Bachelor Thesis

Online Boundary Management in the Facebook Era: Drivers to Online Behaviour on Facebook

Merle Meeuws – s4323467

30-5-2016

Abstract

In this digital era boundaries between work life and personal life tend to fade, especially on Facebook. The importance of boundary management (how people manage the boundaries between their private and professional life) therefore increases extensively. Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) have designed a model regarding online boundary management. This study was conducted to find to what extent the behaviours described by the model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) (based on online integration or segmentation of Facebook contacts and online self-verification or self-enhancement in Facebook posts) can be found on the Facebook platform. Additionally, this study aimed to discover to what extent one's drivers with regards to boundary management are related to one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform. In order to do so a survey was carried out among employees.

Results showed that the behaviours described by the model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) do occur on the Facebook platform. The most popular behaviours were integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts and self-enhancement within online Facebook posts. Results also showed that one's drivers with regards to boundary management did not relate to one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform within this study. In spite of this, other interesting correlations were found regarding self-presentation and integration and segmentation of professional and private contacts (both in daily life and online). Overall, this study creates an understanding of the practical meaning of fading boundaries between private and professional spheres in the online environment with regards to integration versus segmentation and online self-presentation.

Introduction

In today's ever changing modern world, the presence and importance of social media has increased dramatically. Internet itself has been integrated into everyday life, and consequently so has social media. In fact, 2.13 billion people worldwide have an account on social media (Statista, 2016b). Facebook currently holds 1.55 billion monthly active users (Statista, 2016a) and has become an undeniable part of today's society. Most people nowadays are involved in social media which might impact people's professional lives.

In daily life, people experience a natural separation between the work environment and the private environment. However, on social media this separation between work life and personal life tends to fade. In daily life, people usually take on a professional role at work while taking on a more personal role in the private spheres. In the environment of social

media, employees are interacting with their professional contacts while interacting with friends and family as well. Therefore, one's personal and professional spheres might intermingle on social media platforms and separating different roles becomes more complicated. Someone's colleague might come across that person's holiday pictures on Facebook, for example. This study aims to investigate to what extent people separate private and professional roles on Facebook in accordance with how they like to separate these roles in daily life. For instance, do people who prefer to separate their private and professional roles in daily life also separate these roles on Facebook?

In daily life, people experience a natural preference for a certain form of self-presentation, which results in matching behaviour. When someone likes to present himself positively, he will avoid negative comments about himself, for example. The sort of self-presentation in the professional environment might differ from the private environment. The aforementioned fading boundaries between the private and the professional spheres on social media therefore complicate self-presentation online. There might be different audiences represented on social media which may stimulate different sorts of self-presentation. This study aims to research to what extent people present themselves on Facebook in line with how they like to present themselves in daily life. For example, do people that prefer to present themselves realistically in daily life also present themselves realistically on Facebook?

Facebook is used at work more often nowadays. Many companies have profiles on Facebook and also use this channel for recruiting purposes (Wright, 2008; Zeidner, 2008 as cited in Van Eck Peluchette, Karl, & Fertig, 2013). This means that online behaviour is taken into account in the workplace as well these days, which enlarges the importance of insights into this behaviour. The fading boundaries on online platforms might have a negative effect on the professional life. For instance, when someone posts a photo on which he appears very drunk on Facebook and the photo can be viewed by professional contacts, this could lead to not getting hired for a job or even getting fired (Wang, Komanduri, Leon, Norcie, Acquisti, & Cranor, 2011).

Little research has been conducted so far in order to analyse how individuals manage the boundaries between their personal and professional roles online (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Earlier research implied that online boundary management (how people manage the boundaries between their private and professional life) might mirror the boundary management practices in daily life (Fieseler, Meckel, & Ranzini, 2014). However, this has not yet been researched.

The current study was conducted in order to provide more insights into how people manage the boundaries between their private and professional lives online and the possible connections to boundary management in daily life. Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) have designed a theoretical model on online boundary management including the motivational drivers, behaviours and consequences of online boundary management. The relationship between the drivers and the online behaviours described in this model will be tested in this study. In order to test this model, on which will be elaborated further on, Facebook will be used as platform because Facebook is shown to be the most commonly used social media platform today (Del Bosque, 2013). The concept of boundary management will now be further discussed.

Boundary Management

A fair amount of research has been conducted regarding boundary management in general and this has resulted in many different versions of a definition of boundary management. Overall, the core of boundary management literally is 'how people manage their boundaries in a social context'. In other words this means how people present themselves and to whom. Different styles of boundary management are determined by the extent to which people separate their professional and personal roles and by the presented identity and perceived boundary control (Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012).

The personal development of a boundary management style can be seen as a dynamic process. Boundaries are formed by people's expectations and experiences (in a social context) and by those of whom surround them. Therefore the development of boundary management is dependent on circumstances rather than a fixed set of rules (Palen, & Dourish, 2003 as cited in Fieseler et al., 2014). This means that the sort of boundary management that someone puts in practice results from personal values combined with the environment someone lives in, and can thus differ from person to person.

All in all, people manage their boundaries by determining with whom they want to interact and how they want to present themselves to those others. Therefore, the pivotal aspects of boundary management are the choice between integration or separation of the personal and professional audiences and the sort of self-presentation. These pivotal aspects are the motivational drivers in the model of Ollier-Malaterre (2013) on which will be elaborated further on. Boundary management occurs both in daily life and online. The pivotal aspects of boundary management will now each be discussed.

Integration or Separation between Private and Professional Roles in Daily Life

In general, people find themselves in different environments that may ask for different behaviours. In these different environments, people encounter different audiences. In order to manage their social lives, people might have the need to separate their work and private roles. Everyone has different preferences when it comes to separation of audiences in daily life. When someone separates private and professional roles, referred to as *segmentation*, boundaries are less blurry. However, it is more difficult managing not to cross the boundaries. When you *integrate*, on the other hand, there are no boundaries and it becomes more challenging to maintain private and professional roles properly (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000).

The decision to separate or integrate your professional and private roles is based on boundaries comparable to the distance that people set between work and non-work spaces (Lampinen, Lehtinen, Lehmuskallio, & Tamminen, 2011).

Integration or Separation between Private and Professional Roles on Online Platforms

Integration and Separation between private and professional roles does not only happen in daily life, it occurs on online platforms as well. Earlier research has provided varying insights into the extent to which people currently separate their professional lives from their personal lives online. Insights are also provided regarding people's preferences of separation online. For example, many people prefer not to be connected with their bosses on Facebook, but meanwhile they would accept a friend request if their bosses were to add them, because they are afraid to reject their bosses (Del Bosque, 2013). This might force people with a natural preference for segmentation to start integrating online. Del Bosque (2013) also found that people do like to add professional contacts on Facebook in order to stay in touch with colleagues at a distance, but overall, social media is more frequently used for friends than for colleagues. Within Facebook people are actually stimulated to present the company they work for and their work positions on their Facebook profiles due to Facebook settings (Fieseler et al., 2014). This means that Facebook is indirectly stimulating members to integrate professional lives with private lives on Facebook.

On the other hand, Facebook offers many options to separate different roles and audiences that are exposed to certain content. Facebook users can change the settings so that people outside their network cannot find them in their search, but they can also choose the audience of their content per page, per subject or even per post and block certain people from

viewing specific things or even the whole account (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008). Despite these extensive options people rarely use these options and choose not to separate their identities on Facebook (Fieseler et al., 2014). Segmentation between friends and colleagues in particular is not very common within the Facebook environment (Del Bosque, 2013).

