Bachelor Thesis

**Online Boundary Management model among Facebook users**

Lise Ariëns

First reader: Dr. A. Batenburg

Second reader: Dr. Nederstigt

Communication and Information Sciences

Radboud University

30-05-2016

**Abstract**

Young professionals are increasingly connected to professional contacts on Facebook and are becoming concerned about how they should behave online to ensure professionalism. They can engage in online boundary management behaviours by for instance limiting to whom they share personal information online, or selecting what information they share with their online connections. The purpose of this study was to find out to what extent the four online boundary management behaviours (content, audience, open and hybrid) as proposed by Ollier-Malaterre, Rothbard, and Berg (2013) are present online, and whether these behaviours were related to the drivers integration or segmentation of professional and private lives, and self-enhancement or self-verification as self-evaluation motives. A survey was conducted and a corpus of Facebook posts was collected. The study found that no relationship existed between self-evaluation motives and online behaviours, and that integration or segmentation of professional and private lives was related to online integration or segmentation behaviours. The study tested the online boundary management model as proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) and found that only integration or segmentation behaviours online are related to their offline equivalent. In addition, content boundary management behaviours were used most often. The results can be used to gain insight into the way individuals use Facebook and how they deal with professional and private contacts on social media platforms. The study fills the gap in existing research on online boundary management.

**Introduction**

In 2012, Facebook had over 845 million users worldwide who shared four billion posts a day, including 250 million photo's (Facebook, 2012). These posts are shared with a large group of online friends, with whom individuals in real life may not share as much information as they do online. Information posted online is visible to a broad audience. As the age group of users of Facebook is shifting from college students to those 35 years and over (Peluchette et al. 2013), individuals are now sharing the platform with groups they do not share much personal information with in their daily lives, such as co-workers, supervisors, and other professional contacts.

On average, young professionals are friends on Facebook with 16 work-related contacts (Millennial Branding, 2015). By accepting these friend requests, individuals give their new friends an insight into their personal life, feelings, and activities. Accepting friend requests from professional relations can cause a collision between an individual's professional and private life, as individuals present themselves differently at work than at home. Separating one's professional life from one's personal life contributes to professionalism and a good reputation. However, on Facebook users typically do not differentiate their private and professional contacts, and thus their private and professional lives overlap on this online platform.

In addition, social media platforms are increasingly being used as a tool to screen potential new employees (Weisbuch et al., 2009). Bohnert and Ross (2010) found that when a job applicant's Facebook profile displayed family values or professionalism, the chances of the applicant being offered a job increased. However, when the profile displayed inappropriate material such as alcohol use, or provocative statements, chances decreased. 37% Of information found on social networking profiles affected the applicants' prospects negatively (Kaplan Test Prep Online Pressroom, 2016). Organisations screen social media profiles to find out whether the applicants profile themselves professionally, and if they would be a good fit with the company. Therefore, knowing how to behave on social media platforms is becoming increasingly important.

Before social media started playing such a prominent role in the daily lives of individuals, people only engaged in boundary management to separate the overlap between their professional and private lives. Engaging in boundary management ensures a professional reputation, as individuals separate their professional and private lives, which increases the level of respect they receive from others (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). However, nowadays it has become increasingly important to keep in mind that online behaviour can have an impact on an

individual's professional reputation as well (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Even though much research has been conducted on boundary management (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013), not much research has examined how this can be implemented to match online behaviours.

Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) created a theoretical model to classify the different behaviours people might show with regard to managing online behaviours and how they present themselves online. This model gives insight into online self-presentation behaviour based on four motivational drivers: whether individuals self-verify or self-enhance their online messages, and whether they integrate or segmentate their audiences. These motivational drivers result in four typical behaviours that illustrate what actions individuals are likely to engage in when presenting themselves online. As this model has not yet been tested, this study is a first attempt to test how individuals deal with the collision between their personal and professional lives on the social media platform Facebook, and to what extent the proposed drivers (self-enhancement/self-verification, integration/segmentation of professional and private lives) relate to an individual's online behaviour.

**Literature overview**

Much research has been conducted to explain boundary management in the daily lives of individuals (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). However, not much research has been conducted on online boundary management, and whether how individuals manage boundaries in their daily lives influences how individuals manage their online boundaries. This literature overview will cover these studies and will illustrate the urgency for research on online boundary management.

Globally, Facebook was the most popular social media platform in 2015 (Global Web Index, 2015): 71% of online adults worldwide were active on Facebook, of whom 70% engaged with the platform daily (Duggan et al, 2015). The most active group on Facebook are individuals aged 22-40 (Chaffey, 2016). This younger generation seems to be more frequently connected with professional contacts: in 2012, 82% were connected to at least one professional contact (Russel Herder, 2011; Millennial Branding, 2015). The main reasons why individuals use Facebook are to stay in touch with friends (Ellison et al., 2006; Joinson, 2008), to fulfil social needs such as monitoring others and making small talk (Dunbar, 1998; Gosling, 2009), and to overcome boredom (Lampe et al., 2008).

Individuals often have many different connections on Facebook, such as family and friends, but also are connected to a growing number of professional relations, such as colleagues. As Facebook does not make a distinction between an individual's personal and professional life,

audiences that are segmented in the real world come together as one public (Chalmer, 2013). According to Del Bosque (2013), online social media networks can be compared to a "double edged sword", as it can create strong ties with those an individual does not engage much with in real life, but it can also deteriorate relations with whom individuals in real life have strong ties. Online communication can also form a breach of privacy, and interacting with colleagues online can lead to "organizational surveillance" (Allen, Walker, Coopman & Hart, 2007). The boundaries between professional and private life are fading as a result of friending colleagues on Facebook (Frampton & Child, 2013).

This overlap between their professional and private connections can create tension between the private and professional lives of an individual (Binder et al., 2009) as not all content may be appropriate for every group. A drunk picture might best be kept from family, or participating in a controversial demonstration might not fit with policies at work. In the real world, individuals disclose information to a limited and tailored group of people. Online, this information is much more accessible to a broader audience, including groups for which this information might not have been appropriate. Peluchette et al. (2013) found that individuals feel the need to implement an equivalent of the behaviours they use in the real world to deal with their different publics and to manage their online behaviours.

To manage online boundaries and behaviours, individuals can start by categorizing their contacts into different groups, such as 'Work contacts, Friends or Family'. When posting information, they can choose with which group they would like to share this post, thus managing what information they display to their different groups of contacts. Madden and Smith (2010) found that young adults put more effort into limiting sharing personal information online, as they change privacy settings, delete unwanted posts or comments about themselves, and remove their name from photos they do not want others to see. In 2010, more than 50% of online adults used search engines to search for information about themselves, and 65% of online adults changed privacy settings and limiting with whom they share posts (Madden & Smith, 2010). Online adults are realizing the need for limiting personal information online and are changing privacy settings to do so.

In addition, individuals are becoming increasingly concerned with the way they present themselves online, as they are extremely visible to a large audience (Madden & Smith, 2010; Chalmers, 2013). To present themselves in a good light, they engage in a form of self-presentation, driven by their self-evaluation motives; that what motivates individuals to present themselves in a socially or individually desirable manner (Nezlek & Leary, 2002). When

registering to Facebook, individuals are presented with a blank profile, which they fill based on who they are in the 'real world'. Most information on a profile is entered by the owner of the page, and therefore this individual can choose what kind of information he or she wants to present to the public. To make a good impression, individuals often excessively endorse and enhance positive self-views (Schlenker & Leary, 1982). Online they do so by posting positive information about themselves, or by removing information others post about them which they do not like. In addition, individuals can choose to present themselves in a more confirmative way, seeking confirmation for both their negative and their positive self-views (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013), and thus posting more authentic information about themselves. Gosling et al. (2011) found that excessively endorsing and enhancing positive self-views online reflects narcissism. When it comes to promoting the self, individuals were found to be more narcissistic on Facebook as they believe this contributes to the liking they receive from others (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008).

