EXPLORING FACEBOOK USERS' PRIVACY KNOWLEDGE, ENACTMENT AND ATTITUDE: A STUDY ON INDIAN YOUTH

Rahul GADEKAR[1], Saumya PANT[2]

[1]Research Associate, MICA, Gujarat, India
[2]Associate Professor, PhD, MICA, Gujarat, India
Corresponding author: rahul.micore@micamail.in

Abstract

This study tries to explore relationships among knowledge of privacy, enactment of privacy and attitude toward privacy. Specifically, it investigates how users use privacy settings and what is their attitude towards privacy on Facebook. It further attempts to study whether knowledge of privacy settings and attitude towards privacy has any influence on users' privacy behavior on Facebook. It also looks at gender differences in terms of privacy behavior. An online survey was administered to 199 college going students. Knowledge was not found to be an influential factor for enactment of privacy. Attitude toward privacy shares relationship with the enactment of privacy. Gender approach reveals differences between males and females in terms of their concern toward privacy and enactment of privacy measures.

Keywords: *Facebook, privacy, gender, social networking sites.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Social networking sites have revolutionized the communication among people. It has changed the way how individuals interact with each other (Henson, Reyns, & Fisher, 2011). During recent years these sites have penetrated thorough out the world including developing nations. India has been one of the fastest growing countries in terms of social networking sites users. Social networking sites such as LinkedIn, Facebook and twitter has provided the people with a common platform to share their feelings, thoughts, ideas and opinions. Founded on February 4, 2004, Facebook has grown far to become the most popular social networking site in the world. While completing its 10 years in February 2014 it touched the figure of 1.23 billion monthly active users (Guardian, 2014). Students often adopt new communication technology first

(Quan-Haase, 2007). With due credit to this obvious reason, no need to say that Facebook's users mostly come from youth population.

On Facebook, people indulge in various activities such as chatting, watching and uploading videos, photos, connecting with friends who are away from them and so on. They can join virtual communities and get in touch with strangers too. It has given a free mass platform to people for their self-expression. People get chance to talk about themselves to the world through this 'many to many' communication medium. Through performing various activities people share a large amount of information on Facebook. Such information available on virtual space can be accessible to others. This information includes people's memories, family photos, photos with spouse, current location, their relationship status, education, contact details, date of birth, interests and some private moments of their life too. Sharing personal information on such platform might create risks of invasion of privacy and raises security issues which might lead to serious consequences like online interpersonal victimization, for example - harassment or sexual solicitation online (Henson, Reyns, & Fisher, 2011). Facebook has provided some privacy features on its site to insure its users' information gets secured. Some of such features are based on the type of information, for example - name, sex, contact details and birth date (Henson, Reyns, & Fisher, 2011). Whether people are aware of such issues and to what extent they exercise their right to privacy through these features on Facebook is a matter of concern. Rather than just an ethical issue, online privacy

has gathered a worldwide attention as an 'international human rights' issue (Smith, Milberg, & Burke, 1996) and therefore is on the radar of communication researchers as well (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007). We claim this study as a first of its kind systematic attempt to divulge the privacy behavior of selected Indian Facebook users. We base this paper on the data from a pilot study conducted for a larger multi-city study that is planned to discover the Facebook use by Indian youth in much broader context. This paper looks at Privacy from three aspects – enactment of privacy settings, knowledge of privacy settings and individual's attitude toward privacy issues.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Privacy is a well debated phenomenon among the scholars (Einspänner, 2013; Caers R., Feyter, Couck, Stough, Vigna, & Bois, 2013). Almost 18% of the research on Facebook is concerned with privacy and related issues (Wilson, Gosling, & Graham, 2012). Studies have been conducted worldwide to investigate to what extent people are aware about their privacy and security on social networking sites, for example - (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008; Hodge, 2007) and the political economy of the privacy (Fuchs, 2012). Most of these studies have looked at peoples' perceptions about privacy, their privacy behavior on social networking sites and their use of privacy settings.

3. PRIVACY

Privacy means the selective control of access to others that has physical, psychological, social, and informational dimensions (Li & Li, 2007). Privacy concern is a desire to keep personal information out of the hands of others (O'Neil, 2001). Present study pertains to the informational dimension of privacy. Information privacy means one's ability to control the other's access to his/her personal information (Li & Li, 2007). Petronio (2002) has said "individuals fundamentally believe they have the right to own and regulate access to their private information". It is a notion of personal autonomy

over personal information (Phillips, 2004) that gets influenced by personal perceptions and values (Buchanan, Paine, Joinson, & Reips, 2006; Joinson, Paine, Buchanan, & Reips, 2006) and therefore varies from individual to individual. Individuals decide their own privacy boundaries to allow or restrict people from accessing their private information (Catlett, 2007).