Segmentation can also be implemented by creating two or more fully separate online identities that are linked to separate roles in people's lives (Fieseler et al., 2014). Consequently, you can own a Facebook profile or a LinkedIn profile with your professional contacts while at the same time owning a (second) Facebook profile with your personal contacts. These could be interesting options, especially considering that people value privacy to a great extent (Del Bosque, 2013). These are valuable insights into possibilities of separation between the private and professional roles on online platforms.

The choice for integration or segmentation between the private and professional roles is a major aspect of online boundary management. Earlier research implied that online boundary management might mirror the boundary management practices in daily life (Fieseler, Meckel, & Ranzini, 2014). Therefore, this study investigates to what extent there is a relationship between one's preference of separation of audiences in daily life and one's preference of separation between private and professional roles online.

Self-presentation in Daily Life

Besides integration or separation between private and professional roles, self-presentation is a major element of boundary management as well. Presenting ourselves is something we do at all times. However, the manner in which we do so is essential for the way we appear to others. Overall, people have control over other's impressions of them through performances within a social context (Abril, Levin, & Del Riego, 2012). In other words, the way someone presents himself to others will influence the impression of him and that is the control he has over those impressions. When people try to control those impressions, it is called self- presentation (Leary & Tangney, 2010).

People try to control other's impressions by conveying a certain image of the self to others in order to shape the attitudes and behaviour of audiences (Leary & Tangney, 2012). This image can be created through many different approaches to self-presentation that are based on self-evaluation motives. Self-evaluation motives are motives that determine how people want to be seen by others (Ollier-Malaterre, 2013). Within this research two self-evaluation motives will be focussed on and thus discussed: *self-enhancement* [presenting

yourself positively] and *self-verification* [presenting yourself realistically]. This focus was chosen because these self-evaluation motives are likely to play an important role in shaping the content people disclose in online social networks (Ollier-Malaterre, 2013). Furthermore these self-evaluation motives have been frequently discussed and empirically supported in the literature (Ollier-Malaterre, 2013). People may choose to enhance their self-presentation, but may also portrait themselves accurately (Leary & Tangney, 2012). In fact, "people might experience a need for both self-enhancement and self-verification, but these needs vary under different conditions" (Anseel, & Lievens, 2006, p.535). Particularly, research found that in daily life circumstances people are more likely to self-enhance in order to present themselves in the best possible way (Schlenker & Leary, 1982).

Self-presentation on Online Platforms

As mentioned before, people have control over the impressions that others have of them. Online, this control is practiced through shared content on online platforms. Within online platforms profiles are not exclusive. Consequently, nobody can check whether or not the information given online is correct. This makes social media very accessible for users to present a 'desired self' as supposed to the 'actual self' (Fieseler et al., 2014).

For Facebook specifically, Zhao et al. (2008) have found that most users attempt to present themselves socially desirable on Facebook. Due to Facebook's wide-ranging settings, self-presentation strategies can also be differentiated for different audiences (Zhao et al., 2008) which means that people can present themselves differently to their professional contacts than to their private contacts. This broadens the range of self-presentation options.

Even though there is no right or wrong strategy for self-presentation and both strategies are present on Facebook, some trends can be signalled (Wilson, Gosling, & Graham, 2012). It was found that people draw a fairly accurate image of their natural identity in general (Wilson et al., 2012). At the same time Wilson et al. (2012) have presented that most of the visible user information on one's profile is edited or polished, resembling self-enhancement. Perhaps this fairly accurate online representation of people's identity in daily life is a result of the fact that people's identity in daily life is self-enhanced already.

The trend to self-enhance self-presentation in daily life (Schlenker & Lear, 1982) would be adopted online according to Gil-Or, Levi-Belz and Turel (2015). Gil-Or, et al. (2015) have stated that people tend to present a "false Facebook-self" that differs clearly from the actual self in a positive way. Another recent study by Baraket-Bohmel, Moran and Shahar

6

(2016) has shown that people enhance their image on Facebook more than they derogate it (presenting themselves negatively). All these studies point towards the same conclusion: self-enhancement – presenting oneself positively – is the most popular strategy on Facebook.

Within this study, the motivational drivers to boundary management as described so far will be researched on the basis of the model of Ollier-Malaterre (2013) regarding online boundary management drivers, behaviours, and consequences. This model will now be further explained.

Online Boundary Management Drivers, Behaviours, and Consequences

In this research, as mentioned earlier, the motivational drivers and behaviours laid out in the model that was created by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) will be tested: the model of Online Boundary Management Drivers, Behaviours, and Consequences (see figure 1).

Preferences for segmentation versus integration of professional and pesonal identities

	Integration	Segmentation
Self-verification	Open boundary management behaviours	Audience boundary management behaviours
Self-enhancement	Content boundary management behaviours	Hybrid boundary managment behaviours

Self-evaluation motives

Figure 1.   Online Boundary Management Drivers, Behaviours, and Consequences – edited (Ollier-Malaterre, Rothbard, & Berg, 2013, p. 652)

This model is a matrix that serves as a framework of four motivational drivers of online boundary management (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Vertically and horizontally, two so-called 'identity navigation processes' are illustrated. These processes (consisting of the four motivational drivers) represent the choice between integration and segmentation of personal and professional identities and the choice between self-verification and self-enhancement as

self-evaluation motives. The four drivers that lead to certain behaviour are integration, segmentation, self-verification and self-enhancement.

Integration is the approach to boundary management in which one role is taken on in both the professional and the personal sphere. *Segmentation*, on the other hand, is the approach to boundary management in which separate roles are taken on in the professional and the personal sphere. This is the case in both daily life and in the online environment. However, no research was conducted yet in order to investigate whether one's preference for integration or segmentation between the private and professional life in daily life relates to integration or segmentation between the private and professional life online. This study aims to do so.

The main topics for self-evaluation are self-verification and self-enhancement, both as self-evaluation motive and in the online environment. *Self-verification* is a more realistic way of presenting yourself in which you show both negative and positive aspects of yourself. *Self-enhancement* stands for presenting yourself while only showing the positive aspects and therefore enhancing the presentation of yourself. Whether self-verification and self-enhancement as self-evaluation motives relate to self-verification and self-enhancement online remains unclear so far. This study will therefore investigate this possible relation.

By combining the different motivational drivers from this matrix four boundary management behaviour styles are created: open-, audience-, content-, and hybrid boundary management behaviours.

Open Boundary Management Behaviours

Open boundary management behaviours are created when the approach of integration of private and professional contexts online is combined with online self-verification. This means that no concrete action is undertaken in order to manage the online boundaries. Within this style people take on one and the same role in both private and professional spheres in which both the positive and the negative aspects of the self are presented. A consistent and realistic self-presentation for all audiences is essential for people showing open boundary management behaviours. Therefore, boundary challenges are much less present within this category.

Audience Boundary Management Behaviours

The combination of segmentation of private and professional contexts online and online self-verification can be specified as audience boundary management behaviours. This category is set for those who take on different roles for their personal and their professional spheres while remaining realistic in their self-presentation by sharing both positive and negative content.

Therefore, the boundary challenges concern mainly sharing the right sort of content to the right audiences. This content contains, in all cases, both negative and positive information though.