The literature overview illustrated the popularity and use of Facebook among the age group of young professionals, and showed that they are increasingly connected to professional contacts. As they are now connected to different groups on Facebook, individuals are becoming concerned about how they should behave online to ensure professionalism. They can change privacy settings, or limit sharing personal information online. Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) created a theoretical framework to classify how and to whom individuals present themselves online. The framework proposes four types of online boundary management behaviours that illustrate what actions individuals may take online, based on the drivers integration or segmentation of professional and private lives, and self-enhancement or self-verification as self-evaluation motives. This model will be tested in this study.

**Conceptual framework model Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013)**

Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) believe two fundamental questions are at the basis of an individual's online behaviour: '*with whom do individuals communicate online*' and '*what do they communicate*'? With whom individuals communicate depends on how they structure their network, and what they communicate depends on how they present themselves towards others. They can choose to keep professional contacts separated from private contacts, and how much personal information they communicate towards their professional contacts. This results in four motivational drivers that drive individual's online boundary management behaviours: self-enhancement or self-verification behaviours as self-evaluation motives of individuals, and integration or segmentation of professional and private lives.

<u>Motivational drivers</u>

*Segmentation and integration*

Individuals organise their world by segmenting or integrating their private and personal lives (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). If individuals choose to segment their professional lives from their private lives, they will not let professional and private lives mix together. They will not deal with business at home and vice versa, will turn off their mobile (work) phone at home and will not check their email outside of business hours (Kossek et al., 2006). Individuals who prefer to integrate their professional lives with their private lives will not create boundaries between these two domains and thus are likely to deal with business at home and personal stuff at work (Kreiner, 2006; Bulger, Hoffman & Matthews, 2007). They will make personal phone calls at work, and continue to work in the evening or weekend (Kossek et al., 2006).

Kreiner (2006) found that whether individuals integrate or segment private and personal lives depends on how the individual perceives the workplace. Individuals will be more successful at creating boundaries when the workplace provides a situation that adheres to their preferences for integration or segmentation of private and professional lives. Kossek and al. (2006) found that creating and maintaining boundaries at home and at work predicts a higher well-being of individuals than integrating work and home.

According to Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013), individuals will display particular online behaviours based on their preferences for integration or segmentation of their professional and private lives. If individuals have a preference for segmenting their professional from their personal lives, they are likely to put effort into classifying their online contacts, and consequently create boundaries between their online audiences. They may choose to display a Facebook post to a selective group only, and are less likely to accept friend requests from professional contacts (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Individuals who prefer integrating their professional and private lives are more likely to integrate their online contacts, and therefore will not classify their contacts and display Facebook posts to both their professional as their private contacts.

*Self-enhancement and self-verification*

In addition to segmenting or integrating professional and private online contacts, individuals' self-evaluation motives determine how they present themselves online. Self-evaluation motives refers to what motivates individuals to present themselves in a socially or individually desirable

manner (Nezlek & Leary, 2002). The way individuals present themselves online is based on their self-evaluation preferences; they can have a preference for either self-enhancement or self-verification (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Individuals who have a preference for self-enhancement choose to only share positive things in their lives with others in a conversation, such as a promotion or if they feel confident about something. They enhance their self-views or the views others have of them (Swann, 1987; Jones, 1973). In addition, individuals who have a preference for self-verification choose to mention both the positive and negative aspects of their lives, and seek affirmation of their self-views or the views others have of them (Swann, 1983). For instance, they can express insecurities or something they did wrong.

Baraket-Bojmel et al. (2016) found that 50% of Facebook posts are used for self-presentation. These posts either enhance, or verify the self-views (thoughts and feelings) of the individual. Individuals who prefer enhancing their self-views will most likely only disclose positive information about themselves online and manage information others share of them (self-enhancement; Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Individuals who seek affirmation of their self-views will display information that confirms these self-views, both positive and negative (self-verification) (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). In real-life, self-verification behaviours are only expressed when individuals perceive the friendships to be strong enough to see this side of an individual as well, or when the self-views are strongly held (Swann, 1999).

Online boundary management behaviours

Based on the preferences for segmentation or integration of professional and private contacts, and self-enhancement or self-verification of online messages, four types of online boundary management behaviours have been identified: open, audience, content, and hybrid boundary management behaviours. These consist of either integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts, in combination with online self-enhancement or self-verification behaviours. The resulting four combinations are: integrating/self-verification behaviour (open), segmenting/self-verification (audience), integrating/self-enhancement (content), and segmenting/self-enhancement (hybrid) behaviours (see table 1).

Table 1. Preferences for segmentation or integration of professional and private contacts, and online self-evaluation behaviours (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013)

|  | Integration | Segmentation |
|---|---|---|
| Self-verification | Open boundary management behaviours | Audience boundary management behaviours |

| *Self-enhancement* | Content boundary management behaviours | Hybrid boundary management behaviours |

*Open boundary management behaviour*

Individuals who integrate their professional and private contacts, and prefer to display information that verifies their self-views, engage in open boundary management behaviours. They value transparency and authenticity (verification of the self), and consequently they do not construct boundaries on social network platforms. To confirm their self-views, they may express setbacks or personal feelings to their audience, that consists of both their professional and private contacts (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013).

*Audience boundary management behaviour*

Individuals who segment their professional and private contacts, and display information that verifies their self-views, engage in audience boundary management behaviours. They value transparency and authenticity (verification of the self), but construct boundaries to restrict professional contacts from private information. For instance, they may share setbacks or personal feelings online, but do not want their professional audiences to see this (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013).

*Content boundary management behaviour*

Individuals that only disclose information that will enhance their self-views, but do not manage to whom they disclose this information to, engage in content boundary management behaviours. They enhance their messages and integrate their professional and private contacts. Individuals who engage in content boundary management behaviours select the information that will enhance the impressions others have of them, and share this with their audiences, which consist of both professional and private contacts (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013).

*Hybrid boundary management behaviour*

Individuals engage in hybrid boundary management behaviours when they actively classify their professional and private contacts and only disclose information that fits with these groups. The information displayed enhances their self-views. They share information that enhances the views others have of them to selected groups only (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013).

Research questions

With this study it will be examined whether online boundary management behaviours are present among Facebook users, as well as to what extent a relationship between these behaviours and the drivers proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) exists. This research will fill the gap in existing research on online boundary management, and will give insights into how people use Facebook with regard to a professional context.

It is useful to research online boundary management as the results of this study can help understand why individuals act the way they do on social media. In addition, it can explain to what extent the different functions of Facebook are actually being used.

Hence, the following research questions are formulated:

RQ1. *To what extent are online boundary management behaviours (based on integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts on Facebook, and self-enhancement or self-verification in online posts of Facebook) present among Facebook users?*

RQ2. *To what extent is this behaviour on Facebook related to the drivers proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013)?*

**Method**

**Research design**

An online survey and small corpus were used to research preferences of participants when it comes to segmentation or integration of professional and private lives, segmentation or integration of professional and private contacts, self-enhancement or self-verification as self-evaluation motives, and self-enhancement or self-verification on the social media platform Facebook.

