It's More than Personal: Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Privacy Orientation
Scale

Lemi Baruh

Department of Media and Visual Arts

College of Social Sciences and Humanities

Koç University

Turkey

E-Mail: lbaruh@ku.edu.tr

Phone: +90 212 338 1133

Fax: +90 212 338 3760

Zeynep Cemalcılar

Department of Psychology

College of Social Sciences and Humanities

Koç University

Turkey

Abstract

This study summarizes the development and validation of a multidimensional privacy orientation scale designed for measuring privacy attitudes of Social Network Site (SNS) users. Findings confirm the existence of four dimensions: 1) belief in the value of “privacy as a right”; 3) “other-contingent privacy”; 2) “concern about own informational privacy” and 4) “concern about privacy of others.” Moreover, a segmentation of SNS users reveals three types of users: 1) *privacy advocates*, who are concerned about both their own and other people’s privacy; 2) *privacy individualists*, who are concerned mostly about their own privacy, and 3) *privacy indifferents*, whose score on all dimensions are lower than other segments. The results indicate that the four privacy orientation dimensions and three user segments predict key differences in terms of privacy protective behavior, information disclosure, and viewing personal information of others.

Keywords: Privacy Orientation, Attitudes, Social Networks Sites, Voyeurism, Self-Disclosure

The widespread adoption of social network sites (SNSs) has led to a growing number of studies focusing on users' concerns about informational privacy (Lewis, Kaufman, & Christakis, 2008; Wise, Alhabash, & Park, 2010). To date, studies on privacy attitudes and behavior on SNSs have typically focused on individual differences related to privacy protective behavior and information disclosure (Fogel & Nehmad, 2009; Jin, 2013; Lewis et al., 2008). Yet, while sharing information about oneself is a major component of SNS use, the popularity of SNSs is also related to their ability to satisfy users' curiosity about other network members (Carpenter, Green, & LaFlam, 2011). As such, studying the relationship between privacy attitudes and SNS use requires a more in-depth understanding of privacy attitudes as they relate both disclosure of personal information and perusing information shared by others. Given this need, this study will present a multidimensional scale of privacy orientation that can measure constructs related to a wider range of privacy-related behavior in the context of SNSs.

Privacy Concerns and SNS Behavior

While informational privacy has been a hot button issue for the last few decades, the increasing ubiquity of the Internet, and particularly SNSs, raises additional concerns about the permanence, diffusion, and searchability of personal data shared online (boyd, 2012). Consequently, as recent reviews of social media research indicate (Wilson, Gosling, & Graham, 2012; Zhang & Leung, 2014), a considerable proportion of published work in this area investigates privacy of users. These studies have mostly focused on issues such as the extent to which SNS users engage in privacy protective behavior and the relationship between users' privacy concerns and information disclosure (e.g., Christofides, Muise, & Desmarais, 2009; Fogel & Nehmad, 2009).

By focusing on privacy attitudes from the lens of self-protective behavior and disclosure, extant research fails to account for the possibility that SNS use is not merely driven by a motivation to share information about oneself but also a desire to satisfy one's curiosity about others by monitoring them. Indeed, studies on SNS related behavior underline the existence of several types of profile browsing that are oriented towards learning about others, including acquaintances and

strangers. Accordingly, users not only tend to engage in “passive browsing” of news feeds but also “extractive browsing” of profiles for obtaining information about others and their perspectives (Carpenter et al., 2011; Wise et al., 2010).

The fact that SNS usage entails not only sharing information about oneself but also learning about others may have important implications for measurement of privacy attitudes. To date, scales on online privacy attitudes have typically focused on measuring individuals’ concerns about their own privacy. One of the first of such scales was the Internet Users’ Information Privacy Concerns (IUICP) Scale (Malhotra, Kim, & Agarwal, 2004), which measured attitudes about collection of and control over personal information, and awareness of privacy practices of institutions. More recently, the Online Privacy Concern and Protection for Use on the Internet Scale (PCP) (Buchanan, Paine, Joinson, & Reips, 2007) improved on the IUICP by measuring privacy related behavior, such as using technology to protect information privacy, as well as attitudes.

Neither IUICP nor PCP were developed for privacy attitudes in the context of social media use. Consequently, as Taddicken (2010) observes, although there are no discernable differences between the Internet and social media in terms of users’ concerns about their own privacy, these measures may not be sufficient in predicting behavior that users commonly engage in on social media, such as observing and learning about others. Namely, it is possible that individual differences in attitudes about *privacy of others* (i.e., the level of respect one has for privacy rights of others) may influence the extent to which individuals find it desirable to engage in profile browsing.

Relatedly, the fast penetration of social networks has important implications for the extent to which individuals can control the level of privacy they have. As recognized by theories like the Communication Privacy Management (CPM) Theory, the level of privacy that an individual may enjoy is not determined in a social vacuum. First, it has been argued that individuals can enjoy privacy only to the extent that others have a “similar minimum level of privacy” (Regan, 1995, p.213). Second, disclosure of private information creates a codependency between the discloser and the recipient, making both responsible for the protection of information (Jin, 2013; Petronio, 2002).

In short, this conceptualization of privacy underlines the notion that the level of privacy that any individual enjoys will be *contingent* on the choices that others make. As such, particularly within the context of social media, measurement of privacy concerns should take into consideration the potential differences in individuals' level of concern not only as "isolated" decision makers but also as decision makers who are situated in social relations of disclosure and confidence.

Given these considerations, the aim of the present study is to develop and validate a scale of privacy orientation that expands existing scales by measuring individuals' respect for others' privacy in addition to measuring their concerns about own privacy. The validation of this scale is achieved by testing its construct validity via correlations with respondents' voyeuristic curiosity, intentions of self-disclosure (to friends vs. strangers), and types of Facebook uses. Also, we assessed the extent to which different privacy orientation dimensions are associated with online and Facebook privacy protective behavior.

Methods

Sample

The sample comprised 1244 adult online panel members (provided by Qualtrics Panel from ClearVoice Research[®]) out of 2257 who received the invitation for the survey. ClearVoice Research[®] has close to 1 million panelists from 120 countries (ClearVoice Research, 2014). Participation is voluntary, in exchange for cash or giftcards. Panel members are recruited and regularly verified via SMS or phone. The sample for the current study was drawn from panel members residing in U.S.

Mean age of the respondents was 45.7 years ($SD = 14.39$), half were female (50.2%), majority had at least some college education (61%), and almost all (98.4%) reported using the Internet for at least 3 years. 77% of the respondents were Caucasian, followed by African Americans (8%), Hispanics (6%) and other ethnic groups (9%). All except 89 were Facebook users.

Measures

Privacy Orientation Scale. Using an expert panel, 14 items were created based on existing

privacy scales (e.g., Buchanan et al., 2007; Malhotra et al., 2004; Stieger, Burger, Bohn, & Voracek, 2013) but also taking into consideration the need to distinguish between respondents' concern about their own and other people's privacy. A pilot was conducted with a separate online sample ($N = 550$, from SurveyMonkey).

Originally, nine items were developed to measure concerns about own information privacy, and five items were developed to measure concerns about others' privacy. However, the exploratory factor analysis revealed the existence of three factors. After items cross loading on more than one factor were removed, the analysis suggested that: (1) three items measured concern about own privacy, with an $\alpha = .77$; (2) three items measured concern about privacy of others, but with a low reliability of $\alpha = .49$; (3) three items measured an additional component of individuals' concern about privacy—the belief that privacy is a right that needs legal protection, $\alpha = .77$.

Additionally we observed that, three of the cross loading items were related to both the second factor and the third factor. As discussed in the introduction, this may be indicative of a more general tendency to consider privacy as a contingent value (i.e., believing that sufficient protection of one's privacy depends on the extent to which others are careful about their own and others' privacy). Hence, in making revisions to the privacy orientation scale, we decided to (1) keep the two factors “concern about own information privacy” and “belief that privacy is a right that needs legal protection”; (2) revise (and add additional) items for the second factor “concern about others' privacy” and (3) add a fourth factor assessing beliefs about privacy as being “other-contingent”.

The final privacy orientation scale used in this study comprises 18 5-point Likert type items (Table 1). Based on the results of an exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation, 2 items with insufficient loadings were excluded. The resulting items confirmed the existence of four factors, explaining 69.9% of the variance: (1) privacy as a right, (2) concern about own informational privacy, (3) other-contingent privacy, and (4) concern about privacy of others. A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (EQS 6.1), within which factors were allowed to correlate with each other, suggested a strong fit, $CFI=.97$, $RMSEA=.05$, with no items cross-loading across factors and no

across-dimension items correlated with each other. Additionally, we tested alternative 3-factor models combining dimensions with the highest pairwise correlations with each other (dimensions 2 and 3; and dimensions 1 and 4). The alternative models resulted in significantly lower fits (CFI=.90, RMSEA=.09; CFI=.92, RMSEA=.06, respectively), confirming the superiority of the four-factor model over alternative three-factor models.

Table 1. Components of the Privacy Orientation Scale

	Factors			
	1	2	3	4
<i>Factor 1: Privacy as a Right</i>				
Privacy laws should be strengthened to protect personal privacy.	0.79	0.19	0.14	0.26
People need legal protection against misuse of personal data.	0.83	0.13	0.12	0.30
If I were to write a constitution today, I would probably add privacy as a fundamental right.	0.74	0.15	0.14	0.32
<i>Factor 2: Concern about Own Informational Privacy</i>				
When I share the details of my personal life with somebody, I often worry that he/she will tell those details to other people.	0.12	0.80	0.20	0.01
I am concerned that people around me know too much about me.	0.02	0.83	0.17	-0.06
I am concerned with the consequences of sharing identity information	0.26	0.67	0.29	0.21
I worry about sharing information with more people than I intend to.	0.17	0.78	0.22	0.15
<i>Factor 3: Other-Contingent Privacy</i>				
If somebody is not careful about protecting their own privacy, I cannot trust them about respecting mine.	0.14	0.18	0.76	0.19
If I am to enjoy some privacy in my life, I need my friends to be careful about protecting their privacy as well.	0.15	0.19	0.77	0.24
I could never trust someone as my confidant if they go around sharing details about their own private lives.	0.04	0.21	0.80	0.10
The level of privacy that I can enjoy depends on the extent to which people around me protect their own privacy.	0.12	0.26	0.78	0.11
<i>Factor 4: Concern about Privacy of Others</i>				
It is important for me to respect the privacy of individuals, even if they are not careful about protecting their own privacy.	0.28	0.08	0.19	0.72
I value other people's privacy as much as I value mine	0.11	0.07	0.12	0.81
Even when somebody is not careful about his/her privacy, I do my best to respect that person's privacy	0.23	0.09	0.12	0.83
I always do my best not to intrude into other people's private lives	0.14	0.01	0.15	0.73
Respect for others' privacy should be an important priority in social relations	0.30	0.05	0.14	0.79
Cronbach's α	0.83	0.83	0.85	0.88

Outcome variables

Voyeurism. Voyeurism was assessed using 5 items with highest loadings from an existing voyeurism scale (Baruh, 2010). The items asked respondents to indicate how they think they would

react in various situations. For example, one item asked whether the respondents would immediately stop reading (1) or continue reading as much as they can (5) if they received a letter that was intended for somebody else. Higher scores denoted higher voyeurism ($\alpha = 0.89$).

Self-disclosure. Self-disclosure was assessed using the 9-item self-disclosure index (Miller, Berg, & Archer, 1983). Using identical questions, respondents were asked to rate, on a 5-point scale (1 = not disclose at all, 5 = disclose fully), the degree to which they would disclose information (e.g., “my personal habits”) about themselves (a) to a friend ($\alpha=.93$) and (b) to a stranger ($\alpha=.95$).

Facebook use. A Facebook uses and gratification scale was created based on existing scales (Baruh, 2010; Chen, 2011). In the current study, we will focus on three subscales, each comprising 4 items using 5-point Likert scale, that are germane to using Facebook for information seeking: using Facebook to satisfy social curiosity (e.g., “to learn about daily lives of other people”, $\alpha=.89$), for self-evaluation (e.g., “to think about how I would handle situations other people are in”, $\alpha=.92$), and to be up to date about current events (e.g., “to be up to date about news”, $\alpha=.86$).

Additionally, using a single item, the respondents were asked to indicate whether they used Facebook mostly for the purpose of *sharing* their own experiences (20.7%), or to *learn* about the experiences of others (44.5%).

Online privacy protection. Two sets of questions investigated respondents’ online privacy protective behavior by asking respondents to indicate 1) on a 5-point scale the extent to which they protected online privacy by taking measures such as giving a false or inaccurate email address (labeled “general online privacy”, 14 items) (Park, 2011); and 2) whether they have ever taken various measures to protect privacy on Facebook (11 items, Yes/No). A factor analysis of these 11 items suggested two subdimensions of Facebook privacy protection: *i*) protecting privacy in relation to social concerns (e.g., “untagging photos/videos”, 6 items, $\alpha=.80$; labeled “Facebook Social Privacy Protection), *ii*) protecting privacy in relation to system settings of Facebook (e.g., “remove an app...because of the information it collects”, 5 items, $\alpha=.75$; labeled “Facebook System Privacy Protection”).

Results

Below we present the results in two sections. First, we will focus on the validation of the Privacy Orientation Scale. This will entail a summary of the correlations among the subdimensions, and between the subdimensions and the potential outcome variables. Second, we will present results of a cluster analysis that segments the respondents based on their scores on four privacy orientation subdimensions. Also, as a further validation of the scale, the segments will be compared in relation to the same outcome variables.

Privacy Orientation Dimensions

Table 2 summarizes the descriptives and correlations for the four privacy orientation dimensions. The magnitudes of the correlations between these four dimensions were moderate. There was no significant gender difference except for “concern about privacy of others” ($M = 4.14$, $SD = .61$ for females; $M = 4.03$, $SD = .69$ for males), $F(1,1240) = 10.764$; $p < .001$. The effect size of this difference was negligible, $\eta^2 = .009$.

Table 2. Descriptives and correlations for privacy orientation dimensions

	I	II	III	IV
Privacy as a right	1			
Concern about own information privacy	.380	1		
Other-contingent privacy	.379	.529	1	
Concern about privacy of others	.591	.245	.401	1
Mean (1-5)	4.09	3.37	3.48	4.08
SD	.73	.88	.82	.65

Note: all correlations are significant at $p < .001$

Next, we summarize how the four privacy dimensions are related to the outcome variables described hereinabove (Table 3).

With the exception of “concern about own informational privacy” all privacy dimensions had significant negative correlations with voyeurism. All privacy orientation dimensions were negatively correlated with willingness to disclose personal information to strangers; however, only “concern about own personal information” ($r = -.132$, $p < .001$) and “other-contingent privacy” ($r = -.118$, $p < .001$) were negatively correlated with information disclosure to friends.

The four privacy orientation dimensions were differentially associated with the three types

of uses of Facebook. Both “privacy as a right” and “concern about privacy of others” dimensions were negatively related to the use of Facebook for satisfying social curiosity ($r = -.081, p < .01$ and $r = -.146, p < .001$ respectively) or self-evaluative reasons ($r = -.087, p < .01$ and $r = -.153, p < .001$ respectively). Conversely, “concern about own informational privacy” was positively related to all of the three uses of Facebook.

Finally, our analyses indicated that all four privacy orientation dimensions were positively correlated with likelihood of having taken privacy protective measures while using the Internet (general online privacy) and while using Facebook (FB social and FB system privacy protection). The only exception was that being concerned about privacy of others was not significantly associated with taking Facebook system-related measures for privacy protection.

Table 3. Correlation of the four privacy orientation dimensions with study variables

	Privacy as a right	Concern about own info privacy	Other-contingent privacy	Concern about privacy of others
Voyeurism	-.186***	-.017	-.129***	-.296***
Self- Disclosure to Friends	-.005	-.132***	-.118***	.006
Self-Disclosure to Strangers	-.170***	-.057*	-.124***	-.200***
FB Uses - Curiosity	-.081**	.138***	.048	-.146***
FB Uses - Evaluation	-.087**	.180***	.097**	-.153***
FB Uses - Information	.055	.094**	.063*	.065*
General Online Privacy	.243***	.324***	.319***	.162***
FB Social Privacy Protection	.161***	.245***	.166***	.084**
FB System Privacy Protection	.084**	.203***	.143***	.017

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Privacy Orientation Segments

Given the observed differences pertaining to the relationships between privacy orientation dimensions and the outcome variables, we conducted a two-step cluster analysis using the Schwarz’s Bayesian information criterion (BIC) to segment respondents based on their privacy orientation dimension scores. The analysis revealed the existence of three clusters (see Table 4). Internal criterion data suggested that the model had a good fit with an average silhouette measure of cohesion and separation of 0.5.

Table 4. Comparisons of segments by mean standardized privacy dimension scores (Z-Scores)

	Privacy advocates (N=576)	Privacy individualists (N=253)	Privacy indifferents (N=415)
Privacy as a right	.68	-.25	-.79
Concerns about own informational privacy	.07	.76	-.56
Privacy as other-contingent	.29	.29	-.59
Concern about privacy of others	.63	-.13	-.79

The first segment, *privacy advocates* comprises individuals whose scores for endorsement of “privacy as a right” and “concern about privacy of others” were highest among the segments. Members of the second segment, *privacy individualists*, are concerned about their own privacy, but do not consider privacy to be right and they are much less likely than privacy advocates to be concerned about the protection of other people's privacy. The third segment, *privacy indifferents*, is composed of respondents who scored low on all dimensions. There was no significant difference between genders in terms of segmentation results $\chi^2(2, N = 1244) = 3.612, p = .16$.

To test how the three privacy orientation segments differ from each other in terms of the outcome variables, we ran ANOVAs with these three segments on respondents' voyeurism scores, intentions to self-disclose, Facebook uses and gratifications, and online privacy protective behavior (Table 5).

Table 5. Mean differences of study variables for three privacy segments

	Privacy Advocates	Privacy Individualists	Privacy Indifferents	F-value (1, 1155)	η^2
Voyeurism	2.02 (.94) ^a	2.37 (1.00) ^b	2.49 (.93) ^b	28.129	.043
Self-disclosure					
To friends	3.15 (.96)	3.09 (.78)	3.18 (.80)	0.705 ^{NS}	.001
To strangers	1.76 (.91) ^a	2.00 (.95) ^b	2.04 (.91) ^b	13.116	.021
Facebook Uses					
For info	3.23 (1.08) ^a	3.39 (.86) ^b	3.13 (.86) ^a	5.429	.009
Curiosity	2.43 (1.01) ^a	3.01 (.99) ^b	2.72 (.87) ^c	27.413	.046
Evaluation	2.24 (1.19) ^a	2.85 (1.10) ^b	2.52 (.94) ^c	26.258	.044
Share vs. Learn	3.23 (.04) ^a	3.39 (.06) ^b	3.13 (.05) ^a	5.429	.009
Privacy Protection					
Online Privacy	2.93 (.83) ^a	2.95 (.67) ^a	2.55 (.69) ^b	36.170	.055
FB Social Privacy	2.74 (.76) ^a	3.12 (1.74) ^b	2.27 (1.85) ^c	20.113	.034
FB System Privacy	2.02 (1.71) ^a	2.22 (1.85) ^a	1.63 (1.64) ^b	9.998	.017

Note: Cells with different superscripts within a row are significantly different from each other ($p < .000$). For Share vs. Learn, higher scores indicate higher tendency to prefer using FB for learning rather than sharing.

With respect to voyeurism, privacy segments yielded a significant effect, with *privacy*

advocates scoring significantly lower than *privacy individualists* and *privacy indifferents*. There was no significant difference among the three privacy orientation segments in terms of their willingness to self-disclose to friends, whereas a significant difference existed in terms of willingness to self-disclose to strangers, with *privacy advocates* scoring significantly lower than both *privacy individualists* and *privacy indifferents*.

Analyses with privacy segments in terms of Facebook uses and gratifications suggested that (1) *privacy individualists* were more likely than other segments to use Facebook for all three purposes (social curiosity, evaluation, information); and (2) *privacy advocates* were least likely and *privacy individualists* were most likely to use Facebook for satisfying social curiosity and for self-evaluation. Likewise, *privacy individualists* were more likely than the other two segments to use Facebook to learn about others rather than to share information about themselves.

Finally, with respect to privacy protective behavior, analyses suggested that *privacy indifferents* were least likely to take any protective measures for general online privacy, for Facebook social and system privacy. In addition, *privacy individualists* were more likely than *privacy advocates* to take precautions to protect Facebook social privacy (e.g., untagging photos).

Discussion

As underlined by the recent privacy initiative of Facebook, called the “Privacy Check-up”, which actively warns users about the circles that have access to their information, informational privacy is increasingly becoming a major concern for SNS users (Facebook, 2014). To date, studies investigating the relationship between privacy attitudes and SNS related behavior have typically focused on how being concerned about privacy may influence the extent to which users disclose information. However, unlike other online media, SNS usage is characterized by not only sharing information but also looking at information shared by others. If so, privacy scales used in the literature can benefit from including additional dimensions, such as valuing privacy of others, considering privacy as a right and beliefs about trust in others as confidants. As such, this article summarizes the development and validation of a scale that can supplement existing privacy scales

by measuring these additional dimensions.

The factor analysis of the items in the proposed scale confirm the existence of four privacy orientation dimensions: 1) belief in the value of “privacy as a right”; 2) “concern about own informational privacy”; 3) “other-contingent privacy”; and 4) “concern about privacy of others.” These four dimensions were not very highly correlated with each other, confirming that they are distinct dimensions, measuring a different aspect of individuals’ privacy orientations. It is important to note that out of the 70% variance explained by the full scale, only 17% was attributable to the “concern about own informational privacy” dimension that has been the focus of previous literature. This result implies that the other three subdimensions capture a substantial amount of variance in understanding individuals’ privacy orientations. Relatedly, the existence of three privacy orientation segments, *privacy advocates*, *privacy individualists*, and *privacy indifferents*, underlines the need to reconsider long-held assumptions (Westin, 1967) about the unidimensionality of privacy attitudes.

The results indicate that the four dimensions of privacy orientations, and the ensuing user segments, are related to key behavioral differences with respect to sharing personal information and viewing personal information of others. Voyeuristic curiosity was negatively related to seeing privacy as a right, considering privacy as other-contingent, and respecting the privacy of others, but was not related to being concerned about one’s own informational privacy. Likewise, among privacy orientation segments, *privacy advocates* were less likely than members of other segments to exhibit voyeuristic curiosity.

This inverse relationship between voyeurism and being a privacy advocate who values the privacy of others also manifests itself on Facebook usage types. For example, *privacy advocates* are less likely than *privacy individualists* and *privacy indifferents* to utilize Facebook to satisfy social curiosity and for socially evaluative purposes, both of which are monitoring behavior that can be characterized as potentially privacy invasive.

These results are particularly useful for understanding patterns of SNS usage, as well as consumption of other types of “first person” media, such as reality programming, which have both

been assumed to be related to declining social expectations about privacy (Calvert, 2000). Namely, the results underline that being concerned about privacy does not necessarily mean that an individual will refrain from engaging in privacy invasive behavior. Indeed, our results suggest that a heightened expectation of personal privacy among *privacy individualists* is positively related to socially curious uses of Facebook. In this respect, our results are in line with studies suggesting that part of the pleasure derived from what has been named as “social browsing” stems from its panoptic mode, which is characterized by an informational asymmetry that allows the “browser” to peek into private details of other people’s lives without having to reciprocate (Baruh, 2010).

This discussion regarding how differences in privacy orientations may be related to the panoptic appeal of social browsing in SNS contexts also has the potential to explain some of the results we obtained regarding the relationship between privacy orientations and self-disclosure. Namely, the findings indicate that *privacy advocates* are less likely than *privacy individualists* to protect their privacy from other Facebook circles. These findings suggest that for *privacy advocates*, who are less likely to engage in panoptic (asymmetric) forms of social browsing, self-disclosure can be an acceptable component of an SNS-based relationships as long as this disclosure is done in a reciprocal way.

It should be noted that, the effect sizes of the correlations between privacy dimensions and outcome variables and the mean differences between privacy segments are mostly small, which may present a problem regarding the practical applicability of the scale. Yet, the small effect sizes we observed are not particularly surprising, since there is agreement in the literature on attitude-behavior relations that general attitudes (privacy orientation) are weak predictors of domain-specific behaviors (e.g., Facebook privacy protection) (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2005). Indeed, the correlations between privacy orientations and more general measures (e.g., voyeurism-concern about others, general online privacy protection-concern about own privacy) have moderate effect sizes. Hence, future research can possibly find higher effect sizes by adapting the items on the scale for a specific domain (such as Twitter). On a second note, some of the statistically significant differences, such as

the difference between privacy segments in terms of use of Facebook for information (news) or gender differences were unexpected in the first place. Hence, the very small effect sizes ($\eta^2 = .009$) for these differences are not of particular importance in evaluating the applicability of the scale.

In addition to the methodological contributions of this scale to the literature on privacy attitudes and SNS usage, the findings presented regarding the heterogeneity of privacy orientation dimensions has important implications for privacy policy debates. First, it should be noted that informational privacy protection frameworks in the U.S. and in EU assume individuals to be atomized decision makers who will aim to balance their own privacy interests with other benefits (e.g., convenient shopping) (Cohen, 2012). However, our results imply that for a considerable proportion of Internet users, informational privacy decisions are not made in a social vacuum. For example, *privacy individualists*' concerns about others' privacy is driven by their beliefs that their own privacy is contingent on others' decisions. With respect to privacy management in SNS contexts, this finding implies that privacy protection schemes such as the aforementioned Facebook Privacy Check-Up should be able to accommodate these different needs of users. Second, by underlining the existence of a potentially sizeable *privacy advocates* segment whose members endorse the need to protect the privacy of others, these findings can also make significant contributions to debates regarding the viability of "privacy activism" as a means to resist heightened dataveillance of individuals (Bennett, 2008). Third, the existence of a considerably large *privacy indifferents* segment, who are neither careful about their own nor others' privacy, may be of crucial significance in identifying the primary target of digital literacy efforts on privacy.

While this study has mostly focused on how privacy orientations may be related to use of one particular SNS (Facebook), the scale we developed is not domain specific. This means that the scale could potentially be applicable to not only other types of SNSs like Twitter, but can also be of use in understanding general data privacy related behavior, online or offline. Future research can test the applicability of this scale either generally or by adapting it to specific domains and across different cultural contexts. A work in progress with Turkish University students, for example,

indicates the presence of similar relationships between privacy orientation dimensions and types of Twitter use (name deleted for blind review).

References

- Baruh, L. (2010). Mediated voyeurism and the guilty pleasure of consuming reality television. *Media Psychology, 13*(3), 201–221.
- Bennett. (2008). *The privacy advocates: Resisting the spread of surveillance*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- boyd, D. (2012). Networked privacy. *Surveillance and Society, 10*(3/4), 348–350.
- Buchanan, T., Paine, C., Joinson, A. N., & Reips, U-D. (2007). Development of measures of online privacy concern and protection for use on the Internet. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 58*(2), 157–165.
- Calvert, C. (2000). *Voyeur nation: Media, privacy, and peering in modern culture*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Carpenter, J. M., Green, M. C., & LaFlam, J. (2011). People or profiles: Individual differences in online social networking use. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(5), 538–541.
- Chen, G. M. (2011). Tweet this: A uses and gratifications perspective on how active Twitter use gratifies a need to connect with others. *Computers in Human Behavior, 27*(2), 755–762.
- Christofides, E., Muise, A., & Desmarais, S. (2009). Information disclosure and control on Facebook: Are they two sides of the same coin or two different processes? *Cyberpsychology and Behavior, 12*(3), 341–5.
- ClearVoice Research (2014). ESOMAR 26 Questions. Retrieved from:
http://clearvoiceresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/ESOMAR-26-Questions_CVR-March-2014.pdf
- Cohen, J. E. (2012). *Configuring the networked self: Law, code, and the play of everyday practice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Facebook (2014). Making it easier to share with who you want. Retrieved from:
<https://www.facebook.com/notes/facebook/making-it-easier-to-share-with-who-you-want/10150251867797131>

- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2005). The influence of attitudes on behavior. In D. Albarracin, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The Handbook of Attitudes* (pp. 173–221). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fogel, J., & Nehmad, E. (2009). Internet social network communities: Risk taking, trust, and privacy concerns. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25, 153–160.
- Jin, S.-A. A. (2013). Peeling back the multiple layers of Twitter's private disclosure onion: The roles of virtual identity discrepancy and personality traits in communication privacy management on Twitter. *New Media and Society*, 15(6), 813–833.
- Lewis, K., Kaufman, J., & Christakis, N. (2008). The taste for privacy: An analysis of college student privacy settings in an online social network. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(1), 79–100.
- Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S., & Agarwal, J. (2004). Internet users' information privacy concerns (IUIPC): The construct, the scale, and a causal model. *Information Systems Research*, 15(4), 336–355.
- Miller, L. C., Berg, J. H., & Archer, R. L. (1983). Openers: Individuals who elicit intimate self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(6), 1234–1244.
- Park, Y. J. (2011). Digital Literacy and Privacy Behavior Online. *Communication Research*, 40(2), 215–236.
- Petronio, S. (2002). *Boundaries of privacy: Dialectics of disclosure*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Regan, P. (1995). *Legislating privacy: Technology, social values and public policy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Stieger, S., Burger, C., Bohn, M., & Voracek, M. (2013). Who commits virtual identity suicide? Differences in privacy concerns, internet addiction, and personality between Facebook users and quitters. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 16(9), 629–34.
- Taddicken, M. (2010). Measuring online privacy concern and protection in the (social) web:

Development of the APCP and APCP-18 s scale. In *60th Annual Conference of the International Communication Association* (pp. 1–30). Singapore.

Westin, A. (1967). *Privacy and freedom*. London: The Bodley Head.

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

Wise, K., Alhabash, S., & Park, H. (2010). Emotional responses during social information seeking on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 13(5), 555–562.

Zhang, Y., & Leung, L. (2014). A review of social networking service (SNS) research in communication journals from 2006 to 2011. *New Media and Society*. Advance online publication.