Content Boundary Management Behaviours

The combination of integration of private and professional contexts online with online self-enhancement, can be referred to as audience boundary management behaviours. Within these behaviours people do not take on different roles for different spheres while presenting themselves very positively. The self-presentation in this approach is very consistent towards both private and professional audiences; however, it is constantly very positive instead of realistic. Therefore, people within this category will be actively working on content management to ensure solely positive information about them is provided online.

Hybrid Boundary Management Behaviours

The style with the most complex boundary management is hybrid boundary management behaviours. Within this style people use online self-enhancement for presenting themselves while segmenting their audiences into a professional sphere and a personal sphere online. This style is the most complicated one due to the fact that people need to manage content, in order to control its positivity, as well as audiences, in order to ensure that the right audience receives the right sort of information.

This model proposed by Ollier-Malaterre (2013) is a theoretical model; hence, it has not been tested empirically. Therefore, whether or not online boundary management is related to the motivational drivers was not yet researched. This study was conducted in order to test this model and find clarification within the field.

Research Questions

In order to conduct this research, two research questions were designed. These questions are the following:

1. To what extent can the behaviours described by the model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) (based on online integration or segmentation of Facebook contacts and online self-verification or self-enhancement in Facebook posts) be found in online usage on the Facebook platform?
2. To what extent do one's drivers with regards to boundary management relate to one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform?

Method

Within this research, two different sorts of methods were used because varying aspects were measured. The main method that was used in this study is a survey; part of the survey included a corpus analysis on which will be elaborated in this section.

Research Design

By means of a survey respondents' preferences for self-enhancement and self-verification as self-evaluation motives and their preference for segmentation or integration of the private and professional lives in daily life were measured (***independent variables***). Within this survey, online segmentation or integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts (***dependent variable***) was measured as well. As part of the survey, participants were asked to copy and paste their three most recent Facebook posts and this corpus of Facebook posts was analysed in order to research self-enhancement and self-verification within online Facebook posts (***dependent variables***).

Instrumentation

Survey

Facebook usage, privacy settings and more specific data regarding the personal Facebook profiles were measures with several questions that can be found in appendix 1.

The preference for the segmentation or integration of one's private and professional lives in daily life was measured with six items on a 7-point Likert scale ('I strongly agree – I strongly disagree'; based on Clark, 2005; Kossek et al., 2016; and Kreiner, 2006). All Likert scales consisted of statements regarding the preference for segmentation versus integration of the private and professional lives in daily life with a high score meaning a high preference for segmentation and a low score meaning a high preference for integration. The first statement is a general one regarding segmentation versus integration ('I prefer to separate my private and professional life as much as possible'), the next two statements were in favour of segmentation in the sense that people do not think of work when they are at home (e.g. 'I try not to think of work at home') and the last three statements were in favour of segmentation in the sense that people do not think of home when they are at work (e.g. 'I only settle personal aspects at work during my break'). The reliability of the items measuring preference for the segmentation or integration of one's private and professional lives in daily life was adequate ($\alpha = .76$).

Online segmentation or integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts was measured as well. In order to do so, respondents were asked to estimate what percentage of their Facebook contacts are professional contacts ('Approximately … % of all my Facebook contacts are professional contacts').

The self-evaluation motives self-enhancement and self-verification were measured with six items on a 7-point Likert scale ('I strongly agree – I strongly disagree'; based on Wiesenfeld et al., 2007). All Likert scales consisted of statements regarding self-evaluation with the first four statements in favour of self-enhancement (e.g. 'I want people to respect me') and the last two statements in favour of self-verification (e.g. 'I want people to understand who I am'). The reliability of the items measuring the self-evaluation motives self-enhancement ($\alpha = .82$) and self-verification ($\alpha = .80$) was good.

Self-enhancement and self-verification within online Facebook posts were measured by means of a corpus analysis. Within the questionnaire participants were asked to copy and paste their three most recent Facebook posts. The corpus consisted of the collection of the participants' personal Facebook posts. Per participant, the three most recent published Facebook posts were included into the corpus.

In total, 97 participants provided their most recent Facebook posts. The corpus that was analysed, consisting of 291 Facebook posts, was coded by two different independent and objective coders. Every post was coded in either the category 'self-enhancement', 'self-verification' or 'neutral'. The method used to analyse the corpus was based on the study of Baraket-Bojmel et al. (2016).

A Facebook post was coded as 'self-enhancement' when the overall presentation of the self or event described was viewed as positive or socially desirable. A Facebook post was coded as 'self-verification' in the case of a negative self-presentation or way of describing an event. The code 'neutral' was used for Facebook posts in which self-presentation was absent.

Finally, every participant was assigned three scores: one score for self-enhancement (on a scale from 0 to 3, with the score resembling the amount of posts that were coded as self-enhancement), one score for self-verification (on a scale from 0 to 3, with the score resembling the amount of posts that were coded as self-verification) and one score for neutral (on a scale from 0 to 3, with the score resembling the amount of posts that were coded as neutral).

The interrater reliability of the variable 'online self-verification' was good: κ = .90, *p* < .001. The interrater reliability of the variable 'online self-enhancement' was satisfactory: κ = .70, *p* < .001. The interrater reliability of the coding 'neutral' was satisfactory as well: κ = .72, *p* < .001.

Next to the independent and dependent variables based on the model of Ollier-Malaterre (2013), other factors that might be of importance were measured as well. Fieseler et al. (2014) already showed that identification with the organization and Facebook involvement were related to online boundary management. Therefore, Facebook involvement, identification with the organization and identification with the department were also measured.

Facebook involvement was measured with 7-point Likert scales ('I strongly agree – I strongly disagree'; based on based on Ellison et al., 2007). All Likert scales consisted of statements regarding involvement with Facebook with a high score meaning high involvement (e.g. 'I am proud to tell people that I have a Facebook-profile'). The reliability of the four items measuring Facebook involvement was adequate (α = .69).

Both identification with the organization and identification with the department that respondents work for were measured with 7-point Likert scales ('I strongly agree – I strongly disagree'; based on Leach et al, 2008). All Likert scales consisted of statements regarding involvement with the first three statements concerning the organization (e.g. 'I feel connected with the organization') and the last three statements regarding the department (e.g. 'I feel involved with the department I work for'). Both the reliability of the items measuring involvement with the organization (α = .96) and the involvement with the department (α = .97) were good.

At the end of the survey, participants were asked some questions regarding demographics, such as age, gender, nationality and status of employment.

Participants and Procedure

A total of 97 employees participated in the study by filling out the questionnaire (age: *M* = 26.94; *SD* = 10.91; range 18-60; 81.4% female). The most frequent highest educational degree of respondents was a secondary school degree ('VWO' which is the pre-university degree in the Netherlands, 27.8%). The participants were required to work either full-time, part-time or have a side-job. In total, 75.3% of respondents worked part-time and 54.6%

worked based on a temporary contract. Of all respondents, 67% were students. People worked 22.4 hours per week on average (*SD*=13.93), had been working at the current organization for 3.47 years on average (*SD*=6.30) and had been working at the current department for 2.4 years on average (*SD*=3.66). Only 20.6% of respondents took on a managerial role. In order to take part in this study, participants were also required to have an active Facebook account and to be willing to share content from their personal Facebook page.

The data was collected via an online survey on the Qualtrics platform. This survey was launched on 28-04-2016 and remained accessible for 12 days. The survey was sent to 234 people and 109 surveys were completely filled out. Only 97 respondents correctly filled out the survey and were used for analysis. A survey was filled out correctly when respondents also included their Facebook posts. Participants were approached personally as well as via social media and via e-mail.