The independent variables in this study were the preferences for segmenting or integrating individuals' professional and private lives, as well as individuals' self-evaluation motives to present themselves in a positive way (self-enhancement) or in a manner that confirms their self-views (self-verification). These independent variables were measured with a questionnaire.

The dependent variables in this study were the online integration or segmentation behaviours of professional and private contacts, and online self-enhancement or self-verification behaviours on Facebook. Integration or segmentation behaviours of professional and private online contacts was measured with a questionnaire, whilst online self-enhancement and self-verification were measured by analysing Facebook posts.

Facebook was used as the medium of focus in this study, as this is a platform growing in popularity among a range of different age groups, and becoming an increasingly important instrument to screen individuals for potential new jobs. In addition, as information on Facebook is very visible, information posted on Facebook can be seen by a large range of contacts, including professional contacts.

**Instrumentation**

The survey (appendix 1) measured self-enhancement and self-verification as self-evaluation motives of individuals, the preferences for segmentation or integration of professional and private lives, as well as the online segmentation or integration of professional and private contacts.

Segmentation behaviour is operationalised as an individual's preference for segmenting their professional and personal lives. This means that individuals for instance do not take work home, or invite professional relations over for dinner. Integration behaviour illustrates an individual's preference for integrating professional and private lives, and thus individuals are likely to discuss personal stuff at work or stay in touch with their colleagues over the weekend (Ollier-

Malaterre et al., 2013). Segmentation and integration behaviour of professional and private lives were measured with some questions adapted from Clark (2001); Kossek et al. (2006), and Kreiner (2006) and included statements such as 'I prefer to segment my professional and private life'. The statements were measured using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 7= completely agree). The reliability of the scale, consisting of 6 items, was adequate: $\alpha = 0.72$.

In an online setting, segmentation of professional and private contacts means that individuals engage in efforts to keep their different classifications of online contacts separated. This means that individuals create boundaries between the two audiences. Integration of professional and private contacts means that individuals do not construct boundaries between the two audiences, and thus display online posts to all their friends. Segmentation and integration of private and professional online contacts were measured with a questionnaire based on Fieseler, Meckel and Ranzini (2015), and included questions such as 'To what extent do your private and professional social media profiles match?'. The questions were measured using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree). The reliability of the scale, consisting of three items, was not adequate: $\alpha = 0.61$. Removing items did not improve the reliability of the scale. Even though the reliability of the scale still was not adequate, the scale was included in the analyses,

Self-evaluation motives in this study are self-enhancement and self-verification behaviours. Self-enhancement is operationalised as individual's preference for only expressing information about themselves that is positive and will enhance someone else's image of them (Swann, 1987; Jones, 1973). Preferences for self-enhancement was measured with statements adapted from Wiesenfield et al. (2007), and included statements such as 'I want others to have a positive attitude toward me'. The statements were measured using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree). The reliability of the scale was adequate: $\alpha = 0.74$. Self-verification behaviour shows individuals preferences for expressing both positive and negative information about themselves, to verify how individuals feels about themselves (Swann, 1983). These variables were measured with some statements adapted from Wiesenfield et al. (2007), and included statements such as 'I want others to understand who I am'. The statements were measured using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree), and consisted of two items. The reliability of the scale was good: $\alpha = 0.82$.

Online self-enhancement behaviour was operationalised as displaying information online that enhances the self-views of the individual, or the views others have of him/her (Ollier-Malaterre et al, 2013). Online self-verification was operationalised as displaying information online that

confirms the self-views of the individual (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Online self-verification and self-enhancement behaviours were measured by analysing a corpus of Facebook posts. Research participants were asked to copy their three most recent Facebook posts in the questionnaire, which were analysed on whether they showed self-enhancement or self-verification. Posts without a self-evaluation factor were classified as neutral (Baraket-Bojmel et al., 2016). In total, 216 coded statuses were included in the analyses. A post was qualified as an 'enhancement status' when it presented the individual in a positive, socially desirable, or promotive way. A 'self-verification status' was given to the posts that presented the user in a negative way, expressed personal failure or doubt or showed negative comments about the individual. The classification 'neutral posts' was given to posts where there was no presentation of the individual, but included other people's actions, such as activities, views and posts (Baraket-Bojmel et al., 2016). A total of three posts per participant were classified as either 'self-enhancement', 'self-verification', or 'neutral'. Finally, two scores were given to each participants: one score for 'self-enhancement' and one score for 'self-verification'. The scores were given based on the amount of self-enhancing or self-verification posts they displayed, ranging from 0 (no self-enhancing or self-verification posts) to 3 (all self-enhancing or self-verification).

The corpus was then analysed by two International Business Communication students from the Radboud University in Nijmegen. The variables used to code the corpus were self-enhancement and self-verification. The inter-rater reliability for self-enhancement was adequate: $\kappa = .739$, $p < .001$. The inter-rater reliability for self-verification was adequate: $\kappa = .784$, $p < .001$.

Moreover, several additional variables have been used in this study, as the study of Fieseler et al. (2015) showed that age, identification with the organisation, identification with the department, and involvement with Facebook were also related to online integration or segmentation behaviours of professional and private contacts. Involvement with Facebook was measured with some statements adapted from Ellison et al. (2007) and included statements as 'I use Facebook daily'. The statements were measured using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree), and consisted of four items. The reliability of the scale was adequate: $\alpha = 0.75$.

Identification with the organisation was measured with some statements adapted from Leach et al. (2008) and included statements as 'I feel connected to this organisation'. The statements were measured using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree), and consisted of three items. The reliability of the scale was good: $\alpha = 0.958$.

Identification with the department was measured with some questions adapted from Leach et al. (2008) and included statements as 'I feel connected to the departments'. The statements were measured using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree), and consisted of three items. The reliability of the scale was good: $\alpha = 0.94$.

## Procedure and respondents

*Procedure*

An online survey was distributed via several online channels: Facebook, email, WhatsApp, Twitter, and LinkedIn. Respondents were informed about the topic of the questionnaire and asked to agree to participate in the survey. They were then asked to answer some questions and statements regarding how they want others to see them, their preferences for separating work and private issues, their relationship with the organization they work for, and their use of Facebook. Then they were asked to log into their Facebook page and copy their last three written statuses and paste them into the questionnaire. Finally, they were asked to answer demographic questions about age, gender, education, and profession. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. Respondents were thanked for participating and were given the opportunity to stay informed about the results of the survey.

*Respondents*

The preliminary requirements for participating in the study were having an active Facebook account as well as a (professional) job. An initial of 208 respondents filled in the questionnaire. However, a large amount of entries was unfinished, or were missing the Facebook posts. After these entries were removed, 116 respondents were used in the analyses, of whom 30.2% males and 54.3% females. Even though the incomplete entries were filtered out of the data set, an amount of 18 entries were still missing in the data file, as these respondents stopped when asked to copy the Facebook posts into the questionnaire; thus the Facebook posts and descriptive information of participants was missing; meaning only 216 coded Facebook posts were used in the analyses instead of 234.

The respondents were aged 18 to 65 ($M = 29.84$, $SD = 12.36$, Range = 47). The majority of participants finished college (HBO, 30.2%) or university (17.2%). 32.8% of participants was studying full-time, and thus directed towards the end of the survey as they fell outside the target group for this survey. The remaining respondents had a job (51.6%), of whom 31% full-time and 20.6% part-time. The majority did not to have a supervisory function (39.7%) and were active in their current position for about one year (9.5%)

## Statistical analysis

Several correlation (Pearson) analyses and descriptive analyses were used to answer the research questions.

**Results**

The purpose of this study was to find out to what extent the online boundary management behaviours as proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) are found with Facebook users. These online boundary management behaviours are based on the drivers integration or segmentation of professional and private lives, and on self-enhancement or self-verification behaviours as self-evaluation motives. In addition, this study looked at if a relationship existed between integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts, and on self-enhancement or self-verification behaviour online as proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013).

This section provides an overview of how the respondents use Facebook; how do they deal with professional and private contacts, and to what extent do they change privacy settings. Next, in order to answer the research questions, the results of the correlation analyses between the 9 scales (plus age) (as illustrated in table 4) have been given.

*Facebook use*

A descriptive analysis showed that the majority of respondents used privacy settings on Facebook to determine who is able to access their profile page. 51.7% of the respondent's profile pages on Facebook can only be seen by their friends, and 29.3% by friends from friends. Only 12.9% of the respondent's Facebook pages were set on public. In addition, respondents manage to whom they display information: 52.6% of respondents have changed their privacy settings to public, friends, just me, family or work contacts. The remaining 47.4% post information on Facebook without chancing privacy settings. The majority of the respondents (43.1%) used Facebook daily.

85.3% of respondents were connected to professional contacts (both former and current coworkers) on Facebook. The majority of respondents (72.6%) estimated that they were connected to mostly between 0 to 25 professional contacts on Facebook. The estimated number of professional contacts ranges between 0 to 350.

The information respondents show on Facebook can either be work-related or not work-related. 27.6% of respondents sometimes post information regarding their work on Facebook, whereas 69.0% do not post work-related information at all. The remaining respondents said to only post work-related information on Facebook. The results for the descriptive analyses for Facebook use can be found in table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive information about Facebook use (N and %)

|  | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Facebook privacy |  |  |
| Public profile | 15 | 12.9 |
| Friends only | 60 | 51.7 |
| Friends from friends | 34 | 29.3 |
| Connected to professional contacts |  |  |
| Yes | 99 | 85.3 |
| No | 17 | 14.7 |
| Number of professional contacts |  |  |
| 0-25 | 85 | 72.6 |
| 26-50 | 15 | 13.3 |
| 51-75 | 4 | 3.5 |
| 76-100 | 1 | .89 |
| 101> | 11 | 9.7 |
| Amount of work-related FB posts |  |  |
| Never work-related | 80 | 69.0 |
| Sometimes work-related | 32 | 27.6 |
| Always work-related | 4 | 3.4 |

The analysis of Facebook posts uploaded in the questionnaire showed that posts were mostly classified as self-enhancing (43.5%). Only 6.5% of posts were classified as self-verification. The remaining 50% of posts did not show any self-evaluating factors, and thus were classified as neutral. Table 3 shows the amount of self-enhancing, self-verification, and neutral posts.

Table 3. Percentages classification of Facebook posts as self-enhancing, self-verification, or neutral (n =216).

|  | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Self-enhancement | 94 | 43.5% |
| Self-verification | 14 | 6.5% |
| Neutral | 108 | 50% |

Most participants have a preference for segmenting their professional and private lives ($M = 5.43$, $SD = .93$), but prefer to integrate their professional and private contacts on Facebook (table 2). In addition, table 2 shows that respondents have a preference for self-enhancement in as self-evaluation motive ($M = 5.43$, $SD = .93$) as well as online; out of the 50% of content they share that is related to the self, 43.5% is self-enhancing.

### Drivers and online behaviour

Several correlation analyses have been performed to find out whether a relation existed between the drivers as proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) and online behaviour. The descriptives

of the scales used in the correlation analyses and what answer model has been used can be found in table *4*.

*Table 4. Descriptives of the scales (M, SD, answer scale, N)*

|  | *M* | *SD* | *Answer scale* | *N* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Involvement with Facebook | 3.93 | 1.23 | 1-7 | 116 |
| Identification with organisation | 5.09 | 1.36 | 1-7 | 116 |
| Identification with department | 5.52 | 1.09 | 1-7 | 116 |
| Self-verification preferences | 5.33 | 1.17 | 1-7 | 116 |
| Self-enhancement preferences | 5.43 | .93 | 1-7 | 116 |
| Integration/segmentation professional and private lives | 5.43 | .93 | 1-7 | 116 |
| Integration/segmentation professional and private contacts | 4.04 | 1.40 | 1-7 | 116 |
| Online verification in FB posts | .18 | .42 | 1-3 | 78 |
| Online enhancement in FB posts | 1.19 | 1.11 | 1-3 | 78 |

Table 5 shows a correlation matrix for the results for correlation analyses between 9 scales (as illustrated in table 4) and age.

*Table 5. Correlation between the 10 variables used in this research*

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Offline self-verification | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (2) Online self-verification | -.089 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3) Offline self-enhancement | .575** | .066 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4) Online self-enhancement | .171 | -.225* | .133 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (5) Integration/segmentation lives | .000 | .150 | 1.08 | .049 | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| (6) Integration/segmentation contacts | .276** | .075 | .188* | -.025 | -.341** | - |  |  |  |  |
| (7) Identification organisation | .319** | .047 | .244** | -.022 | -.147 | .256* | - |  |  |  |
| (8) Identification department | .257** | .025 | .144 | .003 | -.171 | .300** | .712** | - |  |  |
| (9) Age | -.132 | .001 | -.200* | -.283* | -.305** | .082 | .205* | .198 | - |  |
| (10) Involvement with FB | .180 | -.137 | .279** | .083 | -.162 | .441** | .108 | .127 | -.33** | - |

*\*Significant at the .05 level, \*\* significant at the 0.01 level*

A correlation analysis between self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive and online self-enhancement behaviours showed a non-significant relationship ($r$ (116) = .133, $p$ = .245). A correlation analysis between self-verification as self-evaluation motive and online self-verification behaviours also showed a non-significant relationship ($r$ (78) = -.089, $p$ = .436). Hence, self-enhancement and self-verification as self-evaluation motives were not related to self-enhancement and self-verification behaviours online.

A correlation analysis between integration or segmentation of professional and private lives and integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts showed a significant, negative relationship ($r$ (116) = -.341, $p$ < .001). Respondents who integrate their professional and private lives, also integrate their professional and private contacts.

Although the expected relationships, based on Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) were not found, other significant relationships were found:

A correlation analysis between online self-enhancement behaviours and online self-verification behaviours showed a significant, negative relationship ($r$ (116) = -.255, $p$ = .047). Respondents who self-enhance online do not self-verificate online as well.

A correlation analysis between self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive and integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts showed a significant, positive relationship ($r$ (116) = .118, $p$ = .043). Respondents who have a preference for self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive, integrate online contacts.

A correlation analysis between self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive and self-verification as self-evaluation motive showed a significant, positive relationship ($r$ (116) = .575, $p$ < .001). Respondents prefer both self-enhancement as self-verification as self-evaluation motives.

A correlation analysis between self-verification as self-evaluation motive and integration/segmentation of contacts showed a significant, positive relationship ($r$ (116) = .276, $p$ = .003). Respondents who have a preference for self-verification as self-evaluation motive, have a preference for integration of their online professional and private contacts.

A correlation analysis between self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive and involvement with Facebook showed a significant, positive relationship ($r$ (116) = .279, $p$ = .002). Respondents who had a preference for self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive, were found to be higher involved with Facebook.

A correlation analysis between online self-enhancement behaviour and age showed a significant, negative relationship ($r$ (78) = -.283, $p$ = .012). Older respondents disclosed less self-enhancing information about themselves.

A correlation analysis between integration and segmentation of professional and private contacts and identification with the organisation showed a significant, positive relationship ($r$ (116) = .256, $p$ = .006). Respondents who identified themselves with the organisation, were more likely to integrate their professional and private contacts.

A correlation analysis between integration and segmentation of professional and private contacts and identification with the department showed a significant, positive relationship ($r$ (116) = .300, $p$ = .001). Respondents who identified themselves with their department were more likely to integrate their professional and private contacts.

A correlation analysis between integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts and involvement with Facebook showed a significant, positive relationship ($r$ (116) = .441, $p$ < .001). Respondents who were highly involved with Facebook were more likely to integrate their professional and private contacts.

A correlation analysis between integration or segmentation of professional and private lives and involvement with Facebook showed a non-significant relationship ($r$ (116) = -.162, $p$ = .083). No relation existed between to what extent respondents integrated or segmented their private and professional lives and their involvement with Facebook.

A correlation analysis between involvement with Facebook and age showed a significant, negative relationship ($r$ (116) = -.333, $p$ < .001). Younger respondents were higher involved with Facebook than older respondents.

**Discussion**

The goal of this study was to find out to what extent the behaviours proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) are present online (based on integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts on Facebook, and self-enhancement or self-verification in online posts on Facebook) (RQ1). Secondly, this study looked at to what extent these online behaviours are related to the drivers proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) (RQ2). The results will be discussed per research question.

*Research question 1*

Research question 1 looked at the extent to which open, audience, content, and hybrid boundary management behaviours are present online. These behaviours are based on integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts, and on self-enhancement or self-verification in online posts on Facebook. Most participants have a preference for segmenting their professional and private lives. However, they prefer to integrate their professional and private online contacts. Thus, they do not discuss personal things at work, or invite colleagues over at home, but they are friends with their colleagues or other professional contacts on Facebook and therefore share personal stuff with them online.

85.3% of the participants in this study are connected to at least one professional contact on Facebook, of whom the majority thought to be friends with between 0 to 25 work-related contacts. This is in line with the findings of the researches by Russel Herder (2011) and Millennial Branding (2015), that found that 82% of Facebook users up to the age of 40 are connected to as least one professional contact. In addition, these results support the findings of Frampton and Child (2013), who found that boundaries between professional and private lives are fading as individuals are becoming friends with colleagues on social media platforms.

The majority of participants in this study (52.6%) change privacy settings on Facebook; they change who can see their profile and to whom they display their messages (just friends, friends of friends, public). The findings in this research come close to the 65% of online adults that change privacy settings, and limit to whom they display their posts (Madden and Smith, 2010). However, participants do not limit to whom of their friends they display a post. This supports the finding in this study that the participants in this study have a preference for online integration of professional and private contacts.

In addition, the extent to which the participants in this study prefer self-enhancement or self-verification online was examined. Facebook users in this study post an equal amount of neutral

and self-evaluating information on Facebook. When the posts show self-evaluation elements, self-enhancement (43.5%) is more common than self-verification (6.5%). Thus, showing a more negative side of oneself, such as insecurities, setbacks, or mistakes, is not as common practice as displaying very positive information about oneself. These percentages come close to the findings of Baraket-Bojmel et al. (2016), who found that 50% of posts are used for self-enhancement or self-evaluation. Thus, content boundary management behaviour is found most often with Facebook users: they enhance their messages, and integrate their professional and private contacts.

*Research question 2*

Research question 2 looked at whether integration/segmentation of professional and private lives, and self-enhancement or self-evaluation preferences as self-evaluation motive are related to integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts, and self-enhancement or self-evaluation in online messages.

Frampton and Child (2013) found that boundaries between professional and private lives are fading because individuals are becoming increasingly connected to colleagues on social media platforms. As found in this study, most participants were connected to between zero to twenty-five professional contacts, and thus even when individuals are not at work, they can see what their colleagues are doing: messages of professional contacts intertwine with individual's personal time/space. Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) believe that individuals online behaviour, whether they integrate or segmentate professional and private contacts, is based on their preferences for integration or segmentation of professional and private lives. They expected that individuals put effort in classifying their online contacts, based on their preference for segmentation of professional and private lives, or do not classify their online contact when they prefer to integrate their professional and private lives. Peluchette et al. (2013) also believe that individuals feel the need to implement an equivalent of behaviours they show in real life to deal with their different publics. This study found that preferences for integration or segmentation of professional and private lives are related to online behaviours (of integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts). Thus, if individuals prefer to segment their professional and private lives, they also prefer to segment/classify their online professional and private contacts: they feel the need to implement online segmentation or integration behaviours based on offline their preferences.

In addition, Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) expected to find a relation between self-evaluation preferences and the way individuals present themselves online. However, this study found that preferences for self-enhancement or self-verification as self-evaluation motives were not related to online behaviours (of self-enhancement or self-verification). Perhaps one's offline personality does not reflect on an online platform.

*Additional outcomes*

Other interesting, additional relations were found between several of the variables. A relationship between self-enhancement and self-verification as self-evaluation motives was found. Respondents preferred both self-enhancement and self-verification as self-evaluation motive. This might be explained by the high scores for individualism in the Dutch culture (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). The Dutch will express if they do not feel well, or if something is not going as well as they want it to, as honesty is valued highly. Thus, they may have a preference for expressing positive information about themselves, but as honestly is highly appreciated and accepted, it has become normal to express eventual negative aspects as well.

Another interesting outcome of this study was that individuals with a preference for self-verification as self-evaluation motive were found to have a preference for integration of their online professional and private contacts. Perhaps individuals with a preference for self-verification as self-evaluation motive want to display positive information to all their contacts (private and professional) to enhance their image of them. In addition, individuals who identify themselves with their department and with their organisation, also integrate their professional and private contacts. Perhaps individuals who identify themselves with the department and the organisation integrate their online contacts as they have become friends with their colleagues and other professional relations, because of their high identification/connection with their professional environment.

Individuals who have a preference for self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive were also found to be highly involved with Facebook. This relation was not found for individuals who prefer to self-verificate as self-evaluation motive. Perhaps individuals who prefer to self-enhance are higher involved with Facebook as this medium offers a platform to express positive information about themselves, and this contributes to the likes they receive from others. This enhances their own self-image (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008), whereas Facebook is a less common platform to express negative information about oneself.

Younger respondents were found to be more involved with Facebook than older respondents. Individuals who are highly involved with Facebook are more likely to segmentate their professional and private contacts. Thus, younger individuals are more likely to segmentate professional and private contacts than older individuals. This is in line with the findings of Madden and Smith (2010), who found that young adults put more effort into limiting sharing personal information online. Perhaps older individuals integrate their professional and private lives, as they have been working longer in the same job and with the same colleagues. This can also explain the finding that older respondents disclose less self-enhancing information about themselves; they do not feel as much need for self-enhancement behaviour online than younger respondents.

*Limitations and recommendations*

There was a relatively small sample size. This might be caused by the length of the questionnaire, and the large number of Facebook posts respondents were asked to upload in the questionnaire. Many respondents refused to do so as this was seen as too much effort or a breach of privacy. Thus, future research should find another solution to access Facebook posts. Next, the planned time to gather data was relatively short. Future research should have more time scheduled for the data collection.

In addition, while coding the Facebook posts, it was found that even though many respondents did complete the questionnaire, they did not copy their posts, which made their entry incomplete. Even though the incomplete entries were filtered out of the questionnaire, 18 entries were 'missing' in the analyses. These respondents stopped when asked to copy the Facebook posts into the questionnaire; thus the Facebook posts and descriptive information of these participants was missing. This may have influenced the results slightly.

Finally, the reliability of the scale for segmentation and integration of private and professional online contacts was not adequate. Further research should recalculate the scale and its reliability.

*Implications*

The results of this study can be used to gain insight into the way individuals use Facebook and how they deal with professional and private contacts on social media platforms. The study fills the gap in existing research on online boundary management, and gives insights into how people use Facebook with regard to a professional context. In addition, it shows to what extent

the different functions of Facebook are actually being used. How individuals use social media platforms can have an impact on their professional reputation, as they are connected to a large amount of professional contacts. In addition, as Bohnert and Ross (2010) found, social media platforms are increasingly being used as a tool to screen applicants. When a profile displayed professionalism, the chances of the applicant being offered a job increased. Thus, it is of importance that individuals become aware of how their online behaviour can affect their professional reputation. This study illustrated to whom individuals are connected, and what they communicate to them; and thus how they deal with the collision of their professional and private lives on social media platforms. The finding that respondents' offline integration or segmentation behaviour of professional and private lives affect their online integration or segmentation behaviour of professional and private contacts implicates that how respondents behave in their daily lives has an influence on their online behaviour. Further research should be done into this relation.

Another implication of this study is that the theoretical framework, as proposed by Ollier-Malaterre at al. (2013) was tested. However, this study did not confirm the model, thus further research would aid the interpretation of the motivational drivers and online boundary management behaviours.

**Conclusion**

This study was a first attempt to test the model as proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013). It was found that individuals communicate with a mix of friends, family and professional contacts on Facebook, and that they do not limit who of their friends can see this information. In addition, the information they display is mostly only positive information about themselves.

To conclude the first research question, open, audience, content, and hybrid boundary management behaviours are not equally found among Facebook users. As self-enhancement is used more often than self-verification in Facebook posts, and individuals lean more towards integrating their contacts, it seems that content boundary management behaviour is used most often among the Facebook users examined in this study.

To conclude the second research question, it was expected to find a relation between offline preferences for self-evaluation and online self-evaluation behaviours, and between offline integration or segmentation of professional and private lives, and online integration or segmentation of professional and private contacts. A relation between offline behaviours for integration or segmentation of professional and private lives, and online integration or

segmentation behaviour of professional and private contacts was found. Respondents that integrate their different lives, also integrate their different contacts on Facebook. However, no relation between self-enhancement or self-verification as self-evaluation motives and online behaviours was found.

The theoretical framework of online boundary management behaviours by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) was tested. The framework proposed four different types of online boundary management behaviours were proposed. Even though Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) claim that Facebook users use two type of self-evaluation motives to present themselves online, this study found that self-verification online was hardly used by Facebook users. The majority of self-evaluating messages are self-enhancing the individual. Thus, the behaviours as proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) are not equally found on Facebook. The online boundary management behaviours Audience and Open seem to be hardly present at all. As users prefer to self-enhance their messages and to integrate their online contacts, Content online boundary management behaviour seems to be the only one actually used.

## References

Allen, M. W., Walker, K. L., Coopman, S. J., & Hart, J. L. (2007). Workplace surveillance and managing privacy boundaries. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 172-200.

Baraket-Bojmel, L., Moran, S., & Sharhar, G. (2016). Strategic self-presentation on Facebook: Personal motives and audience response to online behaviour. *Computers in Human Behavior, 55,* 788-795.

Binder, J., Howes, A., & Sutcliffe, A. (2009). The problem of conflicting social spheres: Effects of network structure on experienced tension in social network sites. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Human Factors in Computing System (pp 965-974).* New York, NY: ACM.

Bohnert, D. & Ross, W. H. (2010). The influence of social networking websites on the evaluation of job candidates. *Cyber technology, Behaviors, and Social networking, 13*, 1-7.

Buffardi, L.E., & Campbell, W.K. (2008). Narcissism and social networking websites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 34 (10), 1303-1314.

Bulger, C.A., Hoffman, M.E., & Matthews, R.A. (2007). Work and personal life boundary management: Boundary strength, work/personal life balance, and the segmentation–integration continuum. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(4), 365-375.

Chaffey, D. *Global social media research summary 2016*. Found 25-02-2016, on http://www.smartinsights.com/social-media-marketing/social-media-strategy/new-global-social-media-research/

Clark, D.M. (2001). A cognitive perspective on social phobia. In Crozier, R. en Alden, L. E. Alden (Eds.). *International Handbook of Social Anxiety: Concepts, research and interventions relating to the self and shyness*, pp 403-407.

Del Bosque, D. (2013). Will you be my friend? Social networking in the workplace. *New Library World, 114* (9/10), pp. 428-442.

Duggan, M., Ellison, N.B., Lampe, C., Lenhart, A., and Madden, M. (2015). *Social media update 2014*. Found 25-02-2016, on http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-media-update-2014/

Dunbar, R. (1998). *Grooming, gossip, and the evolution of language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C. & Lampe, C. (2006). Spatially bounded online social networks and social capital: The role of Facebook. *Proceedings of the annual Conference of the International Communication Association, 36*, 1-37.

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

Facebook. (2012). *Statistics of Facebook*. Palo Alto, CA: Facebook. Retrieved from http://newsroom.fb.com/content/default.aspx?NewsAreaId=22

Fieseler, C., Meckel, M., & Ranzini, G. (2016). Professional personae -How organizational identification shapes online identity in the workplace. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 20*, 153-170.

Frampton, B.D., & Child, J.T. (2013). Friend or not to friend: Coworker Facebook friend requests as an application of communication privacy management theory. *Computers in Human Behavior, 13*, 2257-2264.

Gosling, S. (2009). The ancient psychological roots of Facebook behavior. *The Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from http://www.blogs.hbr.org/now-new-next/2009/03/the-ancient-psychological-root.html

Gosling, S.D., Augustine, A.A., Vazire, S., Holtzman, N., & Gaddis, S. (2011). Manifestations of personality in online social networks: self-reported Facebook-related behaviors and observable profile information. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 14* (9), 483-488.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. Revised and Expanded 3rd Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill USA.

Jones, S., & Fox, S. (2009). *Generations online in 2009. Pew Internet and American Life Project.* Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2009/Generations-Online-in- 2009.aspx

Joinson, A. N. (2008). Looking at, looking up or keeping up with people? Motives and use of Facebook. In *Proceedings of the 26ᵗʰ Annual SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1027-1036). New York, NY: ACM.

Kaplan Test Prep Online Pressroom (2016). *Kaplan test prep survey: Percentage of college admissions officers who check out applicants' social media profiles hits new high; Triggers include special talents, Competitive Sabotage.* Found 19-03-2016, on http://press.kaptest.com/press-releases/kaplan-test-prep-survey-percentage-of-college-admissions-officers-who-check-out-applicants-social-media-profiles-hits-new-high-triggers-include-special-talents-competitive-sabotage

Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). *Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work-family effectiveness. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 68*(2), 347-367.

Kreiner, G.E. (2006). Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: a person-environment fit perspective. *Journal of organizational behaviour, 27* (4), pp 485-507.

Lampe, C., Ellison, N., & Steinfield, C. (2008). Changes in use and perception of Facebook. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work* (pp. 435-444). New York, NY: ACM.

Leach, C.W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M.L., Pennekamp, S.F., Doosje, B., Ouwerkerk, J.W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of personality and social psychology,* 95 (1), 144-65.

Madden, M., & Smith, A. (2010). *Reputation management and social media: how people monitor their identity and search for others online*. Found 19-03-2016, on http://www.pewinternet.org/files/old-media/Files/Reports/2010/PIP_Reputation_Management_with_topline.pdf

Millennial Branding (2015). *Millennial branding Gen-Y & Facebook study*. Found 25-02-2016, on http://millennialbranding.com/2012/millennial-branding-gen-y-facebook-study/

Newcom (2015). *Nationaal social media onderzoek 2015*. Found 25-02-2015, on http://www.newcom.nl/index.php?page=socialmedia2015

Nezlek, J.B., and Leary, M.R. (2002). Individual differences in self-presentational motives in daily social interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 28* (2), 211-223.

Peluchette, van Eck, J., Karl, K., and Fertig, J. (2013). A Facebook 'friend' request from the boss: Too close for comfort? *Business Horizons, 56*, 291-300.

Ollier-Malaterre, A., Rothbard, N.P., and Berg, J.M. (2013). When worlds collide in cyberspace: how boundary work in online social networks impacts professional relationships. *Academy of Management Review, 38* (4), 645-669.

RusselHerder (2011*). Making the connection: How Facebook is changing the supervisory relationship*. Found 26-02-2016, on http://russellherder.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/making_the_connection.pdf

Schlenker, B.R., & Leary, M.R. (1982). Audiences' reaction to self-enhancing, self-denigrating, and accurate self-presentations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18*(1), 89-104.

Swann, W. B. 1983. Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony with the self. In J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Social psychological perspectives on the self, vol. 2* (pp 33–66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Swann, W. B. (1999). *Resilient identities: Self, relationship, and the construction of social reality*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Wiesenfield, B. M., Swann, W. B., Brockner, J., & Bartel, C. A. (2007). Is more fairness always preferred? Self-esteem moderates reactions to procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1235-1253.

**Appendix 1 – questionnaire (in Dutch)**

U wordt uitgenodigd om mee te doen aan een onderzoek naar gebruik van sociale media onder werknemers. Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd door studenten van de studie Communicatie- en informatiewetenschappen van de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Het doel van dit onderzoek is om inzicht te verkrijgen in de manier waarop individuen omgaan met professionele en persoonlijke contacten op Facebook. Voorwaarden tot deelname aan dit onderzoek zijn dat u een baan en een Facebookaccount heeft.

Meedoen aan het onderzoek houdt in dat u een online vragenlijst gaat invullen. De vragen hebben betrekking op uw persoonlijk Facebookgebruik, uw zakelijke en privécontacten op sociale media, uw betrokkenheid bij uw organisatie en nog enkele algemene gegevens. Het invullen van de vragenlijst kost ongeveer 10 à 15 minuten.

U doet vrijwillig mee aan dit onderzoek en kunt op elk moment tijdens het invullen van de vragenlijst uw deelname stopzetten. De gegevens die we in dit onderzoek verzamelen, kunnen eventueel door wetenschappers gebruikt worden voor artikelen en presentaties. Natuurlijk zijn deze gegevens volledig anoniem. Er wordt enkel gekeken naar algemene patronen, er worden geen individuele deelnemers uitgelicht. Om een voorbeeld te geven van een bevinding: '36% van de respondenten plaatst informatie over hun familie op Facebook'. We zullen dus nooit melding dat u als individu iets op Facebook heeft geplaatst.

Bij één van de vragen zullen we u vragen om uw laatste zeven Facebookberichten te uploaden in deze vragenlijst. Deze berichten zullen gecodeerd worden op het type inhoud, en zullen na het analyseren worden verwijderd. Er zal vertrouwelijk met uw gegevens om worden gegaan en deze informatie zal niet aan derden worden verstrekt.

Als u vragen heeft over het onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen met Lise Ariëns (lise.ariens@student.ru.nl).

TOESTEMMING: Geef hieronder uw keuze aan.

Door te klikken op de knop 'Ik ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:

- Bovenstaande informatie heeft gelezen
- Vrijwillig meedoet aan het onderzoek
- 18 jaar of ouder bent

Als u niet mee wilt doen aan het onderzoek, kunt u op de knop 'Ik ga niet akkoord' klikken.

- o Ik ga akkoord
- o Ik ga niet akkoord

Onderstaande stellingen gaan over het beeld dat u over het algemeen naar andere mensen wilt uitstralen. Er bestaan geen goede of foute antwoorden, probeer zo eerlijk mogelijk in te vullen in hoeverre onderstaande stellingen bij u passen.

| | Helemaal mee oneens | Oneens | Redelijk mee oneens | Neutraal | Redelijk eens | Eens | Helemaal mee eens |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ik wil dat anderen begrijpen wie ik ben | | | | | | | |
| Ik wil dat anderen me zien zoals ik ben | | | | | | | |
| Ik wil dat anderen een positief beeld van me hebben | | | | | | | |
| Ik wil dat anderen me zien als getalenteerd | | | | | | | |
| Ik wil dat anderen me respecteren | | | | | | | |
| Ik wil dat anderen zien dat ik in staat ben mijn doelen te behalen | | | | | | | |

Onderstaande stellingen gaan over uw voorkeur voor het wel of niet scheiden van uw zakelijk en privéleven. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende stellingen:

| | Helemaal mee oneens | Oneens | Redelijk mee oneens | Neutraal | Redelijk eens | Eens | Helemaal mee eens |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Het liefst houd ik mijn werk en privéleven zo veel mogelijk gescheiden | | | | | | | |
| Ik probeer thuis niet aan mijn werk te denken | | | | | | | |
| Ik houd er niet van om mijn werk mee naar huis te nemen | | | | | | | |
| Ik houd er niet van om over persoonlijke dingen te praten met de meeste van mijn collega's | | | | | | | |
| Ik probeer niet aan familie en vrienden te denken wanneer ik | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| aan het werk ben, zodat ik mij kan focussen | | | | | | |
| Ik handel persoonlijke dingen af op werk wanneer ik een pauze heb | | | | | | |

Onderstaande stellingen hebben betrekking op uw betrokkenheid bij de organisatie waar u werkt. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende stellingen:

| | Helemaal mee oneens | Oneens | Redelijk mee oneens | Neutraal | Redelijk eens | Eens | Helemaal mee eens |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ik voel mij verbonden met deze organisatie | | | | | | | |
| Ik voel mij solidair met deze organisatie | | | | | | | |
| Ik voel mij betrokken bij deze organisatie | | | | | | | |

Onderstaande stellingen hebben betrekking op uw betrokkenheid bij de afdeling waar u werkt. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende stellingen:

| | Helemaal mee oneens | Oneens | Redelijk mee oneens | Neutraal | Redelijk eens | Eens | Helemaal mee eens |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ik voel mij verbonden met deze afdeling | | | | | | | |
| Ik voel mij solidair met deze afdeling | | | | | | | |
| Ik voel mij betrokken bij deze afdeling | | | | | | | |

