# What Does It Mean to be Private? Relation Between Teenager Self-Presentation and Their Digital Privacy

## Moh. Rifaldi Akbar[1*], Syahrul Hidayanto[1]

[1]Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya
Jl. Perjuangan No. 81, Kota Bekasi 17121 - Indonesia
[*]Corresponding author: rifaldi.akbar@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id

**Abstract**
This study aims to determine the relationship between privacy management on Instagram and the self-presentation of teenager. This study took a respondent sample of N=54 that belongs to a Generation Z cohort category. The respondents of this study were VII, VIII, IX grade students of Al Azhar Islamic Middle School (SMP) Kemang Pratama 9 Bekasi City, West Java. This study uses a positivist paradigm with a quantitative approach. This research design is correlational in order to determine the relationship between variables. The independent and dependent variables will be measured simultaneously through a cross-sectional approach. The questionnaire was chosen as a tool to collect data. The questionnaire was created using Google Forms and distributed through the WhatsApp application. This study uses close-ended questions where the respondent can only choose the answer according to the options provided in the questionnaire. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling, with the criteria of respondents being middle school students aged 12-14 years, having an Instagram account, and actively using Instagram for 1-3 years. The results of this study indicate that there is a strong relationship between privacy management on Instagram social media and middle school students' self-presentation. Then, the form of the relationship between the two variables is positive, meaning that the higher the privacy management of middle school students on Instagram, the higher the self-presentation.
**Keywords**: Privacy management, self presentation, instagram, students, teenager

**Introduction**
Along with the development of communication technology, humans have a new self-presentation habit. If interactions were carried out directly in the past, expressing oneself through forums and expressing opinions, today, the conditions are different (Lee, Lee, Moon, & Sung, 2015). Identity no longer entirely belongs to the person who controls their account but belongs together in the digital era. Social media features allow strangers to read and understand a person's character from their photo posts, location, favorite food, and close-friends today (Child, Duck, Andrews, Butauski, & Petronio, 2015; Petronio, 2010). Therefore, self-presentation on social media is intertwined with the governance of privacy (security) for one's social media account.

Social media connects humans with networks of people everywhere. Social media provides space for everyone to see themselves through self-presentation at the same time. This created a condition where everyone began to pay attention to their privacy management on Instagram (Nardis & Panek, 2019). Therefore,

social media has provided users with various ways of managing security and policies.

Along with the development of social media based on posting pictures (photos), self-presentation is an inseparable part of Instagram (Choi & Sung, 2018). Social media, based on posting pictures and photos, is a place for fulfilling someone's needs to present themselves. Social media based on posting pictures and photos is an extension of one's identity in the virtual world. In other words, social media can frame, shape, and edit one's self-presentation to a certain degree (Shane-Simpson, Manago, Gaggi, & Gillespie-Lynch, 2018).

Previous studies have seen that Instagram creates security holes. Teenagers think managing privacy on Instagram is irrelevant to their daily lives. Teenagers feel they understand the management of privacy, but practically the essence of privacy is lost when they take over-sharing actions (Adorjan & Ricciardelli, 2019). In addition, Instagram is visual and provides a security hole for anyone to stalk (voyeurism) for various purposes (Adorjan & Ricciardelli, 2019).

Previous studies have attempted to describe how self-presentation on social media, Instagram, is important in perpetuating social relationships. Parents using Instagram to demonstrate parenting styles are an extension of parental presentation rather than a fundamental goal of caring for children for example (Holiday, Norman, & Densley, 2020). Instagram is a place for teenagers to communicate themselves. Teenagers tend to divert socialization from the real world to the digital world, where teenagers will maximize self-presentation on Instagram in hopes of getting a more comprehensive network of friends (Holiday et al., 2020). Instagram mediates self-presentation, which impacts youth's self-confidence (Jiang & Ngien, 2020).

Instagram is the most popular image-based social media (We Are Social, 2021), where teenagers have the most interactions. Within the Teenage category, there are other categories, namely Gen Z, youth, and adults, although there is no general-formal convention (Dimock, 2021). Teenagers are those born over 1996. Social media plays an essential role in socialization for teenagers (Madden, Cortesi, & Lenhart, 2012).

Teenagers are entering a period of socialization. They enter a period of behavioral transition in which self-exploration is more intense than before (Madden et al., 2012; Yau & Reich, 2019). In the Indonesian cultural landscape, at that age, teenagers attend middle schools (*Sekolah Menengah Pertama*) and MTs (*Madrasah Tsanawiyah*). They fall into the age category (cohort) who most often use social media for self-presentation; at the same time, they are ignorant of privacy management (Sowash, 2020; USDHS, 2020).

Teenagers are entering a period of socialization. They use Instagram to mediate self-presentation that replaces social interactions in the real world. Even though they were born as digital natives, teenagers feel that security management on Instagram is less relevant to them (Han, Lee, Jang, Jung, & Lee, 2016). Because Instagram is a social media for posting photos, where visually, it can depict a person through computer mediation. The management of an Instagram account will be intertwined with the youth's self-presentation on the platform. This paper explores the relationship between social media privacy management and teenager's self-presentation as a teenager in middle school.

## Theoretical Framework
### Communication Privacy Management Theory

Sandra Petronio, a communications professor from Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis, said that communication privacy management (CPM) theory is divided into three parts: privacy ownership, control, and turbulence. Privacy holdings contain privacy boundaries that include information one person owns but is unknown to others. Privacy boundaries can be very thin, fragile, and difficult to penetrate.

Privacy controls, as the second part of the system, involve a person's decision to share personal information with others. This second part is called the privacy management engine, in which a person can decide whom the personal information will be shared with and how to control and establish privacy boundaries. Then, in the last part, privacy turbulence comes into play when personal information is managed and is not as expected. For example, an agreement to keep personal information confidential is violated, even though the rules of the agreement have been made as strict as possible. Decisions made by someone after the agreement is violated will

reduce turbulence (Petronio & Durham, 2008; Petronio, 2004; Petronio, 2002).

*Five Principles of Communication Privacy Management*

CPM was developed to understand how people manage personal information through disclosing or hiding information. CPM is also related to granting or denying access to information to others. At the beginning of its development, CPM required the conceptualization of privacy about disclosure (Petronio & Durham, 2008; Petronio, 2004; Petronio, 2002). According to Altman (1975), the notion of privacy can be best understood when juxtaposed with publicity.

Privacy and publicity are inseparable. Both coexist, interact, and determine the parameters between the two. Publicity or being social can be more easily understood with a measure of privacy. For example, in a family, each family member needs to socialize to get to know each other but remains autonomous. From these examples, it can be seen that even though publicity exists, privacy cannot be lost. This privacy then becomes the background for family privacy management. There are five principles of CPM theory that represent organizing principles that connect individuals and collectives, namely information ownership, control, regulation through privacy rules, ownership or guardianship of other people's personal information, and turbulence or regulation of privacy disturbance (Petronio, 2002).

These five principles serve as a framework for understanding how people manage their personal information and how they add others to their privacy management system. The principles offered by this theory pave the way for an additional examination of the interrelationships among these principles. CPM theory has been useful in gaining insight into different types of privacy contexts. The five CPM principles will be explained as follows:

*Principle1: Ownership of Personal Information.* Some people define personal information as something they claim to be theirs. This means that ownership is used as a fundamental parameter of privacy. Everyone has the right to privacy, which can determine who can find his personal information. Then, everyone also has the flexibility to manage personal information how they want. Claims for ownership of personal information are perceptual and often based on belief (Petronio & Caughlin, 2006; Caughlin & Petronio, 2004; Petronio, 2002).

*Principle 2: Control of Personal Information.* When people believe they have a right to personal information, they then assume a right to control that personal information. People want to control the flow of personal information because of the risk that others may get the information they want to restrict. The level of control over each person's personal information varies depending on the level of risk of the personal information. Some control it very tightly so that the boundaries are pretty thick, and the outflow of information is minimal. There is also the opposite. Information that is tightly controlled is often classified as confidential because access is limited, and very few people know about it. Medium controls, for example, information can only be accessed by some family members but not other family members. Finally, low control means more open access to personal information, permission to access it is easy, and privacy boundaries are elementary to penetrate (Caughlin et al., 2000; Petronio, 2000).

*Principle 3: Personal Information Rules.* This principle argues that people control the flow of personal information through a rule-based system. Rules are made to determine when, how, with whom, and in what way information access is given and denied (Petronio, 2002). Usually, people have criteria for formulating and changing personal information rules. For example, cultural values can influence the assessment and management of privacy. An example of cultural values influencing the management of personal information is that people in the UK set higher privacy thresholds than people in Israel (de Munck & Korotayev, 2007; Kim, 2005; Moore, 1984; Newell, 1998). In addition to culture, gender criteria are often used to establish rules for personal information. Both men and women regulate access to information using various types of privacy rules (Petronio & Martin, 1986; Petronio, Martin, & Littlefield, 1984).

Motivational factors also play a role when someone makes privacy rules (Taylor, 1979). The type of motivation varies. It can be because you want to achieve a goal or avoid the topic. Information rules for some people are flexible. If the adverse effect received is more significant when personal information is given to others, he can establish new rules to

minimize these adverse effects (Golish & Caughlin, 2002). The last criterion is situational. These criteria sometimes interfere with changes to predefined privacy rules. For example, a husband and wife who are bound by marriage make a set of privacy rules that are agreed upon by each other. However, a few years later, they divorced so that the privacy rules that had been made were adjusted according to the situation. Thus, situational transformations often require concurrent changes in privacy rules (Petronio & Caughlin, 2006).

*Principle 4: Shared Ownership and Custody of Personal Information.* When someone gives access to their personal information to another person, that person can be said to be a trusted person or guardian. This fourth principle is considered the most important and contributes to CPM theory for understanding privacy management. This principle provides the choice to identify privacy boundaries in the individual realm and the notion of privacy boundaries held collectively (Petronio & Reierson, 2009). Privacy boundaries can be private or shared. When privacy boundaries become shared property, trusted people or guardians are expected to set mutually agreed terms of privacy and management of personal information. Privacy rules can be negotiated to mitigate or prevent accidental invasion of privacy (Petronio & Reierson, 2009; Petronio, 2002).

There are three types of negotiable privacy rule conditions. They are negotiating these conditions coordinate privacy boundaries, namely linkage rules, permeability rules, and ownership rules. Link rules are parameters for specifying people who can be added as owners of personal information. People who can be added as owners of personal information are those who are considered to know the information, and fall into the criteria of a trusted person, for example, mother, father, aunt, or cousin, level of intimacy, and topic relevance. The rules of permeability address how much other people can know about personal information. These rules govern access to and protection of shared personal information (Greene et al., 2003; Hawk, Hale, Raaijmakers, & Meeus, 2008; Petronio, 2002). Finally, ownership rules relate to how much control others have over managing personal information independently. This condition allows a trusted person to know personal

information but is not given permission to do anything about that information. This means that trusted people do not have distribution rights and control of information because this has been regulated in their agreement (Petronio, 2006; Golish, 2003).

*Principle 5: Turbulence of the Limits of Personal Information.* Although privacy rules have been carefully crafted and negotiated to avoid unwanted intrusion, the fact is that this is not fully realized. Cases were found where confidants violated the established rules. This can happen because of misunderstandings and privacy rules that are not clearly identified. This last principle predicts that misunderstandings, mistakes, and intentional violations can lead to the turbulence of privacy boundaries. Turbulence arises when privacy management is not fulfilled. The existence of turbulence is a challenge for information owners to select recipients of personal information, minimize errors in privacy boundary rules, and take into account when personal information is shared (Petronio, 2006; Petronio, 2002).

*Self-Presentation*

Goffman first developed the concept of self-presentation in 1959. Goffman (1959) describes self-presentation as a way for people to negotiate and validate identity in direct (face-to-face) communication and introduce a "frame" within it to evaluate the meaning of face-to-face meetings. According to Goffman (1959), shame is an essential indicator of a person's failure to present an acceptable self and a person's primary motivator to project a good self-image. The point is that someone will try to present themselves more effectively to minimize the embarrassment of a failed self-presentation. He will also be motivated to look good so that the embarrassment that comes from failure can be avoided. Therefore, when interacting, people tend to present themselves positively and try to match other people's self-presentations (Goffman, 1959). Therefore, when interacting, people tend to present themselves positively and try to match other people's self-presentations (Goffman, 1959).

In the current era of digitalization, computer-mediated communication forms a new framework for interaction. Although limited and less wealthy than face-to-face, computer-mediated communication provides new opportunities for self-presentation. Through self-presentation, individuals are

involved in impression management and information control in everyday life (Schlenker & Pontari, 2000). Papacharissi (2002) analyzes that on the internet, people can control their information online for other people so that they can convey specific images. Boyd (2007) added that people would have more vital self-presentation control than indirect interactions on the internet. They can carefully choose what information is shown to other users. Birnbaum's (2008) studies show that individuals will be careful about their impressions of Facebook. The goal is to communicate, interact with friends, and get support on Facebook. Evidence of self-presentation is selectively found in various spaces on the internet, including e-mail, forums, and online dating sites. Similarly, Tice, Butler, Muraven, and Stillwell (1995) found that people change their self-presentation to be more pleasant when interacting with strangers and tend to be less cautious when interacting with people who already know their background.

Loss et al. (2013) stated that social media allows people to "check, edit, and revise" their self-presentation before making it available to others. This editable self-presentation may increase motivation to engage in intentional impression management tactics and may also lead to more intense use of assertive and proactive self-presentation. Self-presentation tends to be done by individuals on purpose and want to be seen by others (Wong, 2012). Individuals make conscious decisions about presenting themselves based on the people they interact with at any given time (Vitak, 2012). Social media profiles serve as a stage where users can make public or semipublic presentations about themselves, and most often, users will seek to portray themselves in a positive light. Since this self-image is publicly displayed continuously, it is reasonable to assume that social media users use strategies that help present (and promote) themselves as attractive to the public (Loss et al., 2013).

According to Jones and Pittman (1982), self-presentation can be constructed through five strategies: ingratiation, competence, intimidation, exemplification, and supplication. Someone who uses an ingratiation strategy aims to be liked by others. Individuals consciously do good or use flattery to gain the attribution of being liked by others. In the competence strategy, individuals will show their abilities and achievements to make them look competent. Through intimidation strategies, people will signal their power or potential to punish to be seen as dangerous. Then in the exemplification strategy, individuals will present themselves as someone who can be a role model for others. The goal is for the individual to appear more respected. Lastly, supplication a strategy to appear helpless so that others will come to help. Characteristics of this approach include pleas for help and self-deprecation.