After being approached, participants navigated to the Qualtrics survey by clicking on the link provided. The topics were treated in the following order: Facebook involvement, online segmentation or integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts, privacy settings, online self-enhancement and self-verification within Facebook posts, the preference for segmentation or integration of the private and professional lives in daily life, identification with the organization, identification with the department, the self-evaluation motives self-enhancement and self-verification in daily life and demographics. Participants filled out the questionnaire and were asked to attach their three most recent Facebook posts to the survey by logging into their Facebook accounts and copying and pasting the posts.

Statistical Treatment

Since the aim of the study was to research to what extent the independent variables (drivers of behaviour) relate with the dependent variables (online behaviour), a correlation analysis was conducted. This correlation analysis can support the possible relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables.

Results

The main purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent can the behaviours described by the model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) (based on online integration or segmentation of Facebook contacts and online self-verification or self-enhancement in Facebook posts) be found in online usage on the Facebook platform (RQ1) and to what extent one's drivers with regards to boundary management relate to one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform (RQ2). Several statistical tests were carried out in order to answer these questions. The results of these tests are presented below.

Facebook usage

Table 1 displays the means and standard deviations of Facebook usage variables. From this table can be derived that on average people have 510 contacts on Facebook of which 45 are professional contacts. An interesting finding is that participants estimated 13.32% of their contacts on Facebook to be professional contacts.

Table 1.   Means (*M*) and Standard Deviations (*SD)* of Facebook usage variables (*N*=97)

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Amount of contacts on Facebook	510.15	263.15
Amount of professional contacts on Facebook	45.4	68.01
Amount of colleagues at the current organization on Facebook	18.58	39.40
Amount of colleagues at the current department on Facebook	8.73	13.15
Own perception of percentage of professional contacts on Facebook	13.32 %	13.63 %

Table 2 shows Facebook usage variables displayed in percentages. Regarding RQ1, a notable result is that the vast majority of respondents had professional contacts on Facebook (92.8%). Furthermore, the private account is by far the most popular one on Facebook among the respondents (64.9%) and most of the messages on Facebook were posted with adjusted privacy settings (55.7%).

Table 2.   Facebook usage variables displayed in percentages (*N=97)*

Variable	Percentage	*N*
Professional contacts on Facebook		
- Yes	92.8%	90
- No	7.2%	7
Private contacts on a professional social media platform		
- Yes	67%	65
- No	33%	32
Sort of Facebook account		
- Fully public account: everyone can see the full profile on Facebook	7.2%	7
- Partially public account: only Facebook friends, and friends of friends, can see the full profile on Facebook	23.7%	23
- Private account: only Facebook friends can see the full profile on Facebook	64.9%	63
- Respondents that did not know	4.1%	4
Privacy settings		
- Posting messages without adjusting the privacy settings	44.3%	43
- Posting messages with adjusted privacy settings	55.7%	54

Table 3 shows how the corpus of Facebook posts provided by the respondents was coded (291 posts were coded in total) which is interesting information with regards to RQ1. From this table it can be concluded that many more posts were coded as self-enhancement (44%) than as self-verification (4.1%). Interestingly, most posts were coded as neutral.

Table 3.   Amount of Facebook posts rated as self-enhancement, self-verification or neutral displayed in percentages (*N* = 291)

Coding	Percentage of posts rated with the code stated	*N*
Self-enhancement	44%	128
Self-verification	4.1%	12
Neutral	51.9%	151

Correlations

Table 4 displays the means and standard deviations variables regarding Facebook involvement, identification with the organization, identification with the department, self-enhancement and self-verification as self-evaluation motives, integration and segmentation of the private and professional lives in daily life, self-enhancement and self-verification within online Facebook posts and online segmentation and integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts. Overall, respondents were reasonably involved with

Facebook (*M* = 4.57, *SD* = 1.10) and agreed to statements regarding high involvement with the organization (*M* = 5.70, *SD* = 1.24).

Results also revealed that respondents showed more online self-enhancement than online self-verification in Facebook posts since the average score on self-enhancement is higher.

Table 4 clarifies that people tend to agree with statements in favour of segmentation of the private and professional lives in daily life (*M* = 4.07, *SD* = 1.67). However, this agreement is not too strong. With regards to online integrations or segmentation of private and professional Facebook contacts, respondents estimated 13% of their Facebook contacts to be professional contacts on average.

Table 4.   Means (*M*) and Standard Deviations (*SD*) of variables Facebook involvement, identification with the organization, identification with the department, self-enhancement and self-verification as self-evaluation motive, integration and segmentation of the private and professional lives in daily life, online self-enhancement and online self-verification within Facebook posts and online segmentation and integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts (*N*=97)

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*Scale*	*A high score means*
Facebook involvement	4.57	1.10	1-7	More involvement
Identification with the organization	5.53	1.45	1-7	More involvement
Identification with the department	5.88	1.38	1-7	More involvement
Self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive	5.66	0.92	1-7	More self-enhancement
Self-verification as self-evaluation motive	5.40	1.27	1-7	More self-verification
Integration and segmentation of the private and professional lives in daily life	4.07	1.67	1-7	More segmentation
Online self-enhancement within Facebook posts	1.32	1.09	0-3	More self-enhancement
Online self-verification within Facebook posts	.12	.36	0-3	More self-verification
Online integration and segmentation of one's private and professional Facebook contacts	13.32	13.63	0-100	More integration

In order to investigate to what extent one's drivers with regards to boundary management relate to one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform, a correlation analysis was carried out. The results of this correlation analysis are displayed in table 5.

Table 5.   Correlations (*r*) between integration or segmentation of the private and professional lives in daily life, self-evaluation motives self-enhancement and self-verification, online integration or segmentation of one's private and professional Facebook contacts, online self-enhancement within Facebook posts, online self-verification within Facebook posts, Facebook involvement, identification with the organization and identification with the department

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Integration / Segmentation private and professional lives									
2. Self-enhancement	.04								
3. Self-verification	.18	.52**							
4. Online integration/segmentation	.04	-.01	-.04						
5. Online self-enhancement	.14	.01	.16	-.01					
6. Online self-verification	.07	.16	.11	.22*	-.21*				
7. Facebook involvement	.13	.31**	.24*	.12	.01	.11			
8. Identification with organization	-.20*	.08	.04	.15	.09	.03	.17		
9. Identification with department	.15	.07	.04	.19	.10	.16	.22*	.64**	

* $p < .050$, ** $p < .010$

Self-presentation and integration/segmentation

The second aim of this study was to research to what extent self-verification and self-enhancement as self-evaluation motives and integration or segmentation of the private and professional lives in daily life relate to self-verification and self-enhancement within Facebook posts and online integration or segmentation of one's private and professional Facebook contacts online (RQ2).

Results show that no significant correlation was found between self-verification and self-enhancement as self-evaluation motives and online self-verification and self-enhancement within Facebook posts. Likewise, no significant correlation was found between

integration or segmentation of the private and professional lives in daily life and integration or segmentation of one's private and professional Facebook contacts online.

Although no significant correlations were found with regards to RQ2, other variables did show a correlation on which will be elaborated below.

