Research Article

Power, Freedom, and Privacy on a Discipline-and-Control Facebook, and the Implications for Internet Governance

—Ming Cheung and Zhen Troy Chen

***Abstract*—Background:** *The proliferation and penetration of social media into professional and everyday lives have reshaped the way in which people deal with their personal information and call for refreshed perceptions and conceptualizations of the power relationship between individual users and technology giants. Despite intensified privacy concerns and crises over social media, there is little research on the correlations between users' privacy perception and protection in non-Western settings.* **Research question:** *To what extent are Hong Kong Facebook users willing to sacrifice control over their information in exchange for self-expression, sociality, and intimacy in their social roles and relationships?* **Literature review:** *We first identified a gap in the literature on user perceptions and concerns over privacy in Eastern cultures, which is scarce despite the increasing concern over privacy in professional communication. Informed by the recent literature on the privacy paradox and Foucault and Deleuze's work on power, the unbalanced and normalizing power relationship between Facebook and its users in Eastern contexts is identified as a synthesis of discipline and control.* **Research methodology:** *Data from a survey of 797 young users in Hong Kong were used for our analysis of privacy perception and protection. The survey contained three sections: Facebook usage, attitudes and behaviors, and basic demographics.* **Results:** *The findings support our hypotheses in revealing that the privacy paradox is evident for Facebook users in Hong Kong. In addition, excessive Facebook use leads to reactive privacy awareness and normalization behaviors.* **Conclusion:** *We believe that technology giants, such as Facebook, should be pioneers in safeguarding users' privacy while encouraging the establishment of social relationships and freedom of expression. The implications for internet governance are discussed from a multistakeholder perspective.*

Index Terms*—Deleuze, discipline-and-control social media, Facebook, Foucault, freedom, Meta, power, privacy, social network.*

Communication has undergone substantial changes in the past two decades in the social, technical, and professional contexts, arguably the most dramatic of which has accompanied the rise of social media. Although social networking sites such as Facebook (since 2021, a product owned by Meta, but both the product and company are referred to hereinafter as "Facebook"), Twitter, and WeChat are no longer new, communicating on social media platforms has now become a widely adopted strategy to serve and engage with multiple stakeholders in technical and professional communications (TPC). TPC is useful for and penetrates the work, study, and daily life even of laypersons, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic when technical and professional skills have been needed in various spheres of our lives. Earlier studies of TPC have pointed to the importance of privacy protection in new digital media in terms of its characteristics, affordances, and constraints (see, e.g., [1]).

Based on our review of the TPC literature, most of the research on privacy in the social media age has been conducted in Western contexts in the following areas: pedagogical research (e.g., [2]), privacy awareness from a legal perspective (e.g., [3]), and media use and user behaviors (e.g., [4]). Chen and Cheung [5] demonstrate that privacy concerns have been on the rise in Eastern contexts, despite privacy being understood differently in Eastern cultures.

Using Facebook as a case study, this article focuses on the privacy perception and protection of Hong Kong Chinese users among its overall 2.9 billion monthly active users by the end of 2021 [6], with the aim of contributing to filling the research gap opened by the tendency of Facebook research to focus on Western users, despite its primary users being outside the US [7]. Furthermore, much of the TPC research regards the privacy practices

Manuscript received 24 November 2021; revised 4 July 2022; accepted 5 July 2022. Date of publication 1 November 2022; date of current version 28 November 2022. *(Corresponding author: Ming Cheung.)*
Ming Cheung is with the MXII Innovation Institute, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing, China (email: drmingcheung@gmail.com).
Zhen Troy Chen is with the London College of Communication, University of the Arts London, London, UK, and also with the MXII Innovation Institute, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing, China (email: zhentroychen@gmail.com).

IEEE 10.1109/TPC.2022.3191103

Practitioner Takeaway

- The proliferation and penetration of social media into professional and everyday lives have reshaped the way in which people deal with their personal information and call for refreshed perceptions and conceptualizations of the power relationship between individual users and technology giants.
- Data from a survey of 797 young users in Hong Kong were used for our analysis of privacy perception and protection.
- The findings support our hypotheses in revealing that the privacy paradox is evident for Facebook users in Hong Kong. In addition, excessive Facebook use leads to reactive privacy awareness and normalization behaviors.

established by technology giants as a norm to adapt to rather than something to negotiate [8], even as Wilson, Gosling, and Graham [9, p. 203] suggest that "privacy and information disclosure" is one of the top five areas of Facebook research in the social sciences.

Some recent exceptions in the fields of marketing and studies of technology and society contend that the newly established privacy practices are a form of control that affects both our public and personal lives [10], [11]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, social distancing and lockdowns triggered a series of changes in TPC, with teleconferencing, videoconferencing, e-commerce, and working from home becoming new norms. According to Young's study on Zoom, it is becoming ever more important for technology companies

> to incorporate privacy by design and to be frank about their privacy practices with a public who has a growing interest in, and dissatisfaction with, corporate privacy practices. [12, p. 148]

Against this backdrop, our research is significant as a timely contribution in several respects. First, by focusing on users who are university staff members and students from the business, humanities, law, and sciences faculties of a large Hong Kong university, our study examines the expectations, perceptions, and experiences regarding privacy and social media of current and emerging technical and professional communicators. Second, our findings are based on the experiences of Hong Kong Chinese users, thus contributing insights to the field from an Eastern culture. Third, given the "new normal" scenario of the pandemic, even laypersons are immersed in TPC to prepare presentations, conduct online conferences, and develop social media portfolios, among other tasks. Our research findings shed further light on users' behaviors and perceptions regarding privacy from Eastern contexts for business people, researchers, and technical and professional communicators alike.

Facebook has rapidly ascended to the peak of social media popularity [13]. The extent of its stranglehold on the social media market is evident in the global spread of Facebook's 2.9 billion monthly active users, with statistics indicating that Facebook is present in every major global market, in many cases with remarkable levels of penetration [9]. However, the ease of connection to a common space also poses the threat of intrusions into personal space, which is even greater now that Facebook has rebranded itself as Meta and is heavily investing in artificial intelligence, virtual reality, and digital currencies in the Metaverse. The personal information of internet users is now more than ever at hand, regardless of whether they are aware of it [14], [15]. Privacy, as it has been traditionally understood, might be on the verge of death as new media, represented by social media and search engines, constantly erode private spaces and blur the boundary between the private and the public. Against this backdrop, user privacy has become a key point of contention. As it stands, the Facebook privacy debate sits between two extremes: 1. At one end of the spectrum is the argument that society is, in general, loosening its standards regarding privacy, which makes privacy a luxury commodity in the social media age [16], and 2. at the opposite end is the argument that it is essential for personal privacy to be maintained and improved [17].

As pointed out by Cheung [18], Facebook tries to naturalize and advance the notion and acceptance of social transparency as its wealth is sustained through the commodification of personal information generated by its users, which is sold on to advertising companies to assist in targeted

advertising campaigns. Recommendation algorithms and engines presort content in ways that can introduce new products based on users' former or current preferences, which Facebook argues benefits users by having advertisements tailored directly to them and their needs. It is thus in Facebook's best interests to encourage people to continue sharing more personal information and, at the same time, to downplay any concerns raised by privacy advocates. Meanwhile, although it seems logical to say it is not in users' best interests to place their personal information at risk of exposure, users continue to flock to Facebook while doing little to protect their personal privacy. It appears that during the time it has taken for users to reach a point of disillusionment with Facebook, they have simultaneously been heavily investing in and accumulating social capital through the social network, the perceived value of which appears to outweigh that of personal privacy. However, privacy concerns still prevail at different levels.

At a personal level, social media users have newly formed and often algorithm-based social norms and conventions imposed upon them online. They are also the target of information attacks and face political, commercial, and organizational surveillance and intrusion that are directly connected with user privacy [5]. Facebook features, such as *News Feed* and *Share Now*, have also triggered specific privacy concerns. Users can publish their personal information on Facebook and have connected parties automatically notified through the site's *News Feed* function, even though personal information unintended for disclosure may be retrieved by unwanted third parties [19]. This is evident in the scandal involving Cambridge Analytica, with Facebook accused of meddling with the 2016 US presidential election by granting access to users' data to third parties [17]. Users are also forced to grandstand to an ever-greater extent when uploaded materials are "liked" or "reacted to" by other users. In addition to Facebook's overlords and the advertisers who are their clients, each user's own social network of friends, family members, colleagues, and acquaintances also present a heteronomous power over what users post [20], [21].