4. PRIVACY ON FACEBOOK

Petronio's (2002) communication privacy management theory talks about how people perceive and manage privacy. He argued that individuals form their own rules for where and how they disclose their private information. Individual's own rules form their boundaries of users' privacy. Through these rules, individuals allow other users a partial or complete access to their private information. Those who allow complete access to their information have thin privacy boundaries whereas those who try to restrict the access have thick boundaries (Catlett, 2007). For example - Instances such as disallowing others from viewing their profile, only allowing friends to see their posts and photos, hiding the birth date from Facebook profile shows that users are more conscious of their privacy controls and has thick privacy boundaries. Such personal privacy rules/boundaries may vary based on certain factors such as individual's demographics. Thus, how and to what extent Indian Facebook users exercise their privacy security needs to be investigated.

This generation of Facebook users is labeled as a digital generation (Waters & Ackerman, 2011)). For this generation, individual's knowledge regarding computer-related functions is defined as digital literacy (Bunz, 2004). The concept of digital literacy can be related to the users' knowledge of the use of privacy settings on Facebook (Park, 2013). Digital literacy would empower users to take informed decisions regarding securing their privacy on Facebook. Studies have been conducted to investigate users' knowledge/awareness of privacy issues and options available in online platform. boyd & Hargittai (2010) concluded that a significant

number of users are aware about the probable privacy threats online. A report by Jones and Soltren has stated that users' practice poor privacy control over their information (Jones & Soltren, 2005). Dwyer, Hiltz, and Passerini (2007) compared privacy practices of Myspace users and Facebook users. They concluded that users trusted Facebook more as compared to Myspace and therefore disclose more information on Facebook.

5. PRIVACY SETTINGS ON FACEBOOK

Different kinds of information get shared on Facebook every day. In order to manage and secure this information and users' privacy, Facebook provides various ways to restrict others from accessing this information. Privacy on Facebook has two dimensions. One is privacy from other individuals and second is privacy from Facebook itself. To ensure users' privacy from other individuals, Facebook has provided privacy setting for almost each of the features available on Facebook which works as filters that allow few selected users to view the information (https://www.facebook.com/about/privacy/your-info-on-fb). For example – users can decide who can view their profile, birth date and the content, photos, videos posted on Facebook wall. A user can decide who can see this information by using different options such as 'only me', 'friends', 'friends' friends', 'selected friends lists' or 'everyone/public'. To help users to secure their account with the use of these privacy settings, Facebook has provided detailed overview of available privacy settings in its privacy statement which is available for all including non-users. It also describes who on internet can find you and view your profile and timeline. This statement describes the usage and guidelines of all the information control options linked to features available of Facebook. Based on above literature this paper asks:

RQ 1: To what extent users are aware about privacy settings available on Facebook?

RQ 2: To what extent do the users use privacy settings available on Facebook?

Besides privacy settings options provided by Facebook, users' might explore some other options to secure their privacy. This study seeks to understand those. It asks:

RQ 3: What privacy measures users' enact other than privacy settings available on Facebook?

6. FACEBOOK'S PRIVACY POLICY

To make people aware about the Facebook's privacy policy, Facebook has explained in detail about the kind of information it access from users' accounts and how it uses and process the user data (https://www.facebook.com/about/privacy/your-info). As per Facebook's privacy statement, it keeps some of the basic mandatory information of the user always in public domain.

There had been flaws with the Facebook's privacy settings which went to public only after a person who found it made it public. Researchers also have been finding some problems with these privacy settings which are corrected later (Debatin, Lovejoy, Horn, & Hughes, 2009). Features like newsfeed were objected on its inception as it was considered as a privacy threat (boyd, 2008). Groups to protest such things have been formed on Facebook (Debatin, Lovejoy, Horn, & Hughes, 2009). Studies have found out users' casualness regarding such issues (Lewis, Kaufman, & Christakis, 2008). Studies have found out that users' tend to not bother about reading Facebook's privacy policy and terms of service (for example – (Ou, 2011; Jones & Soltren, 2005). A study by Jones and Soltren's (2005) has found out that most of the users (89%) did confess that they have never read Facebook's privacy policy and are not familiar (91%) with the terms of service. Some of the studies have findings contrary to it (Catlett, 2007). Whether Indian users are aware of this policy should be a matter of concern. Thus, we ask:

RQ 4: To what extent users' are aware about Facebook's privacy policy?