*Instagram*

Instagram has become an essential social media in changing the role of photography (Caliandro & Graham, 2020). According to Caliandro & Graham (2020), Instagram is front and backstage for its users. Instagram's platform building allows its users to share non-professional photos. Therefore, Instagram allows users to share every day, worldly, and intimate photos.

Instagram's build sets it apart from other social media platforms. Even though it is not the first platform to make photos and images a part of its activities, the Instagram build differs from Flickr. Instagram users will build behavior that adapts to the platform's design or borrows Gibbs's (2015) term "Instagram's vernacular culture." The unique language and way of conveying it through the posting of photos and features are what Gibbs refers to as "vernacular culture." In addition, Instagram provides space for users to add hashtags, geolocation, and mentions, which, although not a new feature, make the Instagram platform vernacular (Gibbs, Meese, Arnold, Nansen, & Carter, 2015).

**Material and Methodology**

This study uses a correlational research design to determine the relationship between variables. Through a cross-sectional approach, the independent and dependent variables will be measured simultaneously. The research paradigm is positivist with a quantitative approach that prioritizes objective thinking processes. Variable X in this study is privacy management with indicators, namely intimacy, personal disclosure, collective boundaries, personal boundaries, control, ownership, characteristics of privacy rules, boundary coordination, boundary turbulence, tension, and private openness (Petronio, 2002). In comparison, the Y variable is self-presentation

with indicators, namely ingratiation, intimidation, competence/self-promotion, exemplification, and supplication (Jones & Pittman, 1982).

The questionnaire was chosen as a tool to collect data. The questionnaire was created using Google Forms and distributed via the WhatsApp application. This study uses close-ended questions where respondents can only choose answers according to the options provided in the questionnaire. Model questions include the identity of respondents and research questions that are adjusted to the indicators in each variable. The questionnaire measurement technique uses a Likert scale with four options, namely Strongly Disagree (STS) with a value of 1, Disagree (TS) with a value of 2, Agree (S) with a value of 3, Strongly Agree (SS) with a value of 4.

The population in this study were VII, VIII, and IX grade students of the Islamic Middle School Al Azhar Kemang Pratama 9 Bekasi, West Java. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling, with the criteria of being middle school students aged 12-14 years, having an Instagram account, and actively using Instagram for 1-3 years. Out of 56 respondents who filled out the questionnaire, only 54 met the respondent's requirements.

Validity test uses Pearson product-moment with a significance level of 5%. Variables X and Y are valid if r count > r table. As for reliability, decision-making is based on Cronbach's Alpha value > 60. There are two data analyses used, namely univariate and bivariate. The univariate analysis aims to describe data such as frequency and minimum and maximum values of the research variables. In comparison, the bivariate analysis aims to determine whether or not there is a relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

This study has two ways of making decisions in hypothesis testing—first, the significance value of t <0.05. Second, compare the calculated t value with the t table value. If both ways are met, Ho1 is rejected, and Ha1 is accepted.

The following is the proposed research hypothesis:

Ho1: There is no strong relationship between privacy management on Instagram and middle school students' self-presentation.

Ha1: There is a strong relationship between privacy management on social media, Instagram, and middle school students' self-presentation.

## Result and Discussion
*Characteristics of Respondents Based on Class*

**Table 1.** Frequency Distribution of Respondent Characteristics by Class

| Class | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| VII | 3 | 5% |
| VIII | 34 | 64% |
| IX | 17 | 31% |
| **Total** | **54** | **100%** |

Based on Table 1, the vast majority of respondents came from VIII grade, with 34 students (64%), in second place was IX grade, with 17 students (31%), and the least came from VII grade, with 3 students (5%).

*Characteristics of Respondents Based on Gender*

**Table 2.** Frequency Distribution of Respondent Characteristics by Gender

| Sex | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Laki-laki | 25 | 46% |
| Perempuan | 29 | 54% |
| **Total** | **54** | **100%** |

Table 2 describes the characteristics of respondents based on gender. A total of 29 students (54%) were female respondents and 25 students (46%) were male.

*Characteristics of Respondents by Age*

**Table 3.** Frequency Distribution of Respondent Characteristics by Age

| Age | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 12 | 9 | 17% |
| 13 | 32 | 59% |
| 14 | 12 | 22% |
| > 14 | 1 | 2% |
| **Total** | **54** | **100%** |

Table 3 shows that the highest frequency of respondents is aged 13 years with 32 students or 59%. While the least frequency is more than 14 years old, with one student or 2%.

*Characteristics of Respondents Based on Length of Use of Instagram*

**Table 4.** Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Characteristics Based on Length of Use of Instagram

| Length of Use | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| < 1 | 5 | 9% |
| 1 | 5 | 9% |
| 2 | 14 | 26% |
| 3 | 13 | 24% |
| > 3 | 17 | 32% |
| **Total** | **54** | **100%** |

Table 4 describes the characteristics of respondents based on the length of use of Instagram. In the first place is respondents who have used Instagram for over three years, with 17 students or 32%, while in the last position is respondents who have used Instagram for less than one year, with five students or 19%.

*Test the Validity and Reliability of X and Y Variables*

**Table 5.** Test the Validity of Variables X and Y

| Item Statement | r count | r table | Conclusion | Item Statement | r count | r table | Conclusion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X1 | 0.480 | 0.268 | Valid | X33 | 0.380 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X2 | 0.691 | 0.268 | Valid | X34 | 0.463 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X3 | 0.330 | 0.268 | Valid | X35 | 0.627 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X4 | 0.490 | 0.268 | Valid | X36 | 0.662 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X5 | 0.353 | 0.268 | Valid | X37 | 0.510 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X6 | 0.494 | 0.268 | Valid | X38 | 0.557 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X7 | 0.526 | 0.268 | Valid | X39 | 0.401 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X8 | 0.399 | 0.268 | Valid | X40 | 0.337 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X9 | 0.629 | 0.268 | Valid | X41 | 0.436 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X10 | 0.646 | 0.268 | Valid | X42 | 0.388 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X11 | 0.570 | 0.268 | Valid | X43 | 0.553 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X12 | 0.286 | 0.268 | Valid | X44 | 0.551 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X13 | 0.418 | 0.268 | Valid | X45 | 0.328 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X14 | 0.624 | 0.268 | Valid | Y1 | 0.657 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X15 | 0.466 | 0.268 | Valid | Y2 | 0.478 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X16 | 0.527 | 0.268 | Valid | Y3 | 0.555 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X17 | 0.453 | 0.268 | Valid | Y4 | 0.716 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X18 | 0.521 | 0.268 | Valid | Y5 | 0.777 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X19 | 0.276 | 0.268 | Valid | Y6 | 0.280 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X20 | 0.412 | 0.268 | Valid | Y7 | 0.640 | 0.268 | Valid |

| X21 | 0.414 | 0.268 | Valid | Y8 | 0.668 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X22 | 0.315 | 0.268 | Valid | Y9 | 0.814 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X23 | 0.395 | 0.268 | Valid | Y10 | 0.806 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X24 | 0.433 | 0.268 | Valid | Y11 | 0.803 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X25 | 0.306 | 0.268 | Valid | Y12 | 0.644 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X26 | 0.386 | 0.268 | Valid | Y13 | 0.781 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X27 | 0.568 | 0.268 | Valid | Y14 | 0.786 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X28 | 0.386 | 0.268 | Valid | Y15 | 0.758 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X29 | 0.493 | 0.268 | Valid | Y16 | 0.646 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X30 | 0.562 | 0.268 | Valid | Y17 | 0.837 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X31 | 0.553 | 0.268 | Valid | Y18 | 0.584 | 0.268 | Valid |
| X32 | 0.358 | 0.268 | Valid | | | | |

**Table 6.** Test of Reliability of Variable X

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| --- | --- |
| .915 | 45 |

**Table 7.** Reliability of Variable Y

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| --- | --- |
| .932 | 18 |

After testing the reliability of variables using the SPSS application, all variable items X and Y were declared valid and reliable. All r count values obtained are much greater than r table (See Table 5). Then, in the reliability test, the values obtained for each variable are 0.915 and 0.932 (See Table 6). Based on these values, the variable can be declared reliable because the Cronbach's Alpha value is > 0.60.

*X and Y Variable Correlation Test*

**Table 8.** Correlation Test

|  |  | Privacy management | Self-presentation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Privacy management** | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .711** |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | <,001 |
|  | N | 54 | 54 |
| **Self-presentation** | Pearson Correlation | .711* |  |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | <,001 |  |
|  | N | 54 | 54 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on Table 8, the significance value obtained is 0.001. This value is less than 0.05. It can be ascertained that the two variables have a significant relationship. Then, the Pearson correlation value obtained was 0.711, meaning that the closeness of the relationship between the two variables is relatively intense. The form of the relationship between the two variables is positive. That is, the higher the privacy management of middle school students on Instagram social media, the higher the self-presentation of middle school students. Conversely, the lower the privacy management on Instagram, the lower the self-presentation of middle school students.

*Hypothesis testing*

**Table 9.** Hypothesis Testing

|  | Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | B | Std. Error | Beta |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | -7.972 | 6.836 |  | -1.166 | .249 |
|  | Privacy Management | .425 | .058 | .711 | 7.301 | <.001 |

Dependent Variable: Self Presentation

Based on the table above, the results of the t-test show that the significance value of the relationship between privacy management on social media Instagram (X) on self-presentation (Y) is 0.001 <0.05. It is known the t table value is 2.006, and the calculated t value obtained is 7.301. This means the calculated t value is greater than the t table value (7,301 > 2,006). Based on this, Ho1 is rejected, and Ha1 is accepted. This means there is a strong relationship between privacy management on Instagram social media and middle school students' self-presentation.

*Privacy and Self Presentation*

Digital privacy and security are essential concepts in the development of communication technology. Even though the boundaries of privacy are never fixed, basically, information is always open and closed according to the definition of the owner of the information. According to Greene (2009), disclosure of self-information can be verbal or non-verbal. In other words, text types (language and attributes) have information their owners can open and close (Greene, K., Derlega, V. J., & Mathews, 2009).

In the world of the internet, information flows freely. Information becomes an entity that does not necessarily belong to the communicator but also to anyone who sees it. Therefore, Petronio divides information into three typologies: control (control), ownership (ownership), and co-ownership (Petronio, 2003).

Disclosure of information and privacy is dialectical. Someone has the decision to determine the privacy and disclosure of information to the public (Petronio, 2003). In the theory of Communication Privacy Management (CPM), Petronio (2003) reveals that the public has a role that is as important as the communicator. According to Petronio (2003), privacy and disclosure are by definition, separate but intertwined (dependent) on each other in information dialectics (p. 5). People who control the privacy of their self-information have the opportunity to protect

their persona. Therefore, privacy management becomes essential in producing self-presentations (Petronio, 2003).

In the correlation test (see Table 8), privacy management and respondents' self-presentation have a relatively strong relationship. The more frequently respondents manage their privacy on Instagram, the greater their self-presentation. It goes the other way around. This study shows that students of Islamic Middle School Kemang Pratama 9 Al Azhar Bekasi who belong to the Generation Z cohort category will make self-presentations according to the intensity of their interactions with social media on Instagram.

*Self-Presentation on Instagram*

Instagram provides a place for self-presentation. Someone can build an impression about himself by posting on the Instagram timeline (Gibbs et al., 2015). Photos in one place, adding geographic locations, mentions, hashtags, and captions, can build a person's self-presentation. Instagram is a place to build a persona through disaggregated information. In other words, someone can know other people just by looking at what he posts on Instagram (Walther, 2007).

Communication on Instagram is impersonal. This allows Instagram users to shape and construct themselves the way they want. According to Lim et al. (2010), mediation increases self-confidence. Apart from building impressions. According to Gavison (2006), self-presentation is a way to edit one's persona to maintain relationships in a social context. According to Seidman (2013), there are two types of self-presentation showing a way to present a self-profile (name, job, age, hobbies, and others) with motives to display strengths, cover deficiencies, and or display the ideal type from within us (Seidman, 2013 ). According to Posner (in Räikkä, 2017), self-presentation is related to privacy. Privacy forms an understanding that a person's identity and persona should be controlled by himself. In other words, Instagram allows its users to participate in forming a persona about themselves and to provide boundaries regarding what information they want to convey or do not want to convey to communicants (Gavison, 2006; Räikkä, 2017; Seidman, 2013).

*Teens on Instagram*

Teenagers are born as digital natives (Sheffield, 2007). This makes the way teenagers socialize today different from teenagers in the 1990s. Their parents—the millennials—have introduced communication technology as early as possible. A child has been interacting with a smartphone since he was six months old. Digital native parents use smartphones to calm themselves by showing videos from the Youtube platform (Hafidz, Kautsar, Valianta, & Rakhmawati, 2017).

Teenagers are active users of Instagram social media in Indonesia. Of the 132 million internet users in Indonesia, 24 million are teenagers (APJII, 2016). Social media (Instagram) helps teenagers to stay in the social community network around them (Anderson & Jiang, 2018). Teenagers experience a change in behavior from the previous age level. They tend to be socially active, in person or virtually. In other words, they want to involve themselves in various community activities to avoid the impression of being left behind (Madden et al., 2012). Therefore, the intensity of teenager engagement on Instagram is high (Dolot, 2018).

## Conclusions

Based on the research results, the accepted hypothesis is Ha1, there is a strong relationship between privacy management on Instagram social media and middle school students' self-presentation. This is based on the results of the t-test, which shows that the significance value of the relationship between privacy management on social media Instagram (X) on self-presentation (Y) is 0.001 <0.05. Meanwhile, the t table value is 2.006, and the calculated t value obtained is 7.301. This means the calculated t value is greater than the t table value (7,301 > 2,006). This research shows that teenagers manage their self-presentation on Instagram by considering the benefits and risks based on private information shared via social media. The self-presentation that is displayed emphasizes not only the positive side but also a particular impression in the eyes of their followers. Teenagers manage their self-presentation by deciding what information to display and hide through certain strategies to achieve self-presentation goals.

## References

Adorjan, M., & Ricciardelli, R. (2019). A New Privacy Paradox? Youth Agentic Practices of Privacy Management Despite "Nothing to Hide" Online. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, *56*(1), 8–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12227

Altman, I. (1975) Environment and Social Behavior: Privacy, Personal Space, Territory, and Crowding. Brooks/Cole, Monterey.

Anderson, M., & Jiang, J. (2018). Teens, social media & technology. *Pew Research Center [Internet & American Life Project]*, 1–9. Diambil dari http://publicservicesalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Teens-Social-Media-Technology-2018-PEW.pdf

APJII. (2016). Survei APJII. Diambil 6 September 2021, dari https://apjii.or.id/survei2016

Boyd, D. (2007). Why youth (heart) social network sites: The role of networked publics in teenage social life. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), Youth, identity, and digital media (pp. 119–142). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning]

Birnbaum, M. G. (2008). Taking Goffman on a tour of Facebook: College students and the presentations of self in a mediated digital environment. Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A, 69.

Caliandro, A., & Graham, J. (2020). Studying Instagram Beyond Selfies. *Social Media and Society*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120924779

Caughlin, John & Huston, Ted & Houts, Renate. (2000). How does personality matter in marriage? An examination of trait anxiety, interpersonal negativity, and marital satisfaction. Journal of personality and social psychology. 78. 326-36. 10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.326.

Caughlin, J. P., & Petronio, S. (2004). Privacy in families. In A. L. Vangelisti (Ed.), *Handbook of family communication* (pp. 379–412). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Child, J. T., Duck, A. R., Andrews, L. A., Butauski, M., & Petronio, S. (2015). Young Adults' Management of Privacy on Facebook with Multiple Generations of Family Members. *Journal of Family Communication*, *15*(4), 349–367. https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2015.1076425

Choi, T. R., & Sung, Y. (2018). *Instagram versus Snapchat: Self-expression and privacy concern on social media. Telematics and Informatics* (Vol. 35). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2018.09.009

de Munck, V. C., & Korotayev, A. V. (2007). Wife-husband intimacy and female status in cross-cultural perspective. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science, 41*(4), 307–335.

Dimock, M. (2021). Defining Generations: Where Millennials end and Generation Z Begins. Diambil 6 September 2021, dari https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/

Dolot, A. (2018). New trends in management The Characteristics of Generation Z. *E-Mentor*, *2*(2), 44–50.

Gavison, R. (2006). Privacy and the Limits of Law. *The Yale Law Journal*, *89*(3), 421. https://doi.org/10.2307/795891

Gibbs, M., Meese, J., Arnold, M., Nansen, B., & Carter, M. (2015). #Funeral and Instagram: death, social media, and platform vernacular. *Information Communication and Society*, *18*(3), 255–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.987152

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Golish, T. D., & Caughlin, J. P. (2002). 'I'd rather not talk about it": Adolescents' and young adults use of topic avoidance in stepfamilies. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 30(1), 78–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909880216574

Golish, T.D. (2003), Stepfamily Communication Strengths. Human Communication Research, 29: 41-80. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2003.tb00831.x

Greene, K., Derlega, V. J., & Mathews, A. (2009). Self Disclsoure in Personal

Relationships copy.pdf. *The Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships*.

Hafidz, I., Kautsar, A. R., Valianta, T., & Rakhmawati, N. A. (2017). Teenstagram TimeFrame: A Visualization for Instagram Time Dataset from Teen Users (Case Study in Surabaya, Indonesia). *Procedia Computer Science*, *124*, 100–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.12.135

Han, K., Lee, S., Jang, J. Y., Jung, Y., & Lee, D. (2016). "Teens are from mars, adults are from venus": Analyzing and predicting age groups with behavioral characteristics in Instagram. *WebSci 2016 - Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Web Science Conference*, 35–44. https://doi.org/10.1145/2908131.2908160

Holiday, S., Norman, M. S., & Densley, R. L. (2020). Sharenting and the extended self: self-representation in parents' Instagram presentations of their children. *Popular Communication*, *00*(00), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2020.1744610

Jiang, S., & Ngien, A. (2020). The Effects of Instagram Use, Social Comparison, and Self-Esteem on Social Anxiety: A Survey Study in Singapore. *Social Media and Society*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120912488

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self (pp. 231-261). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Kim, Y.Y. (2005), Inquiry in Intercultural and Development Communication. Journal of Communication, 55: 554-577. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02685.x

Lee, E., Lee, J. A., Moon, J. H., & Sung, Y. (2015). Pictures Speak Louder than Words: Motivations for Using Instagram. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *18*(9), 552–556. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2015.0157

Loss, J., Lindacher, V., & Curbach, J. (2013). Do social networking sites enhance the attractiveness of risky health behavior?Impression management in

adolescents' communication on Facebook and its ethical implications. Public Health Ethics, 7(1), 1–12.

Madden, M., Cortesi, S., & Lenhart, A. (2012). Parents, Teens, and Online Privacy. *Interaction*, *9*(8), 29. Diambil dari http://www.crossingguardconsulting.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/PIP_ParentsTeensAndPrivacy.pdf

Moore, Jay. (1984). On Behaviorism, Knowledge, and Causal Explanation. The Psychological Record. 34. 73-97. 10.1007/BF03394854.