A significant positive correlation was found between self-enhancement and self-verification as self-evaluation motive (r (97) = .52, p < .001). Respondents that preferred self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive were shown to prefer self-verification as self-evaluation motive as well. For online self-enhancement and online self-verification within Facebook posts, on the other hand, a significant negative correlation was found (r (97) = -.21, p = .04). Hence, respondents that used more online self-enhancement within Facebook posts used less online self-verification within online Facebook posts.

A significant positive correlation was revealed between self-verification within online Facebook posts and online integration or segmentation of one's private and professional Facebook contacts (r (97) = .22, p = .04). Respondents that were more in favour of self-verification within online Facebook posts more often integrated private and professional Facebook contacts online.

Even though no relationship between the motivational drivers and online behaviour was found, other significant correlations were discovered regarding Facebook involvement and identification with the organization or the department.

Facebook involvement

A significant positive correlation came to light between Facebook involvement and self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive (r (97) = .31, p < .001). Respondents who were more involved with Facebook, preferred self-enhancement as a self-evaluation motive to a greater extent. Simultaneously, a significant positive correlation was found between Facebook involvement and self-verification as a self-evaluation motive (r (97) = .24, p = .02). Therefore, respondents that were more involved with Facebook were shown to prefer self-verification as a self-evaluation motive to a greater extent.

Identification with organization/department

A significant positive correlation was discovered between identification with the organization and identification with the department (r (97) = .64, p < .001). Respondents that identified themselves more with the organization also identified themselves more with the department.

Between Facebook involvement and the identification with the department a significant positive correlation was found as well (r (97) = .22, p = .03). Respondents that were more involved with Facebook identified themselves more with the department. Moreover, a significant negative correlation between identification with the organization and integration or segmentation of the private and professional lives in daily life (r (97) = -.20, p = .04) was found. Respondents that identified themselves more with the organization were shown to integrate private and professional Facebook contacts to a greater extent online.

Conclusion and Discussion

This study aims to answer the two research questions, namely, to what extent can the behaviours described by the model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) (based on online integration or segmentation of one's private and professional Facebook contacts and online self-verification or self-enhancement in Facebook posts) be found in online usage on the Facebook platform (RQ1) and to what extent do one's drivers with regards to boundary management relate to one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform (RQ2)?

Research Question 1

Results show that the behaviours described by the model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) do occur in online usage on the Facebook platform. Respondents revealed to have certain preferences regarding these behaviours. It appears that integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts is preferred over segmentation by most respondents since the vast majority (92.8%) has professional contacts on Facebook and on average respondents estimated 13.3% of their Facebook contacts to be professional ones. The number of professional contacts that respondents befriended on Facebook was approximately 45 professional contacts and 18 colleagues at the current organization were befriended on Facebook on average. The average number of employees per organization in the Netherlands in 2016 is 27 (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2016). This indicates that many of the respondents' colleagues are befriended on Facebook. These results concur with those of Fieseler et al. (2014) and those of Del Bosque (2013) who have also found that people rarely separate their identities on Facebook and that segmentation is not very common within the Facebook environment.

Despite the overall preference for integration, it is notable that 55.7% of respondents do adjust the privacy settings (settings regarding which audience can see the post) when

posting a message on Facebook. Apparently, people do consciously consider who they want to enable to see their posts.

Considering self-evaluation motives people used more self-enhancement ($M = 1.32$, $SD = 1.09$) than self-verification ($M = .12$, $SD = .36$) in Facebook posts, according to the findings. In fact, 44% of the posts were coded as self-enhancement in contrast to the 4.1% of posts coded as self-verification. From this it can be concluded that people like to present themselves positively and/or socially desirable on the Facebook platform. This conclusion is also supported by Baraket-Bohmel et al. (2106), Gil-Or, et al. (2015) and Zhao et al. (2008). However, most posts were coded as neutral (51.9%). This, in turn, is in line with the findings of Zhao et al. (2008) that Facebook users prefer to show their identities implicitly (e.g. by sharing photos and by being member of certain groups) rather than explicitly (e.g. by writing/telling about themselves). Therefore, it is very likely that people prefer expressing themselves implicitly on the Facebook platform, but when they do present themselves, self-enhancement is the most popular preference.

An explanation for the preference for self-enhancement could be that everything posted on social media and on the web in general is retrievable and visible for a larger audience. The posts become part of one's 'digital footprint' which in turn might have unintended negative consequences for the future (Greysen, Kind, & Chretien, 2010). Therefore, people might feel the need to express themselves in a positive manner in order not to damage their reputations for the future.

All in all, this means that online integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts and online self-enhancement in Facebook posts are most widely used. Hence, 'Content boundary management behaviours' (behaviours from the model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013)) are likely to be the most frequently used behaviours on the Facebook platform. Within this category of boundary management, people generally do not take on different roles for different spheres (private or professional) while presenting themselves very positively in the online social context.

Research Question 2
The second research question asked to what extent one's drivers with regards to boundary management relate to one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform. However, results revealed that no significant correlation was present between self-enhancement and self-verification as self-evaluation motives and online self-enhancement and self-verification

within Facebook posts. Neither was there a signification correlation found between integration and segmentation of the private and professional lives in daily life and online segmentation and integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts. Thus, the answer to this question (RQ2) based on this study is that one's motivational drivers with regards to boundary management do not relate to one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform. This could be explained by people having different preferences for boundary management in daily life than for online boundary management on Facebook. Different environments might ask for different behaviour and it is likely that the Facebook environment stimulates other behaviour than the environment in daily life does. Apparently one's motivational drivers with regards to boundary management are not determining one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform. People might even consider their 'Facebook identity' to be completely separated from their 'identity in daily life'.

In spite of the fact that no correlations were found with regards to the second research question, other correlations regarding self-presentation and integration or segmentation of professional and private lives/Facebook contacts (both in daily life and online) were found.

Firstly, respondents in favour of self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive were shown to be in favour of self-verification as self-evaluation motive as well. This is a peculiar finding since these two self-evaluation motives are not likely to occur simultaneously. A possible explanation for this finding is that respondents answered the questions regarding the self-evaluation motives socially desirable. This could especially be the case for the questions measuring self-verification ("I want others to understand who I am" and "I want others to see me the way I am") because of the Dutch culture in which being normal and not standing out is appreciated as can be derived from a low score on power distance (The Hofstede Centre, n.d.). Therefore, it could be socially desirable for respondents to answer that they want others to see them as they are in order to seem normal.

A contrasting correlation was found regarding self-presentation online. Respondents that used more online self-enhancement in Facebook posts appeared to use less online self-verification in Facebook posts. This finding is a more logical one. It namely means that the more someone presents himself positively/socially desirable in Facebook posts, the less that person presents himself realistically in Facebook posts (and vice-versa). Therefore, respondents seem to be more consistent with regards to a specific sort of self-presentation online.

Another finding was that respondents using online self-verification within Facebook posts integrated private and professional contacts on Facebook more often. This means that people who present themselves more realistically also like to befriend both private and professional contacts on Facebook. A possible explanation for this finding is that those who present themselves more realistically are more self-confident. Due to this self-confidence, it could be that these people do not mind to whom they present themselves realistically and thus do not separate private from professional contacts on Facebook. It was already found by Owens (1993) that people with global self-esteem and self-respect are realistic in their evaluations of themselves which increases the plausibility of this possible explanation.