At an organizational level, such digital labour not only sustains the "free in exchange of advertising" business model but also generates valuable big data stacks awaiting further exploitation [22]. At an institutional level, privacy concerns not only challenge the very business model of social media but also pose policy, legal, and political concerns over internet governance. Internet governance is defined by Solum [23, p. 50] as the "regulation of Internet infrastructure, its current operation, and the processes by which it develops and changes over time." The stakeholders include not only existing legislators, policymakers and regulators, and international organizations, such as the United Nations and Internet Governance Forum [24], but also professional communicators and social media users [25].

Within the legal framework, privacy and cybersecurity laws, such as China's Cybersecurity Law and Personal Information Protection Law, and the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation, have been enacted to tackle the issue of privacy and to improve internet governance. Hong Kong is a pioneer in personal data and privacy protection as the first Asian jurisdiction to enact comprehensive privacy legislation (The Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance, which took effect from December 1996 and underwent major amendments in 2012 and 2021) and to establish an independent privacy regulator [26]. However, some unregulated corporate platform strategies, algorithms, and affordances present challenges for users' online privacy literacy [27]. According to some studies, users expressed anxiety and regret over publishing their activities online [28], [29]. The rise of social media poses even more severe threats to the lay users who frequently publish highly personal information onto Facebook.

However, it is unreasonable to simply make use of hindsight to criticize Facebook users' relatively blind confidence in the purity or goodwill of the social network. Their perception of social media is in line with the early utopian notion of an open internet, which has been strengthened by the celebration of participatory culture [30] and empowered by the marketing and public relations rhetoric deployed by commercialized social media and relevant interest groups [5], [18], [31]. The initial sense of grand optimism about the power that Facebook gave users to connect is problematic, especially when the "networked self" has become entangled with the public sphere and when the boundary between the public and the private is increasingly blurred [32]. Against this backdrop, this article explores the power dynamic between Facebook and its users. It addresses the following research question.

RQ. Although Facebook users are expected to adhere to the social and organizational codes,

> regulations, and norms of social media use, to what extent are they willing to sacrifice control over their information in return for the ability to express themselves, and to interact freely and maintain connection and intimacy in their social roles and relationships?

This article first situates the research by reviewing the academic literature relating to Facebook privacy and using Foucault and Deleuze's conceptualizations of power in society to frame relevant hypotheses. It then turns to the research method and introduces a questionnaire survey conducted among 797 participants, the results of which are followed by a discussion of their implications for internet governance and professional communication. This research has significant relevance to the field of TPC, as privacy has been an issue of major concern in the field with regard to emails [33], online forums [34], international trade [35], internet and online information [36], and smart healthcare systems [37], among others. The issue has been discussed from a variety of perspectives: philosophical, ethical, historical, and sociolegal (see, e.g., [38]–[40]). However, discussions of social media platforms within TCP research have use and strategy as their central focus [10], [41], and Steijn and Vedder [42] argue that privacy perception and conception processes are more important in understanding privacy with regard to technologies among different demographics. In addition, Facebook has been increasingly recognized for its value as a major platform for professional communication to expand networks and influence, build business, and find a job [43]. This study contributes to this body of literature through an investigation of privacy perception and protection on Facebook with insights from a non-Western context.

Literature Review

Power Dynamic of Discipline-and-Control Social Media To provide an understanding of the power dynamic between Facebook and its users, this article draws on the work of Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. According to Buchanan [44], the origin of Deleuze and Guattari's work is a central concern with power, with a particularly close link to the Foucauldian conceptualization of power and governmentality. Foucault states that

> power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society. [45, p. 93]

Power, for Foucault, is omnipresent and manifests itself through discursive interactions (e.g., power and knowledge creation). Since the translation of Foucault's *Discipline and Punishment* in 2009, there has been a refashioned sociological interest in revisiting Foucault's ideas on governmentality or the technologies of the self [46]. However, the application of this framework in social media studies in TPC is scarce, with a few exceptions (see, e.g., [47]). As we show in this article, the "individualization of the self" thesis is actualized by the "technologies of the self" [48], where self-formation and normalization (according to certain norms—in this case, the normalization of self-exposure through social media) are practiced through the self as an enterprise, intertwined with disciplinary states, and penetrative market forces. As McNay puts it,

> Foucault's discussion of self as enterprise highlights, *inter alia*, dynamics of control in neoliberal regimes which operate not through the imposition of social conformity but through the organized proliferation of individual difference in an economized matrix. [49, p. 57]

This reflects the central focus of Foucault's account of liberalism and neoliberalism, in which he argues that in the neoliberal market economy, power "conducts the conduct" through economized self-management and disciplinary control. On this line of thought, freedom or autonomy is practiced at a minimal level that is captured and disguised by neoliberalism.

In the online environment of Facebook, users appear to possess many freedoms. However, when it comes to individual privacy, Facebook users have, or at least behave in such a way that would suggest they have, a declined sense of their own freedom and rights to privacy. The widespread acceptance of Facebook as an integral part of modern social and professional communications has bestowed on the network a unique and highly influential form of power: the power to control users' privacy and construct new online privacy norms. If the use of Facebook is a realization of the "technologies of power," then the process of surveillance and normalization by which Facebook users are made objects of control may, to a certain extent, actualize Foucault's well-known panopticon metaphor, which refers to Jeremy Bentham's 1785 architectural design for prisons. Foucault states:

> Panopticism is one of the characteristic traits of our society. It's a type of power that is applied to individuals in the form of continuous individual supervision, in the form of control, punishment and compensation, and in the form of correction, that is, the molding and transformation of individuals in terms of certain norms. [50, p. 70]

From this idea, we can grasp that Facebook actualizes power over its most highly ritualized users (those who are frequent users of the platform and have become familiar with its functions and vernacular culture over time) as reflected by its discipline in shaping their behaviors. In addition, there is a level of control reflected by its normalization of privacy transparency for its less ritualized and prospective users. Deleuze [51] argues that as technology advances, there is a gradual move from the Foucauldian disciplinary society to a "control society." (For a detailed review, see [46].) Unlike the disciplinary society, the control society as described by Savat

> is solely interested in predicting rather than producing specific forms of behaviour, and in part because, depending on the code that is generated, a given pattern is allowed or enabled to continue or not. [52, p. 54]

Based on this assessment, we develop the notion of "discipline-and-control social media" to describe the situation in which the power relationship is coshaped and negotiated among the platform, governing bodies, professional communicators, and its users, in a combination of both discipline and control.

Currently, Facebook users sacrifice to a certain extent the privacy of their personal information in return for the freedom to express themselves and to interact with friends and acquaintances. Despite the seemingly clear decision from many users to comply with this arrangement (forming a kind of social contract at a platform level), it is logical to assume that this will not be mirrored in the thoughts and desires of Facebook users in the future. As users' unwillingness to accept diminished freedom shines through, the dominant position that Facebook enjoys in this power relationship will continually face challenges and resistance.

The significance of Facebook's popularity is now undeniable and, as a result, academic interest has increasingly turned its focus away from less significant social media brands to focus relatively more on Facebook [53]. As is the nature of technology, Facebook has spent its relatively short life in a constant state of evolution. However, one aspect of its development that has remained consistently at the forefront of criticisms of the social network is the way in which Facebook manages its users' privacy on the site [22], [25].

Internet Governance and Its Counterdiscourse: The criticism that Facebook has received through the mainstream media and academic literature has not gone unnoticed; in fact, it has had an evident impact on the level of concern that users display toward privacy. In a study that examined student perceptions of Facebook privacy over a three-year period from 2007 to 2009, a positive correlation was discovered between users' level of concern regarding privacy and an increase in the number of media reports criticizing Facebook's privacy settings [54]. Facebook has, to its credit, been somewhat proactive in response to public criticism, making changes and additions to the functionality of its user-controlled privacy settings. However, these changes have seldom been met with praise from privacy advocates. A key example of an occasion that resulted in a negative backlash and criticism of Facebook came in December 2009, when Facebook initiated a major shift in how their users' privacy was controlled; this involved altering the default privacy settings of users from their old settings to instead making their information visible to "everyone" [55]. When questioned about the privacy changes, Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg stated:

> People have really gotten comfortable not only sharing more information and different kinds, but more openly and with more people. That social norm is just something that has evolved over time. [56]

The most interesting assertion made in this statement comes through Zuckerberg's use of the term "social norm." This implies a direct belief that internet users are evolving into more transparent creatures to be disciplined, controlled, and put under surveillance. It is a counterdiscourse (against the ongoing internet governance and legal discourses) with an aim to shape and normalize, in a Foucauldian sense, the sharing of private information. It forms part of the apparatus of the technologies of the self, with the aim to discipline and change users' behaviors and beliefs. At purely face value, this assertion is hard to rebut; by sheer power of numbers, it would appear that Facebook users are not just comfortable but even keen to live with increased transparency through social media.

However, the assertion has failed to garner any support from research addressing the behaviors, opinions, and perceptions of Facebook users with regard to privacy.

In their article, addressing the behaviors of Facebook users, Lilley, Grodzinsky, and Gumbus [57] aimed to reveal whether this apparent user complicity in new privacy norms is driven by a cultural shift (as Facebook claims) or engineered by Facebook. The most telling discovery of this study, which surveyed 564 students from four universities in the US, was a clear preference for less transparency in favor of privacy. This indicates that Facebook users' complicity in increased levels of transparency is not driven by any internal shift in the beliefs that govern perceptions of privacy norms among Facebook users.

Along the same lines, when Mohamed and Ahmad [58] surveyed 340 university students in Malaysia, they discovered that the participants' awareness of the vulnerability of personal information being publicly accessible and the possibility of severe consequences that could arise through the misuse of such information was a catalyst for increased privacy concerns. Their results indicate that when individuals were informed of their increased transparency online as a result of Facebook use, they became concerned. This, in turn, links back to the work of Lepper [54], who revealed a link between media coverage pertaining to Facebook privacy and an increased concern for privacy among its users.

Combining the knowledge of these studies debunks the manipulation of discourse by Facebook to claim that society is evolving to embrace transparency by way of ignoring individual privacy. This leads us to the conclusion that Facebook does, indeed, play a role in engineering new online privacy norms as support for the assertion that the new norms are socially driven is empirically ungrounded. An obvious question is then raised: Why do users continue to use and, in turn, accept privacy norms that instill concern? The unfortunate reality appears to be that "people become tolerant of dissatisfactory elements in order to share in experiences with others" [25, p. 71].

Given the amount of coverage that Facebook privacy issues have received in the mass media over the past few years, it would be hard for users to not have become aware, to some degree, that they should harbor concerns about the privacy and protection of their personal information on Facebook. It would be logical to assume that the natural response to such concerns would be to seek a means to improve the security of their personal information. However, there is a privacy paradox in that users hold a high level of concern but, in reality, do little to further the protection of such information. This paradox is prominently displayed in the work of Madden [59, p. 4], who states: "When asked, people say that privacy is important to them; when observed, people's actions seem to suggest otherwise."

To try to understand the cause of this paradox, we can speculate that it comes down to a simple cost-benefit analysis by Facebook users. Studies indicate that loneliness, self-presentation, and audience response are positive predictors of Facebook use [60], [61]. Once users have integrated part of their social engagement within the Facebook system, the incentive for them to remain a part of the system outweighs their need to secure their privacy online. In response, the incentive for Facebook to willingly improve the privacy of its users is not nearly as strong as it might otherwise be, as they understand the social investments their users have made will drive most of them to stay regardless of whether Facebook delivers the improvements that they call for. This is without mentioning the fact that Facebook's wealth is sustained through the commodification of user-generated content [18].

The social power that Facebook has now acquired drives more and more people to become involved and to stay involved in an effort to avoid social exclusion. Interestingly, responding in such a manner can be considered completely rational; the standard human reaction to the threat (or reality) of social exclusion is to "respond in ways that gain them acceptance" [62, p. 919]. In the case of Facebook, this translates to users' continued use of the social network despite privacy concerns. This renders Facebook a powerful "discipline-and-control social media" in line with the Foucauldian *disciplinary society* and Deleuzian *control society*.

In this context, *discipline* refers to the designated rules and regulations that shape users' behaviors, and *control* signifies the "becoming" codes and mechanisms that anticipate normalizing and ritualizing the behaviors and beliefs of current and prospective users. Users are part of the power apparatus as they post, share, and carefully curate their own online identity with significant social and emotional investment. Such self-representation

and performance both support and resist the "discipline-and-control social media" as users verbalize (post and share) and confess to their everyday life goals and failures. To continue using social media in the anticipated (and resistant) manner is the only way for users to demonstrate their identity and existence.

What is most concerning about users' acceptance of Facebook's stance on privacy is the idea put forward by Comer, McKelvey, and Curran [63] that over time accepting conditions as norms is equivalent to social legislating. In their article, regarding the evolution of privacy on Facebook, they drew on the work of Immanuel Kant to argue that the acceptance of Facebook's stance on privacy, and subsequently Facebook's continued practice, would result in a new online privacy paradigm being established as the accepted norm, the result of which would be a world in which privacy is significantly, and possibly permanently, reduced. The possibility of such an outcome makes the significance of addressing issues pertaining to user privacy on Facebook evidently clear.

Research Hypotheses: Thus far, we have established the existence of an intriguing and somewhat concerning power dynamic at play between Facebook and its users. Users would not usually willingly sacrifice the freedom of control over their personal information, yet they do so because the alternative of leaving Facebook is the equivalent of self-imposed social exclusion. Despite heavy dialog, Facebook and its users have been unable to reach a point of equilibrium on the matter. This study's first hypothesis is, therefore, the following:

H1. Facebook users possess a concern for their privacy but their behaviors continue to indicate an acceptance of Facebook's imposed privacy norms. That is to say, the perceived fulfillments derived from using Facebook outweigh the importance of privacy protection.

Other studies have indicated that many people are displaying habitual Facebook usage patterns that suggest a wariness and concern for the possibility that their privacy may be exploited or that they are under some form of surveillance. These habits include removing tags from photos, editing the Facebook wall, unfriending people, adjusting self-disclosure strategies, and attempting to adjust privacy settings [29], [64], [65]. This study's second hypothesis is thus as follows:

H2. Facebook users are aware of the surveillance over their lives, and this awareness influences the online behaviors of frequent Facebook users and promotes the formation of behavior normalization on Facebook, in an evident case of "discipline-and-control social media." A panoptic effect is relevant here as the platform aims to "discipline" users' behaviors while also aiming to "control" a process within an anticipated and imposing "prison without walls."

Research Methodology

This study aims to find out the extent to which Facebook users are willing to sacrifice control over their information in return for the ability to express themselves, and to interact freely and maintain connection and intimacy in their social roles and relationships. This section describes the research method used to test our hypotheses. The study was situated in the context of Hong Kong, where the majority of the population is Facebook users. Following the exploratory approach of Nassar-McMillan and Borders [66], a survey instrument was developed and validated through the conduct of focus group interviews with a sample of active Facebook users in the city. The survey questionnaire derived consists of three sections:

1. 15 multiple-choice questions related to Facebook usage
2. 49 items concerning respondents' attitudes toward and behaviors with regard to Facebook, with each item ranked on a 7-point Likert scale
3. Requests for information from the respondents about their basic demographics

The survey was then distributed via an online platform to 1472 young adults randomly recruited from the email lists of the business, humanities, law, and sciences faculties of a large Hong Kong university over a four-week period. They are all Hong Kong Chinese. At the survey's conclusion, a total of 797 responses had been received, yielding a response rate of 54.14%. The survey was voluntary, and respondents were entered into a cash prize draw.

The respondents started by providing basic information on their Facebook usage, including answering such questions as whether they had ever had a Facebook account, how long this account had been registered, how often they logged into the account each week, and the amount of time they spent on Facebook during each visit, excluding idle time after logging in. They were also asked about their motive for setting up their

TABLE I
DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS

Demographics	% (Frequency)	
Facebook user (*n* = 797)		
Yes	99.50	(793)
No	0.50	(4)
Gender (*n* = 793)		
Female	57.38	(455)
Male	42.62	(338)
Age range (*n* = 793)		
18–25	89.53	(710)
26–35	8.70	(69)
36–45	0.88	(7)
Over 46	0.88	(7)
Education level (*n* = 793)		
Diploma/higher diploma/associate degree	17.53	(139)
Undergraduate	68.22	(541)
Postgraduate	14.25	(113)

TABLE II
FACEBOOK USAGE PATTERN ($n = 714$)

Multiple-Choice Questions	% (Frequency)	
How long has your Facebook account been established?		
Less than 6 months	5.18	(37)
6–12 months	5.15	(36)
1–2 years	33.05	(236)
3–5 years	52.80	(377)
More than 5 years	3.92	(28)
How often do you log into your Facebook account?		
3–5 times per week	16.67	(119)
6–9 times per week	19.47	(139)
10 times or above per week	63.87	(456)
How much time do you spend on Facebook during each visit, excluding idle time after logging in?		
Less than 15 minutes	21.01	(150)
15–30 minutes	37.25	(266)
30–60 minutes	20.73	(148)
1–2 hours	11.34	(81)
Over 2 hours	9.66	(69)
What kind of "friends" do you accept on Facebook?		
People with whom I am close friends in real life	13.31	(95)
People whom I know personally	69.89	(499)
People whom I have heard of through others	13.03	(93)
Anybody who requests to be my friend	3.78	(27)
How many "friends" do you have on Facebook?		
Fewer than 100	9.94	(71)
100–200	22.55	(161)
201–300	22.27	(159)
301–400	19.47	(139)
401–500	12.18	(87)
More than 500	13.59	(97)
How often do you update your profile information?		
Seldom	52.80	(377)
1–2 times per week	27.31	(195)
3–5 times per week	13.17	(94)
6–9 times per week	3.50	(25)
10 times or more per week	3.22	(23)

Facebook account (recommended by friends, to follow the trend, peer pressure, curiosity, and other reason). In addition, to investigate the role played by Facebook "friends," respondents were asked to indicate how many friends they had and what kind of friends they accepted (people with whom I am close friends in real life, people whom I know personally, people whom I have heard of through others, and anybody who requests to be my friend).

Moreover, respondents were asked to specify what types of personal information they had revealed in their Facebook profiles, such as basic descriptors (e.g., real name, date of birth, gender, profile picture, sexual orientation, relationship status, partner's name, and religious views), contact information (e.g., personal phone number, email address, and home address), education and work information (e.g., schools attended, academic major, employer's name, and job title), personal likes and interests, and the names of family members. They also indicated the accuracy of each piece of profile information by selecting one of three options: 1. "I don't provide this information at all," 2. "I provide this information, but it is not complete or not accurate," and 3. "I provide this information, and it is complete and accurate." Furthermore, the survey also asked them how often they updated their profile information.

Respondents were also asked a number of questions about their privacy protection practices, including,

1. How often they adjusted their Facebook privacy settings
2. Their major reason for using fake names or photos in their profile
3. To whom they disclosed their profile with regard to six different areas: photos/videos posted by themselves, photos/videos tagged by friends, wall posts posted by themselves, wall posts posted by friends, profile information, and contact information

To evaluate the weight of perceived fulfillments relative to the importance of privacy protection (H1) and to investigate the relationship between awareness of surveillance and the ritualized use of Facebook (H2), 49 attitudinal items were included in the survey questionnaire: 32 items addressing H1 and 17 addressing H2. Respondents reported

their answers on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 for "strongly disagree" to 7 for "strongly agree." Finally, such demographic variables as gender, age range, and education level were also recorded.

Results

Four of the survey respondents ($n = 797$) had no Facebook account and were thus excluded from the dataset. The remaining 793 were all current Facebook users: 455 were women (57.38%), and 710 (89.53%) fell into the 18–25 age range, with just 69 respondents (8.70%) aged between 26 and 35. The majority (541) of the sample was undergraduates (68.22%), followed by diploma/higher diploma/associate degree students (139; 17.53%), and postgraduates (113; 14.25%). Table I presents the demographic data of the 793 respondents.

Since the primary focus of this study is frequent Facebook users, respondents who indicated they logged into Facebook fewer than three times per week were defined as nonfrequent users, with the 79 who fell into this category eventually filtered out of the dataset. As a result, the data of 714 out of 797 respondents (89.59%) were deemed applicable for analysis.

It can be seen from the Facebook usage patterns reported in Table II that 89.77% of the 714 respondents had set up their Facebook accounts more than a year previously and that 56.72% had three or more years of Facebook experience. Less than a quarter (16.67%) of respondents logged into their accounts just three to five times per week, with 19.47% logging in six to nine times per week, and 63.87% logging in at least 10 times per week. Roughly a fifth (21.01%) reported spending 15 minutes or less, on average, during each visit to Facebook, whereas 37.25% said they spent 15–30 minutes, 20.73% said 30–60 minutes, and 21% said more than an hour.

As can also be seen from Table II, when asked about the role of friends on Facebook, 69.89% of the respondents said they accepted as friends only "people whom I know personally," whereas 13.31% did so with "people with whom I am close friends in real life," 13.03% with "people whom I have heard of through others," and only 3.78% with "anybody who requests to be my friend." In this survey, just 9.94% of respondents reported fewer than 100 Facebook friends, followed by 22.55% with 100–200 friends, 22.27% with 201–300 friends, 19.47% with 301–400 friends, 12.18% with 401–500 friends, and 13.59% with more than 500 friends.

When asked about their profile information on Facebook, 52.80% of respondents indicated that they seldom update it, whereas 27.31% said they do so one to two times per week, and the remaining 13.17% said three to five times per week, 3.50% said six to nine times per week, and 3.22% said more than 10 times per week. Facebook users have a choice over with whom they share a variety of items in their profiles. The survey results reported in Table III indicate that respondents were likely to disclose some of their personal information fully, such as their gender (85.43%), profile picture (71.57%), email address (71.01%), and date of birth (63.45%). In contrast, far fewer respondents said they share such information as their personal phone number, home address, employer's name, job title, sexual orientation, partner's name, family members' names, and religious views.

As Table IV shows, when asked about their privacy settings on Facebook, more than half of the respondents (61.48%) reported that they seldom adjust them, with more than a quarter (29.55%) stating that they do so one to two times per month, and very few (8.96%) that they do so more than three times per month. Furthermore, 291 of the respondents (40.76%) reported using fake names or photos on Facebook. The major reason for doing so for 168 of the respondents (23.53%) was "to hide myself"; 74 (10.36%) cited their reason as "to have fun," and 11 (1.54%) "to attract attention."

Facebook also gives users a choice regarding who can see their profile information. As shown in Table V, most of the respondents reported that they were likely to share information with their friends alone, including photos/videos posted by themselves (65.13%) and their friends (57.84%), wall posts posted by themselves (65.41%) and their friends (64.85%), profile information (65.97%), and contact information (64.71%). A rather surprising finding was that 93 respondents (13.03%) said they disclose contact information to themselves alone.

Results of Testing for Hypothesis 1 H1, which predicts that Facebook users possess a concern for their privacy, yet their behaviors indicate an acceptance of Facebook's imposed privacy norms, that is to say, the perceived fulfillments derived from the Facebook experience will appear to outweigh the importance of privacy protection, garners support from the findings. The score for

TABLE III
INFORMATION DISCLOSED IN FACEBOOK PROFILES ($n = 714$)

Information	I don't provide this information at all		I provide this information, but it is NOT complete or NOT accurate		I provide this information, and it is complete and accurate	
	% (Frequency)		% (Frequency)		% (Frequency)	
Real name	23.11	(165)	34.17	(244)	42.72	(305)
Date of birth	8.82	(63)	27.73	(198)	**63.45**	**(453)**
Gender	7.70	(55)	6.86	(49)	**85.43**	**(610)**
Personal phone number	**82.77**	**(591)**	7.56	(54)	9.66	(69)
Email address	17.09	(122)	11.90	(85)	**71.01**	**(507)**
Home address	**89.78**	**(641)**	6.16	(44)	4.06	(29)
Profile picture	9.38	(67)	19.05	(136)	**71.57**	**(511)**
Schools attended	27.03	(193)	14.99	(107)	57.98	(414)
Academic major	49.16	(351)	12.61	(90)	38.24	(273)
Employer's name	**80.11**	**(572)**	8.68	(62)	11.20	(80)
Job title	**82.35**	**(588)**	8.26	(59)	9.38	(67)
Likes and interests	28.71	(205)	30.81	(220)	40.48	(289)
Sexual orientation	**60.64**	**(433)**	11.90	(85)	27.45	(196)
Relationship status	58.12	(415)	15.69	(112)	26.19	(187)
Partner's name	**77.87**	**(556)**	9.24	(66)	12.89	(92)
Family members' names	**74.23**	**(530)**	15.27	(109)	10.50	(75)
Religious views	**73.11**	**(522)**	11.06	(79)	15.83	(113)

TABLE IV
FACEBOOK PRIVACY SETTINGS ($n = 714$)

Multiple-Choice Questions	% (Frequency)	
How often do you adjust your Facebook privacy settings?		
Seldom	61.48	(439)
1–2 times per month	29.55	(211)
3–5 times per month	6.58	(47)
6–9 times per month	1.40	(10)
10 times or more per month	0.98	(7)
What is your major reason for using a fake name or photo in your profile?		
Have never done so	59.24	(423)
To hide myself	23.53	(168)
To have fun	10.36	(74)
To attract attention	1.54	(11)
Others	5.32	(38)

the former comprises 24 items and that for the latter eight. All of these items showed a very high degree of reliability, with an average Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0.91 (see Table VI). Results of a paired-samples *t*-test indicated a significant difference between perceived fulfillments (mean = 4.18, $SD = 0.64$) and the importance of privacy protection on Facebook (mean = 4.35, $SD = 0.74$; $t(714) = -5.45$, $p < 0.0001$). This finding constitutes the first step in the formation of the Facebook privacy paradox. The finding suggests that respondents were more likely to pay attention to privacy protection than to the perceived fulfillments derived from using the social networking site, directly indicating an increasing concern for privacy. However, as our results revealed, users' actions do not always mirror their assessed concerns.

A paired-samples *t*-test was also performed separately to measure the difference between each of these 24 items and two mean scores. Five items (see Table VII) related to perceived fulfillments were each found to have a significantly higher mean score than the mean score of privacy protection at a 0.01 level of significance. It should be noted that these fulfillments were generally related to maintaining relationships, friendship, and entertainment. The result for the item "I have become a more responsible person by participating on Facebook" indicates that respondents took responsibility for constructing their identity through engagement in social interactions.

Surprisingly, there was a significantly positive but very weak correlation between the items "I have become a more responsible person by participating on Facebook" and "I am concerned with the consequences of sharing my identity information on Facebook" ($r = 0.1245$, $p = 0.0009$). The

TABLE V
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ON FACEBOOK ($n = 714$)

Information	Everyone		Friends of friends		Friends only		Specific people		Myself alone	
	% (Frequency)		% (Frequency)		% (Frequency)		% (Frequency)		% (Frequency)	
Photos/videos posted by me	10.50	(75)	14.57	(104)	**65.13**	**(465)**	7.98	(57)	1.82	(13)
Photos/videos tagged by friends	11.06	(79)	13.73	(98)	**57.84**	**(413)**	7.14	(51)	10.22	(73)
Wall posts posted by me	15.41	(110)	12.46	(89)	**65.41**	**(467)**	5.32	(38)	1.40	(10)
Wall posts posted by friends	14.01	(100)	14.99	(107)	**64.85**	**(463)**	4.34	(31)	1.82	(13)
Profile information	14.01	(100)	13.45	(96)	**65.97**	**(471)**	4.90	(35)	1.68	(12)
Contact information	7.84	(56)	7.98	(57)	**64.71**	**(462)**	6.44	(46)	13.03	(93)

implication is that even though a respondent felt he or she had become a more responsible person, he or she was little concerned about the consequences of sharing his or her own information on Facebook. The significantly positive correlation between the items "I have become a more responsible person by participating on Facebook" and "I am always concerned about my privacy on Facebook" ($r = 0.5823$, $p < 0.0001$), in contrast, demonstrated that the respondents were concerned about their privacy on Facebook to a greater extent if they felt that Facebook participation had rendered them more responsible. This indicates that the ritualized use of Facebook, which proliferates forms of privacy reactive behavior, results in users who feel they are more responsible in the wake of privacy concerns.

The paired-samples *t*-test results presented in Table VIII show that each of the two items related to privacy protection had a significantly lower mean score than the mean score of perceived fulfillments. It can be observed that the respondents reported spending little time on adjusting their privacy settings even though they did not believe their personal information to be well protected on Facebook. Recall from the foregoing discussion that the overall result for the importance of privacy protection outweighed that for perceived fulfillments; the implication is that the respondents were aware of the privacy protection concept, but seldom took action to ensure their protection. This concludes our prediction that users would possess an increasing concern for privacy, yet their behaviors would suggest an acceptance of Facebook privacy norms. The privacy paradox thus appears to be rather ingrained in Facebook users, who are behaving in ways that suggest concern but then display acceptance through behavior adaptations.

Results of Testing for Hypothesis 2 H2, which predicts that Facebook users are increasingly aware of the surveillance over their lives and that the increased awareness influences and proliferates reactive behavior normalization in frequent Facebook users, is supported by the results. The first five items composed the score for the ritualized use of Facebook and the other 12 items for surveillance awareness, and all 17 items demonstrated a very high degree of reliability (Cronbach's coefficient alpha = 0.91), as shown in Table IX. It was observed that users who practiced habitual use of Facebook displayed evidence of behavior that could best be described as a direct reaction to increasing awareness of surveillance, for example, sending private messages instead of posting on a friend's wall.

To better understand the relationship between the awareness of surveillance and the ritualized use of Facebook, the scores for the latter were divided into three groups, "high," "medium," and "low," by standardizing the original score for such use to mean = 0 and standard deviation = 1. Respondents with a standardized score higher than 0.6 were defined as "high" ritualized users, whereas those with a score lower than -0.6 were defined as "low" ritualized users, and the remainder were classified as "medium" users. Two correlation coefficients were identified to investigate the relationship between the ritualized use of Facebook and awareness of surveillance on the site for the "high" and "low" groups.

TABLE VI
CRONBACH'S COEFFICIENT ALPHAS FOR H1 ($n = 714$)

Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Belonging to certain Facebook communities gives me a sense of security.	0.90862
I have enjoyed monetary rewards from joining Facebook events.	0.90921
I get pleasure from using Facebook.	0.90893
I am entertained by using Facebook.	0.90922
I use Facebook to escape reality.	0.91045
I use Facebook to maintain social relationships.	0.90865
I enjoy Facebook because it allows me to share common topics with my friends.	0.90811
I get to delve into my friends' lives through Facebook.	0.90940
I feel other users are sincere when I interact with them on Facebook.	0.90876
I play different roles when I encounter different Facebook users.	0.90915
My problems are always solved after being posted on Facebook.	0.91476
I do not feel lonely because I know I have a circle of friends on Facebook.	0.90820
I enjoy the feeling of being cared for by others when I use Facebook.	0.91477
I feel my relationships with other Facebook users have become more intimate.	0.90865
I feel I am of an equal social status to other Facebook users.	0.90916
I have become a more responsible person by participating on Facebook.	0.91606
I feel my reputation has improved since I began using Facebook.	0.90803
Communicating on Facebook has made me a more confident person.	0.90807
I have learned to respect others by interacting with Facebook users.	0.90916
Facebook has broadened my horizons.	0.90860
I feel my life has been enriched by Facebook use.	0.90769
I have become more mature by interacting on Facebook.	0.90920
Using Facebook has made me feel more modern.	0.90861
I am the type of person I desire to be when I use Facebook, in contrast to the way I am offline.	0.90941
I am very familiar with Facebook's privacy policy.	0.91073
I am familiar with Facebook's privacy settings.	0.91435
I would score myself highly for the way I adjust my Facebook's privacy settings.	0.91022
I adjust my privacy settings from time to time.	0.90967
I am cautious about protecting my personal information on Facebook.	0.91029
I am always concerned about my privacy on Facebook.	0.91548
I am concerned with the consequences of sharing my identity information on Facebook.	0.91067
I believe my personal information is well protected on Facebook.	0.91005

For "high" ritualized users (ritualized use mean = 5.68, $SD = 0.43$), the ritualized use of Facebook and surveillance awareness were positively correlated, with Pearson's correlation coefficient $r = 0.2554$, $p = 0.0003$. Thus, these users were more aware of the surveillance over their life (awareness of surveillance mean = 4.33, $SD = 0.79$). The "low" ritualized users (ritualized use mean = 3.50, $SD = 0.61$), in contrast, were found to be less aware of this issue (awareness of surveillance mean = 3.68, $SD = 0.65$), as the two means were relatively lower, albeit still positively correlated ($r = 0.2829$, $p = 0.0003$), than those in the "high" ritualized case. In other words, whereas the users who reported using Facebook in a ritualized manner displayed greater awareness of surveillance, their nonritualized counterparts were found to be less aware. The increase in normalized privacy awareness behaviors was also found to be positively correlated with "high" ritualized users. This suggests that excessive Facebook use leads to reactive privacy awareness behaviors being formed.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Social media is now heavily intertwined with our work, study, and everyday life. During the

TABLE VII
ITEM MEAN SCORES OF PERCEIVED FULFILLMENTS COMPARED TO MEAN SCORE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF PRIVACY PROTECTION USING A PAIRED-SAMPLES t-TEST

Items	Mean[1]	*SD*	*t*-Test	(*p*-Value)
I am entertained by using Facebook.	0.58	1.18	13.16	(< 0.0001)
I use Facebook to maintain social relationships.	0.32	1.37	6.26	(< 0.0001)
I enjoy Facebook because it allows me to share common topics with my friends.	0.15	1.40	2.89	(0.0040)
I get to delve into my friends' lives through Facebook.	0.27	1.28	5.63	(< 0.0001)
I enjoy the feeling of being cared for by others when I use Facebook.	0.15	1.62	2.50	(0.0126)
I feel my relationships with other Facebook users have become more intimate.	0.16	1.38	3.03	(0.0025)
I have become a more responsible person by participating on Facebook.	0.62	1.53	10.82	(< 0.0001)

Note: Mean[1] = mean of item − mean of the importance of privacy protection; level of significance = 0.01.

TABLE VIII
ITEM MEAN SCORES OF THE IMPORTANCE OF PRIVACY PROTECTION AND PERCEIVED FULFILLMENTS USING A PAIRED-SAMPLES t-TEST

Items	Mean[2]	*SD*	*t*-Test	(*p*-Value)
I am familiar with Facebook's privacy settings.	0.12	1.64	2.03	(0.0428)
I adjust my privacy settings from time to time.	0.49	1.48	8.90	(< 0.0001)
I believe my personal information is well protected on Facebook.	0.64	1.29	13.33	(< 0.0001)

Note: Mean[2] = mean of perceived fulfillments from channeling into ethical telos − mean of item; level of significance = 0.01.

TABLE IX
CRONBACH'S COEFFICIENT ALPHAS FOR H2 ($n = 714$)

Items	Cronbach's Alpha
I feel that Facebook has become an important part of my everyday life.	0.90852
Checking my Facebook account is part of my daily routine.	0.91004
I feel uneasy if I cannot gain access to my Facebook account.	0.90902
I find that the role of Facebook cannot be replaced by that of any other social network.	0.90913
I regularly update my current status to show what I am doing.	0.91051
I feel that some users are watching over my life through Facebook.	0.90901
I watch over my friends' lives through Facebook.	0.90923
I selectively choose what information to post on Facebook.	0.90931
I always express my emotions truthfully on Facebook.	0.91391
I always verify the identity of Facebook communities before I join them.	0.90983
I am concerned that people whom I do not know can obtain my personal information on Facebook and use it for unknown purposes.	0.91011
I am concerned that future potential employers will use my personal information on Facebook to assess my suitability for job positions.	0.90973
I regularly post false or inaccurate information on Facebook to restrict strangers' access to information about me.	0.91102
I always send private messages through Facebook instead of posting messages on friends' walls to restrict others' access to information about me.	0.91093
I always delete messages posted on my Facebook wall to prevent other users from gaining information about me.	0.90965
I untag myself from all images and/or videos posted by my friends.	0.91013
I always set my status as "offline" on Facebook Chat even if I am indeed online.	0.91123

COVID-19 pandemic, an explosion of social media use has become particularly prominent. As a result, TPC will continue to face challenges related to rights to privacy and the trade of user data. Addressing the challenges revealed by the explosion of social media use and discussing the case of the dominant social media brand go hand-in-hand, as how issues such as users' rights with regard to personal privacy are addressed in the near future will undoubtedly reverberate into the distant future. It is, therefore, essential that studies such as this continue to be undertaken and expand the awareness of how social media is evolving and penetrating into various aspects of society, including TPC. It is of utmost importance that diminished rights for internet users do not define the current period of social media evolution, as we demonstrate through the concept of "discipline-and-control social media." To ensure that this does not occur, the personal privacy of internet users must remain a constant in discourse surrounding social media, and the conversation must continue to expand as the extent of online human interaction increases.

This article has addressed the issue of privacy on Facebook by placing it in the context of the power relationship between Facebook and its users, with most of the participants being future professionals working in or with TPC in one way or another. Shining a light on the imbalanced nature of this relationship, exhibited most clearly by the Facebook privacy paradox, allows us to grasp the true gravity of the current imbalance in a non-Western context. Furthermore, it strongly asserts that negative outcomes, both social and economic, will result if the balance continues to skew. This has become a pressing issue for participants who are already studying, working, shopping, and socializing on social media and using TPC tools and skills during the pandemic. The new normal posed and elevated by the pandemic calls for more up-to-date and situated studies on privacy perception and protection such as this one that goes beyond the advocacy of media literacy and privacy awareness education.

In response to this study's first hypothesis, the importance of privacy protection was found to outweigh to a significant degree the perceived fulfillments derived from using Facebook. It appears that as the respondents became more ingrained in the Facebook system, their perception of personal data accessibility was affected and this prompted them to seek a higher degree of privacy protection and greater control over their Facebook privacy settings. At the same time, however, the findings show that a large proportion of the respondents reported rarely adjusting their privacy settings and stated that they shared such personal information as their real name and date of birth and their personal photos. The survey results indicate that in a *renqing shehui* (networked society or society of favor), the sociality between known acquaintances and strangers still has a lasting impact and is strengthened through the network effect garnered through technology giants such as Facebook. The results also show that maintaining relationships with friends outweighed any privacy concerns the respondents had with regard to Facebook, even their belief that the disclosure of information could lead to such serious consequences as surveillance and stalking. There is thus an obvious contradiction between how Facebook users think and how they act when it comes to privacy protection, which reveals the discrepancy between users' understanding and actions in defending their personal information and maintaining privacy on the social networking site.

In support of the second hypothesis, the survey results indicated that respondents were aware of the surveillance and control over their lives stemming from their use of Facebook. Chaulk and Jones [67] reported that keeping tabs on a target of interest, following that target through members of a user's network, and reading a user's wall and profile are some of the common ways to obtain information about user activities. The issue of concern, they pointed out, is that Facebook allows such monitoring behavior to take place in relative anonymity, as "it is near to impossible to determine who has been visiting one's space on Facebook and how often" [67, p. 250]. In the current study, "high" ritualized users were found more likely to have had a superior sense of surveillance on Facebook than their "low" ritualized counterparts, who displayed little such sense.

The result showing that ritualization on Facebook was positively correlated to the extent of respondents' surveillance awareness also supports this argument. It suggests that the "low" ritualized users are most vulnerable and therefore the most likely to have their privacy exploited. It is thus essential that those who make Facebook a part of their daily lives and work develop a deeper understanding of the site's operation and better familiarity with its privacy settings. This also confirms our proposal of the

"discipline-and-control social media" in the sense that "high" ritualized users develop and negotiate constantly with Facebook within a power dynamic. Conversely, "low" ritualized users have little capital to negotiate because their engagement is minimal; therefore, their power to counter the discourse being shaped and engineered by Facebook is limited. Nonetheless, these "low" ritualized users are still being controlled.

The desire for the liberation of expression is a natural consequence of intellectual development; since the Age of Enlightenment, the notions of freedom and democracy have evolved into the primary framework underpinning numerous societies. In recent centuries, freedom of expression has become a constitutionally protected right in many countries, which has supported the intellectual development of the technologies of the self and society. Discourses on freedom are so well articulated in democratic societies that almost every individual therein takes it as a naturally granted right. As the internet continues to flourish, cyberspace culture is becoming more vibrant than ever. Therefore, it is not surprising to find that the desire for unlimited freedom has recently expanded to this frontier. This is exemplified by those users, academics, and entrepreneurs who hold a utopian ideal and attempt to create a borderless "Garden of Eden" with no restraints imposed by the laws of any jurisdiction and the geographic domain of which encompasses the entire globe or at least those parts of the globe with internet access.

This has several implications for professional communicators and for internet governance in general. Compared with freedom of expression, the protection of privacy is a relatively recent concern, and few national constitutions guarantee comprehensive privacy for individuals. Although privacy contributes to personal safety, which is in the second layer of Maslow's hierarchy of needs [68], it may not be threatened until an individual is in the course of attaining a higher level need, such as establishing relationships with others. It is, therefore, unsurprising that concerns over the privacy of expression are quite recent even in the developed world, where physical safety and intellectual freedom are generally well protected. Although internet users enjoy the liberation of expression afforded by internetization and the expansion of their channels of expression, they often retreat rather suddenly upon discovering that their privacy is at imminent risk. It appears that many individuals are happy to enjoy, assert, promote, or even abuse freedom of expression until their own privacy comes under threat and they experience the embarrassment of having their personal privacy breached.

Internet governance may prove necessary if harmony is to be achieved in an international virtual platform on which millions of selves are channeling voices expressing different extremes of opinion. Although freedom of expression should be protected as a fundamental human right, that protection should be balanced with the safeguarding of privacy as a shield against possible abuses of such freedom. Foucault's panopticon metaphor is applicable to today's internet environment to the extent that self-regulated behavior and mutual respect are required of all users, with everyone conforming to a common set of rules. In the context of "discipline-and-control social media," control over users and platforms should be and is being negotiated, exemplified by platform regulation and surveillance, users' self-disciplining, and more important, users' countercontrol over platforms. Extreme applications of freedom of expression, including Facebook's engineered discourse on radical privacy transparency, may on the one hand lead to invasions of privacy and on the other hand lead individuals to become overly protective of their own privacy and experience the anxiety that goes with it. Eventually, and ironically, this will diminish users' desire to express themselves as the survey results in this study indicate. This should be an especially prominent concern for Facebook as they look to further increase their stranglehold on the global social media marketplace.

Facebook has introduced its users to a refreshingly new virtual communication experience. Through integrated functions that allow the editing of personal profiles, the uploading of pictures and videos, and the tagging of friends, users are encouraged to express themselves and to disclose more of their personal information through the voluntary sacrifice of privacy. Individuals' sense of sacrifice and sense of alarm over privacy violations are alleviated when disclosure is limited to their friends. Although the prerequisite for such a sense of security is mutual trust and respect among friends, these factors may easily be neglected as a user's social sphere expands. Personal privacy is particularly threatened when the newly added connections are not close friends. There is no question that Facebook users bear the primary responsibility for safeguarding their personal information. However, if Facebook wishes to attract

more users, then it has both the responsibility and an incentive to ensure that its platform is technically and legally secure.

Neither Facebook nor its users should consider the current privacy paradigm to be an end point. As social communications are now taking place via complex channels that are new to human history, policymakers are inevitably being pushed to synchronize their legal approaches to privacy protection with the rapid advancement of information technology. The challenges they face are not limited to protecting internet users' sense of security, which is a basic need that arises in people in the course of expressing themselves to and interacting with others; they also stem from the need to balance human beings' natural desire for freedom of expression in social interactions with the necessary restrictions against and censorship of cybermedia to shield against privacy intrusion and cyberbullying. Privacy acts and related legislation and policies must, therefore, be regularly revised to meet the urgent need to regulate the virtual world while giving due consideration to the constitutionally guaranteed and fundamental human right to freedom of expression.

Facebook, which currently enjoys an advantage over its competitors due to its extremely broad range of users of different ages, cultures, and views, could be used as a platform to educate users and raise their privacy awareness, thereby establishing a convergence of cross-cultural perspectives on balancing freedom of expression and privacy protection and providing a vision for the elimination of cultural and geographical barriers. Facebook holds a unique form of power in terms of control over its users' personal privacy through its influence in engineering and re-engineering privacy norms. Consequently, it is of vital importance for professional communicators, academics, and policymakers to ensure the world's social media giant wields this power with due responsibility.

This survey-based study has several limitations, which are similar to those of other studies adopting quantitative measures. First, the results were primarily obtained from a survey targeting young adults of a particular university, and different results may be obtained if the same survey were to be administered to more mature Facebook users. Second, the generalizability of the findings to users of different cultural backgrounds and those governed by the laws of different jurisdictions may be limited, as the survey targeted Hong Kong Chinese Facebook users. Future research could therefore attempt to make cross-sector and cross-cultural comparisons using the same survey items as those used herein. The quantitative measures could also be supplemented with in-depth interviews with Facebook users to obtain richer insights into their personal experience of Facebook use.

References

[1] J. P. Zappen, "Digital rhetoric: Toward an integrated theory," *Tech. Commun. Quart.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 319–325, 2005.
[2] S. Aydin, "A review of research on Facebook as an educational environment," *Educ. Technol. Res. Develop.*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 1093–1106, 2012.
[3] K. Martin, "Understanding privacy online: Development of a social contract approach to privacy," *J. Bus. Ethics*, vol. 137, no. 3, pp. 551–569, 2016.
[4] H. Xu and H. Jia, "Privacy in a networked world: New challenges and opportunities for privacy research," *J. Washington Acad. Sci.*, vol. 101, no. 3, pp. 73–84, 2015.
[5] Z. T. Chen and M. Cheung, "Privacy perception and protection on Chinese social media: A case study of WeChat," *Ethics Inf. Technol.*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 279–289, 2019.
[6] S. Dixon, "Facebook audience reach," *Statista*, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://www.statista.com/statistics/346167/facebook-global-dau/
[7] S. Singh and K. J. Bagchi, "How Internet platforms are combating disinformation and misinformation in the age of COVID-19," *New Amer.*, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep25418.5
[8] W. Quesenbery, "Who is in control? The logic underlying the intelligent technologies used in performance support," *Tech. Commun.*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 449–457, 2002.
[9] R. E. Wilson, S. D. Gosling, and L. T. Graham, "A review of Facebook research in the social sciences," *Perspectives Psychol. Sci.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 203–220, 2012.
[10] C. Tucker, "Social networks, personalized advertising, and privacy controls," *J. Market. Res.*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 546–562, 2014.
[11] N. Gertz, "The four Facebooks," *New Atlantis*, vol. 58, pp. 65–70, 2019.
[12] S. Young, "Zoombombing your toddler: User experience and the communication of Zoom's privacy crisis," *J. Bus. Tech. Commun.*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 147–153, 2021.
[13] P. B. Brandtzæga, M. Lüdersa, and J. H. Skjetnea, "Too many Facebook 'friends'? Content sharing and sociability versus the need for privacy in social network sites," *Int. J. Human-Comput. Interact.*, vol. 26, no. 11/12, pp. 1006–1030, 2010.

