinct from the previous category in the sense that the respondents stated they post about the significant aspects of their lives, instead of merely about their lives.

> (5) Stuff related to my life. ***Mostly the more significant changes.*** For example if I were to move, I'd post about it.

This answer generated hits to both the category *own life* and *own life (significant)*. This is due to the respondent stating that they post mostly about the significant changes, but it can be said that they post about the insignificant aspects as well. However, in most of the cases these two categories were not apparent in the same answer, but it was stated that the respondents post specifically about the significant aspects and not the more

insignificant ones.

> (6) I post if something really different has happened in my life, something cool, different and especially funny. […]
> (7) […] if something extraordinary happens to me (to let others know about it); […]

It can be interpreted from these answers that the respondents would not post about everyday matters or otherwise insignificant matters about themselves.

The third largest category in this theme was *own feelings/thoughts* (semantic). The answers included in this category were differentiated from these presented before by including answers that contained inner thoughts or feelings of the respondent, but not actual actions.

> (8) My thoughts about important nowadays issues (which I feel important), [...]
> (9) I post seldom. ***Only some important thoughts of mine*** and news
> (10) ***My personal feelings,*** opinions, happenings and funny things that might, in my opinion, interest some of my friends. [...]

These respondents clearly do not refer to their actions or events in their lives, but their inner thoughts and attitudes and thus a separate category was made. If one stated they post about their thoughts, feelings, opinions or such, the answer was included into this category.

Studies (semantic) and *work* (semantic) were also prominent categories. Both of these received several mentions in the responses.

> (11) Things relating to everyday life, **studies**, current affairs, the weather... […]
> (12) ***School, work,*** view of life, funny stuff, music
> (13) […] About school projects to keep "collegues" posted.
> (14) […] Stuff about my hobbies, interests and **occupation**. […]

The high number of statements about school and studies was most likely due to the relatively high amount of students participating in the questionnaire. It should be noted especially in the case of *work* that although the category is relatively large (20 respondents), it only covers 5.1% of all the respondents. Thus, although these categories were more common than many others, it can not be deduced that these would be overall common topics based on these results.

Hobbies (semantic) and *travel* (semantic) were also relatively common explicitly stated subjects. *Hobbies* included direct statements about posting about hobbies, as well as statements about specific hobbies, such as martial arts or role-playing.

(15) Politics, economics, game industry, research, health, **martial arts**, tech, local stuff, national stuff. […]
(16) Music, Movies, surprising events, **my hobbies**. […]

Statements about travelling or trips were included into *travel* (semantic), but cases where the respondents merely stated they post about where they are were not included into *travel* but into another category, *location* (semantic).

(17) […] *If I am e.g.* **traveling** or trying something new […]
(18) […] If I'm going on a trip, I like to annoy them with this information.
(19) **Where I am**, interesting news, pictures, events *[Location]*

In addition to posting about travel, a few respondents stated they post *travel pictures*, which was differentiated from the category to make a distinction between text-only posts and multimodal posts.

Other categories listed in this theme were *mundane (*content about themselves that contained next to no relevant information. Semantic/attribute), *accomplishments* (semantic), *sports training* (their own training or sports actions. Semantic.), *complaint* (semantic), *teaching* (semantic), *pride* (attribute), *bragging* (semantic), *own blog* (semantic), *health* (semantic), *drinking* (semantic), *own life (negative)* (differentiated from *own life* as the respondent stated they post about the negative aspects, but avoid posting about the positive. Semantic/attribute.), *trying something new* (semantic), *announcements* (semantic) and *attention seeking* (attribute). These categories received only a few hits, but were distinct enough to generate their own categories. The array of different personal topics is quite varied, which was quite expected.

Theme 2. Communication with/about social surroundings

This theme contains categories that deal with the respondents' social surroundings. This includes friends, family, pets, as well as direct communication towards one's network. Although the communication can be about the self, the distinction from the previous

theme is that actions included in this theme presume co-operation of other people. The categories in this theme were not as large as the ones in the previous theme.

Table 6. Subjects posted on Facebook. Theme 2. Communication with/about social surroundings

Category	Number
Matters presumably of interest to others	31
Pets	12
Required help/instruction	10
Communication with friends	6
Birthday etc. wishes	5
Information for others	5
Family	5
Friends	4
Group topic	4
Thanks	2
Own children	2
Affect opinions	2
Seasonal greetings	2
Important for others	1
Advice for others	1
Comments	1
Social activities	1
Pictures of friends	1
Sibling's children	1

The largest category in this theme was *matters presumably of interest to others* (attribute). That is to say, respondents stated they post about subjects and matters they believe others are interested in.

> (20) daily life, when something interesting happens, **something that might interest others,** too
> (21) Things regarding my life **that I believe will interest/amuse/etc. others**. […]
> (22) […] Facebook is mostly for keeping in touch with my friends, and therefore I only share information or links that I feel my friends are interested in.

From these cases it can be seen that the respondents do not post for the sake of themselves, but to add suitable content for others. There seems to be an affinity to share

matters that are relevant for others, and not only for the self.

The second category in this theme was *pets* (semantic). This included direct references to pets, as well as cats and dogs. Cat pictures or similar were not included, if it could be interpreted that the origin was not of the respondent's own pets.

(23) i post something about my dogs. i don`t want to share my own private things.
(24) What is happening in the lives of me and **my cat**. […]

As can be seen from example (23), the respondent does not want to post about their private life, but in order to post about something relevant to themselves they post about their pet. This is probably due to the will to protect one's privacy while at the same time wanting to share about oneself, resulting in using the pet as a representation of the self.

Respondents also stated they post about needing help on some matter. These notions were included in the category *required help/instruction* (semantic).

(25)I post on Facebook to thank people for the birthday wishes and also *if I need help with something.* Facebook is a good way to reach masses
(26) […] I also tend to ask help in some problems or f. eg. finding people to help with moving from home to home osmt.
(27) Either it is about something I need for example, I need to borrow a chainsaw or another item which would be stupid to buy for that one occasion. […]

Facebook seems to be also used for asking for help, due to users being able to easily reach their entire network.

Other categories that deal with directly communicating with one's network included *communication with others* (references to direct communication through Facebook. Attribute.), *information for others* (posting information for the sake of one's network, but without giving value to it being interesting for others. Semantic.), *birthday etc. wishes* (semantic)*, group topic* (discussions in Facebook groups. Semantic.), *seasonal greetings* (semantic)*, thanks* (semantic)*, affecting opinions* (attempts to affect the opinion of others. Attribute.), *important for others* (matters presumed important for others. Attribute.), *organizational matters* (semantic)*, helping others* (semantic)*, comments* (commenting the posts of others. Semantic.) and *advice for others* (semantic). None of these categories were very prominent and many had only one entry.

However, they are identified as categories of their own due to containing distinct information not apparent in other categories. I can be said that the more public posts are also used for directly communicating with other people, instead of merely posting content for the possibility of someone seeing it..

Smaller categories about one's social surroundings include *family* (semantic)*, friends* (semantic)*, own children* (semantic)*, pictures of friends* (semantic)*, sibling's children* (semantic) and *death of a relative* (semantic). All of these categories are very small, which could be interpreted as unwillingness to speak about the matters of other people. Therefore it could be said that people prefer to post about themselves and direct their communication directly towards their social surroundings, instead of posting about their social surroundings for others.

Theme 3. Socio-political/informational

The third theme consists of categories that deal with external third party matters, instead of personal or interpersonal matters. The subjects added into this theme are however relevant to the respondents personal views or issues. That is to say, the subjects are not directly matters based on the opinions of the respondent, but may be such the respondent agrees with or considers important.

Table 7. Subjects posted on Facebook. Theme 3. Socio-political/informational

Category	Number
News	62
Politics	28
Science and research	9
Activism	7
Culture	6
Art	5
Literature	5
Language	3
Required change	3
Religion	3
Current affairs	2

Propaganda	2
Light politics	2
Education	2
Law	1
Bible	1
History	1
Economics	1
International (Korea)	1
Immigration	1

The largest category in this theme is *news* (semantic). This category includes news as an external source of information, that is to say direct references to generally news or articles.. Thus news about oneself were not included, but news about other topics were included.

> (28) I post about my university studies, interesting **news**, special events such as vacations, anniversaries or really great parties. […]
> (29) […] If I find something interesting (**news**, videos etc.) I post them to my wall. […]

It can be noted from the answers that news were most often conveyed by sharing links to the news sources. References to sharing articles were included in this category, even if it contained no direct reference to being a news article. In addition, news topics that were prominent and definite enough were allocated in their own categories and will be presented below.

The second largest category in this theme is *politics* (semantic). This includes statements about posting about politics, political issues or other such matters, e.g. democracy.

> (30) Religion, **politics**, culture, critincs, science, languages, music, history, funny things, personal opinions and things like that. […]
> (31) […] Politics is part debate, part work, part trying to change the world and part affirming me and my friends social circle.

There was one mention about open democracy, but otherwise the contents of the posts are not stated. The respondents were willing to admit that they post about political subjects, but not willing to submit information about what their opinion on those

matters are.

Respondents also stated they post about *science and research* (semantic)*, culture* (semantic)*, art* (semantic) and *literature* (semantic). *Science and research* contains direct statements about science, science news and research related topics. Direct references to culture without further elaborations were allocated into *culture* and direct references to art were allocated into *art*. Statements about literature or books were both allocated into *literature*.

In addition to politics and news, there were references to social activism which were allocated into the category *activism* (semantic). These include direct statements about activism, as well as different topics within the subject.

> (32) […] world & humanitarian issues.
> (33) Mostly about subjects about environmental/nature issues, because I update my company pages.

These subjects were not allocated into the *politics* category due to them being distinct from regular political activity or discussion.

Other categories within this theme are *religion* (semantic)*, required change* (posting about what needs to change. Semantic.), *language* (semantic)*, propaganda* (direct statement about posting about propaganda. Semantic.), *education* (semantic)*, current affairs* (not elaborated on by respondents. Semantic.), *light politics* (severity of topic is relevant. Semantic.), *international (Korea)* (semantic)*, law* (semantic)*, economics* (semantic)*, immigration* (semantic)*, history* (semantic) and *Bible* (semantic). All of these categories are differentiated from the larger general ones as they are explicitly stated and thus their existence is relevant. It can be generally stated based on the categories that people wish to inform others and discuss impersonal matters on Facebook as well.

Theme 4. Entertainment/media

This theme consists of categories that deal with external media sources without further elaboration on content, as well as matters dealing with entertainment media. Thus,

categories that can be considered informational, but exist for entertainment purposes are included in this theme.

Table 8. Subjects posted on Facebook. Theme 4. Entertainment/media

Category	Number
Pictures	56
External links	55
Music	51
Video	33
Movies, television	16
Sports	8
Memes	7
Games	6
Entertainment	2
Idols	1

The first category in this theme is *pictures* (semantic). This includes pictures from external sources, such as the internet, as well as pictures and photographs originally supplied by the respondent themself.

(34) mostly personal pictures for the consumption of family and friends back home. […]
(35) photos someone else has posted already
(36) I usually share news links and **funny pictures,** and sometimes (rarely) something personal.

Example (34) shows a statement where the respondent posts pictures generated by the respondent. In examples (35) and (36) the pictures are from an external source, Facebook and from other websites.

The second category in this theme is *external links* (semantic). Although many categories previously presented can be considered as external links, they are more definite and therefore are given a category of their own. That is to say, if the content of the link can not be determined, be it news, video or other, the statement can not be allocated into a more specific category.

(37) youtube links, music, **funny links, links other people have linked,** ...
(38) […] I might also post **a link,** picture etc if it's really, really, good, relevant or funny, and I want other people to read/see it too.
(39) […] When I find something funny I think is worth sharing. […]

As can be seen from the examples, it is not clear what the links are about. Although it is stated in example (37) that the respondent posts Youtube links, he/she speaks of other links as well, without much elaboration on their content. Notions about sharing content was also included, as it is a term which refers to sharing material found on the internet. Generally, if a respondent stated they share what they found on the internet without being explicit on the content, the statement was allocated in this category.

Respondents also stated they post *music* (semantic) and *videos* (semantic) on Facebook. Actual musical content as well as posts about music were added in the category *music*. *Video* refers to only actual video material posted, however including videos made by self as well as shared from other sources.

(40) […] Sometimes I also post something random or "advertise" **new music** etc. […]
(41) Mostly fun stuff like **videos, clips***, etc. 'cos they're funny. […]

As can be seen from example (41), the source of the videos are not always stated, which prevents allocation into a more specific category.

Respondents also stated they post about *television and movies* (semantic)*, sports* (semantic)*, memes* (semantic)*, games* (semantic)*, entertainment* (semantic) and *idols* (semantic). As in previous themes, these categories are not large, but contain necessary information and elaborate on the matter.

Theme 5. Other

The categories listed in this theme were such that could not be properly included in the other themes. This includes conceptual subjects, attributes of subjects as well as subjects whose actual content could not be properly specified.

Table 9. Subjects posted on Facebook. Theme 5. Other

Category	Number of references
Funny	145
Interesting	45
Positive	30
Events	28
Important matters	11
Significant event	9
Food	9
General matters	7
Status update	6
Positive for others	2
Everything	1
Coffee	1
Trying to create happiness	1
Weather	1
Wordplay	1
Facebook	1
Everything (contradiction)	1
None	*14*

The largest category in this theme is *funny* (attribute). This is the second most common category on posting. Matters that were referred to as funny or fun were added to this category.

> (42) […] **funny**/meaningful events of my own life and some times memes. […]
> (43) […] Random silliness for humour value […]
> (44) Life events, interesting articles (science, entertainment), **funny** things found online, upcoming gigs.

As can be seen from the examples, the topic of the posts is not 'funny' but funny refers to the nature or feature of the post or content. Thus, *funny* can not be identified as a subject in itself, but rather as a characteristic of the posts. Funny material is probably posed for entertainment value social contacts, such as would be with telling jokes face-to-face.

The second category in this theme is *interesting* (attribute). This covers statements in which the respondents say they post about matters they are interested in. Thus, as with *funny*, references to the characteristic of the post as interesting are also included.

(45) subjects I find **interesting**, usefull or entertaining. […]
(46) *Interest* (hobbies & otherwise), **interesting** articles & videos etc., curious stuff I've encountered during my day, commentary about recent events & news
(47) about personal interests, common interests with my friends, […]

Respondents often did not say what they consider to be interesting, as is with example (45), but still stated that the content they post should be interesting for them. In example (47) the respondent clearly meant specific subjects, possibly fitting other categories, but due to lack of information the statement is allocated into this category.

The third category in this theme is *positive* (attribute). If a respondent explicitly stated they post about positive or good things, the statement was added into this category.

(48) […] **Mainly positive** and not very personal things that people might actually find interesting.
(49) I write about **nice things** that happen in my life, such as travelling, having fun with friends, success at school. […]

It can be noted from the responses that the ones who state they post about positive things generally attempt to keep Facebook positive. Often, unwillingness to post about negative matters was present in these cases.

In addition to these, respondents stated they post about *events* (semantic), such as parties or concerts, *important matters* (not stated what about. Semantic/attribute.), *food* (semantic), *significant events* (not stated what about. Semantic/attribute.), *general matters* (attribute), matters that are *positive for others* (semantic/attribute), *Facebook* (semantic), matters with which they are *trying to create happiness* (attribute), *weather* (semantic), *wordplay* (semantic) and *coffee* (semantic). Overall, the variety of different topics is quite large. In addition, problematic statements and corresponding categories were included in this theme. 6 people stated they post *status updates* (pragmatic), but did not state anything about the contents. Two people stated they post about *everything* (semantic), but one of them proceeded to provide avoided topics. 14 people stated they do not post on Facebook at all.

As can be seen from the results, there is a vast array of different topics people post about. Some topics, such as oneself, as well as some attributes, such as being funny, are clearly more popular than many other subjects. The subjects presented are not surprising as such, as they can be discussed within one's personal network in other contexts as well. Larger categories and the array of different categories can however present us with information on the general idea of subjects posted on Facebook. What is avoided gives additional insight to posting on Facebook, which is discussed in the following segment.

4.4. Avoided subjects

The respondents were asked the question "What subjects do you not post about on Facebook?". There were 375 answers to this question, 3 of which contained no information. As with the posted subjects, there were semantical lists of avoided subjects, possibly grouped with reasons for avoiding those subjects, as well as longer explanations and elaborations of the attributes of matters that were avoided.

> (50)- Daily activities
> - Rumours and hearsay, especially of other people
> - Relationships
> - Moods and feelings
> - Anything I deem uninteresting
> (51) I never post about anything really personal on Facebook, about my feelings or if I have some problems. I just don't want to tell about those things to a bunch of people in a short message, if I want to talk about anything really personal I talk about it face to face with a close friend.

Theme 1. Unsuitable based on self

This theme consists of categories that were listed as avoidable based on the respondent themselves. That is to say, subjects listed as private or otherwise such personal information preferably kept to oneself. This also includes subjects that the respondent themselves felt negative towards and therefore did not wish to post about the subject. Matters that were avoided for the protection of the self, be it the protection of one's own privacy, the protection of ones own feelings or indisputably based on the self, were allocated into this theme.

Table 10. Avoided subjects. Theme 1. Unsuitable based on self

Category	Number of references
Private	191
Intimate relationships	47
Work	24
Sex	14
Illness	11
Negative feelings	10
Personal life	9
Feelings	9
Health	8
Personal problem	8
Personal thoughts	8
Uninteresting	7
Matters possibly damaging self or reputation	5
Personal information	4
Travel	4
Too much information	4
Location	4
Drinking	4
Work (details)	3
Strong opinion	3
Relationship troubles	3
Unsuitable for strangers	3
Polyamory	2
Absence from home	2
Money	2
Own life (negative)	2
Personal relationships	2
Own life (positive)	2
Not suitable for face-to-face	2
Own life (contradiction)	1
Strong feelings	1
Secrets	1
If unable to add own value to subject	1
Harmful for employment	1

Matters against own ideal	1
Fears	1
Matters disturbing self	1
Personal life (conditional)	1
Parties	1

The first and largest category in this theme is *private* (attribute). If a respondent stated they do not post about a subject because it is private, or do not post about private matters, the statement was included into this category. It should be noted that due to language difficulties, as the majority of the respondents were not native English speakers, there was much interpretation in relation to this category. That is to say, many respondents did not seem to understand the difference between private and personal, as many stated they post about themselves, but then proceeded to explain they do not post about personal matters. It was interpreted in these cases that the respondents mean private matters, or overly personal, that is to say, matters about themselves and their lives they consider private and thus not to be disclosed with others.

> (52) Things that I find too private for sharing with other people. […]
> (53) […] my personal life, […] [Respondent previously stated that posts about: relationships, my life, what I do with my friends, my feelings.]
> (54) I don't post about really personal things because I don't want everyone knowing my business
> (55) **Very personal life details**, I for example won't post much about personal relationship issues to facebook. To me those things feel like a truly personal issue and choice (and for example discussing the morals of polyamory in fb hasn't been my thing, even if I participate in it).

There were direct statements about not posting of private matters, but without further elaboration on the content of private, as is with example (52). Example (53) shows how the statements of respondents were sometimes contradicting and thus it is interpreted the respondent means private. (54) is an example of statement that was interpreted as meaning private based on the statement itself. Some respondents elaborated on what they consider private, as is with example (55), but usually the elaboration is not exhaustive, but merely exemplary.

The second category in this theme is *intimate relationships* (semantic). This category includes interpersonal relationships that can be characterised as intimate or romantic. That is to say, dating, spouses, intimate interaction etc. statements. If a respondent stated they do not post about 'relationships', it was interpreted as a reference to intimate

romantic relationships, if there was no reason to assume otherwise. This is due to language issues, as the Finnish word used for romantic relationships translates into English as the general 'relationship'. As the majority of respondents are non-native English speakers, this assumption has to be made.

(56) **Relationships**, work etc. - I like to keep some parts of my life private
(57) ***My work, my relationship with my fiancé,*** other people's business, general topics eg. news I never share. […]
(58) Very personal stuff like being very drunk, sexual and ***d*ating things, relationship issues if there's something bad about them.**

Example (56) is the most ambiguous in terms of the intimacy of the relationship. However, as it would seem strange that the respondent means all relationships, with no regard to what kind, it is assumed the statement refers to intimate relationships.

The next category in this theme is *work* (semantic). This category includes direct referrals to work, occupation and other matters of employment.

(59) My work: I don't think it's appropriate or necessary. […]
(60) […] work-related issues (unless I start in a new job, that's the only thing I could post about work) […]
(61) […] and nowadays especially work. There's been talk about people getting fired because they have posted negative stuff about their bosses or work overall in Facebook so I've realised that it's better to keep quiet about such matters. It's not that I would be afraid of losing my job but instead I just think that it's better to think ahead and rather not post.

There were general statements, like example (59), and statements with some conditions, like example (60). If a reason was stated it was usually as can be seen in example (61). As there has been reactions to people posting about their work, this has had an effect on how people consider posting about one's work. There were also three statements about posting details of one's work and these were allocated into their own category, *work details* (semantic/attribute).

Other categories made based on subjects the respondents wished to keep private are *sex* (semantic), *illness* (semantic), *negative feelings* (semantic/attribute), *personal life* (matters about one's own life. Semantic), *feelings* (semantic), *personal thoughts* (semantic), *health* (semantic), *personal problems* (semantic), *personal information* (address, back accounts etc. Semantic), *Travel* (semantic), *too much information* (revealing too much about oneself. Attribute), *relationship troubles* (semantic),

unsuitable for strangers (attribute)*, polyamory* (semantic)*, personal relationships* (all interpersonal relationships. Semantic)*, money* (semantic)*, not suitable for face-to-face* (attribute)*, fears* (semantic)*, secrets* (semantic) and *strong feelings* (semantic/attribute). In addition, one respondent stated they do not post about their own life, unless it is something they want others to know (*own life (conditional)*). Also, one respondent stated they do not post about their own life, although they previously stated they post about their personal life (*own life (contradiction)*). These categories are all based on the subjects being private.

Other subjects the respondents avoided for the sake of themselves are *uninteresting* (attribute) *damaging self or reputation* (attribute)*, drinking* (semantic)*, location* (semantic)*, strong opinion* (semantic)*, absence from home* (semantic)*, own life (positive)* (semantic)*, own life (negative)* (semantic), *harmful for employment* (attribute), *matters disturbing self* (attribute), *matters against own ideals* (semantic) and *unable to add own value to subject* (attribute). Posting about these subjects was considered harmful for the self, or otherwise unsuitable for Facebook based on the respondent themselves.

Theme 2. Unsuitable based on others

This theme consists of categories that are avoided in regard to other people. Thus, subjects that are about other people or would have a negative effect on other people are allocated into this theme. For example, matters that would insult the privacy of others or insult another's feelings.

Table 11. Avoided subjects. Theme 2. Unsuitable based on others

Category	Number of references
Family	20
Other people's matters	19
Complaint	14
Offensive	10
Argument	9
Complaint about acquaintance	6
Bragging	6

Gossip	5
Hateful/mean	5
Controversial	4
Children	4
Harmful for others	3
Pictures of others	2
Aggressive	2
Uncomfortable for others	2
Uninteresting for others	2
Racism	2
Friends	1
Upset others	1
Unsuitable for minors	1
Leads to discussion	1

The first category in this theme is *family* (semantic). This category consists of all statements about not posting about family matters.

> (62) About family matters, family illnesses, etc. Those are private information.
> (62) Private life events (relationship problems, **family problems** etc.)

As can be seen from both of the examples, family is seen as a private matter of the self. This category is in theme 2 as although family is indeed a personal matter,as a subject it is not about the self, but about other people. However, it could be allocated into theme 1 as well.

The second category in this theme is *other people's matters* (semantic). This category includes statements according to which the respondents avoid posting about other people or their business.

> (63) Private things of my friends' lives, for example.
> (64) I do not post about other people on Facebook, because I think it is rude.

According to the responses allocated into this category, one can see that it is believed to be the right of the individual to decide on their own privacy.

Respondents also stated they avoid *complaining* (semantic) and *complaining about acquaintance* (semantic).

> (65) I think that people who whine a lot in Facebook or share EVERYTHING they do are extremely irritating or just plain boring, so I try to avoid being like those people. No one cares if I've done the dishes or went to buy groceries. No one wants to hear/see you whining about your miserable life every f-ing day. […]
> (66) […] I don't want to say anything bad about the people I know. […]

(65) is a good example of venting on this questionnaire. When asked what people do not post about or what they consider unsuitable in general, there were some cases where the respondent answered in an aggressive way as in the example. As can be seen in (66), badmouthing or negative statements of acquaintances are included into *complaining about acquaintance*.

Offensive (attribute)*, hateful/mean* (attribute) and *aggressive* (attribute) posting was also avoided. Two people specified they do not post about *racism* (semantic).

> (67) […] Also I don't want to post anything that could offend someone. If your friend acted shitty towards you, Facebook isn't the place to discuss about it, or worse: to make an open post about it.
> (68) Anything hateful (because that's what I hate seeing on FB)
> (69) Personal matters that involve other people, hard to understand without context -posts, attention "whoring" posts, **agressive posts***, political opinions... they're not the norm in my fb-community

Respondents also reported avoiding *arguing* (semantic) and *bragging* (semantic). In addition to these, other categories in this theme are *gossip* (semantic), *controversial* (attribute)*, children* (semantic)*, harmful for others* (attribute)*, pictures of others* (semantic)*, uncomfortable for others* (attribute)*, uninteresting for others* (attribute)*, friends* (semantic)*, topics that *lead to discussion* (attribute)*, unsuitable for minors* (attribute) and *upsetting for others* (attribute). All of these categories are based on the idea that they are about other people or cause a negative effect on other people.

Theme 3. Annoying behaviour

This theme consists of categories, the contents of which are not considered negative or harmful to anyone, but more of an annoyance. These categories can be seen as a violation to implicit norms within an SNS environment.

Table 12. Avoided subjects. Theme 3. Annoying behaviour

Category	Number of references
Mundane	104
Fishing for attention	3
Excessive amounts	3
Vague	2
Too many pictures	1
Vain	1

The largest category in this theme is *mundane* (attribute). This consists of everyday things, irrelevant menial things and other such statements.

> (70) My daily stuff - every one knows I go to school, eat, sleep and clean my apartment.
> (71) "Ate an apple" -type of things.

As this category is relatively large (104 hits), it seems that there is a norm that requires people to include somehow important or novel information to the posts.

Other categories in this theme are *fishing for attention* (semantic)*, excessive amounts* (attribute)*, vague* (attribute)*, vain* (attribute) and *excessive pictures* (attribute, semantic). These other categories are very small, but were explicitly stated.

Theme 4. External nuisance

This theme consists of categories whose subjects are impersonal and pose no threat towards any person or their values. The categories collected under this theme are *memes* (semantic)*, entertainment news* (e.g. yellow press. Semantic)*, advertisement* (semantic)*, junk posts* (semantic)*, external slogans* (e.g. motivational slogans. Semantic)*, games* (semantic)*, external links* (semantic)*, external funny* (semantic/attribute) and *Facebook apps* (semantic). The subjects are mundane in the sense that they have no direct relation to any one person, do not portray any political, religious or otherwise lifestyle related attitudes. They are avoided for reasons other than personal or interpersonal protection.

Table 13. Avoided subjects. Theme 4. External nuisance

Category	Number of references
Memes	4
Entertainment news	4
Advertisement	3
Junk posts	3
External slogans	2
Games	2
External funny	1
Facebook apps	1
External links	1

Theme 5. Sociopolitical

This theme consist of some of the same topics of categories presented in the previous section on what people post about. The categories included are *politics* (semantic), *religion* (semantic), *heavy politics* (semantic), *wolves* (semantic) and *activism* (semantic). *Wolves* was included as it is considered a social subject that is based on one's values. It is basically the same as *activism*, but with a more specified topic. This specific topic may have emerged due to a wolf poaching incident in Finland a few months prior to the questionnaire. These categories were grouped as they deal with social and political matters.

Table 14. Avoided subjects. Theme 5. Sociopolitical

Category	Number of references
Politics	25
Religion	14
Heavy politics	3
Wolves	2
Activism	1

Theme 6. Other

The categories that could not be allocated into other themes or did not have adequate volume to generate themes of their own were allocated into this theme. Therefore the

variety of categories is quite large. As many of the categories consist only of one reference, they are not presented here. They are however visible in table 15.

Table 15. Avoided subjects. Theme 6. Other

Category	Number of references
Negative	31
Serious	7
Unsuitable	4
News	3
Negative event	3
Very important matters	3
Pictures	2
Death	2
Unsuitable for context	2
Sports	2
Negative news	1
Animals	1
Surrounding environment	1
Song links	1
Too negative	1
Science and research	1
Profanity	1
Sharing media	1
Weather	1
Violence	1
Illegal	1
Pictures, severe content	1
Music	1
Misinformation	1
Everything	*11*
All OK	*2*
Everything else	*1*

The largest category in this theme is *negative* (attribute). 31 respondents stated they avoid posting negative post or about negative subjects.

(72) […] i actually don't post about anything negative, i don't see the point in it.
(73) […] generally negative things and whining.

As there are other categories that can be also considered negative, these respondents did not specify on what kind of negative subjects they do not post about. Therefore they are included in this category.

Some respondents also stated they do not post about *serious* (attribute) matters and subjects that are *unsuitable* (attribute), although they did not specify what is unsuitable. *Negative events* (semantic) were also avoided, as were *very important matters* (attribute). In addition, *news* (semantic)*,* matters that were *unsuitable for context* (attribute), *sports* (semantic)*, death* (semantic)*, pictures* (semantic) and 14 other categories visible in table 15 were avoided.

In addition to the themes and categories presented above, there were other answers to the question as well. Two people stated there are no subjects they would not post about. 11 people stated they do not post about anything at all. Also, three people stated they do not post about anything but the subjects they mentioned in the previous question. This poses a problem for analysis, as it does not give direct material for categorisation. These answers are allocated into their own category, but they are not comparable with the other categories.

As can be seen from the results, people tend to avoid posting about private and intimate matters, as well as mundane events. It seems people want to protect their privacy and avoid posting about subjects they would not discuss openly in other contexts as well. As Facebook posts are usually visible to a large number of people, one does not post about subjects he/she would discuss with only a few selected people. In addition, mundane posting is avoided, proposing a requirement of meaningfulness in posts as well. These categories are based entirely on what people do not post themselves, with no answer to what they think of the subjects if posted by others. What is considered appropriate by others is discussed in the following two segments.

4.5. Avoided subjects that are suitable for others

The respondents were asked "Are there subjects you do not want to post about, but other people can post about? What are those and why?". 340 respondents answered this question. Seven of the answers did not contain any usable information. In addition, there were numerous cases where it could be interpreted that the respondent did not understand the question as it was designed. This may be due to the use of the word "can", as it was intended to point to having no objection towards that behaviour, but it can also be interpreted as "being able to". This resulted in many answers being excluded from being analysed in terms of the original question. Additionally, as many answers showed poor understanding of the intended question, if there is no sign of the respondent correctly understanding the question, it can not be safely assumed that the question has been understood. This hinders the reliability of conclusions made based on the responses. However, the findings will be presented here nevertheless.

> (74) Relationship status updates are fine by me - when others post them.
> (75)Sexlife. People are free to write and post about what they want, in general, but I just don't feel like telling too detailed information about my life.
> (76) As I explained in previous questions, I'm not interested in, for example, knowing details in one's sickness. That's why I don't post anything like that myself. I don't update stuff about my relationship because that's between me and him. I'd feel awkward posting something like "yay just had sex!!!!" on my wall.

As can be seen in example (76), the respondent does not explain what topic he/she considers suitable for others but does not post about his-/herself. The respondent merely describes what he/she does not post about and what kind of material is considered annoying. It is evident that the respondent did not understand the question or merely did not want to answer it.

Theme 1. Self/private

This theme consists of categories that deal with the user or is otherwise considered private. Matters that are intimate or otherwise not considered the business of others were included in this theme.

Table 16. Avoided subjects that are suitable for others. Theme 1. Self/private

Category	Number of references
Private	61
Intimate relationships	33
Personal life	20
Drinking	10
Sex	10
Work	9
Personal problem	8
Health	7
Location	6
Opinions	6
Intimate details	5
Parties	5
Money	5
Illness	5
Feelings	4
Personal information	2
Relationship conflict	2
Travel	2
Relationship status	1
Personal, non-harmful	1
Daily thoughts	1
Current actions	1
Home	1
Emotional	1
Negative life events	1
Achievements	1
Significant life changes	1
Radical opinions	1
Absence from home	1

The first category in this theme is *private* (attribute). Statements about private matters, privacy, too personal issues or similar are allocated into this category.

(77) I generally don't post about my health issues, money issues, relationship issues or any **other private issues.** I does not help me one bit if everyone knows about them, so I keep them to myself. I only complain about injustices that might affect other people as well. I other words, if something bad happens to me, I consider whether I should warn other people about that. If I see no need for that, I don't complain just for the sake of complaining. If other people want to complain about their private matters, it's their choice.
(78) People can post about their personal things if they want but I don't want to do that.
(79) Personal things like health related issues.

There were long elaborate answers such as (77) as well as shorter answers. In some cases it was explicitly stated that the respondent does not want to post about the matters, but does not mind others doing so. However, in cases such as (79) this kind of statement is not made and thus it is not completely certain the respondent has understood the question. As this category is the largest based on this question, it could mean that people generally wish to avoid risking their own privacy, but want to know about the private matters of others.

The second category in this theme is *intimate relationships* (semantic). References to relationships, dating, significant others and similar were allocated into this category.

(80) I don't want to post about *my relationship* or family stuff but others might. […]
(81) I wouldn't post about my relationship issues to fb, but others are welcome to discuss their own issues.
(82) I'm of course interested to read about **the relationship problems** and lack of money of other people, but I don't want to tell about them myself.

As is with the category *private*, it seems that people wish to keep relationship matters as their own, but at the same time are willing to hear about the matters of others. Relationships can be considered private, although they are not explicitly stated as such in every case in the answers.

The third category in this theme is *personal life* (semantic). The category refers to people posting about their own lives, matters about themselves. These subjects are not private by definition and thus are not allocated into *private.*

(83) I'd rather not post too many pictures or details about my personal life on FB because I will become immortal and that information might be used against me later in life.
(84) I don't want to let all the people know how I'm doing or what is happening in my life.I do like to know what other people are doing.

If the respondent has stated previously that he/she posts about their own life, statements about avoiding posts of personal life are interpreted to mean private and thus allocated

in *private*. Interpretations similar to the last two categories can be made, that is to say people are interested in the lives of others while avoiding telling about their own lives.

Other categories allocated into this theme are *sex* (semantic)*, drinking* (semantic)*, work* (semantic)*, personal problem* (semantic)*, health* (semantic)*, opinions* (semantic)*, location* (semantic)*, money* (semantic)*, intimate details* (semantic)*, illness* (semantic)*, parties* (semantic)*, feelings* (semantic)*, relationship conflict* (semantic)*, personal information* (semantic)*, travel* (semantic) and 10 others visible on table 16. In it is apparent that people are not overly sensitive about the personal subjects of others, although they want to keep their own private. However, as stated before, it is not apparent in every answer that the respondent has answered to what they believe is suitable for others to post and not to what kind of subjects they have seen.

Theme 2. Negative behaviour

This theme consist of categories that can be labelled directly as negative behaviour. Offensive, aggressive, hateful etc. material that can be seen as directly hostile towards someone or something, as well as socially inappropriate or questionable behaviour. The individual categories are small, but there is a relatively large number of categories allocated into this theme.

Table 17. Avoided subjects that are suitable for others. Theme 2. Negative behaviour

Category	Number of references
Badmouthing	4
Matters leading to argument	4
Offensive	4
Complaint	3
Fishing for attention	2
Racist	2
Bragging	2
Humiliation	2
Provocative	1
Cause jealousy	1
Celebrating death	1

Illegal	1
Matters possibly hindering future	1
Immature	1
False information	1
Hate speech	1
Spam	1
Sexist	1

The three largest categories are *badmouthing* (semantic)*, offensive* (attribute) and *matters leading to argument* (semantic).

(85) […] Saying bad things about others. […] *[badmouthing]*
(86) Highly offensive subjects. I choose my audience for each topic. *[offensive]*
(87) As said, anything that leads to discussions. I just like to avoid things to get into a vicious circle on my own Facebook. I don't mind others inciting dicussions though. *[Matters leading to argument]*

In most cases it was not explicitly stated whether or not the respondent approves of others posting about these matters, but cases such as (87) also existed. Still, people tend to avoid negative behaviour.

Other categories in this theme are *complaining* (semantic)*, bragging* (semantic)*, racist (*attribute*), humiliation* (semantic)*, fishing for attention* (semantic) and 10 other categories listed in table 17. As the categories are small and in many cases it is not stated whether or not the respondents actually approve of this behaviour, it seems that this kind of conduct is somewhat frowned upon, although in some cases not disapproved of.

Theme 3. Beliefs/values

This theme consists of categories that are matters of values or beliefs. That is to say, social or political matters that are not inherently negative as such, but the judgements of which is based on an individual's values.

Table 18. Avoided subjects that are suitable for others. Theme 3. Beliefs/values

Category	Number of references
Politics	23
Religion	16
Against own opinion	2
Subject for contempts	2
Strong activism	1
Controversial politics	1
Animal rights	1
Homosexuality	1

The two largest categories are *politics* (semantic) and *religion* (semantic). It seems that people who talked about these topics do not want to show their own stand on these matters, but have no problem with others doing so.

(88) […] strong personal opinions about politics etc […]
(89) I don't like to post about religion or politics, but I don't mind if others do. […]

Other categories listed in this theme are *subject for contempt* (matters the respondent dislikes. Semantic)*, against own opinion* (semantic)*, animal rights* (semantic)*, controversial politics* (semantic)*, homosexuality* (semantic) and *strong activism* (semantic). The categories are so small that conclusions can not be made based on them, but they may elaborate what is considered suitable.

Theme 4. External and media

This theme consists of categories that are based on external sources or media. These include *advertisement* (semantic)*, sports* (semantic)*, sexual pictures* (semantic)*, entertainment news* (semantic)*, pictures* (semantic)*, external links* (semantic)*, questionable pictures* (semantic)*, stupid pictures* (semantic)*, offensive pictures* (semantic) and *harmless pictures* (semantic). The large number of specific picture related categories is due to specific statements made by the respondents. This theme or its categories are not very prominent in size and thus generalisations can not be made reliably.

Table 19. Avoided subjects that are suitable for others. Theme 4. External and media

Category	Number of references
Advertisement	10
Sports	3
Entertainment news	3
Sexual pictures	3
Pictures	2
Harmless pictures	1
Stupid pictures	1
Questionable pictures	1
Offensive pictures	1
External links	1

Theme 5. Others

This theme includes categories that are essentially information about other people. The largest category is *children* (semantic), after which came *family* (semantic)*, gossip* (semantic)*, others* (semantic), *pictures of others* (semantic) and *pictures of children* (semantic). As with the categories of the previous theme, these are also quite small. It could be said that based on this people would not approve of posting about other people, but making conclusions based on what is not stated is not appropriate.

Table 20. Avoided subjects that are suitable for others. Theme 5. Others

Category	Number of references
Children	11
Family	4
Gossip	2
Others	2
Pictures of others	1

Theme 6. Other

Categories that did not fit other themes or could not generate a theme of their own were allocated into this theme. Therefore, there is no connecting features between the categories.

Table 21. Avoided subjects that are suitable for others. Theme 6. Other

Category	Number of references
Mundane	35
Food	2
Chain letter	2
Animals	2
Questionable humour	2
Negative	2
Not enough information on subject	2
Serious	1
Too many posts	1
Significant	1
Games	1
Not suitable for real life	1
Models/ "girl stuff"	1
Mainstream	1
Pets	1
Not suitable for colleagues	1
Unwilling to discuss subject	1
Uninteresting for others	1
Weather	1
All OK	*39*
Irrelevant answer	*27*
None	*13*

The only significant category in this theme is *mundane* (attribute), as all other categories consisted of one or two items. *Mundane* refers to insignificant everyday matters that are not considered important or relevant.

> (90) […] Also, I don't see the point of a mundane post such as "I'm bored".
> (91) Everyday stuff, something that's really common and not very interesting. They can of course post them but I think it's not very interesting to read those posts.

It seems somewhat important for posts to be relevant or important in some way. As respondents claim they do not post about mundane matters, but do not mind others doing so, it should be kept in mind that what one considers mundane might not be so for someone else. Thus, for example it may be important and relevant for someone that they

are bored, although someone else considers it mundane.

Other categories are *chain letter* (semantic), *questionable humour* (semantic)*, animals* (semantic)*, negative* (attribute), *not enough information on subject* (respondents claim they do not wish to post about matters they do not know about. Semantic)*, food* (semantic) and 12 other categories that are based as individual statements by single respondents (visible in table 21). These categories are small, but the statements could not be allocated into pre-existing categories.

In addition to these categories, 39 respondents stated that people may post about what they want or do not care about what others post about. 13 people stated that there are no such topics, in essence stating that their judgement on what is appropriate is certain. 27 respondents gave an irrelevant answer to this question. These include statements about not posting at all, giving null or incoherent answers, clearly misinterpreting the question or being general to the extent of not including any useful information.

> (92) It's a matter of personal opinion.
> (93) I only use the fb messenger to talk with normal people who are skype allergic or telephonically disabled. I don't post anything.
> (94) I do not understand the question.

Responses like these are one of the underlining reasons for doubting the reliability of the answers. The problem may again be based on linguistic proficiency of the respondents, as well as the wording of the question. As many of the answers are ambiguous, no definite conclusions or generalisations can be made based on the results. However, suggestive conclusions can be made based on the more prominent categories.

It seems that avoiding private matters is more about personal protection than overall unsuitability. People do not want to post about private matters, but do not mind as such if others post about their own lives. However, private and intimate matters are considered unsuitable to an extent, as can be seen from the difference in numbers between avoided subjects and avoided but accepted subjects, as well as the results from the question about overall unsuitable topics presented in the next section.

4.6. Completely unsuitable subjects

The respondents were asked "What subjects should people not post about and why?". 338 respondents gave an answer to this question, three of which contained no useful information. The purpose of this question was to determine what kind of subjects are considered completely unsuitable for Facebook and should not be discussed in that environment. That is to say, what people think no one should post about. With this question also, there were longer explanations as well as semantic lists.

> (95) Basically things that violate human rights. But everybody has the choice not to read them. I personally do not understand if people make dull or boring posts or seem like a cry for help like one of my fb-friend's post: "Should I make lasagna today?" Posted 4 hours ago, not a single like or a comment. That is so sad.
> (96) Violence, hardcore sex, nudity, stuff like that.

Theme 1. Intimate/private

This theme consists of categories that can be identified as intimate relationships or actions, or otherwise considered private. These factors are inherently connected with the self. It should be noted however that as the question asks what should not be posted overall, the responses are not necessarily about the respondents themselves, but about other people posting about themselves as well.

Table 22. Completely unsuitable subjects. Theme 1. Intimate/private

Category	Number of references
Personal intimate	38
Sex	37
Too intimate	27
Illness	13
Intimate relationships	13
Relationship troubles	12
Bodily functions	9
Personal information	7
Money	4
Unsuitable for public location	4
Personal problem	4
Private conversation	4

Too much information	3
Absence from home	2
Mental illness	2
Unsuitable for entire network	2
Location	2
Grades	1
Drama	1
Embarrassing	1
Pregnancy	1
Abortion	1
Using real name	1

The first category in this theme is *personal intimate* (attribute). This category includes mentions of personal or private matters, intimate details and general intimate life.

(97) Too many details of your personal life are not something what I would like to read.
(98) Their personal life; details about their relationships, too explicit details about anything.. People usually don't care to hear about every single thing in someone's life.

As has been mentioned before, due to language differences the respondents do not seem to understand the difference between personal and private. Thus, depending on the context mentions of personal life were added to this category as well.

The second category in this theme is *sex* (semantic). This refers to mentions of sex, sex life and general sexual matters, if it is not justifiable to allocate the comment in another category (e.g. pornography).

(99) Please, please, please keep your sexual experiences in your closets or bedrooms where they belong! […]
(100) **sexual** or someone else things

It is difficult to determine whether or not these statements are based on experience, that is to say whether or not people do post about sex, or if it is merely considered universally inappropriate. However, this trend is quite similar to that of face-to-face communication.

The third category in this theme is *too intimate* (attribute). This includes statements that state that people should not post about too intimate or personal matters, that is to say a statement about the level of intimacy was a requirement for allocation to this category. If a respondent only stated people should not post about personal or intimate matters in general, it was not allocated into this category.

> (101) **Too personal stuff** or inappropriate things like sexlife... or homeadresses and bank account numbers etc.
> (102) Anything too personal subjects.

In (101) it is explained what is considered too personal, but in many cases like (102) it is not stated. Therefore from these responses it is difficult to determine where the line for too personal or intimate goes.

Other categories in this theme are *intimate relationships* (e.g. spouses, marriage etc. Semantic), *illness* (semantic), *relationship troubles* (semantic), *bodily functions* (semantic), *personal information* (address, backing information etc. Semantic), *personal problem* (semantic), *money* (semantic), *private conversation* (semantic), *unsuitable for public location* (attribute) and 11 other categories visible in table 22. It seems that based on these categories intimate relationships and matters connected with them are generally considered unsuitable for Facebook posts.

Theme 2. Negative behaviour

This theme consists of categories that are based on negative behaviour, e.g. aggressive, insulting, hateful etc. matters. Other minor behaviour that is also received as negative is included, such as complaining. In general, if the behaviour could be could be considered negative in general, it was added into this theme.

Table 23. Completely unsuitable subjects. Theme 2. Negative behaviour

Category	Number of references
Racist	28
Hateful/mean	22
Insulting	20
Fishing for attention	14

Offensive	14
Complaint	12
Argument	9
Fights	7
Provocative	7
Badmouthing	6
Sexist	5
Misinformation/lies	4
Bragging	2
Vague	2
Trolling	2
Explicit	1
Swearing	1
Sarcasm/cynicism	1
Threats	1
Celebrating death	1
Commanding/ordering	1

The first category in this theme is *racist* (attribute). Statements about racist conduct or stating that racism is unsuitable were allocated into this category.

> (103) […] And obviously racism and other discrimination is not okay.
> (104) I really do not care what others post about. That is anybody's own choice. Really offencive or violent stuff or **extremely racist** things are of course something I wouldn't like to see.

Every comment about racial discrimination was explicitly stated as "racist" or "racism". There were no implicit referrals to the subject, nor were there any elaborations. Thus, it can not be determined based on the responses what is considered racist and how the respondents actually see the subject.

The second category in this theme is *hateful/mean* (attribute). This includes direct mentions of hateful or mean posting, as well as referrals to hate.

> (105) Racist or **hateful** content
> (106) **I wish people refrained from making posts that bring forth anger or hatred towards other people.** For example, nationalism and racism can be dangerous.

Mentions of hate speech was also allocated into this category, if there was no mention of who it the target. Although hateful material seems quite universally inappropriate, it should be noted that only 22 respondents identified it as unsuitable. Although we can not make valid conclusions based on what is not found by open questions, we also can not determine if hateful material is generally considered inappropriate as the statements are so few.

The third category in this theme is *insulting* (attribute/semantic). This refers to statements about material that is insulting, as well as the act of insulting someone.

> (107) Anything **insulting to anyone** or a purposeful ill-explained and provocative stuff.
> (108) Insults and stuff. I feel that area is immature.

This category is differentiated from *offensive* (attribute) as these are not completely synonymous and different terms were used when discussing these matters. Other categories in this theme are *fishing for attention* (semantic), *complaining* (semantic), *argument* (semantic), *provocative* (attribute), *fights* (semantic), *sexist* (attribute), *misinformation/lies* (semantic), *badmouthing* (semantic), *bragging* (semantic), *trolling* (semantic), *vague* (attribute) and 6 other categories visible in table 23. It seems derogatory behaviour and act that elicit negative responses are not generally accepted.

Theme 3. Harmful/illegal

This theme includes categories of subjects that are considered harmful for someone or illegal. This includes material that is harmful for the poster, as well as material that is harmful for someone else.

Table 24. Completely unsuitable subjects. Theme 3. Harmful/illegal

Category	Number of references
Illegal	22
Inappropriate pictures	11
Harmful	9
Harmful pictures	7
Harmful for others	6
Violence	4

Disgusting	2
Killing	1
Harmful for employment	1
Paedophilia	1
Drugs	1

The first and largest category in this theme is *illegal* (attribute). This category includes explicit statements about illegal matters. Other categories in this theme are *inappropriate pictures* (e.g. pornography. Semantic), *harmful* (attribute), *harmful pictures* (semantic), *harmful for others* (explicitly stated that harm is caused for others. Attribute), *violence* (semantic), *disgusting* (attribute), *drugs* (semantic), *paedophilia* (semantic), *killing* (semantic) and *harmful for employment* (attribute). Other than *illegal*, the categories are very small and thus conclusions are difficult. It could be considered possible that these matters are considered self-evident and thus are not explicitly stated as much.

Theme 4. Others

This theme consists of categories that are based on other people. That is to say, posting about other people and other people's matters. Although in some cases these could be considered relationships of the person, the decision was made to include those categories into this theme, as the focus is not on the relationship itself.

Table 25. Completely unsuitable subjects. Theme 4. Others

Category	Number of references
Other people's matters	45
Children	13
Children (details/pictures)	8
Gossip	7
Pictures of others	5
Excessive babies	4
Family	4
Secrets of others	3
Illness of others	1

Baby pictures	1

The first category in this theme is *other people's matters* (semantic). This includes direct statements about posting about other people or their lives

> (109) Anything that is someone else's private thing and you don't have permission to post it. Example private argument or lovers fight.
> (110) Generally people should be careful about posting things about OTHER PEOPLE without their consent, e.g. posting a picture of a person or a status update with someone's name on it (whether the inormation is sensitive or not).

It is evident in these responses that one's own matters is considered one's own and that person should have control over posting about it. As was seen before, posting about one's own life is popular and it is possible that there is a general norm to post about oneself, but not about others.

Other categories in this theme are *children* (semantic), *children (details/pictures)* (semantic), *gossip* (semantic), *pictures of others* (semantic), *family* (semantic), *excessive babies* (semantic), *secrets of others* (semantic), *baby pictures* (semantic) and *illness of others* (semantic). These categories are quite small, but there seems to be a trend for disapproving of posts about children. This is due to irritation towards such matters, as many respondents stated they are annoyed by baby pictures, as well as concern for the security and privacy of the children.