The combination of online integration of one's private and professional Facebook contacts and online self-verification within Facebook posts leads to 'open boundary management behaviours' according to the model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) which means that a consistent and realistic self-presentation for all audiences is pivotal. Due to the correlation described, people using self-verification within Facebook posts and people who integrate private and professional contacts on Facebook are more likely to implement open boundary management behaviours.

Identification with the Organization

Even though this study did not aim to research identification with the organization in relation to boundary management, some interesting correlations regarding this topic were found. Firstly, respondents that identified themselves more with the organization they work for were shown to more often integrate between one's private and professional lives in daily life. This finding shows that someone's preference for integration or segmentation might be dependent on identification with the organization. However, the discovered correlation could also mean that identification with the organization is dependent on one's preference for integration between one's private and professional lives in daily life. Ashforth et al. (2000) and Fieseler et al. (2014) already found that people would be more likely to integrate in general when they define themselves more through a role and thus identify themselves more with that professional role. Apparently this could also imply to defining oneself more through the organization as a whole.

Furthermore, respondents that identified themselves more with the organization were also found to be more involved with Facebook. Perhaps respondents that identified themselves with the organization became more involved with Facebook in order to follow the

organization's Facebook page. It could also be the case that respondents who were more involved with Facebook ended up identifying themselves more with the organization due to shared content of the organization on Facebook that they have come across. In either case, this relation could be beneficial for the organization in terms of identification with the organization.

Facebook Involvement
Other interesting correlations regarding Facebook involvement than the one described above were encountered as well. Respondents that were more involved with Facebook were found to prefer self-enhancement as self-evaluation motive to a greater extent. Simultaneously, respondents that were more involved with Facebook were shown to prefer self-verification as self-evaluation motive to a greater extent. From this it could be concluded that when people experience a greater preference for a certain self-evaluation motive (either self-enhancement or self-verification) they are also more involved with Facebook. Perhaps a great preference for a certain self-evaluation motive is based on a higher need to control other's impressions. This would increase the likelihood for those with a great preference for a certain self-evaluation motive to be more involved with Facebook in order to control other's impressions of them on Facebook as well. However, existing literature does not provide evidence for this. This could be an interesting issue for further research. Additionally, the relations could also work reversely.

This study has added to the existing theory in several ways. First of all, it has revealed how people behave on Facebook with regards to segmentation or integration between the private and professional Facebook contacts and self-enhancement and self-verification in online Facebook posts. Peoples' preferences towards online boundary management have been analysed which provides us with a more accurate and present image of these preferences and behaviours online. Moreover, it has revealed several correlations regarding self-verification as self-evaluation motive, integration or segmentation between private and professional Facebook contacts, self-enhancement and self-verification in online Facebook posts, Facebook involvement and identification with the organization and the department.

Practical Implication of the Findings
What do the findings mean for society and the business environment as a whole? In this digital era in which Facebook has become an undeniable part of today's society it is of great value to understand how employees behave on Facebook. This study creates an understanding of what it means in practice that boundaries between private and professional spheres are

fading in the online environment. In fact, results demonstrated that respondents that were more involved with Facebook were found to also identify themselves more with the organization. These findings suggest that it might be interesting for companies to promote Facebook involvement since this could have a positive impact on the identification with the organization.

This study provides companies with an insight into how employees might utilize their Facebook platforms in relation to their professional roles. Additionally, it shows what the most popular behaviour of online boundary management is and therefore creates an understanding of what currently is common practice regarding boundary setting online. As described before, this common practice is to integrate professional and private contacts on Facebook and to self-enhance within Facebook posts. Since employees indirectly represent a company, it is of interest for companies to know how employees act online. Adding on to that, the fact that integration of professional and private contacts on Facebook is preferred could mean that colleagues discuss work related issues on Facebook as well. This might call for more monitoring of Facebook and social media in general.

This study also increases awareness of the fact that behaviour with regards to boundary management (self-presentation and the separation of the private and professional life) in daily life is not necessarily comparable with this behaviour online. Thus, when employees show proper behaviour towards the company at work, this does not mean that such behaviour is copied online. Therefore, too, it could be of interest for companies to monitor Facebook and other social media.

Limitations and Recommendations

This study contains several limitations. One of those aspects is the selection of respondents. Firstly, the sample size could have been larger. In total, 97 people filled out the questionnaire successfully (completely and with actual posts copied and pasted into the questionnaire). The study would have been more representative with more respondents. Part of the reason for this is that many of the original respondents closed the questionnaire when they came to the point at which they had to copy and paste their most recent Facebook posts. Apparently this was either too much effort or the content was perceived too personal to share. A large number of respondents valued privacy to a great extent which can be derived from the percentage of respondents with a private account (64.9%) and the percentage of respondents that adjusted messages with privacy settings (55.7%). Many respondents may have closed the questionnaire

on grounds of these privacy values. Future research should take this into account by accentuating respondents' privacy in the survey instructions.

In addition, the vast majority of respondents (67%) were students which distorts the image of employees in general. Perhaps, future research could aim for only full-time employees as respondents. Respondents were also relatively young on average ($M = 26.94$, $SD = 10.91$) and mainly female (81.4%). Due to differences in generations, young people probably exploit social media differently than older people. Especially generation Y (those born between 1981 and 1990) who are often described as digital natives, having grown up with technology, and as strong users of social media (Bolton, et al., 2009), probably utilize these media differently. Furthermore, differences between genders might be existing as well. This also deforms the overall image of employees. Future research could aim for respondents of all ages and with an equal distribution of gender in order to overcome these flaws.

Results showed that one's motivational drivers with regards to boundary management do not relate to one's online behaviour on the Facebook platform. This could be caused by the corpus of Facebook posts and the coding of that corpus. Majority of posts were coded as neutral due to photos that could not be coded, shared content that could not be coded and messages in which respondents were tagged that could not be coded. Instructions for copying and pasting the messages probably could have been clearer. Future research could also undertake to code photos instead of merely textual posts in order to draw a more accurate image of the self-presentation within the Facebook posts.

This research has thrown some other questions in need of further investigation. As described before, it might be true that a great preference for a certain self-evaluation motive is based on a higher need to control other's impressions. However, existing literature does not provide evidence for this. Further research could aid to the literature by investigating this possible relation. In addition, the manner of self-presentation online might be related to personality traits (e.g. being self-confident) as was proposed earlier. Future research could investigate these topics in order to discover whether or not this is the case.

With regards to future research, it can also be recommended to carry out more research in order to test the relation between motivational drivers to boundary management and online boundary management. Within such research, the aforementioned limitations should be taken into account.

References

Abril, P. S., Levin, A., & Del Riego, A. (2012). Blurred boundaries: Social media privacy and the twenty-first-century employee. *American Business Law Journal, 49*(1), 63-124.

Anseel, F., & Lievens, F. (2006). Certainty as a moderator of feedback reactions? A test of the strength of the self-verification motive. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79*(4), 533–551.

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *The Academy of Management Review, 25*(3), 472-491.

Baraket-Bojmel, L., Moran, S., & Shahar, G. (2016). Strategic self-presentation on Facebook: Personal motives and audience response to online behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior, 55*(3), 788-795.