[14] Y. Li, Y. J. Li, Q. Yan, and R. H. Deng, "Privacy leakage analysis in online social networks," *Comput. Soc.*, vol. 49, pp. 239–254, 2015.
[15] R. F. Mansour, "Understanding how big data leads to social networking vulnerability," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 57, pp. 348–351, 2016.
[16] Z. Papacharissi, "Privacy as a luxury commodity," *First Monday*, vol. 15, 2010, Art. no. 8. [Online]. Available: https://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3075/2581
[17] C. Cadwalladr and E. Graham-Harrison, "Revealed: 50 million Facebook profiles harvested for Cambridge analytica in major data breach," *Guardian*, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/17/cambridge-analytica-facebook-influence-us-election
[18] M. Cheung, "User experience design in digital service innovation," in *Routledge Companion Design Studies*, P. Sparke and F. Fisher Eds. Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge, 2016, pp. 330–338.
[19] Amnesty International, "Surveillance giants: How the business model of Google and Facebook threatens human rights," 2019. [Online]. Available: https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/POL3014042019ENGLISH.PDF
[20] B. Light and K. McGrath, "Ethics and social networking sites: A disclosive analysis of Facebook," *Inf. Technol. People*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 290–311, 2010.
[21] J. D. M. Underwood, L. Kerlin, and L. Farrington-Flint, "The lies we tell and what they say about us: Using behavioural characteristics to explain Facebook activity," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 1621–1626, 2011.
[22] C. Fuchs, "The political economy of privacy on Facebook," *Telev. New Media*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 139–159, 2012.
[23] L. B. Solum, "Models of Internet governance," *Univ. Illinois Public Law Res. Paper*, vol. 7, no. 25, pp. 48–91, 2008.
[24] E. Siapera, *Understanding New Media*. London, UK: Sage, 2018.
[25] D. O'Brien and A. M. Torres, "Social networking and online privacy: Facebook users' perceptions," *Iranian J. Manage.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 63–97, 2012.
[26] "The Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance," Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data, Hong Kong, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://www.pcpd.org.hk/english/data_privacy_law/ordinance_at_a_Glance/ordinance.html
[27] M. Bartsch and T. Dienlin, "Control your Facebook: An analysis of online privacy literacy," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 56, pp. 147–154, 2016.
[28] K. Moore and J. C. McElroy, "The influence of personality in Facebook usage, wall postings, and regret," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 28, pp. 267–274, 2012.
[29] W. J. Xie and C. Y. Kang, "See you, see me: Teenagers' self-disclosure and regret of posting on social network site," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 52, pp. 398–407, 2015.
[30] H. Jenkins, *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 1992.
[31] T. Gillespie, "The politics of 'platforms'," *New Media Soc.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 347–364, 2010.
[32] Z. Papacharissi, *A Networked Self: Identity, Community, and Culture on Social Network Sites*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2011.
[33] P. A. Chociey, "Who's reading my e-mail? A study of professionals' e-mail usage and privacy perceptions in the workplace," *IEEE Trans. Prof. Commun.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 34–40, Mar. 1997.
[34] L. J. Gurak, "Rhetorical dynamics of corporate communication in cyberspace: The protest over lotus marketplace," *IEEE Trans. Prof. Commun.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 2–10, Mar. 1995.
[35] M. Markel, "Safe harbor and privacy protection: A looming issue for IT professionals," *IEEE Trans. Prof. Commun.*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 1–11, Mar. 2006.
[36] S. Chai, S. Bagchi-Sen, H. R. Rao, C. Morrell, and S. J. Upadhyaya, "Internet and online information privacy: An exploratory study of preteens and early teens," *IEEE Trans. Prof. Commun.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 167–182, Jun. 2009.
[37] A. Alaiad and L. Zhou, "Patients' adoption of WSN-based smart home healthcare systems: An integrated model of facilitators and barriers," *IEEE Trans. Prof. Commun.*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 4–23, Mar. 2017.
[38] L. P. Hitch and J. P. Miller, "Historical perspectives on technology, ethics, and privacy," *IEEE Trans. Prof. Commun.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 11–13, Mar. 1994.
[39] E. Perkins and M. Markel, "Multinational data-privacy laws: An introduction for IT managers," *IEEE Trans. Prof. Commun.*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 85–94, Jun. 2004.
[40] V. Peruginj, "Anytime, anywhere: The social impact of emerging communication technology," *IEEE Trans. Prof. Commun.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 4–15, Mar. 1996.
[41] S. Zhang, J. F. Gosselt, and M. D. T. de Jong, "How large information technology companies use Twitter: Arrangement of corporate accounts and characteristics of tweets," *J. Bus. Tech. Commun.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 364–392, 2020.
[42] W. M. P. Steijn and A. Vedder, "Privacy under construction: A developmental perspective on privacy perception," *Sci., Technol., Human Values*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 615–637, 2015.
[43] S. Sreenivasan, "How to use social media in your career," *The New York Times*, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://www.nytimes.com/guides/business/social-media-for-career-and-business
[44] I. Buchanan, "Assemblage theory and its discontents," *Deleuze Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 382–392, 2015.
[45] M. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1. New York, NY, USA: Random House, 1980.
[46] N. Gane, "The governmentalities of neoliberalism: Panopticism, post-panopticism and beyond," *Sociol. Rev.*, vol. 60, pp. 611–634, 2012.
[47] C. Barreneche, "Governing the geocoded world: Environmentality and the politics of location platforms," *Convergence: Int. J. Res. Into New Media Technol.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 331–351, 2012.

[48] M. Foucault, "Technologies of the self," in *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar With Michel Foucault*, L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, and P. H. Hutton, Eds. Amherst, MA, USA: Univ. Massachusetts Press, 1988.
[49] L. McNay, "Self as enterprise: Dilemmas of control and resistance in Foucault's the birth of biopolitics," *Theory, Culture, Soc.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 55–77, 2009.
[50] M. Foucault, "Truth and juridical forms," in *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984*, vol. 3, J. B. F. Power and P. Rabinow, Eds. New York, NY, USA: New York Press, 2000.
[51] G. Deleuze, "Postscript on the societies of control," *JSTOR*, vol. 59, pp. 3–7, 1992. [Online]. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/778828
[52] D. Savat, "Deleuze's objectile: From discipline to modulation," in *Deleuze and New Technology*, M. Poster and D. Savat. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh Univ. Press, pp. 45–62, 2009.
[53] G. Hull, H. R. Lipford, and C. Latulipe, "Contextual gaps: Privacy issues on Facebook," *Ethics Inf. Technol.*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 289–302, 2011.
[54] T. S. Lepper, "Facebook: Student perceptions of ethical issues about their online presence," in *The Ethics of Emerging Media: Information, Social Norms and New Media Technology*, B. E. Drushel and K. German, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Continuum Int., 2011, pp. 175–189.
[55] M. Kirkpatrick, "The day has come: Facebook pushes people to go public," *ReadWriteWeb*, 2009. [Online]. Available: http://readwrite.com/2009/12/09/facebook_pushes_people_to_go_public
[56] B. Johnson, "Privacy no longer a social norm, says Facebook founder," *Guardian*, 2010. [Online]. Available: http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2010/jan/11/facebook-privacy
[57] S. Lilley, F. S. Grodzinsky, and A. Gumbus, "Revealing the commercialized and compliant Facebook user," *J. Inf. Commun. Ethics Soc.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 82–92, 2012.
[58] N. Mohamed and I. H. Ahmad, "Information privacy concerns, antecedents and privacy measure use in social networking sites: Evidence from Malaysia," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 28, pp. 2366–2375, 2012.
[59] M. Madden, "Privacy management on social media sites," *Pew Internet Rep.*, pp. 1–20, 2012. [Online]. Available: https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2012/02/24/privacy-management-on-social-media-sites/
[60] L. Bareket-Bojmel, S. Moran, and G. Shahar, "Strategic self-presentation on Facebook: Personal motives and audience response to online behavior," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 55, no. Part B, pp. 788–795, 2016.
[61] A. Blachnio, A. Przepiorka, W. Boruch, and E. Balakier, "Self-presentation styles, privacy, and loneliness as predictors of Facebook use in young people," *Pers. Individual Differences*, vol. 94, pp. 26–31, 2016.
[62] N. C. DeWall and S. B. Richman, "Social exclusion and the desire to reconnect," *Social Pers. Psychol. Compass*, vol. 5, no. 11, pp. 919–932, 2011.
[63] R. Comer, N. McKelvey, and K. Curran, "Privacy and Facebook," *Int. J. Eng. Technol.*, vol. 2, no. 9, pp. 1626–1630, 2012.
[64] A. Dhir, P. Kaur, K. Lonka, and M. Nieminen, "Why do adolescents untag photos on Facebook?," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 55, pp. 1106–1115, 2016.
[65] A. Taneja, J. Vitrano, and N. J. Gengo, "Rationality-based beliefs affecting individual's attitude and intention to use privacy controls on Facebook: An empirical investigation," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 38, pp. 159–173, 2014.
[66] S. C. Nassar-McMillan and L. D. Borders, "Use of focus groups in survey item development," *Qualitative Rep.*, vol. 7, 2012, Art. no. 1. [Online]. Available: http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR7-1/nassar.html
[67] K. Chaulk and T. Jones, "Online obsessive relational intrusion: Further concerns about Facebook," *J. Fam. Violence*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 245–254, 2011.
[68] A. H. Maslow, "A theory of human motivation," *Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 370–396, 1943.

Ming Cheung received the MDes, MA, MSc, LLM, Ph.D. and other degrees in Digital Media, Design, Applied Linguistics, Computing, Information and Technology Management, Information Technology and Intellectual Property Law, Education, Music, and Psychology, from the University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK; University College London, London, UK; University of Hong Kong, China; and others. She is currently the Chief Distinguished Chair Professor in Media and Design, and the Dean of MXII Innovation Institute, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing, China. Her research and professional interests focus on strategic communication, visual communication, digital media, and experience innovation. Prof. Cheung has authored or coauthored in IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION, *Ethics and Information Technology*, *International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, *Instructional Science*, *The Design Journal*, *Social Semiotics*, *Semiotica*, and *Journal of Pragmatics*, among others.

Zhen Troy Chen received the Ph.D. degree in Cultural Studies from the University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK. He is currently a Senior Lecturer in Digital Advertising with the London College of Communication, University of the Arts London, London, UK, and an Adjunct Research Fellow of MXII Innovation Institute, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing, China. His research interests include digital media and advertising, cultural and creative industries, cultural and media policy, and experience design. He has authored or coauthored in the *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *Ethics and Information Technology*, *Social Semiotics*, *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, *SAGE Research Methods*, and *Global Media and China*. Dr. Chen is an FHEA.