Onderstaande stellingen gaan over uw persoonlijke Facebook gebruik. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende stellingen:

| | Helemaal mee oneens | Oneens | Redelijk mee oneens | Neutraal | Redelijk eens | Eens | Helemaal mee eens |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ik gebruik Facebook dagelijks | | | | | | | |
| Ik vind het vervelend als Facebook het niet zou doen | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ik ben er trots op om tegen mensen te zeggen dat ik een Facebook-profiel heb | | | | | | | |
| Ik heb het gevoel alsof ik dingen mis wanneer ik een tijdje niet ben ingelogd op Facebook | | | | | | | |

Onderstaande stellingen gaan over uw perceptie van de persoonlijke overlap die u ervaart tussen uw privé en werksituatie op sociale media. Geef aan in hoeverre u de volgende stellingen passen bij u:

| | Helemaal niet | Niet | Bijna Niet | Weet ik niet | Een beetje | Veel | Heel veel |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In welke mate overlappen uw privé en werk-gerelateerde sociale media profielen? | | | | | | | |
| Heeft u privécontacten (vrienden/familie) op een zakelijk sociaal media platform (zoals LinkedIn)? | | | | | | | |
| Heeft u zakelijke sociale contacten (collega's/leidinggevenden) op een persoonlijk sociaal media platform (zoals FB)? | | | | | | | |

Wanneer u informatie deelt op Facebook, gaan deze berichten dan wel een over werk?

- o Nee, ik deel op mijn Facebookpagina geen informatie over mijn werk.
- o Ja, ik deel op mijn Facebookpagina wel eens informatie over mijn werk.
- o Ja, ik deel op mijn Facebookpagina (bijna) alleen maar informatie over mijn werk.

Log in op uw Facebookaccount en ga naar uw vriendenoverzicht. U heeft deze informatie nodig om onderstaande vragen te beantwoorden. Onderstaande vragen gaan over uw persoonlijke Facebookgebruik.

Heeft u zakelijke contacten (zowel ex- als huidige collega's/leidinggevenden) op Facebook?

- o Ja, ik heb zakelijke contacten op Facebook.
- o Nee, ik heb geen zakelijke contacten op Facebook.

Kunt u een schatting geven van het aantal zakelijke contacten waarmee u bevriend bent op Facebook (zowel ex- als huidige collega's/leidinggevenden)? ……………………………………………………

Kunt u een schatting geven van het aantal collega's (van de organisatie waar u op dit moment werkzaam bent) waarmee u bevriend bent op Facebook? ……………………………………………………

Kunt u een schatting geven van het aantal collega's (van de afdeling waar u op dit moment werkzaam bent) waarmee u bevriend bent op Facebook? …………………………………………………………....

Als u naar al uw Facebook contacten kijkt, hoe groot is dan het aandeel zakelijke contacten? Probeer hieronder een zo goed mogelijke schatting te maken. Van mijn totaal aantal Facebook contacten bestaat ongeveer ….. % uit zakelijke contacten.

Heeft u privécontacten (familie/vrienden) op een zakelijk sociaal media platform (zoals LinkedIn)?

- o Ja, ik heb familieleden/vrienden toegevoegd op een zakelijk sociaal media platform.
- o Nee, ik heb geen familieleden/vrienden toegevoegd op een zakelijk sociaal media platform.
- o Nee, ik maak geen gebruik van een zakelijk sociaal media platform.

Is uw Facebook profiel openbaar?

- o Ja, iedereen kan mijn volledige Facebook profiel bekijken.
- o Nee, alleen mijn Facebook vrienden, en de vrienden van mijn vrienden, kunnen mijn profiel zien.
- o Nee, alleen mijn Facebook vrienden kunnen mijn profiel zien.
- o Ik weet het niet.

Wanneer u informatie deelt op Facebook, deelt u deze informatie dan met al uw Facebook contacten?

- o Nee, ik pas bij het plaatsen van een bericht wel eens aan met wie ik mijn bericht deel (bv. openbaar, vrienden, alleen ik, familie, werkcontacten, etc.)
- o Ja, ik plaats mijn berichten zonder mijn privacy instellingen/ontvangers aan te passen.

Om meer inzicht te krijgen in wat voor informatie mensen delen op Facebook, willen we u vragen om naar uw persoonlijke Facebook pagina gaan en uw zeven meest recente Facebookberichten (status updates) te kopiëren en te plakken* in de onderstaande tekstvelden. U kunt alleen tekst kopiëren en plakken, dus u kunt de berichten zonder tekst overslaan.

 * Op een Windows computer kunt u kopiëren door de tekst te selecteren en vervolgens tegelijkertijd de 'Ctrl' en de 'C' toets in te drukken. Plakken doet u door in het bovenstaande tekstveld te klikken en vervolgens de 'Ctrl' toets en de 'V' toets tegelijk in te drukken. Voor een Apple computer geldt de toetscombinatie Cmd+C en Cmd+V .

Wilt u hieronder uw eerst meest recente status plakken?

Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Wilt u hieronder uw tweede meest recente status plakken?

Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Wilt u hieronder uw derde meest recente status plakken?

Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Tot slot vragen wij u een aantal persoonlijke gegevens in te vullen. Wij zullen vertrouwelijk met uw gegevens omgaan en deze anoniem verwerken. De antwoorden op deze vragenlijst zullen niet naar u te herleiden zijn.

Wat is uw geslacht?

- o   Man
- o   Vrouw

Wat is uw leeftijd? ……

Wat is uw hoogst behaalde diploma?

- o   Geen
- o   Basisonderwijs
- o   Lager/voorbereidend beroepsonderwijs (lbo/vmbo)
- o   Middelbaar algemeen voortgezet onderwijs (vmbo-t)
- o   Middelbaar beroepsonderwijs (mbo)
- o   Hoger algemeen voortgezet onderwijs (havo)
- o   Voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs (vwo)
- o   Hoger beroepsonderwijs (hbo)
- o   Wetenschappelijk onderwijs (wo)

Bent u momenteel student?

- o   Ja, ik doe een voltijd studie (en heb eventueel een bijbaan)
- o   Ja, ik studeer naast mijn werk (bv. deeltijdstudie of avondstudie)
- o   Nee, ik heb een baan en studeer op het moment niet.

**//Alleen voor respondenten met een baan//**

Werkt u fulltime of parttime?

- o   Fulltime (5 dagen per week)
- o   Parttime (4 dagen per week)
- o   Parttime (3 dagen per week)
- o   Parttime (1 of 2 dagen per week)

Heeft u een vast of tijdelijk dienstverband?

- o   Vast
- o   Tijdelijk

Heeft u een leidinggevende functie?

- o   Ja
- o   Nee

Hoeveel jaar bent u werkzaam bij de organisatie waar u op dit moment werkt? ….. jaar

Hoeveel jaar bent u werkzaam bij de afdeling waar u op dit moment werkt? ….. jaar

Dit is het einde van de vragenlijst. Bedankt voor het invullen! Indien u nog vragen heeft kunt op contact opnemen met Lise Ariëns (lise.ariens@student.ru.nl).

Indien u op de hoogte gebracht wilt worden van de resultaten van het onderzoek kunt u hier uw e-mailadres invullen.