7. PRIVACY AWARENESS AND PRIVACY ENACTMENT

Researchers have been exploring relationship between users' knowledge/awareness of privacy

settings and its actual use. Debatin et al.'s (2009) assumption that "users would have a limited understanding of privacy settings in social network services and, therefore, will likely make little use of their privacy settings" got a partial support. They could find a significant association between familiarity of privacy settings on Facebook and utilizing privacy settings. Those users' who were not familiar with privacy settings were most likely to not to use privacy features. Still, this study has noted some contrary findings too. Despite of being familiar with privacy settings users were found to be allowing their friends to view large amount of their personal information (Debatin, Lovejoy, Horn, & Hughes, 2009).

Govani and Pashley (2005) in a study on Facebook users' awareness of privacy, had found similar pattern. Out of their sample, more than 80 percent of users were aware about the available privacy settings on Facebook, still only 40 percent actually enact these privacy settings. Many of the profiles displayed personal information like birth date, hometown, interests, and relationship status.

Jones and Soltren (2005) too located similar trend in their study as 74 percent of the users were found to be aware about the privacy settings on Facebook and only 62 percent of them actually used those. They also found out that users were willingly posting large amount of personal information. But, Christofides, Muise, & Desmarais's (2012) study stated a contrary view. They have found out that the adolescent users having bad experiences on Facebook are tend to use more privacy settings on Facebook and this relationship is moderated by the knowledge of privacy settings. What might be the case of Indian students? Based on the above literature this study asks:

RQ 5: Is there any difference between the users' who are high on privacy awareness and users' who are low on privacy awareness in terms of their degree of enactment of privacy on Facebook?

8. ATTITUDE TOWARD PRIVACY

The literature above indicates that there is miss match between users' knowledge about

available privacy settings and their actual enactment of privacy on Facebook. Many researchers have noted negligence among Facebook users, for reading and understanding Facebook's privacy policies and terms of service (Acquisti & Gross, 2006 as cited in Debatin, Lovejoy, Horn, & Hughes, 2009; Govani & Pashley, 2005). Govani and Pashley's (2005) paper did observe that even after being educated about the privacy issues and available privacy settings, most of the student users did not change their privacy settings on Facebook. Some studies have noted little relationship between users' disclosure of private information on Facebook and their concern towards privacy (Dwyer, Hiltz, & Passerini, 2007; Livingstone, 2008). A study on Singaporean youth states that these users are privacy-oriented and are aware of the use of privacy settings on Facebook. Still, they are ready share their personal information on Facebook and compromise some privacy, to help their friends to understand them better. This is despite the fact that these Singaporean youth do not trust Facebook. Such paradox was found in other studies too (Barnes, 2006). In an interesting finding, Livingstone (2008) notes that teenagers have concerns for their privacy online but their conceptions of privacy do not match with the privacy settings available on most social networking sites. Lewis, Kaufman, & Christakis (2008) argue that privacy behavior is the outcome of social influences and personal incentives. Social influences and personal incentives contribute to individual's attitude. Drawing upon this logic, the reason for this paradox between individual's privacy concern and enactment of privacy might be attributed to the attitude of the users' toward privacy on Facebook. Therefore, this study seeks to understand:

RQ 6: What is the attitude of users towards their privacy on Facebook?
RQ 7: What is the relationship between users' attitude towards privacy and their enactment of privacy on Facebook?

9. GENDER AND PRIVACY

Gender provides another approach to look at the privacy behavior on Facebook. Dominant

gender discourses in society are also prevalent on Facebook profiles. Scholars have noticed the evidence for the differences between males and females with regard to their Facebook use as well as their use of privacy settings. Both groups differ at their online life style and privacy concerns too (Tufekci, 2008). A study states that females are more concerned about privacy than males (O'Neil, 2001). It might be because females are more prone to be easy targets of online offenders (Henson, Reyns, & Fisher, 2011). This safety concern makes them restrict access to their profile for others and change their privacy settings regularly (boyd & Hargittai, 2010). They avoid disclosing contact details such as mobile number and email address as compared to males (Acquisti and Gross, 2006 as cited in (Taraszow, Aristodemou, Shitta, Laouris, & Arsoy, 2010). Turow et. al.'s study (2005) has found significant association between gender and privacy behavior. Females are considered less competent in technology than males (Park, 2013). They tend to have private profiles (Lewis, Kaufman, & Christakis, 2008). There is a possibility of a girl called as low character if she has an open profile, too many friends, or if she posts too much information on Facebook (Bailey, Steeves, Burkell, & Regan, 2013). Thus, it is possible that girls might use stronger privacy settings to prevent others seeing what they do on Facebook. Petronio (2002) too in his communication privacy management theory has confirmed that individual's personal privacy rules are based on gender among other factors. These rules describe and define how male and female enact privacy management. Both genders differ on motivations to disclose private information on Facebook (Waters & Ackerman, 2011)) Therefore, as Caers, Feyter, Couck, Stough, Vigna, and Bois (2013) has suggested, there is a need to investigate these gender differences related to Facebook use in other countries. Present study considers an Indian context. Drawing upon the literature above this study proposes:

H1: Females will have more awareness about privacy settings on Facebook than males.

H2: Females will use privacy settings of Facebook more than males.

H3: Females will enact privacy measures other than what is available on Facebook more than males.

H4: Females will be more concerned about their privacy on Facebook than males.

10. METHOD

Sample

An online questionnaire was administered to a group of conveniently selected under graduate and post graduate college going students. Total 199 completed responses collected from six different Indian cities were considered for this study.

Questionnaire design and measurement

Awareness of privacy settings

Awareness was looked at from two dimensions: 1) awareness of privacy settings available on Facebook and 2) awareness of Facebook's privacy policy. To measure the awareness of privacy settings available on Facebook, a set of privacy related activities were listed and respondents were asked to respond to a question whether it was possible for one to do these activities on Facebook. For example - A user can review, approve, and reject any tag to photos and posts. To measure the awareness of Facebook's privacy policy, respondents were asked whether Facebook allows you to do certain things. For example - Does Facebook's privacy policy allow you to have more than one Facebook account/profile? Respondents were also asked whether they have ever read Facebook's privacy policy in full?

Enactment of privacy

A preliminary study was conducted to design this section of the survey tool. College students were asked to respond to an open ended question in writing: What measures do you take to protect your privacy on Facebook? The qualitative analysis of responses showed two kinds of privacy measures: 1) they use privacy settings available on Facebook and 2) they enact their own measures.

To measure the use of privacy settings, we prepared a list of six popular features through which users upload their personal information on Facebook: profile, photo/video albums, wall posts, status updates, apps activity, and friends' posts on own Facebook wall. Facebook provides

five different privacy settings that a user can apply to his/her information on Facebook: Only me, Specific people/friends lists, all friends, friends' friends and anyone/public. Some respondents who are the regular users of Facebook were asked for their perception about the degree of privacy for each of these settings. This perception was based on the level of restriction associated with each of the settings. In other words, it is the possibility of who can see the information once a setting is applied to the content/feature. For example - If one applies the 'only me' setting to a profile, only the user can see his/her profile and no one else. This can be considered as the high degree of privacy. If one keeps his/her profile open for 'anyone/ public', it indicates his low degree of privacy. Drawing upon this logic respondents were asked for what kind of settings they have applied for the above listed six features. A composite index was prepared for each respondent which gave us a score indicating his/her degree of privacy.

To study what are the other measures users adopt to protect their privacy, a set of statements was prepared based on their written responses to preliminary study. Respondents were asked whether they follow these measures to protect their privacy.

Attitude toward privacy

A list of attitude statements was prepared based on the written responses of preliminary study and a group discussion of seven regular Facebook users. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement to these statements on a five point likert scale

11. RESULTS

RQ 1: To what extent users are aware about privacy settings available on Facebook?

The data indicates that most of the users are aware about the privacy settings available on Facebook. The mean awareness score of the users was 5.67 out of 7.

RQ 2: To what extent do the users use privacy settings available on Facebook?

The data indicates that users use privacy settings up to a moderate level with mean of M = 2.73. Most of the users have set their privacy settings open for all friends they have in their Facebook account.

RQ 3: What privacy measures users' enact other than privacy settings available on Facebook?

Users enact their own measures, other than what Facebook has provided in terms of privacy setting features, to protect their privacy. For example – they do not subscribe to applications and games so that my profile doesn't become public (55%), search for any unwanted content in my account and report or delete it (67%) and put in limited information about themselves on Facebook (69%).

RQ 4: To what extent users' are aware about Facebook's privacy policy?

Table 1 shows that users are mostly unaware about the privacy policy of Facebook. 75% users have not read Facebook's privacy policy in full till date. 67.3% do not know that this policy does not allow Facebook to disclose their information. 71.3% users do not know that Facebook's privacy policy does not allow you to tag other users without their permission. 69.4% users are unaware about Facebook's policy that restricts you from having more than one Facebook account. 71.4% users do not know that as per Facebooks policy they are not allowed to tag other users without their permission.

Table 1. Awareness about Facebook's privacy policy

	No %	Yes %	Don't know %
Have you ever read Facebook's Privacy Policy in full-	69.8	24.6	5.5
Does Facebook's privacy policy allow Facebook to disclose information about you to third parties (for example advertising agencies etc)-	32.7	25.1	42.2
Does Facebook's privacy policy allow you to have more than one Facebook account/profile-	30.7	37.2	32.2
Does Facebook's privacy policy allow you to tag other users without their permission-	28.6	47.7	23.6
Does Facebook's privacy policy allow you to create an account for anyone other than yourself	32.7	35.2	32.2

RQ 5: Is there any difference between the users who are high on privacy awareness and users who are low on privacy awareness in terms of their degree of enactment of privacy on Facebook?

T test revealed no significant difference between the users who are high on privacy awareness (M = 2.62, SD = .76) and users who are low on privacy awareness (M = 2.8, SD = .74) in terms of their degree of enactment of privacy on Facebook, t (197) = 1.61, p = 0.107.

RQ 6: What is the attitude of users towards their privacy on Facebook?

Table 2. Attitude of users towards their privacy on Facebook

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
I am not bothered about privacy on Facebook	54.3	25.6	20.1
I believe nothing is really private once you enter your personal details on Facebook	31.2	25.1	43.7
I believe that Facebook's policy of sharing information about its users with third parties (advertising agencies, etc) is appropriate	42.2	38.2	19.6

RQ 7: What is the relationship between users' attitude towards privacy and their enactment of privacy on Facebook?

Pearson correlation showed significant positive relationship between users' attitude towards privacy and their enactment of privacy on Facebook, r = +0.283, n = 199, p = .000, two tailed.

H1: Females will have more awareness about privacy settings on Facebook than males.

T test indicated that there is no significant difference between males (M = .81, SD = .23) and females (M = .80, SD = .23) in terms of the awareness about privacy settings on Facebook, t (197) = -.393, p = 0.695.

H2: Females will use privacy settings of Facebook more than males.

T test showed the significant difference between males (*M* = 2.37, *SD* = 0.83) and females (*M* = 2.99, *SD* = 0.56) in terms of use of privacy settings on Facebook, *t* (197) = 6.21, *p* = .000.

H3: Females will enact privacy measures other than what is available on Facebook more than males.

There is a difference between males (*M* = 0.38, *SD* = 0.23) and females (*M* = 0.43, *SD* = 0.18) in terms of their enactment of privacy measures other than what is available on Facebook. But this difference is not significant, *t* (197) = 1.67, *p* = 0.096.

H4: Females will be more concerned about their privacy on Facebook than males.

The means of both groups shows that females (*M* = 3.46, *SD* = 0.64) are more concerned about their privacy than males (*M* = 2.88, *SD* = 0.77). This difference is statistically significant, *t* (197) = 5.72, *p* = .000.

12. DISCUSSION

This paper deals with the most debated recent issue of privacy on Facebook. It uses the data of 199 respondents to describe how Indian youth perceive and enact privacy on Facebook. Specifically, it investigates whether these young users are aware about Facebook's privacy policy and the privacy settings it has provided on its web site. It also studies how and to what extent these users use the privacy settings or take measures to protect their privacy on Facebook. This study takes the gender approach to study whether males and females differ in their knowledge, enactment and attitude toward privacy.

The data indicates that most of the users are aware about the privacy settings available on Facebook. They know that they can review and accept/reject a tag if someone has tagged them in their post or photos. They are aware that they can remove friends from their friends' list without notifying them or hide content from them. They know they can restrict others to access their posts and can control who can view

their profile. In other words, they are quite knowledgeable about what settings Facebook offers them to protect their privacy. But, it is not the similar case, when it comes to the knowledge of Facebook's privacy policy. Most of the users have not read the Facebook's privacy policy and therefore are not aware about its terms and conditions.

In the context of Pentronio's (2002) research, users who use more restricted privacy settings shows thick privacy boundaries and the users who enact quite flexible privacy settings indicates thinner boundaries. In present study, the users have shown a moderate level of privacy boundaries. The mean of privacy settings use (*M* = 2.73) shows that users use these privacy settings up to moderate level. Most of them have restricted access to their Facebook account and information to their Facebook friends. Users keep these boundaries quite thinner for their profile as compared to other content. Almost 33% users have kept access to their profile open for anyone/public. Users' favorite level of privacy setting is 'All friends'. They keep the privacy settings of most of the features open for their friends circle. Rather than just relying on Facebook's privacy settings, these users adopt their own measures to decide their privacy boundaries. The search for unwanted content in their account regularly and delete it. Some of them avoid subscribing to external applications and games and upload correct but minimum information on Facebook. Users' presence on Facebook shows that they wish to get connected to the world (Gadekar, Krishnatray, & Gaur, 2012) and the degree of thickness of their privacy boundaries shows that they also wish to control this connection.

This study shows no connection between users' knowledge of privacy settings and their enactment of privacy on Facebook in terms of use of privacy settings. The users with high awareness of privacy settings are no different than users with low awareness in their use of privacy settings. In other words, knowledge has nothing to do with the thickness of privacy boundaries. This finding is contrary to what Catlett (2007) has found. Catlett's finding suggests that users' knowledge of privacy settings is related to the thickness of the privacy

boundaries of users. The present study might have arrived at the contrary findings due to two possible reasons. First reason might be attributed to the homogeneity in the sample. All of the respondents were college going students and were aware about the privacy settings. The second reason would be that, rather than knowledge, attitude has an effect on privacy enactment. This study shows moderate evidence of such relationship. Correlation analysis has found significant positive relationship between attitude and enactment of privacy. Users who have greater concern for their privacy on Facebook use more strict privacy settings and users who are less concerned about their privacy use quite lenient privacy settings. Though this relationship is not strong enough ($r = .28$), it is significant. Though, the literature indicates digital literacy empower users to undertake informed control of their digital identity (Park, 2013), it is the attitude that actually make users enact this control which frames the privacy boundaries. This study claims, privacy boundaries are possibly dependent on the users' attitude rather than their knowledge.

Users have shown moderate concern for privacy. 54% users expressed their disagreement to the statement that they are not bothered about privacy on Facebook where as 20% expressed agreement and 25% chose to be neutral. About 44% users believe that there is nothing really private once you enter your personal details on Facebook. Almost a quarter of respondents chose to be neutral on attitude related questions.

This paper adopts gender approach to look at the Privacy issues on Facebook. It investigates if there are any differences between males and females in terms of their knowledge, privacy enactment and attitude towards privacy on Facebook. Though the literature indicates females tend to have more awareness about privacy than males, this study does not confirm it. The hypothesis, Females will have more awareness about privacy settings on Facebook than males, did not get support from the empirical data. Data shows that both males and females possess almost equal knowledge about privacy settings and are equally unaware about Facebook's privacy policy. The reason for this might be attributed to the homogeneity in the sample as all the respondents are from colleges and universities.

The hypothesis, Females will use privacy settings of Facebook more than males, got significant evidence from the data. Another finding of this study is in the line of this notion. The hypothesis, Females will be more concerned about their privacy on Facebook than males, got support from the data. Females have shown greater concern for their privacy on Facebook. They have different attitude toward privacy than males. They adopt some other measures of privacy on their own, besides what Facebook provides through its privacy settings, to make their privacy secure. In this sense too, females score higher than males, though this difference is statistically not significant. This means females enact comparatively thicker privacy boundaries on Facebook than their male counterparts. This might be because they are more attractive targets for online offenders and therefore there is a greater chance for them to be the victim of online interpersonal victimization (Henson, Reyns, & Fisher, 2011).

In general, besides the description of knowledge, attitude and enactment of privacy, this paper tries to explore relationship among them. Knowledge was not found to be an influential factor for enactment of privacy. Attitude toward privacy shares relationship with the enactment of privacy. Gender approach reveals differences between males and females in terms of their concern toward privacy and enactment of privacy measures. Gender does not have any influence on knowledge of privacy options.

References

ACQUISTI, A., & GROSS, R. (2006) *Imagined communities: Awareness, information sharing, and privacy on Facebook.*
BAILEY, J., STEEVES, V., BURKELL, J., & REGAN, P (2013). Negotiating With Gender Stereotypes on Social Networking Sites: From ''Bicycle Face'' to Facebook. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, *Published online*, p. 1-22.
BARNES, S. B. (2006) A privacy paradox: Social networking in the United States. *First Monday*, *11* (9), Retrieved on June 16, 2014 from http://firstmonday. org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1394/1312.

BHASIN, M. L. (2006) Guarding Privacy on the Internet. *Global Business Review*, 7 (1), p. 137-156.

BOYD, D. (2008) Facebook's Privacy Trainwreck: Exposure, Invasion, and Social Convergence. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies,* 14 (1), p. 13–20.

BOYD, D., & HARGITTAI, E. (2010) Facebook Privacy Settings: Who Cares? *First Monday*,15 (8).

BUCHANAN, T., PAINE, C. B., JOINSON, A. N., & REIPS, U. D. (2006) Development of Measures of Online Privacy Concern and Protection for Use on the Internet. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 58 (2), p. 57–165.

BUNZ, U. (2004) Growing from computer literacy towards computer-mediated communication competence: Evolution of a field and evaluation of a new measurement instrument. *Information Technology, Education, and Society*, 4 (2), p. 53-84.

BUTLER, E., MCCANN, E., & THOMAS, J. (2011) Privacy Setting Awareness on Facebook and Its Effect on User-Posted Content. *Human Communication*, 14 (1), p. 39–55.

CAERS, R., FEYTER, T. D., COUCK, D. M., STOUGH, T., VIGNA, C., & BOIS, C. D. (2013) Facebook: A literature review. *New Media Society* 15 (6), p. 982–1002.

CAERS, R., FEYTER, T. D., COUCK, M. D., Stough, T., VIGNA, C., & BOIS, C. D. (2013) Facebook: A literature review. *New Media Society*, 15 (6), p. 982-1002.

CATLETT, J. (2007) An Analysis of Female University Students' Communicative Management of Privacy Online via Facebook. *National Communication Association*, p. 1-29.

CHO, H., RIVERA-SÁNCHEZ, M., & LIM, S. S. (2009) A multinational study on online privacy: global concerns and local responses. *New Media Society*, 11 (3), p. 395-416.

CHRISTOFIDES, E., MUISE, A., & DESMARAIS, S. (2012) Risky Disclosures on Facebook : The Effect of Having a Bad Experience on Online Behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 27 (6), p. 714–731.

DEBATIN, B., LOVEJOY, J. P., HORN, A.-K., & HUGHES, B. N. (2009) Facebook and Online Privacy: Attitudes, Behaviors, and Unintended Consequences. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 15, p. 83–108.

DWYER, C., HILTZ, S. R., & PASSERINI, K. (2007) Trust and privacy concern within social networking sites: A comparison of Facebook and MySpace. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Americas Conference on Information Systems.*, (p. Retrieved from http://csis.pace.edu/~dwyer/research/DwyerAMCIS2007.pdf).

EINSPÄNNER, J. (2013) Privacy online: Perspectives on privacy and self-disclosure in the social web. *New Media Society*, 15, p. 1401-1402.

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

FUCHS, C. (2012) The Political Economy of Privacy on Facebook. *Television New Media*, 13 (2), p. 139–159.

GADEKAR, R. R., KRISHNATRAY, P., & GAUR, S. (2012) A descriptive study of facebook uses amongst Indian students. *Media Asia*, 39 (3), p. 140-147.

GARDE-PERIK, E. V., MARKOPOULOS, P., RUYTER, B. D., EGGEN, B., & IJSSELSTEIJN, W. (2008) Investigating Privacy Attitudes and Behavior in Relation to Personalization. *Social Science Computer Review*, 26 (1), p. 20-43.

GOVANI, T., & PASHLEY, H. (2005) Student awareness of the privacy implications when using Facebook. *Carnegie Mellon*, Retrieved May 5, 2007, from http://lorrie.cranor.org/courses/fa05/tubzhlp.pdf.

HENSON, B., REYNS, B. W., & FISHER, B. S. (2011) Security in the 21st Century: Examining the Link Between Online Social Network Activity, Privacy, and Interpersonal Victimization. *Criminal Justice Review*, 36 (3), p. 253-268.

HENSON, B., REYNS, B. W., & FISHER, B. S. (2011) Security in the 21st Century: Examining the Link Between Online Social Network Activity, Privacy, and Interpersonal Victimization. *Criminal Justice Review*, 36 (3), p. 253-268.

HINDUJA, S., & PATCHIN, J. W. (2008) Personal information of adolescents on the Internet: A quantitative content. *Journal of Adolescence*, 31, p. 125-146.

HODGE, M. J. (2007) The Fourth Amendment and privacy issues on the ''new'' Internet: Facebook.com and. *Southern Illinois University Law Journal*, 31, p. 95-123.

JOINSON, A. N., PAINE, C., BUCHANAN, T., & REIPS, U. D. (2006) Watching Me and Watching You: Privacy Attitudes and Reactions to Identity Card Implementation Scenarios in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Information Science*, 32 (4), p. 334–43.

JONES, H., & SOLTREN, J. H. (2005) *Facebook: Threats to privacy. Project MAC: MIT Project on Mathematics and Computing.*

LAHLOU, S. (2008) Identity, social status, privacy and face-keeping in digital society. *Social Science Information*, 47 (3), p. 299–330.

LANGE, R., & LAMPE, C. (2008) Feeding the Privacy Debate: An Examination of Facebook. *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association*, p. 1-26.

LEWIS, K., KAUFMAN, J., & CHRISTAKIS, N. (2008) The taste for privacy: An analysis of college student privacy settings in an online social network. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 14 (1), p. 79-100.

LEWIS, K., KAUFMAN, J., & CHRISTAKIS, N. (2008) The Taste for Privacy: An Analysis of College Student Privacy Settings in an Online Social Network. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, p. 79–100.

LEWIS, K., KAUFMAN, J., & CHRISTAKIS, N. (2008) The Taste for Privacy: An Analysis of College Student Privacy Settings in an Online Social Network. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, p. 79-100.

LI, S., & LI, Y.-M. (2007) How Far Is Far Enough? A Measure of Information Privacy in Terms of Interpersonal Distance. *Environment and Behavior* 39 (3), p. 317-331.

LIVINGSTONE, S. (2008) Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: Teenagers' use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and selfexpression. *New Media & Society,* 10 (3), p. 393–411.

LIVINGSTONE, S., KIRWIL, L., PONTE, C., & STAKSRUD, E. (2014) In their own words: What bothers children online? *European Journal of Communication,* 29 (3), p. 271–288.

METZGER, M., & PURE, R. (2009) Privacy management in Facebook.

MICHETI, A., BURKELL, J., & STEEVES, V. (2010) Fixing Broken Doors: Strategies for Drafting Privacy Policies Young People Can Understand. *Bulletin of Science Technology & Society*, 30 (2), p. 130.

O'NEIL, D. (2001) Analysis of Internet Users' Level of Online Privacy Concerns. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19 (1), p. 17-31.

OU, M. (2011) Generation Gap = Gap in Online Privacy Perceptions? The Case for Singaporean Youths and Their Parents. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association.* TBA, Boston, MA.

PARK, Y. J. (2013). Digital Literacy and Privacy Behavior Online. *Communication Research*, 40 (2), p. 215–236.

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

PHILLIPS, D. J. (2004) Privacy Policy and Pets: The Influence of Policy Regimes on the Development and Social Implications of Privacy Enhancing Technologies. *New Media & Society*, 6 (6), p. 691–706.

QUAN-HAASE, A. (2007) University students' local and distant social ties: Using and integrating modes of communication on campus. *Information, Communication & Society*, 10 (5), p. 671–693.

SMITH, H. J., MILBERG, S. J., & BURKE, S. J. (1996) Information Privacy: Measuring Individuals' Concerns about Organizational Practices. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 20 (2), p. 167–96.

TARASZOW, T., ARISTODEMOU, E., SHITTA, G., LAOURIS, Y., & ARSOY, A. (2010). Disclosure of personal and contact information by young people in social networking sites: An analysis using Facebook™ profiles as an example. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 6 (1), p. 81–102.

TUFEKCI, Z. (2008) Can You See Me Now? Audience and Disclosure Regulation in Online Social Network Sites. *Bulletin of Science Technology & Society*, 28 (1), p. 20-36.

TUFEKCI, Z. (2008) Can You See Me Now? Audience and Disclosure Regulation in Online Social Network Sites. *Bulletin of Science Technology & Society*, 28 (1), p. 20-36.

TUROW, J., FELDMAN, L., & MELTZER, K. (2005) *Open to exploitation: American shoppers online and offline.*

WATERS, S., & ACKERMAN, J. (2011) Exploring Privacy Management on Facebook: Motivations and Perceived Consequences of Voluntary Disclosure. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17, p. 101–115.

WESSELS, B. (2012) Identification and the practices of identity and privacy in everyday digital communication. *New Media Society*, 14 (8), p. 1251–1268.

WILSON, R. E., GOSLING, S. D., & GRAHAM, L. T. (2012) A Review of Facebook Research in the Social Sciences. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7 (3), p. 203–220.