Theme 5. Beliefs/values

This theme consists of categories that deal with values or beliefs. People's attitudes towards these matters is defined by the values they consider their own. The categories included in this theme are *politics* (semantic), *religion* (semantic), *extreme politics* (semantic), *extremist* (attribute), *atheism* (semantic), *extreme personal views* (semantic) and *propaganda* (semantic). All of these categories are small, which could indicate that these matters are generally considered suitable for posting and discussion on Facebook, as many of the same subjects are listed as popular topics. In addition, as some of the subjects are listed as avoided subjects, it can be argued that the subject has not merely been forgotten and thus not stated here (e.g. politics).

Table 26. Completely unsuitable subjects. Theme 5. Beliefs/values

Category	Number of references
Politics	7
Religion	6
Extreme politics	5
Extreme personal views	1
Extremist	1
Propaganda	1
Atheism	1

Theme 6. Other

The last theme concerning unsuitable subjects is Other. This theme consist of categories that did not fit other themes and could not form a new theme. Thus the variety of categories is vast. It should be noted that most of the categories are very small, even only including one item. This is again due to specific statements made by individual respondents, which could not be allocated into pre-existing categories.

Table 27. Completely unsuitable subjects. Theme 6. Other

Category	Number of references
Mundane	44
Work	20
Drunk	9
Death	6
Too Negative	4
Bad quality	3
Negative	3
Excessive amount	3
Spam	2
Games (FB)	1
Hashtags	1
Pets	1
Excrement	1
Extremes	1
Stereotypes	1

Sports	1
Too positive	1
Pictures	1
"Stupid"	1
Interesting/uninteresting for others?	1
Advertisement	1
Against own opinion	1
Boring	1
War	1
Workout glorification	1
Unsuitable (not defined)	1
None	*24*
None (conditional)	*5*
Can't say/no comment	*5*

The largest category in this theme is *mundane* (attribute). Mundane refers to the same kind of meaningless everyday matters as was shown before.

> (111) […] I sometimes also feel that Facebook posts should have more content than just an ordinary mention about "going to gym" or alike. Of course, there's nothing ethically wrong about posting about your daily activities but it's so awkward to read those.
> (112) I hate people who posts every single thing about their day. "Should I go to sleep?" "Huh, it was hard gym today." "Good feeling after 1512931283 + 12391km running" etc...
> I think you know why.

As was mentioned before when discussing mundane matters, the term is not objective as such, as something may be meaningful for one and mundane for someone else. It seems that people want Facebook to be entertaining and thus the reactions towards matters that are considered mundane or boring are so strong.

The second category in this theme is *work* (semantic).

> (113) […] People should also be careful when they talk about their job on Facebook. I heard that some people have lost their job because they complained too harshly about their job on Facebook or alike. […]
> (114) Maybe work stuff.

It is not stated that people would not want to hear about other people's work, but as in (113) it is for the posters own good to abstain from posting about his/her work. Thus it

is not against the norms of the environment, but against the norms of the workplace to post about work.

Other categories that could not be listed in other themes are *drunk* (posting while drunk or about alcohol use. Semantic/attribute), *death* (semantic), *too negative* (attribute), *negative* (attribute), *excessive amount* (attribute), *bad quality* (attribute), *spam* (semantic) and 17 other categories that included only one item. In addition, 24 respondents stated that people can and should post about anything they like. Five other respondents stated people can post about anything, but at the same time run a risk of ruining their reputation or suffering from other negative consequences. Five respondents said they do not comment or can not say. The list of subjects considered unsuitable overall is quite diverse, which indicates people project their own values onto what should be posted in their opinion.

There is a multitude of different subjects that are listed as not suitable for Facebook. Some are more general and popular opinions, others are singular opinions of specific individuals. However, it can be seen that not everything is considered appropriate for Facebook and thus one should be aware of what one posts. No single subject was generally considered more inappropriate than others, although intimate subjects were common. It seems that there is no universal consensus on subjects that should not be posted about, but the suitability is more based on individual values and attitudes. The reactions to posts one considers unsuitable are presented in the following sections.

4.7. Reactions to unsuitable subjects

The respondents were asked "If someone posts on a subject you think is inappropriate, how do you react?". There were 376 answers to this question, one of which contained no useful information. The aim of this question was to determine how people react to the before mentioned unsuitable subjects, if they react at all. There were various answers to this question, but most answers were short.

(115) Just ignore the subject or comment it with an argument.
(116) "...what an idiot.." and move on. And hope that darwinism takes its natural course...
(117) I don't read it.
(118) First, I take it off if it has been posted on my wall. If it's not on my wall, and the person is very close to me, I might contact her/him and ask kindly to take it off. Otherwise, I might either report to FB staff or leave it to others.

Theme 1. Action

This theme consists of categories that are based on action. That is to say, using the tools of Facebook or relying on other immediate action to change the visibility of the post or the user.

Table 28. Reactions to unsuitable subjects. Theme 1. Action

Category	Number of references
Hide post	21
Hide user (strong violation)	19
Hide user	18
Unfriend (strong violation)	17
Report post	12
Unfriend	12
Hide post (strong violation)	7
Report post (break rules)	7
Unfriend (weak relation)	5
Log out	1
Report post (conditional)	1
Report post (strong violation)	1
Report post (weak relation)	1
Unfriend (depends on relation)	1
Hide post (weak violation)	1
Legal action (strong violation)	1

The first category in this theme is *hide post* (semantic). This category consists of statements that claim that the respondent hides the particular post from their news feed so that they do not have to see it. Hiding a post has no effect on anyone else on Facebook. This action does not hide other posts from the poster and the information is in no way conveyed to the poster.

(119) i might hide the posts
(120) *I might hide the story* or delete that person from my friends.

As can be seen from the answers, the respondents are slightly tentative in terms of hiding the post.

The second category in this theme is *hide user (strong violation)* (semantic). This action hides the user from one's newsfeed and thus one can not see posts made by that user, unless one does not visit the user's profile page to see them. This category consists only of answers that include the requirement for the violation to be strong.

(121) I don't react, **unless it's racist or really unpolite in other ways I might make a mark about it. If it continues, I'll take the person off the feed** or remove from friends (only if the person is an asshole).
(122) I ignore that. Or **if such posts repeat on a regular basis, I will simply hide that person from my wall.**

If specific subjects were mentioned or characterised or if the posting is given a discriminating condition, it was added into this category. It was noticed that some of the respondents wrote about the wall, although the context clearly shows they mean the newsfeed (e.g. one can not hide a user from their wall). This may be due to the newsfeed being a more recent addition to the Facebook tools and with it's emergence it has replaced the wall as a general communication tool. As the wall still exists, newer users may not know the difference between the wall and the newsfeed.

The third category in this theme is *unfriend (strong violation)* (semantic). Unfriending removes the user from one's friend list and removes rights received through friending. The removed person does not receive a notification, but can notice the action in other ways. Similar to the previous category, only answers that include the requirement for the violation to be strong are included in this category.

(123) Depends entirely on just how inappropriate it is. Mildest cases I just ignore, and after that it's either hide the post, hide the person from my feed, or **remove the person from my friend list with a note as to why.** ...
(124) […] If it's mild, I might just think to myself "that's not okay" and move on, but if it's something really bad, I might even tell the poster so **or unfriend them.**

It can be seen from these answers that there is a scale of actions depending on the violation. Unfriending is most often considered the most drastic procedure. Thus it is usually used as a last resort.

Other categories in this theme are *hide user* (no conditions included. Semantic), *unfriend* (no conditions included. Semantic), *report post* (report as inappropriate by using Facebook tool. Semantic), *report post (breaks rules)* (breaks the rules of Facebook. Semantic), *hide post (strong violation)* (semantic), *unfriend (weak relation)* (semantic), *hide post (weak violation)* (semantic), *legal action (strong violation)* (semantic), *report post (conditional)* (depending on content of post. Semantic), *report post (strong violation)* (semantic), *unfriend (depends on relation)* (semantic), *log off* (semantic) and *report post (weak relation)* (semantic). All of the categories excluding *legal action (strong violation)* and *log off* are based on hiding the post, hiding the user, unfriending and reporting to Facebook, with the difference based on the severity of the violation and the relation to the poster. It is evident that users apply the tools of Facebook to solve problems posed by subjects perceived as inappropriate.

Theme 2. Communication

This theme consists of categories that can be described as communication. Communication with the poster as well as other individuals are included in this theme.

Table 29. Reaction to unsuitable subjects. Theme 2. Communication

Category	Number of references
Confrontation	25
Discussion with others	20
Comment post	20
Confrontation (conditional)	15
Comment post (conditional)	14
Confrontation (strong relation)	10
Request removal of post	6
Confrontation (pm)	5
Request removal of post (strong relation)	1
Request removal of post (if involved)	1
Contact poster (conditional)	1
Contact subject of post	1

The first category in this theme is *confrontation* (semantic). The confrontation can occur on the comment section, privately or through other routes. The difference with the

category *comment post* is the direct statement of telling the poster that the post is inappropriate, thus confronting them about the appropriateness of the post.

> (125) I might just reply that I don't feel that subject belongs there, and why.
> (126) Just ignore the subject or **comment it with an argument.**
> (137) **I might comment on it, saying that it's inappropriate,** flag it for Facebook or just ignore it. If one of my close friends did something like that I might send him/her a private message about it.

Although the category is not very large, it is the largest of the communication categories. The social situation is complex, but the threshold for confronting someone on their Facebook behaviour does not seem extremely high.

The second category in this theme is *comment post* (semantic). Using the comment tool one can comment directly on the post. The comment is visible to the same people that can see the post.

> (128) I might comment something on that post, propably no specific reaction.
> (129) Occasionally I comment on the issue, if the person is someone I wouldn't mind getting into argument with. […]
> (130) […] Sometimes I comment something, tell them to think if it's really a good idea to share this or something.

Usually the content of the comment is not stated in the answers. It should be noted that as comments are public, the commenter wants others to see the comment as well, or does not perceive the public nature of the comments.

The third category in this theme is *discussion with others* (semantic). As respondents stated they discuss the inappropriateness of the post with people other than the poster, the statement was included in this category. The media of discussion is not relevant.

> (131) Well of course I form an opinion about it and might curse about it to my friends, but that is about it. Then I try to forget it.
> (132) **Raise my eyebrows and moan about it to my friends (face to face, not online, hah!).** If it's something I don't want to pop on my newsfeed again, I hide it.

These respondents do not confront the poster and do not communicate their disapproval to them in any way. Instead they discuss the matter with someone else, usually in a disapproving tone.

Other categories in this theme are *confrontation (conditional)* (semantic), *comment post (conditional)* (semantic), *confrontation (strong relation)* (semantic), *request removal of post* (request made to poster. Semantic), *confrontation (private message)* (semantic), *contact poster (conditional)* (semantic), *request removal of post (if involved)* (semantic), *request removal of post (strong relation)* (semantic) and *contact subject of post* (the person the post talks about. Semantic). The categories are based on commenting the post, confronting the poster, requesting removal of the post and discussing the topic, with variations to the conditions of the actions. As with the previous theme, the scale of actions is quite limited but the conditions by which to determine the course of action varies.

Theme 3. Invisible/inner reactions

This theme consists of categories that are characterised as reactions that are not visible to other people. This includes ignoring the post, having feelings without acting upon them and other emotional and inner reactions. These reactions are not considered actions.

Table 30. Reactions to unsuitable subjects. Theme 3. Invisible/inner reactions

Category	Number of references
Ignore	184
Inner reaction	45
Irritation	19
Ignore (conditional)	14
Lose respect	9
Ignore (if uninvolved)	8
Ignore (weak relation)	7
Amusement	5
Feel pity	4
Follow conversation	2
Ignore (strong relation)	1
Avoid commenting	1
Feel shame	1
Disapproval (conditional)	1

The first and by far the largest category in this group and within the entire question is *ignore* (semantic). Almost half of the respondents reported they do not act on inappropriate posts and choose to ignore them.

> (133) **I usually ignore it** or politely let them know that the subject might not be appropriate for Facebook
> (134) I don't read it.
> (135) I ignore it
> (136) I don't really react. I just keep on reading. I might shrug.

The category could have also been named 'inaction', but as the term 'ignore' was used to such a large extent, it was taken as the name of the category. Cases where the respondent see the post but chose to do nothing are the basic cases included in this category. It seems that as this is by far the most common reaction to inappropriate subjects, there is not much feedback given on unsuitable behaviour. Thus, if there are common norms on Facebook, they are not usually explicitly stated even in cases of violation.

The second category in this theme is *inner reaction* (semantic). This refers to one having feelings, feeling emotions or thinking something to themselves. As there are more precise categories that can be considered emotions and other inner reactions, they are separated by the precision of the feeling. The answers included in this theme are not suitable for the other named feelings or reactions, as they are too general or vague.

> (137) I probably think "...."
> (138) I only react on my mind, not on Facebook for example
> (139) I just thing that OOOK right.

The reactions can in some cases be described in more precise terms, but it is difficult to determine what exactly is the feeling or thought the respondent means. For example, (137) could be described as 'dumbfounded' or 'perplexed', but there is no clear way of defining what the respondent means. Much meaning can not be determined from the content of the answers as the respondents may have had a more precise idea in mind, but did not consider necessary to spell out their thought in detail. Thus, we can not determine meaning from what is missing. However, these responses can be thought as similar to those of *ignore*, as there is no action involved.

The third category in this theme is *irritation* (semantic). This category includes statements that claim that the respondent gets irritated when seeing posts about inappropriate subjects or answers where it is implicitly evident. The items in this category do not require any kind of action, but statements about performing actions based on irritation are also considered articles of irritation.

(140) Hide everything **by the idiot** and/or flag it
(141) **I get annoyed** and lose some respect for them
(142) I get irritated but usually don't say/write anything out loud.

It is clear in (140) that the respondent is irritated by inappropriate subjects, although he/she does not explicitly state it. The other parts of the response are included in categories *hide user* and *report post*. However, as with *inner reaction*, most answers did not include any kind of action and thus there respondents did not act or show their discontent to anyone. The difference with *ignore* is that there is a negative emotional response. Still, norm violation is not communicated in any way.

Other categories in this theme are *ignore (conditional)* (semantic)*, lose respect* (semantic)*, ignore (if uninvolved)* (semantic)*, ignore (weak relation)* (semantic), *amusement* (semantic)*, feel pity* (semantic)*, follow conversation* (no visible action. Semantic), *avoid commenting* (semantic)*, feel shame* (semantic)*, disapproval (conditional)* (semantic) and *ignore (strong relation)* (semantic). In *ignore (conditional)* there are various different conditions included, which could not be adequately determined as categories of their own. If new categories would have been created based on the conditions, there would be as many categories as there are answers. As can be seen, most of the reactions are negative, with the exception of *amusement*, where respondents stated they felt humoured by inappropriate subjects and their posters. Although one would not react visibly or aggressively on norm violations, the reaction can still be quite negative.

Theme 4. Other

The last theme in regards to this question includes categories that could not adequately be place in other themes. There are only three categories in this theme and they are all very minimal in size. The largest category is *no experience* (semantic). This category

includes statements about respondents not witnessing any such behaviour and thus were unable to give any information on their reactions in such cases. The two other cases are *doesn't know* (semantic), where the respondent stated he/she doesn't know how he/she would react, and *depends on relation* (semantic), where the respondent stated it depends on the relation to the poster, but did not elaborate on any examples. As these categories are very small, one might argue that there are very few people using Facebook that have not encountered inappropriate subjects being posted about. However, it is not evident in the other responses whether or not they are actual reactions that have taken place, or hypothesised reactions based on opinion. Thus, such claims can not be made reliably. It does, however, give us a hint in that direction and possibly should be studied further in other studies.

Table 31. Reactions to unsuitable subjects. Theme 4. Other

Category	Number of references
No experience	6
Doesn't know	1
Depends on relation	1

As can be seen from the categories, ignoring unsuitable posts is the most common course of action. Facebook tools are also used and the poster is sometimes confronted, but ignoring posts is by far the most common reaction. That is to say, conflicts are avoided instead of acted upon, which may have an effect on the generally open atmosphere on Facebook. If someone posts about an unsuitable subject, they are rarely informed of the unsuitability and thus will not change their behaviour.

4.8. Reactions to unsuitable style

The respondents were asked "If someone posts in a way you think is inappropriate, how do you react?". There were 362 answers to this question, 2 of which contained no usable information. A large portion of respondents answered "same as above" or similar, showing that they do not see a difference between a subject and how one posts about it, or see no need to react differently to them.

(143) Same as above.
(144) I just ignore it.
(145) The same as above. Or in both cases might delete them from my friendlist, if they're not really close friends with me
(146) Umm... I don't know how this would differ from the previous one.

It seems that the distinction should have been made more clear in order to acquire the aimed-for data. In this case the responses are analysed also in comparison with the previous question where it is relevant. Cases of "same as above" and similar are categorised similarly to the answer to the previous question.

Theme 1. Action

Similarly to the previous question, this theme consists of statements that are based on action. For example, using Facebook tools to change friend status or visibility of posts.

Table 32. Reactions to unsuitable style. Theme 1. Action

Category	Number of references
Unfriend (strong violation)	22
Hide post	20
Hide user	18
Hide user (strong violation)	17
Unfriend	13
Report post	6
Report post (break rules)	5
Unfriend (weak relation)	5
Report post (conditional)	5
Hide post (strong violation)	3
Unfriend (depends on relation)	1
Revenge	1
Log out	1
Report post (weak relation)	1

The first category in this theme is *unfriend (strong violation)* (semantic). This action is performed on the condition that the violation is strong, of large calibre or persistent.

(147) If it's first time and nothing too serious, I usually ignore and let it be. **If it's continuous or something really inappropriate, I remove the person from my friends** or hide his/her posts from my newsfeed, depending on the nature of the posts and on how close the person is to me.
(148) I don't read further, comments and stuff. **I may unfriend him or her, if it is very inappropriate or if it happens often.**

There were 5 more people who stated they would unfriend a person based on the way of posting than on the subject. However, the difference is very small and thus no valid conclusions can be made based on the difference.

The next two categories in this theme are *hide post* (semantic) and *hide user* (semantic). In these categories no other conditions are given for the action than the inappropriate way of posting.

(149) i might hide the posts
(150) **Hide them from my newsfeed** and/or unfriend.

The amount of respondents saying they would hide the user or post is almost identical to the previous question. These respondents do no seem to view a difference between the two cases.

Other categories in this theme are *hide user (strong violation)* (semantic), *unfriend* (semantic), *report post* (semantic), *report post (breaks rules)* (semantic), *report post (conditional)* (semantic), *unfriend (weak relation)* (semantic), *hide post (strong violation)* (semantic), *report post (weak relation)* (semantic), *log off* (semantic), *unfriend (depends on relation)* (semantic) and *revenge* (semantic). The categories are very similar to those of the previous question. One addition is *revenge*, which is interesting as a case.

(151) Again I get mad and try to find a subtle way to take my revenge. For instance, once one fb friend of mine posted a picture where there was an overweight person in an x-ray picture and underneath it a text where it said that overweight people don't have big bones and it's no excuse. This fb friend posts this kind of stuff all the time and it's really annoying. So, I noticed that this "big bones" picture was taken from the fb page of fitness girls or something like that. I went there to search for material for my revenge (which would probably go unnoticed in the end). I found a picture of a very flexible girl who was wearing pointe shoes. There were a million of admiring comments and likes but I laughed my head off because as an old ballet dancer I immediately noticed that she had been unable to tie her shoe laces correctly. She would have broken her ankles if she had tried to dance with those pointe shoes. Moreover, her feet were stiff and I could see that she has never trained her feet. So I posted this on my own wall with mean comments.

Although the case does not bring much information to this study, the specific details in this case are interesting, as the respondents has the need to "get even" when someone posts about something in a way he/she considers inappropriate. It should be noted that the respondent stated he/she wants to post about positive things in general, but the answers given to the questionnaire were very negatively loaded and even aggressive.

Theme 2. Communication

This theme consists of cases of communicating with another person about the post. It may be the original poster or some other person relevant or irrelevant to the post. The categories are similar to those of the previous question.

Table 33. Reactions to unsuitable style. Theme 2. Communication

Category	Number of references
Comment post	26
Confrontation (conditional)	23
Confrontation	22
Discuss with others	18
Confrontation (strong relation	14
Confrontation (pm)	9
Comment post (conditional)	6
Request removal of post	5
Discussion	3
Confrontation (humour)	2
Request removal of post (strong relation)	1
Like	1

The first category in this theme is *comment post* (semantic). This includes cases where the respondent states he/she uses the comment function to post a comment attached to the original post, but it is not explicitly stated that the aim is to confront the poster.

> (152) I might comment on the post, but I don't really know what this question is going for.
> (153) I might make a comment. Sometimes some posts seem to be kinda racist, for example.

As can be seen in (152), the respondent does not understand the difference to the previous question. Such cases are quite common in terms of the reactions and thus they can not be adequately compared.

The next two categories in this theme are *confrontation (conditional)* (semantic) and *confrontation* (semantic). The respondents state they confront the poster about the inappropriate nature of the post.

> (154) Usually make a mental note of the idiot in question and just ignore the matter. **If repeated I might mention it personally to the poster,** or just remove the post/poster from my facebook view.
> (155) If it doesn't concern me I feel that I can't do anything about it. **If it would**, I'd probably remove it first and **then tell the one who posted it that it was inappropriate**.
> (156) I attack verbally

The conditions in *confrontation (conditional)* are too varied and thus individual categories are not made based on them. The amount of cases in these categories are slightly different to those of the previous question, but as the difference is small, no conclusions can be made. It may be that the respondents merely decided to emphasise different approaches on the different questions.

Other categories in this theme are *discussion with others* (semantic), *confrontation (strong relation)* (semantic), *confrontation (private message)* (semantic), *comment post (conditional)* (semantic), *request removal of post* (semantic), *discussion* (with the poster. Semantic), *confrontation (humour)* (semantic), *request removal of post (conditional)* (semantic) and *like* (using the like-function. Semantic). All the other categories are similar to the previous question, except for *like*. I presume that the respondent either wants to act sarcastically, or follow the conversation connected to the post, as liking a post enables one to receive notifications on comments. The category is allocated into this theme as it is visible to others and communicated meaning.

Theme 3. Invisible/inner reaction

This theme consists of reactions that are not visible to others. Those include actions that have no effect on anyone else, as well as emotional responses.

Table 34. Reactions to unsuitable style. Theme 3. Invisible/inner reaction

Category	Number of references
Ignore	169
Inner reaction	43
Irritation	17
Ignore (conditional)	14
Amusement	7
Ignore (weak relation)	7
Ignore (if uninvolved)	6
Lose respect	6
Follow conversation	2
Attempt to understand	1
Feel pity	1

The first and clearly largest category in this theme is *ignore* (semantic). This category includes cases where the respondent acknowledges the inappropriate way of posting, but does nothing about it.

> (157) Not caring
> (158) Comment and/or unsubscribe. **Mostly I just ignore.**

Disregarding inappropriate posts seems to be the general norm also in the case of the way of posting about a subject. Inaction is common.

The second category in this theme is *inner reaction* (semantic). This refers to the respondent stating he/she has a inner emotional reaction or thought, but does not show it in any way.

> (159) Usually I don't care. I'm not that active in facebook. **Perhaps I reprehend that just in my mind.**
> (160) **I cringe and look away.** If it's something that really annoys or disturbs me, I block further posts from that person.

The answer was allocated into this category if it could not be identified as a specific inner reaction of which a category existed or is eligible for creation.

The third category in this theme is *irritation* (semantic). This refers to people getting angry or irate because of the post.

> (161) *I get irritated, agitated* and question his, her reasons.
> (162) *I get annoyed* and lose some respect for them

Irritation is a very natural reaction to posts written in a way one disapproves of. It should be noted that many respondents who stated they get irritated by the way of posting stated it by referring to the previous question. That is to say, they get irritated by inappropriate subjects as well as styles.

Other categories in this theme are *ignore (conditional)* (semantic), *amusement* (semantic), *ignore (weak relation)* (semantic), *ignore (if uninvolved)* (semantic), *lose respect* (semantic), *follow conversation* (semantic), *attempt to understand* (semantic) and *feel pity* (semantic). Mostly these categories seem to be a form of ignoring or considering the poster to be inferior to oneself. It seems that people consider themselves better than others more or less.

Theme 4. Other

This theme consists of categories that could not be allocated in other themes. The categories are *no experience, doesn't know, irrelevant answer, react (unspecified)* and *depends on relation*. None of these answers contained information on how the respondent would act. The answers categorised as irrelevant contained no information relevant to this question.

> (163) the way someone speaks about a topic isn't that important, the topics are.
> (164) If, if..
> (165) I don't think any posts are inappropriate except maybe lies about other people

As can be seen, there is no mention of how the respondent would react and thus the answers are irrelevant to this question. In the other categories, the reaction is not specified in any way and thus can not be allocated into other categories.

Table 35. Reactions to unsuitable style. Theme 4. Other

Category	Number of references
No experience	6
Doesn't know	4
Irrelevant answer	3
Depends on relation	1
React (unspecified)	1

In cases where respondents do not answer the question or speak of other matters, it is difficult to determine a proper category for the response. It is also quite interesting how people fail to give a definite answer, as often the matters are discussed in previous questions. However, the lack of information does not permit analysis of the respondents' train of thought.

5. DISCUSSION

When given the opportunity to freely express their opinions on appropriate and inappropriate subjects on Facebook, the respondents gave an extensive amount of different answers which are difficult to generalise into conveyable form. However, there are some reoccurring themes and subjects that can be seen as common, as well as some individual interesting cases. As stated before, the number of categories could have been reduced by assimilating smaller categories together, but doing so would have resulted in the loss of information. Although the questionnaire concerns the respondents' own attitudes, more common attitudes can be generalised and some conclusions can be made from them. Clearly popular categories can be defined as injunctive norms and large categories considering action can be defined as descriptive norms, although tentatively as reported and measured activities may differ from each other (Junco 2013:626, Acquisti and Gross 2006: 48). In this section I wish to discuss the findings and what meaning can be derived from them.

It is clear that the most common and popular subject to post about on Facebook is the poster themself. Although it is self-evident that everything one posts about has something to do with the poster, be it directly about the poster or something to do with his/her interests, matters that are specifically about the poster are very common. People

seem to be interested in letting others know what is happening in their lives, be it daily matters or significant events. As Facebook is an easy outlet for communicating with a large audience, it is economical to publish one's life events on Facebook, instead of for example talking about the same matters with numerous different people. Indirect self-presentation is also very common, as was also noted by Yang and Brown (2012: 405), as posting about one's interests, music etc. is common among the respondents. However, it should be noted that directly posting about oneself was more common among the respondents than any indirect subject. It seems that people are interested in showing others what is happening in their lives, and are not as shy about it as presumed by Yang and Brown. Self-disclosure is an inherent part of Facebook, be it a goal in itself (Acquisti and Gross 2006: 54) or for the benefit of personal relationships (Mazer et al. 2007: 12-15) and staying connected (Donath 2007: 231-232) People post about themselves and their lives a great deal.

In addition to the subjects being much about the self, the mood of the posts was referred to often. Funny, interesting and positive subjects were preferred, keeping the general atmosphere quite positive. Negative, grave or serious subjects were few, showing that the general theme for posting is more positive and light that serious. Although there were some respondents who stated they post about e.g. politics or social issues, they were the minority. This may be due to the desired effects of capitalization (Choi and Toma 2014: 533, 539), in addition to the possible norm for keeping Facebook positive. As social sharing of positive experiences increase the positive affect and posting about negative experiences hinders coping, the general mood of Facebook may have evolved into a more positive one. This may be the reason why people seem to post more about matters they find fun and nice, instead of serious and important matters.

Although there are categories that are significantly more popular than others, it should be noted that there are 91 categories based on the posted subjects alone. Many subjects were mentioned only once, but a low number of mentions does not directly indicate a low amount of posting about the particular subject. As the question was open ended, there is a good possibility the respondents did not mention all the subjects they post about. Excluding a subject from the response is not necessarily a conscious decision. However, the ones clearly popular can be defined as more popular, but less popular subjects can not be directly identified as insignificant. As was stated at the beginning of

the analysis chapter, a conscious decision was made to create new categories for responses that could not be reliably allocated into pre-existing categories, thus resulting in a larger number of overall categories. This was done to ensure the integrity of the categories. All of the categories should be considered valid, although some are statistically less significant.

What people consider inappropriate to post about or do not want to discuss in the semi-public environment of Facebook is quite an interesting question. What is interesting is that as posting about oneself was the most popular subject, posting about one's private matters was the most avoided subject. That is to say, people want to post about themselves, but what is posted seems to be very limited. As was noted before, many respondents did not seem to comprehend the difference between personal and private, which in some cases resulted in quite contradictory claims, as sometimes respondents claimed they post about themselves, but not about personal matters. In these cases it was interpreted they mean private. In addition, what is considered private and to what extent was very rarely indicated, hindering the possibility to accurately determine what exactly is avoided, although e.g. intimate relationships were quite often mentioned. What can be determined from this however, is that people post about themselves a great deal, but are quite specific on the matters they include in the posts. That is to say, people are conscious about what they post about, take their imagined audience (boyd 2006) into consideration and are possibly aware of the invisible audiences (boyd 2011: 49) present on Facebook. As the context is also difficult to determine (boyd 2011:50-52), people may opt to post less information instead of more information in order to avoid possible awkward situations. In addition to private matters, mundane matters were very often mentioned as avoided subjects. This is a contradiction to the findings by Choi and Toma (2014: 538), according to which mundane posts were preferred instead of intensively positive ones. There seems to be a balance between posting about too private or serious matters and posting about mundane and insignificant matters, as both of the extremes are often avoided.

As with the popular subjects, there are a few categories that are significantly larger than others, but in addition there are also a large number of other smaller categories that are avoided. There are in sum 107 categories in the avoided subject, 39 of which are based on the self. That is to say, about 36% of the avoided subjects are subjects that are about

the poster themself. Many of the categories had only one mention, but they are still separate from the other categories. As many of the categories were more general, as is with *private* or *other people's matters*, the mass of topics that are avoided is in reality larger than is visible here. It should also be noted that the reported subjects are quite diverse, including personal matters and opinions, aggressive and mean posting, political controversy and seeking attention. In addition, as one individual posts about a matter in their life, another may consider it mundane and thus this difference in interpretation may affect the results. There is a diverse group of subjects people want to avoid, although different people avoid different matters.

As was mentioned before in the relevant section, the question "Are there subjects you do not want to post about, but other people can post about? What are those and why" posed a problem, as it seemed that several of the respondents did not properly understand the question and thus may have given an invalid answer. This made it essential to also question the cases where comprehension was not explicitly shown. Therefore it is difficult to determine whether or not the results from this question are valid. However, with this in mind the results should still be discussed.

The subjects that are considered suitable for others, but the respondents avoid themselves are very similar to those they avoid in general. The largest difference between the two groups is volume, as the amount of respondents who consider topics suitable for others is much smaller than the amount of respondents who only state the subjects are avoided. However, it should be noted that many respondents for example stated that others may freely post about their private matters or intimate relationships, which could indicate that the reason for people to avoid particular subjects is not the idea that they are considered inappropriate in general, but that people believe posting about the subjects would be harmful for them personally in some way. That is to say, it would not be a general norm, but merely self-preservation. What is interesting as well is that the number of respondents who stated that they do not want to post about politics and religion is almost identical to the number of respondents who stated it is suitable for others to post about them. This may hint again about the general idea of such subjects being appropriate, but people do not want to state their own position on the matters. Self-restriction seems to be stronger than the disapproval of the subjects as such.

From what people consider inappropriate in general, we can best determine general norms of interaction on Facebook. There were various subjects mentioned but none was particularly salient in sample size. Intimate matters, other people's matters, racist and otherwise hateful material was considered inappropriate, in addition to the clear annoyance with mundane posting. In general, posting publicly about private matters, being hostile or acting in a generally negative way was considered inappropriate. This finding is in accordance with the study of McLauglin and Vitak (2012: 308). A correlation was not found with the statement that the most common norm violation is too many posts or too emotional posts (ibid: 307-308), but as the question was about subjects and not specifically behaviour, the respondents may not have thought about the matter in the same terms as in the previous study. In addition, there seems to be a hint in the direction that people should have the right to choose themselves what is posted about them, as posting about others was mentioned relatively often. There are no surprises in terms of the subjects that are considered unsuitable for Facebook.

As it can be interpreted that many of the respondents did not conceive a difference between the question of posting about a subject and posting in a way about a subject, in addition to the number of references to different reactions being quite similar when comparing the reactions to unsuitable subjects and unsuitable style, the reactions to unsuitable subjects and styles will be discussed together. In relation to the previous parts of the study, the reactions to inappropriate posting were much more consistent. That is to say, there was less deviation between the forms of reactions than there were with e.g. avoided subjects or unsuitable subjects. The pattern of reactions was more clear.

In the case of reactions, they can reliably be discussed based on the theme, as the allocation are quite definite in this case. The three general reactions given by the respondents were based on doing something directly about the post, contacting and communicating with someone about the post, or reacting in a way that is not visible to anyone. In case of action, the respondents usually either hid the post from their feed, hid the user completely, or unfriended the user in case of strong violations. These actions show that the respondents do not wish to be in contact with individuals that post content they do not approve of. However, it was noted that unfriending was more popular in case of strong violations, whereas lighter violations resulted in hiding the post or user. This is in accordance with the statement by McLauglin and Vitak (2012: 309). In terms

of communication, confronting the poster or commenting the post were very popular reactions. It can be argued that norm violations thus result in communicative approaches as well, instead of only changing the visibility or status of the contact. It is also interesting to note that some respondents did not communicate in any way with the original poster, but discussed the matter with their other acquaintances. This conduct enhances the idea that Facebook is kept impersonal to a degree.

By far the most common reaction to inappropriate posts is ignoring the post. Almost half of the respondents stated they ignore inappropriate posts, which indicates that people do not care as much about what other people post about. This may also be a result from trying to avoid conflict, as confrontation on Facebook is visible for other users as well. Still, what can be deduced is that not reacting to norm violations is a norm in itself as well. Instead of rigorously trying to uphold a standard, people tend to leave conflicts alone and carry on with their own lives. Thus violating norms on Facebook may not result in any kind of reaction at all.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The aim for this study was to determine what subjects do people post about on Facebook, what subjects they avoid, what they consider unsuitable in general and how they react to violations to their perceived norms. An online questionnaire was performed with a wide array of open ended questions and the responses were categorised and analysed. The categories were allocated into themes in order to simplify reporting of the findings. Some categories were greatly more salient than others, but in general the mass of categories was very diverse.

The most common subjects for posting were the poster themself, funny subjects, and various smaller groups of subjects relevant to the poster. Private and mundane matters were avoided, which leads to the conclusion that there is a general medium of relevance and privacy which is considered suitable for Facebook. This medium is not perceived as rigidly in terms of other people posting. Generally intimate posts, hostile posts and mundane posts received the most disapproval when performed by others. In accordance with previous research, popular reactions to violations was reported to result in hiding the post, hiding the user or unfriending the user in cases of strong violations. However,

the most common reaction to violations was indeed inaction or ignoring the post, which is a different result from previous research. However, this may also be due to the different data and method of analysis. In general, the findings are in accordance with previous research.

What is interesting to find is that although Facebook is about the users presenting themselves and posting material about themselves, there seems to be some norms as to what is appropriate to post about. The respondents stated they post about themselves, but not about private matters or mundane matters. These subjects are somewhat considered inappropriate by other users as well. Of course, what is appropriate varies depending on he person, but it seems to be expected that people post about average matters in terms of personal relativity. Personal subjects should have some significance on a personal level, but one should not disclose too much information. Posting on Facebook is considered impersonal to a degree.

The practical uses of the findings are limited, but they can be helpful nevertheless. As the study is performed by an open-ended questionnaire, the mass of data is immense and thus difficult to analyse. However, as the responses are categorised, these categories can then be used for further studies, as they allow a multiple-choice questionnaire to be made based on the categories. In this case, the possibility of directing responses by fabricating possible choices decreases, as the choices are made based on the responses of a large sample of respondents. A multiple-choice questionnaire then allows for a larger sample size and thus more valid results. This study and the categories made can therefore be utilised for further study of the same phenomenon.

As for practitioners, clear examples of different attitudes and possibilities help understand and apply principles to situations. Public organizations or people may find useful points in what should be put up in the open, what helps and what damages public image. Teachers who are interested in introducing their pupils to the online world have more material to explain and validate their claims. There will be clear lines in what is appropriate and what is not.

As for the general public, it may be interesting to know what others think of certain topics on Facebook. Since the results are unanimous, people will be able to broaden

their knowledge on the differences of people's attitudes. As one of the main goals for using Facebook in general is keeping tabs on people, the knowledge of what people post, avoid and think of different subjects may satisfy people's thirst for knowledge, although they can not identify the respondents. If people are interested in other people's opinions, they will find something interesting in this study.

In addition to practical applications of the results, they contain social significance as well. Although there re negative effects and attitudes to Facebook as well, the most common type of post was positive. People wan to keep Facebook and the activities therein positive, fun and interesting. They want to share about themselves and keep in touch with their network. The multitude of different subjects reported portray the significance and versatility of SNS communication. Many subjects are considered inappropriate for Facebook, which in turn also means that there are subjects people wish to discuss face-to-face, showing that Facebook is a tool for communication, instead of a substitute for interpersonal communication. Possible violations are more often ignored than not, showing that there is little need for people to attack differing opinions and values. Although Facebook is only a small and definite part of peoples lives, it may still give insight on the values and behaviour of people in the modern world.

There are a few aspects that have an effect on the reliability of the study. First, as mentioned before, the questionnaire was performed in English while most of the respondents were Finnish. This may have resulted in misinterpretations of the questions as the linguistic competence of the respondents may not have been adequate to understand the differences between the various questions. Thus it may have been better to give brief examples and more extensive elaboration alongside the questions to ensure proper understanding of the questions. It may also have been useful to perform the questionnaire as a set of multiple-choice questions, which would have simplified the need for linguistic expression. This choice would also have alleviated other problems, mainly the mass of data to be analysed and interpreted, as well as being more valid in defining what is not stated by the respondents. In the present study every response had to be analysed individually, resulting in a large workload and resulting in a possibility of interpretation error. It also restricts the questions eligible for analysis, as there are not enough temporal resources to address all of the questions. In the present study, the respondents were given freedom to state whatever they wish, which allows for more

diverse and accurate responses, but completely removes the possibility to discern what is not stated. If a respondent has left something out of their response, there is no hint of it available. In addition to these questions, the group of respondents was more homogeneous than would be desirable for a large scale study. Out of all the respondents participating in the questionnaire 67.3% are between the ages 22 and 29, 69.2% were female, 96.4% were Finnish and 69.8% were students. That is to say, the findings from this study can not be generalised to apply to the general public, but instead they are more of a reference to Finnish female students in their twenties. This is one more reason to perform a more extensive study by using multiple-choice questions and a much larger sample size in order to heterogenise the sample. The results should thus not be used for conclusions as such, but should be utilised to provide a framework or a guideline for possible future research.

REFERENCES

Acquisti, A. and R. Gross. 2006. Imagined Communities: Awareness, Information Sharing, and Privacy on the Facebook. In D. Ganezis and P. Golle (eds.), *Privacy enhancing technologies.* Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 36-58.

Baym, N. K. 2010. *Personal Connections in the Digital Age.* Cambridge: Polity.

boyd, d. 2006. Friends, Friendsters, and Myspace top 8: Writing community into being on social network sites. *First Monday,* 11 (12). (11 December, 2014) http://www.firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1418/1336

boyd, d. 2007. None of this is real: identity and participation in Friendster. In J. Karaganis (eds.), *Structures of participation in digital culture.* New York: Social Science Research Council, 132-157.

boyd, d. 2008. Why Youth (Heart) Social Network Sites: The Role of Networked Publics in Teenage Social Life. In D. Buckingham (eds.), *Youth, identity, and digital media.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

boyd, d. 2011. Social Network Sites as Networked Publics: Affordances, Dynamics, and Implications. In Z. Papacharissi (eds.), *A networked self: identity, community, and culture on social network sites.* New York: Routledge.

boyd, d. and N. Ellison. 2008. Social network sites: Definition, history and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication.* 13 (1), 210-230.

boyd, d. and N. Ellison. 2013. Sociality through social network sites. In W. H. Dutton (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of internet studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 151-172.

Chambers, D. 2013. *Social Media and Personal Relationships: Online Intimacies and Networked Friendship.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Choi, M. and C. L. Toma. 2014. Social Sharing Through Interpersonal Media: Patterns and Effects on Emotional Well-Being. *Computers in Human Behaviour.* 36, 530-541

Corey, S. M. 1937. Signed versus unsigned attitude questionnaires. Journal of Educational Psychology. 28. 144-148.

Cozby, P. C. 1973. Self-disclosure: A literature review. *Psychological bulletin.* 79 (2). 73-91.

Donath, J. 2007. Signals in social supernets. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication.* 13 (1). 231-251.

Donath, J. and d, boyd. 2004. Public displays of connection. *BT Technology Journal.* 22 (4), 71-82.

Dwyer, C., S. R. Hiltz and K. Passerini. 2007. Trust and privacy concern within social networking sites: A comparison of Facebook and MySpace. Paper presented at the Proceedings of AMCIS, Keystone, 9-12 August, 2007. http://csis.pace.edu/dwyer/research/DwyerAMCIS2007.pdf (28 May 2015)

Ellison, N.B., C. Steinfield, and C. Lampe. 2007. The benefits of Facebook "friends:" Social capital and college students' use of online social networking sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication.* 12 (4), 1143-1168.

Facebook Newsroom (20 November, 2015) http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/

Foddy, M., M. J. Platow and T. Yamagishi. 2009. Group-based trust in strangers. *Psychological Science.* 20 (4). 419-422.

Fornäs, J., K. Klein, J. Ladendorf, J. Sundén and M. Svenningsson. 2002. Into digital borderlands. In J. Fornäs, K. Klein, J. Ladendorf, J. Sundén and M. Svenningsson (eds.), *Digital borderlands: Cultural studies of identity and interactivity on the Internet.* New York: Peter Lang. 1-47.

Fuchs, C. 2014. *Social media : a critical introduction.* London : Sage

Georgalou, M. 2014. *Construction of identity on Facebook: A discourse-centred online ethnographic study of Greek users.* PhD dissertation. Department of Linguistics and English Language. Lancaster University

Jeong, H. S. and F. T. McAndrew. 2012. Who does what on Facebook? Age, sex, and relationship status as predictors of Facebook use. *Computers in Human Behavior.* 28, 2359–2365.

Junco, R. 2013. Comparing actual and self-reported measures of Facebook use. *Computers in Human Behavior.* 29, 626–631.

Kim, J., & Lee, J.-E. R. (2011). The Facebook paths to happiness: Effects of the number of Facebook friends and self-presentation on subjective well-being. *CyberPsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking.* 14 (6). 359–364.

Krippendorff, K. 1980. *Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology.* Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Krippendorff, K. 2013. *Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology.* Los Angeles; London: Sage.

Kross, E., P. Verduyn, E. Demiralp, J. Park, D. Lee, N. Lin, H. Shablack, J. Jonides and O. Ybarra. 2013. Facebook use predicts declines in subjective well-being in young adults. PLoS ONE [online]. (28 May 2015) http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0069841

Kytölä, S. 2012a. Multilingual web discussion forums: Theoretical, practical and methodological issues. In M. Sebba, S. Mahootian and C. Jonsson (eds.), *Language mixing and code-switching in writing: Approaches to mixed-language written discourse.* New York: Routledge. 106-127.

Kytölä, S. 2012b. Peer normativity and sanctioning of linguistic resources-in-use: On non-standard Englishes in Finnish football forums online. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta and T. Räisänen (eds.), *Dangerous multilingualism.* Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan. 228-260.

Ledbetter, A.M., J.P. Mazer, J. M. DeGroot, Y. Mao, K. R. Meyer and B. Swafford. 2011. Attitudes towards online social connection and self-disclosure as predictors of Facebook communication and relational closeness. *Communication Research.* 38 (1). 27-53.

Leppänen, S., S. Kytölä, H. Jousmäki, S. Peuronen and E. Westinen 2013. Entextualization and resemiotization as resources for (dis)identification in social media. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, paper 57.

Manago, A. M., T. Taylor and P. M. Greenfield. 2012. Me and my
400 friends: The anatomy of college students' Facebook networks, their communication patterns, and well-being. *Developmental Psychology.* 48 (2). 369–380.

Mandiberg, M. (eds.) 2012. *The social media reader.* New York: New York University Press.

Marichal, J. 2012. *Facebook Democracy : The Architecture of Disclosure and the Threat to Public Life.* Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Marwick, A. 2005. I'm more than just a Friendster profile: Identity, authenticity, and power in social networking services. Paper presented at Internet Research 6.0, Chicago, 5-9 October, 2005.

Mazer, J.P., R. E. Murphy, and C. J. Simonds. 2007. I'll see you on "Facebook": The effects of computer-mediated teacher self-disclosure on student motivation, affective learning, and classroom climate. *Communication Education.* 56 (1). 1-17.

McLauglin, C. and J. Vitak. 2012. Norm Evolution and Violation on Facebook. *New Media and Society.* 14 (2), 299-315.

Metzger, M. J. 2004. Privacy, trust and disclosure: Exploring barriers to electronic commerce. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* [online], 9 (4), 00. (28 May 2015)

http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2004.tb00292.x/full

Moreno, M. A., L. A. Jelenchick, K. G. Egan, E. Cox, H. Young, K. E. Gannon and T. Becker. 2011. Feeling bad on Facebook: Depression disclosure by college students on a social networking site. *Depression and Anxiety*. 28 (6). 447–455.

O'Reilly, T. 2005a. *What is web 2.0?* (26 November, 2014)

http://www.oreilly.com/pub/a/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html?page=1

O'Reilly, T. 2005b. *Web 2.0: Compact definition.* (26 November, 2014)

http://radar.oreilly.com/2005/10/web-20-compact-definition.html

Preibusch, S., B. Hoser, S. Gurses and B. Berendt. 2007. Ubiquitous social networks: Opportunities and challenges for privacy-aware user modelling. DIW-Diskussionspapiere, No. 698. [online] (28 May 2015) http://hdl.handle.net/10419/18430

Rotter, J. B. 1980. Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. *American Psychologist.* 35 (1). 1-7.

Saeri, A.K., C. Ogilvie, S. T. La Macchia, J. R. Smith and W. R. Louis. 2014. Predicting Facebook Users' Online Privacy Protection: Risk, Trust, Norm Focus Theory, and The Theory of Planned Behaviour. *The Journal of Social Psychology.* 154, 352-369.

Schreier, M. 2012. *Qualitative content analysis in practice.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Shirky, C. 2008. *Here comes everybody: the power of organizing without organizations.* New York: Penguin Press.

Stæhr, A. 2014. *Social media and everyday language use among Copenhagen youth.* Københavns Universitet, Det Humanistiske Fakultet.

Toma C. L. 2013 Feeling Better But Doing Worse: Effects of Facebook Self-Presentation on Implicit Self-Esteem and Cognitive Task Performance. *Media Psychology.* 16 (2). 199-220.

Toma, C. L. and J. T. Hancock. 2013. Self-affirmation underlies Facebook use. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.* 39 (3). 321-331.

Trottier, Daniel. 2012. *Social Media as Surveillance: Rethinking Visibility in a Converging World.* Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Whelan, T. J. 2007. *Anonymity and Confidentiality: Do Survey Respondents Know the Difference?* Poster presented at the 30th annual meeting of the Society of Southeastern Social Psychologists. Durham, 26-27 August, 2007. (30 November 2015)
http://www4.ncsu.edu/~tjwhelan/SSSP07_Whelan.pdf

Wilson, R. E., S. D. Gosling, and L. T. Graham. 2012. A review of Facebook research in the social sciences. *Perspectives on Psychological Science.* 7 (3). 203-220.

Yang, C. and B. Brown. 2012. Motives for Using Facebook, Patterns of Facebook Activities, and Late Adolescents' Social Adjustment to College. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence.* 42 (3), 403-416.

Youn, S. and K. Hall. 2008. Gender and online privacy among teens: Risk perception, privacy concerns, and protection behaviours. *Cyberpsychology & Behaviour.* 11, 763-765.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Questionnaire

<div style="border:1px solid">

Questionnaire about Facebook Posting Behaviour

Background Information

1. Age

 3 characters remaining

2. Gender

 Female
 Male
 Other

3. Nationality

4. Native Language

What is your first language?

5. Education

Please indicate all of the school levels you have completed. If you are studying at the moment, please check that school as well.

 Elementary school
 Secondary school
 High school
 Vocational school
 University
 Polytechnic

6. Occupation

E.g. unemployed, customer service, teacher, student etc.

</div>

Frequency of Facebook use

7. How often do you log in to Facebook?

Several times a day
Daily
Few times a week
Weekly
Monthly
Less
I don't use Facebook

8. How often do you post on Facebook?

Several times a day
Daily
Few times a week
Weekly
Monthly
Less
I don't use Facebook

Questionnaire

9. Where did you come across this questionnaire?
E.g. Facebook, email, Twitter etc.

Posting on Facebook

10. What subjects do you post about on Facebook?
Write also why you post about these subjects.

11. What subjects do you not post about on Facebook?
Write also why you do not post about these subjects.

Inappropriate Subjects on Facebook

12. Do you think that people can post about what they want, or are there subjects people should not post about in general?
  People can post about anything they want
  Others can post about what they want, but I do not want to post about everything
  There are subjects people should not post about in general

13. Are there subjects you do not want to post about, but other people can post about? What are those and why?

14. What subjects should people not post about and why?

Reacting to Inappropriate Subjects

15. If someone posts on a subject you think is inappropriate, how do you react?

16. If someone posts in a way you think is inappropriate, how do you react?

Posting Clearly and Openly

17. Do you post in a way which allows everyone to understand your post? If so, how?

18. What subjects do you post about openly? Why?

19. Do you post so that your post contains hidden meanings or allusions that only some recipients can understand? If so, how?

20. What subjects do you post less clearly about? Why?

21. Do you restrict the visibility of your posts?

Always
Often
Sometimes
Never

22. Do you restrict the visibility of any particular subjects? What are those and why?

Languages on Facebook

23. In what languages do you post on Facebook?

24. If you use other than your native language, what kind of posts do you use it on and why?

Commenting on Posts

25. Do you comment on other peoples posts?

Often
Sometimes
Never

26. What kind of posts do you comment on and why?

27. Do you have conversations in the comment section of posts?

Often
Sometimes
Never

Feedback

28. Anything else you want to say about Facebook or the questionnaire?

Thank you!

Your contribution to this research is greatly appreciated. Have a good day!