Bolton, R. N., Parasuraman, A., Hoefnagels, A., Migchels, N., Kabadayi, S., Gruber, T., et al. (2009). Understanding generation Y and their use of social media: a review and research agenda. *Journal of Service Management, 24*(3), 245 - 267.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. (2016, April 15). *Bedrijven; bedrijfstak.* Retrieved May 21, 2016, from www.statline.cbs.nl: http://statline.cbs.nl/statweb/publication/?vw=t&dm=slnl&pa=81589ned&d1=0&d2=0,2,50,68,470,484,504,549,847,910,936,986,1043,1057,1133,1209,1225,1259,1318,1392,1437,1446&d3=(l-15)-l&hd=160224-1421&hdr=t,g1&stb=g2

Clark, D. M. (2005). *A cognitive perspective on social phobia.* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

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

DeVault, M. L. (1997). Reviewed work: home and work: Negotiating boundaries through everyday life by ChristenaE. *American Journal of Sociology, 102*(5), 1491-1492.

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*, 1143-1168.

Fieseler, C., Meckel, M., & Ranzini, G. (2014). Professional personae - How organizational identification shapes online identity in the workplace. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 20*(2), 153-170.

Gil-Or, O., Levi-Belz, Y., & Turel, O. (2015). The "Facebook-self": characteristics and psychological predictors of false self-presentation on Facebook. *Frontiers in psychology, 6*(99), 1-10.

Greysen, S. R., Kind, T., & Chretien, K. C. (2010). Online professionalism and the mirror of social media. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 25*(11), 1227-1229.

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.

Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work–nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 81*(1), 112-128.

Kreiner, G. E. (2006). Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: A person-environment fit perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 27*(4), 485-507.

Lampinen, A., Lehtinen, V., Lehmuskallio, A., & Tamminen, S. (2011). We're in it together:Interpersonal management of disclosure in social network services. *Proceedings of the 2011Annual Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 3217–3226.

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., et al. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(1), 144–165.

Leary, M. R., & Tangney, J. P. (2012). *Handbook of self and identity.* New York: Guilford Press.

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

Owens, T. (1993). Accentuate the positive – and the negative: rethinking the use of self-esteem, self-deprecation, and self-confidence. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 56*(4), 288-299.

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

Statista. (2016a). *Leading social networks worldwide as of January 2016, ranked by number of active users (in millions).* Retrieved March 11, 2016, from www.statista.com: http://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/

Statista. (2016b). *Number of social network users worldwide from 2010 to 2018 (in billions).* Retrieved March 11, 2016, from www.statista.com: http://www.statista.com/statistics/278414/number-of-worldwide-social-network-users/

The Hofstede Centre. (n.d.). *What about the Netherlands?* Retrieved May 21, 2016, from www.geert-hofstede.com: https://www.geert-hofstede.com/netherlands.html

Van Eck Peluchette, J., Karl, K., & Fertig, J. (2013). A Facebook 'friend' request from the boss: Too close for comfort? *Elsevier, 56*(3), 291-300.

Wang, Y., Komanduri, S., Leon, P. G., Norcie, G., Acquisti, A., & Cranor, L. F. (2011, July 20). "I regretted the minute I pressed share": A qualitative study of regrets on Facebook. *Proceedings of the Seventh Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security*, pp. 1-13.

Wiesenfeld, 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.

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

Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*(5), 1816–1836.

Appendix 1: The Questionnaire

Social media gebruik onder werknemers

Q1 U wordt uitgenodigd om mee te doen aan een onderzoek naar het sociale media gebruik onder werknemers. Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd door 5 studenten Communicatie- en Informatiewetenschappen aan de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Meedoen aan het onderzoek houdt in dat u een online vragenlijst gaat invullen. De vragen hebben betrekking op uw Facebookgebruik. We zijn met name geïnteresseerd in wat mensen delen met hun online contacten zoals familie, vrienden en zakelijke contacten. Het invullen van de vragenlijst kost ongeveer 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 u invult blijven volledig anoniem, en zullen niet aan derden worden verstrekt. De resultaten van het onderzoek, kunnen eventueel door wetenschappers worden gebruikt voor artikelen en presentaties. De data wordt enkel gebruikt om algemene patronen aan te duiden en 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 melden dat u als individu iets op Facebook heeft geplaatst. Als u vragen heeft over het onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen met wvan.santvoort@student.ru.nl.

Alvast bedankt.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Wies van Santvoort , Florie van Hummel, Maud Hendriksen, Fleur Bakker en Merle Meeuws

Q2 TOESTEMMING: Geef hieronder uw keuze aan. Door te klikken op de knop 'Ik ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:

● voorgaande 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.

❍ Ik ga akkoord (1)
❍ Ik ga niet akkoord (2)
If Ik ga niet akkoord Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q3 Heeft u een account op Facebook?

❍ Ja (1)
❍ Nee (2)
If Nee Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q4 Bent u momenteel werkzaam? (voltijd werk, deeltijd werk, vrijwilligerswerk etc.)

○ Ja (1)
○ Nee (2)

If Nee Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

FB gebruik Persoonlijk Facebook-gebruik We beginnen de vragenlijst met vragen over uw Facebookgebruik.Er bestaan geen goede of foute antwoorden, probeer zo eerlijk mogelijk in te vullen in hoeverre onderstaande stellingen bij u passen.

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Redelijk oneens (2)	Enigszins oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins eens (5)	Redelijk eens (6)	Helemaal eens (7)
Ik gebruik Facebook dagelijks. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik vind het vervelend als Facebook het niet zou doen. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik ben er trots op om tegen mensen te zeggen dat ik een Facebook-profiel heb. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik heb het gevoel alsof ik dingen mis wanneer ik een tijdje niet ben ingelogd op Facbook. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

FB gegevens Facebook gegevens

Wilt u naar uw persoonlijke Facebook pagina surfen (gelieve een nieuwe pagina/tabblad te openen en dit venster niet te sluiten). Ga nu naar uw vrienden-pagina op Facebook. Hoeveel contacten (Facebook vrienden) heeft u op dit moment op Facebook?

Q35 Heeft u zakelijke contacten (zowel ex- als huidige collega's/leidinggevenden) op Facebook?

❍ Ja (1)
❍ Nee (2)

If Nee Is Selected, Then Skip To Heeft u privécontacten (vrienden/fami...

FB gegevens

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

FB gegevens

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?

Q36 Als u naar al uw Facebook contacten kijkt, hoe groot is dan het aantal zakelijke contacten?Probeer hieronder een zo goed mogelijke schatting te maken.Van mijn totaal aantal Facebook contacten bestaat ongeveer ... % uit zakelijke contacten:

_____ % (1)

Q37 Heeft u privécontacten (vrienden/familie) op een zakelijk sociaal media platform (zoals LinkedIn)?

❍ Ja (1)
❍ Nee (2)

Q38 Is uw profiel openbaar?

❍ Ja, iedereen kan mijn volledige Facebook profiel bekijken. (1)
❍ Nee, alleen mijn Facebook vrienden, en de vrienden van mijn vrienden, kunnen mijn profiel bekijken. (2)
❍ Nee, alleen mijn Facebook vrienden kunnen mijn profiel bekijken. (3)
❍ Ik weet het niet. (4)

Q39 Wanneer u informatie deelt op Facebook, deelt u deze informatie dan met al uw Facebook contacten?

❍ 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.). (1)
❍ Ja, ik plaats mijn berichten zonder mijn privacy instellingen / groep ontvangers aan te passen. (2)

Posts

Omdat we geïnteresseerd zijn in de onderwerpen van de berichten die men zoal op Facebook plaatst en hoe men deze onderwerpen beschrijft, willen wij u vragen om uw 7 meest recente berichten (die u zelf heeft geschreven, dus geen 'Deel & Win'-acties of berichten waarin u door een ander in bent getagd) met ons te delen. De gegevens die u invult blijven volledig anoniem en zullen niet aan derden worden verstrekt. De data wordt enkel gebruikt om algemene patronen aan te duiden.   Wilt u naar uw persoonlijke Facebook pagina surfen (gelieve een nieuw pagina/tabblad te openen, en dit venster niet te sluiten).   * 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 onderstaande 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.