Nardis, Y., & Panek, E. (2019). Explaining Privacy Control on Instagram and Twitter: The Roles of Narcissism and Self-Esteem. *Communication Research Reports*, *36*(1), 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2018.1555522

Newell, W. (1998). Professionalizing interdisciplinarity. In W. Newell (Ed.),Interdisciplinarity: Essays from the literature (pp. 529-563). New York: CollegeBoard.

Papacharissi, Z. (2002). The presentation of self in virtual life: Characteristics of personal home pages. Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 79(3), 643–660. doi:10.1177/107769900207900307

Petronio, S. (2000). The boundaries of privacy: Praxis of everyday life. In S. Petronio (Ed.), *Balancing the secrets of private disclosures* (pp. 37–49). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Petronio, S. (2002). *Boundaries of privacy: Dialectics of disclosure.* State University of New York Press.

Petronio, S. (2003). *Boundaries of privacy: dialectics of disclosure. Choice Reviews Online* (Vol. 40). https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.40-4304

Petronio, S. (2004). Road to Developing Communication Privacy Management Theory: Narrative in Progress, Please Stand By, Journal of Family Communication, 4:3-4, 193-207, DOI: 10.1080/15267431.2004.9670131

Petronio, S. (2006). Communication privacy management theory: understanding families. In Engaging theories in family communication: Multiple perspectives (pp. 35–49). Sage Publications.

Petronio, S. (2010). Communication Privacy

Management Theory: What Do We Know About Family Privacy Regulation? *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, *2*(3), 175–196. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2010.00052.x

Petronio, S., & Caughlin, J. P. (2006). Communication Privacy Management Theory: Understanding Families. In D. O. Braithwaite & L. A. Baxter (Eds.), Engaging theories in family communication: Multiple perspectives (pp. 35–49). Sage Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452204420.n3

Petronio, S., & Durham, W. T. (2008). Communication Privacy Management Theory. In L. A. Baxter, & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), Engaging Theories in Interpersonal Communication: Multiple Perspectives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Petronio, S., & Martin, J. N. (1986). Ramifications of revealing private information: A gender gap. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 42(3), 499–506. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(198605)42:3<499::AID-JCLP2270420317>3.0.CO;2-I

Petronio, S., Martin, J., & Littlefield, R. (1984). Prerequisite conditions for self-disclosing: A gender issue. *Communication Monographs, 51*(3), 268–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758409390200

Petronio, S., & Reierson, J. (2009). Regulating the privacy of confidentiality: Grasping the complexities through communication privacy management theory. In T. D. Afifi & W. A. Afifi (Eds.), *Uncertainty, information management, and disclosure decisions: Theories and applications* (pp. 365–383). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Räikkä, J. (2017). Privacy and Self-Presentation. *Res Publica*, *23*(2), 213–226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11158-016-9342-1

Schlenker, B. R., & Pontari, B. A. (2000). The strategic control of information: Impression management and self-presentation in daily life. In A. Tesser, R. B. Felson, & J. M. Suls (Eds.), Perspectives on self and identity (pp. 199–232). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10357-008

Seidman, G. (2013). Self-presentation and belonging on Facebook: How personality influences social media use and motivations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*(3), 402–407. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.10.009

Shane-Simpson, C., Manago, A., Gaggi, N., & Gillespie-Lynch, K. (2018). Why do college students prefer Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram? Site affordances, tensions between privacy and self-expression, and implications for social capital. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *86*, 276–288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.04.041

Sheffield, C. C. (2007). Technology and the gifted adolescent: Higher order thinking, 21st century literacy, and the digital native. *Meridian*, *10*(2).

Sowash, J. R. (2020). 10 Data Privacy Lessons Chromebook Lesson Ideas Data Privacy Lessons About the Project Digital Citizenship lesson from the Applied Digital Skills. Diambil dari https://www.chrmbook.com/data-privacy/

Taylor, J. B. (1979). Staggered Wage Setting in a Macro Model. The American Economic Review, 69(2), 108–113. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1801626

USDHS. (2020). Employee Resources. Diambil 17 Agustus 2021, dari https://www.dhs.gov/employee-resources/blog/2020/05/12/using-social-media-safely

Vitak, J. (2012). The impact of context collapse and privacy on social network site disclosures. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56(4), 451–470. doi:10.1080/08838151.2012.732140

Walther, J. B. (2007). Selective self-presentation in computer-mediated communication: Hyperpersonal dimensions of technology, language, and cognition. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *23*(5), 2538–2557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2006.05.002

We Are Social. (2021). Digital 2021: The Latest Insights into the "State of Digital." Diambil dari

https://wearesocial.com/blog/2021/01/digital-2021-the-latest-insights-into-the-state-of-digital

Yau, J. C., & Reich, S. M. (2019). "It's Just a Lot of Work": Adolescents' Self-Presentation Norms and Practices on Facebook and Instagram. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *29*(1), 196–209. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12376