Post1 Kopieer* uw meest recente bericht (Facebook status update) en plak* deze in onderstaand veld.

Like1 Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Post2 Kopieer* uw op één na meest recente bericht (het tweede bericht op uw tijdlijn) en plak* deze in onderstaand veld.

like2 Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Post3 Kopieer* en plak* het derde bericht op uw Facebook pagina in onderstaand veld.

Like3 Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Post4 Kopieer* en plak* het vierde bericht op uw Facebook pagina in onderstaand veld.

Like4 Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Post5 Kopieer* en plak* het vijfde bericht op uw Facebook pagina in onderstaand veld.

Like5 Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Post6 Kopieer* en plak* het zesde bericht op uw Facebook pagina in onderstaand veld.

Like6 Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Post7 Kopieer* en plak* het zevende bericht op uw Facebook pagina in onderstaand veld.

Like7 Hoeveel 'likes' heeft dit bericht gekregen?

Int/seg online De volgende vragen gaan over het scheiden van zakelijke- en privécontacten op Facebook.

	Niemand (1)	Een kwart (2)	De helft (3)	Drie kwart (4)	Iedereen (5)
In welke mate heeft u directe collega's als vrienden op Facebook? (1)	○	○	○	○	○
In welke mate heeft u privé contacen als vrienden op Facebook? (2)	○	○	○	○	○

Q47 Wanneer u informatie deelt op Facebook, gaan deze berichten dan wel eens over werk?

❍ Nee, ik deel op mijn Facebook pagina geen informatie over mijn werk. (1)
❍ Ja, ik deel op mijn Facebook pagina wel eens informatie over mijn werk. (2)
❍ Ja, ik deel op mijn Facebook pagina (bijna) alleen maar informatie over mijn werk. (3)

Betrokkenheid De volgende vragen gaan niet meer over uw Facebook gebruik, maar hebben betrekking op de organisatie waarvoor u werkt. Uw betrokkenheid bij de organisatie Er bestaan geen goede en foute antwoorden, probeer zo eerlijk mogelijk in te vullen in hoeverre de stellingen bij u passen.

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Redelijk oneens (2)	Enigszins oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins eens (5)	Redelijk eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik voel mij verbonden met deze organisatie. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik voel mij solidair met deze organisatie. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik voel mij betrokken bij deze organisatie. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Betrokkenheid Uw betrokkenheid bij de afdeling waar u werktOnderstaande stellingen gaan over uw betrokkenheid bij uw baan en in hoeverre u zich verbonden voelt met uw afdeling. Er bestaan geen goede en foute antwoorden, probeer zo eerlijk mogelijk in te vullen in hoeverre de stellingen bij u passen.

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Redelijk oneens (2)	Enigszins oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins eens (5)	Redelijk eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik voel me verbonden met de afdeling waar ik werk. (1)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Ik voel me solidair met de afdeling waar ik werk. (2)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Ik voel me betrokken met de afdeling waar ik werk. (3)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Enhancement offline <u>Persoonlijke voorkeuren</u> Onderstaande stellingen gaan over het beeld dat u over het algemeen naar andere mensen wilt uitstralen. Er bestaan geen goede en foute antwoorden, probeer zo eerlijk mogelijk in te vullen in hoeverre de stellingen bij u passen.

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Redelijk oneens (2)	Enigszins oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins eens (5)	Redelijk eens (6)	Helemaal eens (7)
Ik wil dat anderen een positief beeld van me hebben. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik wil dat anderen me zien als getalenteerd. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik wil dat anderen me respecteren. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik wil dat anderen zien dat ik in staat ben mijn doelen te behalen. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

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

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Redelijk oneens (2)	Enigszins oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigzins eens (5)	Redelijk eens (6)	Helemaal eens (7)
Ik wil dat anderen begrijpen wie ik ben. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik wil dat anderen me zien zoals ik ben. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Int/seg offline <u>Overlap tussen zakelijk en privéleven</u>Onderstaande stellingen gaan over de overlap van uw zakelijk en privéleven en in hoeverre deze elkaar beïnvloeden. Er bestaan geen goede en foute antwoorden, probeer zo eerlijk mogelijk in te vullen in hoeverre de stellingen bij u passen.

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Redelijk oneens (2)	Enigszins oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigszins eens (5)	Redelijk eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Het liefst houd ik mijn werk en privé leven zo veel mogelijk gescheiden. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik probeer thuis niet aan mijn werk te denken. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik houd er niet van om mijn werk mee naar huis te nemen. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik houd er niet van om over persoonlijke dingen te praten met de meeste van mijn collega's. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Ik probeer niet aan familie en vrienden te denken wanneer ik	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

aan het werk ben, zodat ik mij kan focussen. (5)							
Ik handel alleen persoonlijke dingen af op werk wanneer ik een pauze heb. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q30 U bent aangekomen bij het einde van de vragenlijst. Wij willen u vragen nog enkele demografische gegevens in te vullen.

Leeftijd Leeftijd

Geslacht Geslacht

○ Man (1)
○ Vrouw (2)

Opleiding Wat is uw hoogst behaalde diploma?

○ Geen (1)
○ Basisonderwijs (2)
○ Lager/voorbereidend beroepsonderwijs (lbo/vmbo) (3)
○ Middelbaar algemeen voortgezet onderwijs (vmbo-t) (4)
○ Middelbaar beroepsonderwijs (mbo) (5)
○ Hoger algemeen voortgezet onderwijs (havo) (6)
○ Voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs (vwo) (7)
○ Hoger beroepsonderwijs (hbo) (8)
○ Wetenschappelijk onderwijs (wo) (9)

Q49 Bent u momenteel student?

○ Ja, ik doe een voltijd studie (en heb eventueel een bijbaan) . (1)
○ Ja, ik werk maar studeer daarnaast (bijvoorbeeld een deeltijdstudie of avondstudie). (2)
○ Nee, ik heb een baan en studeer op dit moment niet. (3)

Q50 Wat voor een arbeidsovereenkomst heeft u?

❍ Fulltime (1)
❍ Parttime (2)

Q51 Hoeveel uur werkt u per week?

Q52 Heeft u een vast of tijdelijk dienstverband?

❍ Vast (1)
❍ Tijdelijk (2)

Q53 Heeft u een leidinggevende functie?

❍ Ja (1)
❍ Nee (2)

Q54 Hoeveel jaar bent u werkzaam bij deze organisatie (indien u minder dan 1 jaar in dienst bent, gelieve nul ("0") in te vullen)?

Q55 Hoeveel jaar bent u werkzaam bij uw huidige afdeling (indien u minder dan 1 jaar in dienst bent, gelieve nul ("0") in te vullen)?

Q48 Bedankt voor uw deelname aan deze enquête. Voor meer informatie of uiteindelijke uitkomst vanIndien u vragen heeft over dit onderzoek kunt u contact op nemen met wvan.santvoort@student.ru.nl. Indien u de resultaten van het onderzoek wilt ontvangen kunt u hier uw e-mailadres invullen: