University of Cincinnati

Date: 5/16/2018

I, Katelyn Ritchie, hereby submit this original work as part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Communication.

It is entitled:

To Post, or Not to Post? Exploring Adjunct Faculty and Staff Social Media Use Among a Converged Mixed Audience

Student's name: **Katelyn Ritchie**

This work and its defense approved by:

Committee chair: Nancy Jennings, Ph.D.

Committee member: Pamara Chang, Ph.D.

Committee member: Eric Jenkins, Ph.D.

30500

To Post, or Not to Post? Exploring Adjunct Faculty and Staff Social Media Use Among a Converged Mixed Audience

A thesis submitted to the

Graduate School

of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in the Department of Communication

of the College of Arts and Sciences

by

Katelyn Ritchie

2018

B.A. The Ohio State University

June 2010

Committee Chair: N. A. Jennings, Ph.D.

Committee Members: P. F. Chang, Ph.D. and E. S. Jenkins, Ph.D.

Abstract

This study explores how adjunct faculty and staff use social media among a converged mixed audience. With social networking sites (SNSs) serving as digital spaces where various social spheres often converge, the result can dramatically impact how an individual presents oneself and can even negatively impact one's behavior culminating in self-withdrawal. Specifically, through in-depth interviews, the present research seeks to understand how adjunct faculty and staff self-present among a collapsed audience, or "context collapse" (Marwick & boyd, 2011); the different concerns and challenges they face; and how a collapsing of audiences can lead to self-withdrawal. Results of the present study suggest that context collapse is occurring frequently on adjunct faculty and staff members' social media accounts—particularly the blurring of personal and professional boundaries. However, SNS platforms are found to not only serve as sites of context collapse but also afford tools to restore context by allowing users to segment audiences. This study finds support for audience segmentation strategies covered in existing literature, but also expands overall methods to include Facebook groups and lists. In addition, participants were classified along a continuum into four different behavioral categories, including: Strict Separators, Savvy Segmenters, Positive PG Posters, and Reluctant Participants. Future avenues for further research around adjunct faculty and staff, the blurring of personal and professional boundaries, and self-withdrawal are also discussed.

Keywords: Self-Presentation, Social Networking Sites, SNSs, Context Collapse, Self-Withdrawal, Audience Segmentation, Adjunct Faculty, Staff

Acknowledgements

I would like to first thank my thesis committee, Dr. Nancy Jennings, Dr. Pamara Chang and Dr. Eric Jenkins, for their helpful input, advice and encouragement to help make this research study a success. I feel honored to have been able to learn from each one of you. Eric, you were the first to believe in me as a graduate student, and I am forever grateful for that. Additionally, I would like to express tremendous gratitude toward my thesis committee chair, Dr. Jennings, who served as more than an advisor but as a mentor. Nancy, thank you for patiently answering my many questions throughout this journey, going above and beyond to offer help and guidance, and for being a true joy to work with. I cannot thank you enough for your constant support and enthusiastic encouragement.

Additionally, I must thank my family—both immediate and in-law. To have all of you rooting for me has made all the difference in making it through. Mom and Dad, your modelling of work ethic and perseverance is potentially the greatest gift that can be bestowed. Because of you both, I know if I dig deep enough I can accomplish anything.

Finally, to my biggest champion, my amazing husband. No words will ever be able to express how grateful I am for you and your support. You are always there for me, especially when facing my biggest hurdles. Your steadfast love, support and hard work continue to inspire me. Thank you for believing in me and cheering me on all the way through the finish line. May our adventure ever-continue.

Table of Contents

Introduction **1**

Chapter 1: Literature Review **3**

Confronting Collapsed Contexts on SNSs 3
Imagining the Audience 6
Presenting the Self (In)Appropriately 8
Self-Presentation Defined 8
Self-Presentation Online 11
Issues of Privacy and Self-Withdrawal 13
Self-Presentation on SNSs in Higher Education 16
Research Questions 17

Chapter 2: Method **21**

Participants 21
Recruitment 23
Procedure 24
Measures 26
Data Analysis 26

Chapter 3: Results **27**

General SNS Use 28
Managing Self-Presentation 29
Challenges and Concerns 35
Collapsed Contexts and Self-Withdrawal 43

Chapter 4: Discussion **50**

Spectrum of Behavior 52
Self-Presentation Theory on SNSs 60
Limitations and Future Research 69
Conclusion 71

References **72**

Appendices **77**

List of Tables

Table 1: Research Participants.. 22

Table 2: Sample Responses to Feeling Pressure to Use Facebook or Twitter for Work/Professional Purposes.. 42

Introduction: An Increasingly Connected World

Technology has always played a major role in shaping how communities are composed and function. Paper and writing revolutionized how people think, record, learn, and communicate (Ong, 2013); the printing press impacted the accessibility and distribution of books and other printed materials, as well as literacy rates in the U.S. (Postman, 1985); and the Internet changed how we work, spend leisure time, conduct research, and even connect with friends or family members. Technology continues to advance and evolve, and society adjusts accordingly in light of the latest developments.

In today's world, more and more of personal and professional life take place online. According to the Pew Research Center, 86% of U.S. adults claimed to currently use the Internet (Greenwood, Perrin & Duggan, 2016). The same study found that of those U.S. adults who are "online," 79% currently use Facebook—the most common social media platform reported—with more than three-quarters (76%) reporting daily use. That is, as the number of Americans using the Internet has increased in recent years, so has the number of people using social media. In a separate Pew Research Center report, 77% of U.S. adults reported owning a smartphone, which is an increase from 35% reported in 2011, just six years ago (Rainie & Perrin, 2017). With such widespread adoption of smartphones, it has never been easier for individuals to scroll through their Facebook, Twitter, or other social media feeds to see the latest news headlines and updates from friends or to grow their professional network by connecting with their latest contacts.

With so many Americans online and using social media for both personal and professional reasons, it comes as no surprise that overlap exists between these two worlds. Due to overlapping personal and professional personas, as well as a blending of potential audiences, social networking sites (SNSs) can be a difficult terrain to navigate. How does one appropriately

present oneself when various audiences are watching, or will watch, the show? Considering that SNSs are still relatively new, this is an especially daunting task with a lack of clear guidelines or widespread best practices. The question of how to appropriately navigate the interconnected digital landscape of SNSs persists and has become a central concern for higher education professionals who wish to remain on the employment roster.

This study will first explore social media use, self-presentational practices, and audience management strategies employed by adjunct faculty and staff within higher education. Being that adjunct faculty and staff are faced with the dilemma of not only personal and professional (bosses, colleagues) spheres colliding on social media, but also the controversial addition of students and alumni to these digital spaces as well, adjunct faculty and staff offer a unique lens into the consequences of blended audiences online. Further, with no protection from academic freedom, as is the case for tenured faculty, adjunct faculty and staff potentially have more to lose for their behavior on their personal social media accounts. Second, this study will seek to understand the various challenges and concerns adjunct faculty and staff members face as they navigate social networking sites among a converged mixed audience. Differences and similarities in challenges and concerns will be compared across both groups. Third, and finally, with SNSs collapsing a user's social spheres, amid widespread pressure to build and maintain a personal (and professional) digital brand, adjunct faculty and staff experiences of self-withdrawal on SNSs will be investigated.

Findings from the present study suggest that social media are not only potential sites of context collapse (Marwick & boyd, 2011) but offer tools to effectively manage collapsed contexts via audience segmentation. Such tools include Facebook groups and lists. These tools are the latest strategies to be uncovered for how individuals combat blurring boundaries on SNSs

to behave appropriately according to audience segment. Without audience segmentation or separation, SNS users risk a sanitization of their personal selves as well as their professional identity outweighing their personal one, in an innately personal space. Related to the degree audience segmentation strategies were employed, if at all, a spectrum of participant behavior emerged including: Strict Separators, Savvy Segmenters, Positive PG Posters and Reluctant Participants. An expansion of concepts is also discussed, including context collapse, self-presentation theory, and the hyperpersonal model. Finally, results from the study lay the groundwork for best practices for those using SNSs for both personal and professional purposes.

In the following chapters, relevant literature around SNSs and context collapse will first be reviewed. Included in this review are closely related concepts such as imagined audiences, self-presentation (the theoretical framework for this study), and self-withdrawal. In contrast to when one self-discloses, self-withdrawal refers to when one retracts oneself in one or more forms from a SNS community. Research questions will also be proposed. Following the literature review and research questions, the methodology for the present study will be reviewed. Next, the results of the study will be discussed, per research question. Finally, implications from the findings will be explored, followed by study limitations and directions for future research.

Literature Review

Confronting Collapsed Contexts on SNSs

Compared to face-to-face encounters, there is one major element that becomes complicated in digital environments: context. Context guides us and provides cues for in-person interactions we have with others. Specifically, this can help us judge what topics might be relevant, or *ir*-relevant; appropriate, or *in*-appropriate; what sort of linguistic choices to make

(including word selection, level of formality, etc.); and also how much to disclose about oneself. Context also enables constant feedback within an in-person interaction, allowing the message creator to adjust to their conversational partner accordingly. In Meyrowitz' (1985) discussion of new digital media (i.e. TV and radio) impacting social behavior, he stressed that to carry out a successful interaction one must know the "definition of the situation" (p. 24). In this line of thinking, people navigate life by applying the various situational definitions they acquire along the way. For example, how one behaves at a bachelorette party is not how one typically behaves at a job interview. The definitions of the situations are different, as are the corresponding expected social behaviors (Davis & Jurgenson, 2014; Meyrowitz, 1985).

However, SNSs often merge a user's various social spheres, causing once distinct situational definitions (contexts) to become blurred—a phenomenon known as "context collapse" (Marwick & boyd, 2011, p. 122; Meyrowitz, 1985, p. 92). As Vitak (2012) explained, context collapse is "the flattening out of multiple distinct audiences in one's social network, such that people from different contexts become part of a singular group of message recipients" (p. 451). That is, on SNSs, various social circles (friends, family, work peers, bosses and other superiors, professional contacts, etc.) unite, creating a converged mixed audience. Distinct social cues and definitions are lost among the crowd.

Davis and Jurgenson (2014) have distinguished between two different types of context collapse: collusions and collisions. While the former is characterized as intentional mixing of audiences (for example, for ease of promotion), "collision" is defined as the "unintentional" mixing of contexts, "with potentially chaotic results" (pp. 481-482). As a user's social circles collide on SNSs, much could be at stake, including friendships, professional relationships, or even one's job. In a critical review of faculty-student SNS interactions and policy, Sugimoto,

Hank, Bowman, and Pomerantz (2015) explained that collapsed contexts may contribute to "dueling relationships" (section 3, para. 13) when one's various personas, such as personal and professional, clash in a common digital space. With a blurring of audiences comes the potential for a blurring of roles and personas. Overall, by losing important contextual social cues, communication among mixed audiences can range from uncomfortable to risky.

Among mixed audiences, two of the most concerning and problematic contexts to collide on SNSs, as documented widely by scholars, appear to be one's personal and professional spheres (Davis & Jurgenson, 2014; LaPoe, Olson, & Eckert, 2017; Marwick & boyd, 2011; Sugimoto, Hank, Bowman, & Pomerantz, 2015; Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013). In a study by LaPoe, Olsen, and Eckert (2017), media scholars' social media usage was explored via in-depth interviews. The researchers found that participants struggled to find division between their personal and professional lives on SNSs. Further, Facebook was commonly reported as being difficult to classify as either personal or professional, while Twitter was found to contain "distinct audiences" (p. 198) and used primarily for professional reasons.

Veletsianos and Kimmons (2013) conducted a phenomenological study of faculty members' experience of social media. They explained: "The SNS experience of faculty members culminates in a tension between personal connection and professional responsibility…that may arise from the use of technologies that collapse personal and professional contexts and audiences" (p. 49). By combining more than one situational definition (personal and professional) in the same space, appropriate social and communicative expectations become increasingly unclear, opening up the door for serious repercussions. While social media offers users many benefits, it's clear that it may also result in anxiety or stress because of a tension between personas.

Imagining the Audience

When multiple social circles become mixed on SNSs, users must commonly "imagine" which specific segment of their audience they're addressing or for whom they're performing (Anderson, 1983; Litt; 2012; Litt & Hargittai, 2016a; Marwick & boyd, 2011). Rooted in the germinal concept of the "imagined community" (Anderson, 1983), Litt (2012) defines the imagined audience as "the mental conceptualization of the people with whom we are communicating, our audience" (p. 331). When distinct audiences are collapsed and contextual cues are sparse, if available at all, one must rely on some idea of an audience when publishing a message (Litt, 2012; Marwick & boyd, 2011). That is, in order to present oneself appropriately, he or she relies on *some* mental conceptualization of who will read a created digital artifact. Hogan (2010) distinguishes between a performance space or region and an "exhibition space" (p. 377), where such digital artifacts are not only available for an immediate audience to view, but, rather, persist for many potential viewers to consume and choose to engage with *after* the time of its creation. In this regard, viewers extend beyond the initial imagined audience.

In a study involving in-depth interviews with creative content producers (i.e. designers/artists, bloggers/writers, marketers/publicists, etc.), Duffy, Pruchniewska, and Scolere (2017) found that participants imagined a division in audience between personal and professional contacts that guided self-presentational behavior accordingly. As one interviewee explained, while his Facebook profile featured a compilation of personal photos of his dog and family, the content shared on his Instagram profile, an outlet for professional work, had "to be a little more curated" (p. 6). Self-presentation, and appropriate social behavior, hinge on the imagined audience of each SNS platform.

Litt and Hargittai (2016a) distinguished between abstract imagined audiences (anyone) and target imagined audiences, which were comprised of four different circles: personal ties, professional ties, communal ties, and phantasmal ties. The authors found that the concept of the imagined audience is not a stable construct, but, rather, represents abstract audiences about as frequently as it represents target audiences. One's imagined audience is a dynamic conceptualization, possibly changing from moment to moment and post to post. Also, Marwick and boyd (2011) labeled a user's most sensitive connections (parents, partners, and bosses) as the "nightmare reader" (p. 125) and explained that, due to context collapse, the audience a user commonly imagines tends to consist of members who fall under this category.

However, contrary to this conceptualization of a nightmare reader imagined audience, Litt and Hargittai found that while a select few did think of those members who would be the harshest critics, "the most common sub-audiences [read: target audiences] people imagined tended to be people who would likely be the least judgmental such as friends and family, and people who they thought would like or agree with their posts, perhaps neglecting those who may be less forgiving" (2016a, p. 8). In addition, Bernstein, Bakshy, Burke and Karrer (2013) concluded that most SNS users do not fully understand the extent of their audience, as illustrated by participants underestimating the size of their connected audience. Therefore, the gravity of one's online disclosures might not always be taken into account. This becomes problematic, especially when professional connections are occupying the same digital space as one's personal connections.

Although, other studies show that when one is actively engaged in self-monitoring, SNS users often either worry about parents seeing their disclosures (Marwick & boyd, 2014; 2011; Hogan, 2010), or one's professional contacts, such as current employers (Marwick & boyd,

2011; Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013; Vitak, Blasiola, Patil & Litt, 2015). The presence of these particular social groups may dramatically change a user's online self-presentation behavior. As Duffy, Pruchniewska and Scolere (2017) state:

> Platform-specific imaginations of the audience coincided with self-presentation strategies that were unique to particular platforms. Such findings indicate that platform-specific personae may be used to challenge the context collapse endemic to social networks, particularly for those workers eager to maintain a division between 'personal' and 'professional'. (p. 6)

Distinguishing between personal and professional spheres appears to be a top priority for many SNS users. As commonly cited by scholars, some SNS users may even employ a "lowest common denominator" approach (Davis & Jurgenson, 2014; Hogan, 2010; Litt, 2012; Marwick & boyd, 2011; Vitak, 2012; Vitak, Blasiola, Patil & Litt, 2015), in which disclosures are diluted down to be easily digestible (and void of offensive content) for audiences that pose the most risk, such as one's employer. Hogan (2010) distinguishes between the "idealized front" and those who would find such conduct problematic (p. 383). With the lowest common denominator strategy, one always has his or her harshest critics in the back of their mind when publishing content on social media—but how prevalent is this strategy employed by SNS users?

Presenting the Self (In)Appropriately

Self-Presentation defined. Social media allows us to participate in a slew of different activities and engage with people from all corners of our personal and professional worlds. Individuals keep up with their childhood friends, continually add new "friends" from the bar or yoga class, rant publicly about the latest political folly, browse a coworker's recent wedding

photos, and even get their daily dose of “news”. In all of these different acts, one important thing to consider is how that person presents him- or herself. To investigate such phenomena, this study relies on Erving Goffman’s (1959) theory of self-presentation.

In this theory, Goffman applies a dramaturgical approach to life, claiming that individuals behave as actors who perform differently among different audiences. The way a person performs in front of their boss is different than how they behave among their parents, or closest friends. Goffman referred to this as the “’working consensus’” (p. 10), or the definition of the situation (Goffman, 1959; Meyrowitz, 1985). The situation (performance) one might be in dictates which version of oneself (role/persona) one should assume. Actors use “audience segregation” to keep performances straight. As Goffman stated: “by audience segregation the individual ensures that those before whom he plays one of his parts will not be the same individuals before whom he plays a different part in another setting” (p. 49). A certain boundary becomes apparent between the performer and the audience, where the two are interdependent upon each other. Should the wrong performance be displayed before an unintended audience, confusion, embarrassment, and possibly far worse are likely to ensue.

Goffman (1959) distinguished between three separate areas of a performance: front stage, backstage, and “the outside”. The front stage, or “front region”, is the space in which performances take place (p. 107). This is the site where one’s many social interactions occur—the performer is “on” and aware of the audience, and the audience of the performer. The front region is the space where formal gestures and expressions may take place, and where the actor behaves according to the situational definition. Depending on who the audience is comprised of determines which performance the actor presents.

The backstage, or “back region”, is a space where “suppressed facts make an appearance”, where “the impression fostered by the performance is knowingly contradicted”, where “illusions and impressions are openly constructed”, where the actor can relax and forget about any front stage roles, and where conversations can be held “’privately’” (p. 112). The actor is in a different mode altogether in the back region. With no crowds to please or impressions to uphold, the back stage offers a performer a much-needed break. An actor is not necessarily alone in the backstage, as fellow actors may also occupy such a space while not delivering their own performance. For example, the back kitchen of a restaurant functions as a backstage for the wait staff—comments about a rude customer may be made in this space, where they would not be uttered out on the floor (the front stage).

The third region, “the outside”, is where things get a bit more interesting. Outsiders are defined as those persons who do not belong at a given performance—they are not the *intended* audience for the current presentation. According to Goffman (1959):

> When outsiders unexpectedly enter the front or the back region of a particular performance-in-progress, the consequence of their inopportune presence can often best be studied not in terms of its effects upon the performance-in-progress but rather in terms of its effects upon a different performance, namely, the one which the performers or the audience would ordinarily present before the outsiders at a time and place when the outsiders would be the anticipated audience. (p. 135)

It can be a disorienting experience to witness an individual’s personal performance, which differs from the performance they typically employ. With these different audiences clashing in the same physical space, different situational definitions also end up clashing. How should the actor proceed in light of converging audiences? This is a central concern of the present study.

Self-Presentation online. Self-presentation theory (Das & Kramer, 2013; Davis & Jurgenson, 2014; Hogan, 2010; Litt, 2012; Marwick & boyd, 2011; Tufekci, 2008; Vitak, 2012) and impression formation (Hancock & Dunham, 2001; Utz, 2010; Walther, Loh & Granka, 2005) have commonly been cited in studies of SNSs and mediated interactions. Since Goffman studied face-to-face interpersonal interactions within his scholarship, scholars have applied self-presentation theory to media environments in a variety of ways.

Consistent with the non-deterministic approach to evaluating computer-mediated communication (CMC) (i.e., social information processing theory, hyperpersonal model, etc.), specifically CMC features, Hancock and Dunham (2001) conducted an experiment to examine the breadth of impressions fostered in CMC versus face-to-face (FTF) interactions. Interestingly, they found that participants made more extreme attributions (greater intensity) in CMC interactions, compared with FTF interactions. Following this school of thought, Walther, Loh and Granka (2005) found in their study of verbal and nonverbal cues within CMC and FTF environments that no restriction existed for relational behavior (e.g. affinity) from the channel through which individuals interact. That is, users adapt to the communication context they find themselves in, allowing bonds and relationships to occur and develop over time regardless of communication channel.

Meanwhile, Utz (2010) studied impression perception of SNS users based on information generated by the user, the system, and the user's connected friends. According to Utz (2010), "To make a good impression, it is not enough to carefully construct one's profile; it is also wise to carefully select one's *friends*" (p. 329; emphasis original). Therefore, one's impression is not solely created by the SNS user but can also be influenced by one's connections as well. Further, some scholars study online self-presentation in terms of various "personas" (Litt, 2012;

Sugimoto, Hank, Bowman, & Pomerantz, 2015). In this vein, individuals have different personas, which they enact on SNSs while addressing different segments of their collapsed audience.

This concept of personas is similar to what Goffman (1959) refers to as "roles". As Sugimoto, Hank, Bowman and Pomerantz (2015) explained:

> A treatment of both dual relationships and collapsed contexts in connection to diverse expressions communicated by faculty across social networks . . . contributes to a potential 'dueling relationship' effect due to the ambiguity between professional and personal personas and the potential for unfavorable interpretation by recipients, known and unknown. (Section 3, paragraph 13)

As illustrated by the authors, collapsed contexts create turbulent waters where one's personas do not always mix well within the same digital space. Perhaps performing for collapsed audiences is not as graceful an endeavor as social media users hope it to be.

In his work detailing the changes in social structures and behaviors by new media (then, TV), Meyrowitz (1985) called for an expansion of Goffman's terms, suggesting revised regions of "deep back region", "forefront region", and the addition of a "middle region" (p. 47). The middle region comes into existence when an audience member is somehow exposed to parts of an actor's front stage performance, as well as their backstage performance—or the transition in between such spaces, resulting in a new onstage performance altogether. This new blended space of the middle region an actor finds him- or herself in results in new performed behaviors. It might be helpful to think of the middle region as a pop-up space displaying impromptu performances. Middle region behavior is, in essence, an "overlapping of situations and audiences" (p. 50). That is, the actor isn't quite in full performance mode (as found in the

forefront region), yet isn't quite resting from a performance either (as in the deep back region). Rather, they are stuck somewhere in-between, where they are a bit caught off guard, split between roles, and not fully rehearsed.

The mixing of multiple audiences can be a challenging scenario for an actor, especially if the audiences greatly differ. As discussed previously, this has become increasingly more common with context collapse on social media. It might be that SNSs create these middle regions where individuals are always caught in-between performances and in-between various roles. Among converged mixed audiences, the SNS user might not ever fully be in one role or the other, since they know multiple audiences are in attendance. According to Meyrowitz (1985), "New media that tend to divide existing social information-systems will allow individuals to develop both 'deeper' backstage and more 'forward' onstage behavior styles; new media that tend to merge existing information-systems will lead to more . . . 'middle region,' behaviors" (p. 51). SNSs appear to create disorienting and alarming improvisational performance spaces for users, with unclear situational definitions and, perhaps, unintended audiences.

Issues of Privacy and Self-Withdrawal

With social spheres merging and, at times, colliding on social media, it can be challenging to determine how to present oneself. Users do not want the wrong content to fall into the wrong hands. In a sense, the world of online social networking seems contradictory. While users often value privacy and boundary management on SNSs, the platforms themselves value widely published self-disclosures (Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013). As reported by Baumer et al. (2013), "many users felt that the [privacy] violations they experienced on Facebook happened because, as an entity, Facebook '*disrespected and devalued'* the idea of privacy" (Privacy

section, para. 2, emphasis original). This discrepancy leads to some SNS users limiting their SNS use, or leaving altogether (Baumer, et al., 2013), or perhaps even becoming entangled in a web of "participatory reluctance" (Cassidy, 2016, p. 2614).

Concerns of privacy on SNSs is a widely covered topic by scholars (Baumer et al., 2013; Das & Kramer, 2013; Houghton & Joinson, 2010; Litt & Hargittai, 2016b; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Tufekci, 2008a, 2008b; Vitak, 2012; Vitak, Blasiola, Patil, & Litt, 2015). More specifically, audience/boundary management has been found to be an important consideration for a user's sense of privacy and self-disclosure (Litt & Hargittai, 2016b; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Tufekci, 2008a; Vitak, Blasiola, Patil & Litt, 2015). In their study calling for a new conception of privacy for today's digital age (i.e. "networked privacy"), Marwick and boyd (2014) stated: "*Networked privacy* invokes the constellation of audience dynamics, social norms, and technical functionality that affect the processes of information disclosure, concealment, obscurity, and interpretation within a networked public" (p. 1063, emphasis original). They continue, "If we understand privacy to be about the management of boundaries, networked privacy is the ongoing negotiation of contexts in a networked ecosystem in which contexts regularly blur and collapse" (2014, p. 1063). Other scholars have found the "trail of digital breadcrumbs" (Sugimoto, Hank, Bowman & Pomerantz, 2015, section 2, paragraph 1), or data persistence (Davis & Jurgenson, 2014), left behind on SNSs to be of particular concern for users, though, this was less so with college-aged users (Tufekci, 2008a).

However, with much of the existing SNS literature focusing on self-disclosure behavior (e.g. LaPoe, Olson & Eckert, 2017; Seidman, 2013; Sugimoto, Hank, Bowman & Pomerantz, 2015; Vitak, 2012), few scholars have examined user "self-withdrawal" (see: Dienlin & Metzger, 2016; Tufekci, 2008a). In a study expanding the privacy calculus model on SNSs, Dienlin and

Metzger (2016) distinguish between self-disclosure and self-withdrawal. Citing Altman (1975), they explained, "self-withdrawal refers to the active retention of information" (Dienlin & Metzger, 2016, p. 369). Further, they clarify that self-withdrawal is not simply the mirror-image of self-disclosure, but, rather, is a distinct concept that refers to withholding information and avoiding "negative outcomes of communication" (p. 370). The present study seeks to contribute to advancing this concept within SNS research. For the purposes of this study, self-withdrawal is defined as the feeling of wanting to pull away or detach from an SNS community, through reducing (or eliminating altogether) public disclosures, or by withholding certain information (depth, breadth, or specific topics). Self-withdrawal is an umbrella term that may include multiple forms of an individual retracting oneself and their disclosures from a SNS, including self-censorship, as just one example.

In a study about user self-censorship in Facebook posts and comments, Das and Kramer (2013) found that users self-censor more when the audience is broader (converged), such as with general status updates, as well as when the relevance of one's disclosures are narrower. That is, collapsed audiences or audiences centered around a specific topic or purpose lead a user to being more careful about what they disclose—exhibiting one form of self-withdrawal. As Tufekci (2008a) found in a study on college students and audience and disclosure management, "students *do* try to manage the boundary between publicity and privacy, but they do not do this by total withdraw because they would then forfeit a chance for publicity" (p. 33, emphasis original). The same may be true of working professionals, especially for those who are either required to use social media for their current job, or for those who feel pressure to have some form of a digital personal and/or professional presence. Self-withdrawal can take different forms, depending on the extent a user wants or needs to maintain a digital identity.

Self-Presentation on SNSs in Higher Education

For many individuals, participation in online social networking sites is an assumed part of today's digitally-connected world. However, considering that social media is still relatively new, one's personal and professional identity appear to clash and collide on SNSs, whether the user seeks separation between such personas, or not. This is especially visible in light of many higher education professionals losing their jobs, and sometimes their entire academic careers, in response to something they posted on their personal social media account.

For example, Dr. Steven Salaita, a former prospective faculty member at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, found himself without a job when one of his controversial tweets surfaced at his soon-to-be new institution (Jaschik, 2015). Likewise, Jonathan Higgins, a student affairs staff member at Claremont Colleges (a consortium of undergraduate and graduate schools) in California, was let go from his position after he was publicly called out by conservative media for his personal tweets critiquing police and white supremacy (Bauer-Wolf, 2017). Numerous higher education professionals have lost their jobs or careers, and have even been barraged with death threats, due to activity that took place on their personal social media accounts (for a recent review, see: Quintana, 2017). However, with SNSs being so new, clear guidelines and best practices have yet to be established or adopted on a wide scale (LaPoe, Olson & Eckert, 2017).

Despite the risky terrain of the online social networking world, many higher education professionals feel a real or perceived need, or pressure, to use social media (Baumer, 2013; LaPoe, Olson & Eckert, 2017). In today's world, many people (especially researchers) are commonly advised to have a digital presence to network and establish their personal or professional brand. As LaPoe, Olson and Eckert (2017) posit, to have a digital identity is to have

"significance in an information economy" (p. 200). A user's digital identity becomes their actual identity—their online existence becomes visible.

In higher education, staff members may be required to use SNSs for their job. For example, an alumni relations professional might be expected to use their personal social media accounts to build expansive connections with students and/or former students (alumni), promote institution-related programs and events, or it may behoove them to establish a digital brand. Likewise, while not formally required, an adjunct or tenured faculty member may feel pressured to grow their online networks to aid in networking, finding job opportunities, connecting with current and former students, expanding learning opportunities to meet students where they are, and disseminating one's own research. While tenured faculty are protected by academic freedom (although, not immune to negative repercussions), staff members and adjunct faculty share one key commonality: both groups are exposed to a certain degree of dispensability, especially regarding their behavior on social media. Therefore, with blurred personal and professional boundaries on SNSs, and no clear guidelines, it is important to explore how adjunct faculty and staff are navigating such nuanced digital spaces among mixed (collapsed) audiences.

Research Questions

Self-Presentation management. The present study seeks to explore adjunct faculty and staff use of Facebook and/or Twitter among converged mixed audiences. While much of the existing research focuses on tenured faculty (Sugimoto, Hank, Bowman, & Pomerantz, 2015; Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013), this study seeks to help fill a gap in literature by targeting adjunct faculty and staff members in higher education. With so many social spheres merging on SNSs (family, friends, professional contacts, colleagues, bosses, university leadership, students,

and alumni), it can be challenging to discern how to present oneself among so many different (and sometimes opposing) audiences. Something that might be appropriate for a staff member to post for their friends to see, might not be suitable for their boss or work-related audiences (colleagues, students, etc.). Similarly, an adjunct faculty member who stays in contact with alumni on Facebook might share their personal political viewpoint openly while imagining an audience of friends, family or like-minded individuals, but their job may be at stake if their post receives enough negative public attention. Sometimes, with a tarnished online (and offline) reputation, careers may become permanently damaged.

Self-presentation and audience management strategies will be explored in this study. For example, LaPoe, Olson and Eckert (2017) found that participants managed personal and professional audiences by "splitting identities" online (p. 198). As the researchers explain:

> For some, this meant registering multiple accounts on the same social media platform with one strictly for private posts and another one for public posts. Others said they write specific messages tailored to particular slices of their audience on the same social media site. Yet, others designated different social media channels for personal or professional use." (LaPoe, Olson & Eckert, 2017, p. 198)

The present study will investigate the various strategies that adjunct faculty and staff employ primarily on Facebook and Twitter. Therefore, this study asks the following research question:

> *RQ1: How do higher education professionals manage their mediated self-presentation among converged mixed audiences on social networking sites (SNSs)?*

Challenges faced on SNSs. Similar to other SNS users, adjunct faculty and staff face many challenges using social media. First, due to collapsed contexts on SNSs, they may find it

difficult to judge what is appropriate behavior, and, perhaps more importantly, what is not. As many adjunct faculty and staff may be connected to students, alumni, professional contacts, bosses and university leadership, along with friends and family in the same digital space, a user's communicative acts may be strained. What is key to point out is the personal and professional divide. These two social spheres may be considered opposing, or "dueling" (Sugimoto, Hank, Bowman & Pomerantz, 2015), at times, and the blurring of such boundaries may be the most challenging to overcome. Further, with many staff being required to use SNS for work-related reasons, and with the widespread prevalence of pressure to establish a digital identity in today's always-connected world, adjunct faculty and staff must often navigate how to use their own personal social media accounts for both personal and professional purposes. The result, of which, may lead to a user's reluctant participation (Cassidy, 2016) on SNSs.

Second, besides personal and professional social spheres, adjunct faculty and staff may also experience difficulty in using SNSs for both public and private purposes. That is, they may find themselves needing or wanting to share certain information intended for public distribution (e.g. promoting one's work or research), or they may find themselves wanting to keep communication private (e.g. posting one's personal opinions or photos for oneself, or participating in a targeted conversation). However, there may be complications with keeping such divisions separate. As Marwick and boyd (2014) explain, SNS posts and images can become more public than initially intended by other users tagging a certain individual on Facebook, or by @replying on Twitter, shifting a private interaction to the public realm (if the person replying has a public Twitter account). This leads to great uncertainty for SNS users.

Third, users may experience partial control of their own impression management. While they (mostly) have control over the content they publish on SNSs, their given impression may be

impacted simply by those individuals to which they are connected (Utz, 2010; Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013). That is, one's impression may be tarnished by the impression another user is giving, via posts or images they choose to share publicly. Similarly, a user cannot control exactly what a connection tags or posts on a user's own profile or SNS account, meaning a user's online self-presentation actually becomes "co-constructed" (Davis & Jurgenson, 2014, p. 478; Marwick & boyd, 2014, p. 1063) by those within their digital network.

Finally, as mentioned previously, adjunct faculty and staff are more at risk of job dispensability, as compared to tenured faculty who enjoy the benefit of academic freedom. Adjunct faculty and staff experience a greater threat of potential job loss over their behavior on social media, meaning they must exercise even more caution than other users. As seen in recent reports (Quintana, 2017), adjunct faculty (and staff) are easier to fire than protected tenure-level faculty, suggesting their job security is tenuous at best.

Therefore, with all of these different challenges in mind, the following question is posed:

RQ2: How are the challenges and concerns that adjunct faculty and staff face when posting on SNSs different or similar?

Withdrawing from online social networks. Finally, with collapsed contexts and ambiguous situational definitions, online social network sites make it challenging to discern how to appropriately present oneself, and also how much personal information is the right amount to share, without *oversharing*. Converged social spheres, blurry audience boundaries, and the co-construction of one's online identity may result in a user's self-withdrawal from SNSs. Building on the work of Dienlin and Metzger (2016)—who credit Altman (1975)—self-withdrawal is defined in this study as a user feeling the desire to pull away or detach from a SNS community

through the reduction or elimination of public disclosures, or by withholding information (depth, breadth, or specific topics). Further, self-withdrawal can include the following activities: deleting or modifying posts; self-censoring within posts; refraining from publishing public posts; or refraining from SNS use altogether. With much of the existing research focusing on self-disclosure behavior on SNSs (e.g. LaPoe, Olson & Eckert, 2017; Seidman, 2013; Sugimoto, Hank, Bowman & Pomerantz, 2015; Vitak, 2012), this study seeks to help fill a gap in literature by expanding the concept of self-withdrawal, especially among collapsed audiences. Therefore, the final research question is posed:

RQ3: How does context collapse lead to feelings and behaviors of self-withdrawal among adjunct faculty and staff?

Method

Participants

Participants (N=15) in this study consisted of adjunct faculty and staff members employed by the University of Cincinnati, including some whose primary location was at one of two regional college campuses. Five respondents identified as being employed at the "Main Campus," whereas 10 identified as being employed at a "Regional Campus". Through interviews and self-identification, dual role participants emerged. Therefore, the breakdown becomes four adjunct faculty participants, four staff member participants, and seven adjunct faculty/staff member participants (dual role participants) (See Table 1).

In addition, there were more female participants (73%) than male participants (27%), and 73% of the overall participants identified as White/Caucasian. One each identified as the following: Asian/Pacific Islander, Black or African American, Hispanic, and Multiple

Ethnicity/Other, in which they specified “European/Native American”. Qualified participants ranged in age from 23 to 62 years, with an average age of 43.46 years. There was almost an even divide of participants who have children (53%) and those who do not have children (47%). At the time of data collection, the majority of respondents were employed Full-Time (73%), compared to Part-Time (27%). While the length of time participants reported being employed in their current position ranged from “Less than 1 Month” to 6-9 Months, the median response for length of time working within higher education was 6-9 Months. However, all respondents worked within higher education for at least one month or more.

Table 1

Research Participants

ID #	Gender	Role
101	Female	Staff
102	Female	Dual Role
103	Female	Staff
104	Male	Staff
105	Female	Dual Role
106	Male	Dual Role
107	Female	Adjunct Faculty
108	Female	Staff
109	Female	Dual Role
110	Female	Dual Role
111	Female	Dual Role
112	Female	Adjunct Faculty
113	Male	Dual Role
114	Male	Adjunct Faculty
115	Female	Adjunct Faculty

In regards to social media, all participants were required to currently use either Facebook or Twitter at the time of data collection. All participants reported using Facebook, and 60%

reported using Twitter. As such, the majority of overall participants used both SNS platforms. Other SNSs listed that fell outside of the primary scope of the present study included: LinkedIn (80%), Instagram (67%), Snapchat (40%), Academia.edu (7%), ResearchGate (7%), and a write-in response of "Vitae (Chronicle of Higher Education)" (7%). While a few questions did ask about all of the participants' social media accounts, the primary focus of the study was on their use of Facebook and Twitter.

Recruitment

For adjunct faculty, recruitment was open to all disciplines. However, for staff participants, recruitment targeted specific departments where employees typically work with students and/or alumni on a regular basis (at least once per week). Examples of targeted staff departments include: Academic Advising, Student Affairs, and Development/Alumni Relations. This targeted staff approach was designed to allow for as close of a comparison as possible between both groups of participants, in regards to possible audiences they might, or might not, engage with on SNSs, specifically in regards to students and alumni. All eligible participants were required to currently use either Facebook and/or Twitter, at the time of data collection.

Initial participants were recruited for the study by using available faculty, staff and department listservs. Then, a snowball sampling method was used to collect referrals from initial participants in order to obtain additional study participants. Each participant was asked to refer both adjunct faculty and staff participant leads who they believed might use either Facebook or Twitter. Referral requests were adjusted as the study progressed in an effort to balance out the number of adjunct faculty and staff member participants. Recruitment was ceased when a point of data saturation was reached. That is, when interviews failed to uncover new information the

researcher had not yet heard in previous interviews. Participation in this study was fully voluntary; no incentives were provided.

Procedure

A brief pre-survey was sent via email to all prospective participants in order to screen for eligible participants, as well as to gain demographic, employment, and basic SNS use information. The email contained a brief introduction to the research study as well as a link to the pre-survey. In the beginning of the pre-survey, an information sheet (see Appendix A) was displayed, which was followed by a prompt asking participants to select either "Yes" or "No" in response to the question, "Do you wish to participate in this study?" All final participants in the study were required to indicate "Yes" as their desire to participate and proceed within the study. In total, 19 respondents completed the pre-survey, with four being disqualified for not satisfying the study's minimum eligibility criteria.

Then, qualified participants (N=15) were invited to participate in a one-on-one, semi-structured in-depth interview lasting no more than 1.5 hours in length. In order to qualify for the present study, participants needed to be currently employed as either an adjunct faculty or staff member; have worked within higher education for at least one month; currently worked with students and/or alumni on at least a weekly basis; and use either Facebook and/or Twitter at least every few weeks. Prior to the start of the interview, a separate consent form (Appendix B) was provided to participants, in which their signature was required in order to proceed. The interviews were held in private meeting rooms on college and university campuses, or other similar spaces, with access to Wi-Fi. To aid in the analysis process, interviews were audio-

recorded. Participants were given the option of declining audio-recording on the consent form; no participants declined audio-recording of the interviews.

An interview guide was created to ask participants about their SNS use. Specifically, the different sections pertained to: 1) general SNS use, 2) audience/context collapse, 3) created content/self-withdrawal, 4) self-presentation, and 5) imagined audiences. Some of the questions included in the interview guide (see Appendix C) were inspired by interview questions developed by LaPoe, Olson, and Eckert (2017) in their recent study on SNSs. Two pilot interviews were conducted prior to data collection, from which the interview guide was modified slightly to add clarity and streamline interview questions. Once data collection commenced, the interview guide remained unchanged through the completion of the final interview.

At the end of the interview, in section 5 (imagined audiences), participants were asked to login to either their Facebook or Twitter account. Immediately preceding this section, participants were reminded of their voluntary participation in the study and were given the opportunity to opt-out. However, no participants opted out. During this final section, participants were prompted to identify, display and discuss specific posts which included conceptualizations of various imagined audiences (professional or work-related, personal, and both) they were thinking of while posting or sharing each post. Screenshots of participant SNS feeds depicting imagined audience examples, and any other examples that might have aided the researcher in the post-interview analysis, were captured during the interview with permission from each research participant.

Measures

A pre-survey was used to capture basic background and demographic data, and to determine participant eligibility in the study, but results were not used during data analysis. The pre-survey consisted of blank fields for participants to write in their responses (e.g. name, age, position title, etc.) as well as multiple-choice prompts (e.g. gender, race/ethnicity, length of time in current position, SNSs currently used, etc.) where, depending on the nature of the question, participants either selected one response (gender) or multiple responses (SNSs currently used). The pre-survey also asked participants about frequency in regards to working with students or alumni, and also in regards to how often they used various SNSs, based on their prior indications of ones they currently used. For these questions, the frequency scales used were modeled after ones found in the complete report of Pew Research Center's "Social Media Update 2016" (Greenwood, Perrin & Duggan, 2016).

Data Analysis

The interviews were transcribed prior to analysis. Initial transcripts were completed by VoiceBase, a web-based transcription service. Then, they were checked for accuracy and corrected by the researcher and student research assistants. Four of the transcripts were outsourced and completed by an external transcriber. Once all interviews were fully transcribed, the researcher read through the data, section by section of the interview guide, to identify salient themes across participant responses. A directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) of interviews was conducted where themes were identified as guided by pre-determined key concepts. As part of this process, emergent thematic coding was completed representative of patterns and trends in participant responses.

A series of readings took place during data analysis to ensure a thorough understanding of participant experiences using social media as members of higher education, self-presentational practices, challenges and concerns expressed, and any indicators of self-withdrawal. An initial reading was conducted to capture the essence and key concepts of participant responses, followed by a second reading (at a minimum) to identify commonalities and major themes. Second readings were conducted by cohort (Adjunct Faculty, Staff, Dual Role) to determine if any differences or similarities existed. As major themes emerged across the data, representative participant quotes were selected as well. The researcher was fully responsible for the analysis of the data; no coding software was used in the present study.

Results

Results from the current study yielded some expected and some surprising findings. With different social circles coming together on social media, various strategies to appropriately manage one's self-presentation were employed. This study uncovers two new strategies to achieve this, including the use of Facebook groups and lists. Regarding concerns and challenges, no major differences were identified between cohorts. That is, many expressed similar concerns and challenges, yet, surprisingly, privacy concerns were only mentioned by a few. Finally, while many participants experienced context collapse on their primary SNS, a large number of participants avoided or effectively managed it by separating or segmenting their audiences. A lack of audience separation or segmentation resulted in significant repercussions for one's personal self and space on social media, with strong signs of self-withdrawal.

General SNS Use

Adjunct faculty and staff in the present study reported a wide array of uses of Facebook and Twitter, although some commonalities exist. While all participants reported using Facebook, just under half (47%) claimed to be current users of Twitter—a slightly lower percentage than the number who reported current use of Twitter on the pre-survey. Overall, nearly all participants appeared to use Facebook as their primary SNS, with only one participant preferring Twitter over Facebook. In this instance, this particularly tech-savvy Dual Role participant expressed frustration over a sense of clutter on Facebook's general feed and a lack of control over the visibility and timeliness of friends' posts showing up on his feed. However, with an obligation of managing various group pages on Facebook, he reduces his time spent on the platform by posting indirectly through his linked Twitter account, which he described as his "landing point for all my social needs" (Participant #113). Although, this case was an outlier in the sample studied; linking SNS accounts (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram) was not common.

As expected, all participants mentioned connecting with family and friends on Facebook. However, the most commonly cited reason for using Facebook was to connect with family and friends who are located geographically distant from them—either across the country, or even across the world. One female Dual Role participant (#111) explained that she doesn't tend to check the Facebook pages of people she sees regularly, but, rather, uses Facebook to stay updated on those who do not live near her. On Twitter, some participants mentioned connecting with family or friends, but this SNS was overwhelmingly used for professional reasons (e.g. connecting with university offices and departments (86% of those using Twitter); updating/informing students (57%); interacting at professional conferences (43%); etc.). Personal usage of Twitter was quite limited compared to participants' personal use of Facebook.

On Facebook, some users mentioned showcasing their travel adventures by posting photos for followers to see, others mentioned updating their connections on their children (e.g. pictures of kids' Halloween costumes), but the majority of users (73%) discussed using Facebook for professional reasons in some way, alongside their personal use of the SNS. Some examples include reading articles related to a participant's profession, being a part of and engaging with (including promoting for) a professional association, brainstorming and collaborating on work-related projects or ideas, managing or participating in Facebook groups or pages, and connecting with fellow committee members or attendees from conferences. One female Dual Role participant referred to these connections as "conference friends," and uses Facebook as a way to stay up-to-date with what's happening in their lives in-between when she sees them at each year's conference. She explained that if she didn't use Facebook in this way, "I would feel like maybe I'm like starting new every time I saw those people at a conference" (Participant #111). Facebook helps to bridge the gap from year to year in-person encounters.

While many participants cited using Facebook professionally, others did not. Further, the various way these professional purposes materialized on a user's Facebook account differed from participant to participant. Therefore, participant experiences, common themes, and differences will be discussed in more detail for both Facebook and Twitter throughout the following sections.

Managing Self-Presentation

As Goffman (1959) explains, people perform differently in the presence of different audiences. However, what happens when various audiences converge on social media? The first research question asked how higher education professionals manage their mediated self-

presentation among mixed (collapsed) audiences on social networking sites. There appears to be a fair share of context collapse occurring on both adjunct faculty and staff members' Facebook accounts, although not as much on Twitter. The blending of personal and professional worlds is evident by participants connecting with colleagues (67%), alumni (40%), bosses (40%) and current students (20%), and, as mentioned earlier, by almost three-quarters of participants using Facebook for a variety of professional reasons. This professional activity either related to their work as an adjunct faculty or staff member, their affiliation or membership in a broader professional community, or in support of an external business venture. One female Adjunct Faculty member (Participant #112) even talked in detail about her volunteer work organizing, facilitating discussions, and marketing for nonprofit organizations.

However, with so many different audiences and roles coming together on Facebook, participants use a variety of methods to manage their presentation of self. The first way is by using different platforms to connect with different audiences. That is, some participants reserved Facebook for personal connections by using either Twitter or LinkedIn for work-related reasons, or for professional connections as a whole, for example:

- I prefer to keep Facebook my friends. (Participant #110)
- My professional connections are all with LinkedIn. (Participant #112)
- I try to avoid mixing Facebook with professional. (Participant #109)

These quotes demonstrate the desire to separate one's personal sphere from their professional sphere by using SNS platforms for different audiences. In this last excerpt (Participant #109), there is an assumption, made by the participant, conflating the personal sphere with Facebook. That is, in this example, Facebook is perceived to be inherently personal and not a space to mix with professional life.

Second, another common strategy used to manage multiple audiences was using Facebook groups. Forty percent of participants mentioned using groups—some managing, some just participating. Most are closed-groups and the nature of them varies widely, including relating to: professional conferences; committees; mentoring; health and fitness; physical and mental health conditions; vacation planning; dog breeds; book clubs; and student groups, among others. Since these are walled-off spaces where the audience is limited and shares a common interest or experience, participants are able to express themselves more openly, compared with their entire Facebook network.

For example, a male Dual Role participant (#106) shared an example of when he posted on Facebook about coming down with pneumonia. He posted about this in two different places: on his general Facebook feed, and in a closed men's health group. However, his self-presentation was different depending on the audience. On his general feed, his post contained background information and context, technical terminology, longer sentences and more words (36). In the closed men's health group, his message was more direct, used less technical terms and details, and included a brief note of encouragement for readers to take their health seriously by visiting a doctor when feeling ill. This post only contained 23 words. In the first post, more details, technical terms, and context leading up to his diagnosis were provided, serving as a robust update to his general connections (e.g. his mom). In the second post, he provided a quick update, but his post mostly served as a model for healthy behavior among fellow group members.

This Dual Role participant (#106) uses Facebook groups extensively and even creates one for each class he teaches. However, he clarified that he doesn't "friend" students, but rather tells them they can create a "dummy" account. The Facebook group is embedded within each class's curriculum, serving as a common space to share content, such as presentations, and collaborate.

He also posts announcements and class handouts within the group as well. He explains, "it gives more options for communication, which I think is always good, and it also helps build a class community."

The third method for managing various audiences is using Facebook lists. While this method was less common, and less well-known overall, it appears to be an effective way to segment one's audience. One female Dual Role participant (#110) has all of her Facebook network divided across different lists, including high school friends; college friends; church connections; parents of her kids' friends; and even a list of her "favorites" who get to see everything. She also has a separate list for her work connections, so she can easily block them from a post:

> Now if I am going to post something that I don't want somebody to see, that's why I have them in groups, I will block my work population from seeing that because it might be something, not against my job, but something I don't necessarily want my professional colleagues [to see]. (Participant #110)

While she said this doesn't happen often, she might block coworkers if she shares something that is quite personal in nature. In this instance, college friends, family, and her "favorites" would have access to such a post. By enabling and disabling post visibility for her various lists of connections, this participant is able to control a collapsing of contexts on Facebook.

Finally, while existing research has shown that some SNS users manage context collapse by creating multiple accounts on a single platform (LaPoe, Olson & Eckert, 2017), most of the participants in this study did not appear to use this method. Only one Adjunct Faculty participant (#107) reported having a second account on Facebook, but she admitted that she had completely forgotten about it until prompted during the interview. She explained it was created as a model

for her students in one of her former classes. However, on Twitter, this method was found to be a bit more common. One male Dual Role participant (#113) mentioned having four accounts: one personal account, two business accounts, and one "fake" account he created "for fun" to share jokes related to his industry.

Another female Staff participant (#101) discussed managing multiple accounts. On Facebook, she manages her office's official account, and on Twitter, she posts from her office's account, a social justice account, and her personal account. She commented on how easy it is on Twitter to switch between accounts that she's posting from, which allows her to quickly and easily manage her self-presentation according to audience and which role (personal, professional, activist) she is assuming. She explained, "I started my own account so I could say my personal opinions and not represent a whole movement...". Therefore, by using various accounts she can represent herself appropriately (according to role) yet express herself openly by properly segmenting the audience.

Even though the aforementioned strategies were used to effectively manage participants' self-presentation among a converged mixed audience on Facebook, multiple social circles (including personal and professional/work-related) were often still combining on their general feed. For many, this may be impacting their overall behavior and use of Facebook. Specifically, almost half of participants (47%) emphasized using Facebook for their own personal pleasure, or to share positive, uplifting content, while avoiding negative content, for example:

- I like Facebook for fun things. I don't want to be serious. (Participant #107)
- I try to keep the negative off because I don't... you know, I try to keep Facebook for fun, not for the constant negative. (Participant #110)

- It’s kind of funny. I don’t use it for what I would think I should use it for. I’m very into politics, I’m very into current events, but I use it mostly for entertainment and for posting. I’m that one person that’ll post that cute dog video. (Participant #104)

As seen, these participants were clear in expressing their desire and intention of keeping Facebook a positive, upbeat, joyful environment.

Some of this emphasis on positive content seemed to be in direct response to the recent divisive 2016 Presidential election. One Dual Role participant (#110) mentioned that she was unfriended by several connections after posting more heavily about politics during the campaign and expressing her concerns after the presidential transfer of power. In fact, only one participant mentioned openly discussing politics on her Facebook page, two participants reported posting more about politics during the election than they do now, and seven participants (47%, including the primary Twitter user) explicitly stated that they avoid posting about politics. Some argued that Facebook is not the appropriate platform for the subject (along with religion), and others cited the nature of their work as higher education professionals as the reason to not post about politics, for example:

- I don't feel like Facebook is my platform to express anything related to politics, religion, [or] businesses. You know maybe a nonprofit. (Participant #109)
- I still see myself as, you know, being a higher ed. [professional] and, working with students, you’ve got to be neutral in some regard because when you’re working with a student and trying to help them see their potential or where they want to go, I can’t go in there and start sprouting what I believe in. (Participant #114)

Therefore, with so many participants avoiding controversial topics such as politics and religion, perhaps collapsed contexts strains one’s self-presentation. While certain segments may

appreciate or agree with a political post, others might feel alienated or offended. With greater audience diversity of opinions brings greater uncertainty in reactions and results—and possibly greater instances of self-withdrawal.

Challenges and Concerns

Social media can bring people together, but SNSs can also become complex digital spaces to navigate. The second research question asked about the challenges and concerns adjunct faculty and staff members face when posting on SNSs and whether these are different or similar based on employment role. Overall, adjunct faculty and staff appear to face many of the same challenges, including: personal and professional worlds merging on SNSs, image and impression management, platform competency, frequency in posting, appropriateness of Facebook as a communication channel, privacy concerns, and a pressure to use SNSs for work or professional purposes. No major differences appeared to exist between adjunct faculty and staff cohorts. Of course, this comparison is complicated by the large emergent third cohort of Dual Role participants (47%), leaving both adjunct faculty and staff cohorts to be quite small with just four members in each (27% each). While no major differences in challenges and concerns were identified, several themes emerged from across the data.

First, a major theme found across all participant cohorts was a concern over personal and professional worlds blending. Some participants were clear about dividing these two spheres, where other participants allowed some blending (i.e. connecting with coworkers, students or alumni, and sometimes bosses), but still voiced concerns. For example, one female Staff participant stated that Facebook is “strictly family” (#108). She explained that previously, she

once connected with a colleague on Facebook and "felt, like, such an invasion of privacy." Other participants expressed concern as well, for example:

- I think I just keep my professional life and my personal life separate I don't feel a need to mix them…. So if I go to vacation on the beach and I'm having a piña colada, I really don't care for my boss or my coworkers to see that. (Participant #109)
- I would feel really uncomfortable using [Facebook] for professional reasons…because then I wouldn't have anywhere to go that's like... It would be like I'm taking my work home with me. (Participant #102)
- I don't want to be only known as a professional. (Participant #115)

As is clear from these examples, participants feel concerned about personal and professional worlds blending for a variety of reasons. One participant cited feeling an invasion of privacy by allowing a coworker into her personal world of Facebook, another doesn't want people at her work seeing photos of her enjoying an alcoholic beverage on the beach, and another would feel a decrease in her work-life balance—the latest sentiment was echoed by another Dual Role participant as well. In the last example (Participant #115), this Adjunct Faculty participant is concerned that her portrayal on Facebook has become *too* professional, suggesting that her professional persona is overshadowing her personal one.

In general terms, this concept of portrayal ties into the next theme. The second major concern that was identified across cohorts is participant image and impression management on SNSs, or one's self-presentation. Many participants expressed various concerns in relation to their image on social media, or what sort of an impression others might perceive. Some participants expressed concern over how something they posted or shared might be perceived, or what the possible ramifications could be. In the former example, a female Staff member

(Participant #108) discussed enjoying humorous political content shared by her brother on Facebook but hesitated to share it on her own account for fear of offending some of her close friends who hold different views. While she admitted to laughing "out loud" to such content, her concerns over how it would be perceived and impact others' impression of her took precedence in her decision.

Other participants mentioned their desire to uphold a professional image on either Facebook or Twitter. A female Staff member referred to herself as a "brand" (Participant #101), explaining that the type of content she interacts with on Twitter, and how she interacts, reflects back on her image as a professional. While many participants mentioned maintaining an overall image and feeling of positivity on their Facebook accounts, one male Staff member described his page as "G-rated" (Participant #104). He explained that he doesn't want to offend anyone and uses other channels to have deeper dialogue (e.g. in person, or phone call). Further, since he is connected with students, he states, "I want to set a good example and be a good role model." Students seem to up the ante in terms of how one is portraying him- or herself on social media.

Similarly, another female Staff participant (#103) expressed concern over students' potential impression of her based on her Facebook page. She explained that when she started in her staff role, she was close in age to many of the students she was working with. Therefore, she "wanted to … intentionally create that barrier … so that I'd appear more professional and not as much as one of them." She admits that before connecting with students, she filtered out some things she wouldn't want them to see on her Facebook page and changed her behavior of what types of things she would post. One example is posting about politics:

> Moving into my professional position, that's one of the things that I gave up because I just did not want to be or appear like I didn't care for students because of their political perspective. (Participant #103)

In this way, in order to be effective at her job, she felt a need to change the way she was behaving (i.e. what she was posting about) on her personal Facebook page. Therefore, with students added to the blended audience equation, image becomes an even greater consideration. Overall, with various audiences coming together in one space, this seems to contribute to a heightened awareness and concern for adjunct faculty and staff members' image and impression given off on their personal social media accounts.

Another common concern among participants was that of competency and if they were using a particular SNS platform correctly, namely Twitter. Though there weren't many participants actively using Twitter in general, a large proportion of Twitter-using participants expressed concern over using it appropriately (i.e. hashtags, tagging, meeting the 140-character limit):

- That's one of the challenges is that sometimes I don't know if it's even making sense what I'm doing or if anybody's paying attention. (Participant #103)
- I'll start to type something and I'll be like 'I'm going to come across looking like a total idiot because I don't know how to use hashtags correctly on this one, so I'm just going to retweet this person who said it better than I could anyway.' (Participant #110)

Overall, there was a lot more uncertainty expressed by participants using Twitter, than those using Facebook. This was especially evident if a participant was tagging in someone else or using hashtags. In the second example above, a Dual Role participant (#110) distinguished that

she puts more thought and curation into her Twitter posts compared to those she shares on Facebook. This is mostly due to her separation of audience—she reserves Facebook for personal use, while using Twitter primarily for professional reasons. To avoid using Twitter incorrectly and feeling incompetent, she retweets posts from others rather than creating her own.

Another female Staff participant (#108) demonstrated this idea of curation well. She explained her process of scrutinizing her tweets before posting:

> On Twitter … if I'm tagging, so 'Am I saying this right?' you know, thinking again and thinking again … before it posts and then I think it over and over and over, read it over, over and over, and edit it, you know, 100 times before it actually goes out there. (Participant #108)

In this way, Tweeting becomes a grueling process. What is designed to be a quick update on what is taking place becomes a burden that she must pour over—over and over again. She explained that much calculation goes into her Tweets to make sure they are accurate, polished, and effective. While this occurs less often on Facebook, she admitted she is still quite calculated in her Facebook posts, especially as she often must decide between posting in Spanish, or in English "just for simplicity purposes" (despite the Spanish-speaking target audience).

Similar to posting appropriately, a handful of participants expressed concern about frequency of posting, making it clear when and what types of things they will and will not post. These participants were concerned about their posts being relevant and interesting to their connections. Therefore, a couple of participants mentioned they refrain from posting daily, mundane content. As one female Dual Role participant (#111) stated, "I don't post, like, my random daily life." Adjunct faculty and staff who expressed concern over posting mundane content explained they don't necessarily post every day, like some of the people they are

connected to, but rather post things of particular interest. One female Dual Role participant (#109) discussed how she posts mostly while traveling, or for a special event, such as a wedding, holiday, or family reunion:

> I post frequently, almost daily, when I'm on a[n] international trip because I just have a lot of friends and acquaintances who, who also enjoy international or international travel and so they always enjoy it when I post. So when I'm traveling it's daily, then when I get home barely anything. Weeks and weeks will go by nothing…that I'll post. It has to be fairly significant, like a major event. But otherwise I don't tend to post very much at home. (Participant #109)

This individual has major swings in her posting behavior on Facebook: Low activity in her daily life—unless it's a special occasion—then at the extreme posting almost daily while traveling abroad. As a whole, this group of adjunct faculty and staff refrained from sharing every small detail about their lives on Facebook. Instead, they posted in a more intentional and purposeful way.

The next theme that emerged relates more to Facebook as a channel of communication. Specifically, some of the participants discussed Facebook as an inappropriate place to discuss certain topics and to engage in deep conversations. As mentioned earlier, just under half of participants said they avoid politics on Facebook, with some aiming to appear politically neutral, or "a-political" (Participant #106). In regards to politics, one female Dual Role participant (#111) stated she won't argue on Facebook and avoids posting things that might cause a "massive argument." She explained that Facebook is not the most "productive way to…have a confrontation or even a discussion." Other participants shared this perspective as well. Some

clarified that Facebook is not the right medium for controversial conversations or deep dialogue. Rather, in-person conversations or phone calls would be better alternatives.

Surprisingly, only a few participants mentioned a concern over privacy. Two participants expressed concern about their children's privacy—one did not post much about her kids in consideration of them growing up online, while the other participant did appear to post about her kids frequently. Both discussed using various privacy features and strategies, including using various account names (e.g. maiden versus married name). The former participant, a female Adjunct Faculty member (#109), even shared a personal experience of being stalked, which led to her being extra cautious about all of her social media behavior. A couple of other participants expressed concern of posting photos while being away from home, in fear of that information getting into the wrong hands. In these cases, they would ask friends to wait to post photos until they were back home, but that did not always happen.

Finally, though not always expressed as an explicit concern, one major theme that is worth noting is a sense of pressure to use social media either for work-related or broader professional reasons (e.g. professional associations, connect with fellow professionals in field, etc.). This important theme provided interesting and complex results. Forty percent of participants admitted they felt an explicit pressure, 27% disagreed that they felt any pressure to use social media for work or professionally, and, most importantly, one-third of participants denied that they felt pressure but gave examples that alluded otherwise. This last group gave reasons such as needing to keep up with technology, that it was not pressure but either annoying or expected, or that it was not pressure but something else that they couldn't identify. Some examples of the ranges in responses can be found in Table 2.

Table 2

Sample Responses to Feeling Pressure to use Facebook or Twitter for Work/Professional Purposes

ID #	Quote
Yes	
115	Sometimes I look at my Facebook newsfeed and I think 'oh, I better do this, I better share this'…I feel like I need to share information.
103	I feel like I should be a better Tweeter than I am.
113	Facebook is a chore.
108	[Pressure] was not imposed by the actual office, 'You're not doing this yet.' It was more like a personal, like, you know, I will become obsolete if I don't learn this.
No	
104	No, I haven't felt that, and actually it's been the opposite. It's kind of been like Facebook is a social tool.
106	Pressure? No, I think it's voluntary as part of my creative process, and it's part of my collaborative process, that's part of the way that we build things. And it's part of the
No, But Something Else	
114	I wouldn't say pressure. I think in some situations it's almost surprising if you're not…I think it's unusual…It's expected.
107	Sometimes I feel like, I don't feel pressured it's just something you get annoyed by.
110	I mean I… in the sense that I need to keep up with technology for my students to be able to like, to be able to want to relate.
105	I don't feel pressure, but I feel some kind of…I think that's the kind of pressure I feel is that…Being a little bit older in the workplace and being surrounded by college students.

While a couple of participants commented on the benefits and opportunities of social media, many others either acknowledged an explicit pressure to use social media professionally or for work, or they discussed an implicit pressure (avoiding becoming antiquated or obsolete, relating to students, social media use being an expectation and a norm, etc.). Even though these participants weren't always directly acknowledging a sense of pressure, it was clear that it exists, even if implicitly.

This was further demonstrated by the subgroup of participants who did not want to label it as pressure but could not always come up with an alternative. Additionally, it was commonly

mentioned by Staff participants to use Twitter to engage during professional conferences. As one female Dual Role participant (#105) revealed, “When I go to conferences and things, that's when I'm more likely to tweet something because they urge you to tweet. [They’ll] say ‘tweet this at…’” This is a clear example of explicit pressure. Although, the true danger exists in participants’ blindness to this underlying pressure to use social media for work or for broader professional purposes. Whether it’s expected, implied, encouraged, or clearly articulated, this sense of pressure can serve as a major obstacle and challenge for adjunct faculty and staff, as personal and professional worlds collide on social media.

Collapsed Contexts and Self-Withdrawal

The third research question explored how context collapse leads to feelings and behaviors of self-withdrawal among adjunct faculty and staff members. As mentioned earlier, many participants are taking active measures to manage a collapsing of multiple audiences on their social media accounts. These tactics include: using various Facebook groups, using Facebook lists to segment and block different members, using different accounts differently to engage with different audiences, and some used different accounts on the same platform (mostly Twitter). Converging audiences does appear to impact behavior on social media.

One female Staff member (Participant #101) described her Facebook connections like a Venn diagram. She explained that she has her personal connections, her professional or work-related connections, and then she has a blended group that account for the overlapped middle of the two spheres. She could not quite figure out how to classify them, as they easily fit into both categories—this was not uncommon among the other participants (e.g. former students/alumni, former colleagues or bosses, etc.). However, she treats this varied audience on Facebook the

same. On Twitter, she manages a social movement account, her personal business account, her office's account, and her personal account. In this way, she is able to effectively split identities and target her audience appropriately—something she does less frequently on Facebook.

What is interesting is that diversity in audience seems to play a major factor on adjunct faculty and staff behavior on social media. The narrower the audience, the more comfortable participants seemed to feel, and the less self-withdrawal seems to be evident. Two participants shared opposing experiences of Twitter, based on their perception of audience:

- [Compared to Facebook] I'm less censored I guess but it's more specific topics that I would be communicating about. (Participant #103)
- Twitter can be personal but it's also open to my job, so I also keep that one... I'll say, if I do want to state an opinion I'll state it more on Facebook than I will on Twitter. (Participant #110)

In the first example, this female Staff participant (#103) distinguishes between her Facebook page, where she has multiple audiences coming together (including work-related and professional) and Twitter, where she only uses for professional purposes and for hobbies (i.e. sports updates). She admits that she can express herself a bit more freely (e.g. post political content) on Twitter since she uses that SNS for more specific topics and due to the audience being narrower (many professional connections share similar political views).

In the second example, this participant's (#110) experience of Twitter is in complete opposition to the first participant, which can be attributed to the composition of audience on her SNS accounts. On Facebook, she is connected to some coworkers, but, overall, claims to maintain a separation between her personal and professional worlds. However, on Twitter, since she has a wider audience (including professional connections and some random strangers), she

admits to being much more cautious and keeps her content "P.G." Therefore, she defers to Facebook to express herself openly and honestly. What's clear from these examples is how big of an influence audience composition can have on one's behavior online—especially as it relates to self-withdrawal.

In this study, self-withdrawal consists of the feeling of wanting to pull away or detach from a SNS community, through reducing (or eliminating altogether) public disclosures, or by withholding certain information (depth, breadth, or specific topics). It also encompasses self-censorship as a method of retracting oneself and one's disclosures. Based on the participant data, self-withdrawal materialized throughout this study in a couple different ways.

First, self-withdrawal was illustrated by participants maintaining their Facebook account as a positive, happy, and uplifting space. Avoiding negativity was commonly cited among participants. Second, many participants mentioned avoiding certain controversial topics to "avoid fallout" (Participant #110) from their connections, to avoid arguing or stirring arguments, and to avoid offending or excluding some of their connections, especially students. Usually such controversial topics included politics or religion. Third, participants also made the distinction that Facebook is not the right medium for deep dialogue or drawn out conversations. One participant explained that he would invite connections, including students, to move to a channel where it can be easier to carry on an in-depth conversation (i.e. over the phone). In these examples, participants exhibit self-withdrawal by limiting the content they produce on Facebook—either depth, breadth or specific topics.

Fourth, a couple of participants even explicitly mentioned self-censoring their content on Facebook. A male Staff participant (#104) admitted to censoring his Facebook content to be "all group appropriate." He even referred to his page as "G" appropriate. One female Staff member

(Participant #103) explained that over the course of time, and the evolution of who gained access to Facebook, she changed her disclosures on the SNS:

> I'm a little more censored. I still am pretty open but I'm more censored with what I'm sharing because when I first started it was only people in your institution that you were a student at and it was a much smaller community who kind of knew and were part of everything that you were doing anyway... I think that I'm maybe a bit more censored because there are all of these people and I don't necessarily need all of them to know what I'm doing all at all times.

From this example, it's clear to see how the diversifying of one's audience can lead to self-withdrawal. Content, behavior and self-disclosures that were once appropriate, shared and normal, is not as safe to share among a converged mixed audience. These examples illustrate yet another form of self-withdrawal—censoring what one makes public on social media. With some participants being connected to students or their boss, some support for the "lowest common denominator" (Hogan, 2010) approach to dealing with context collapse was evident.

Fifth, some participants even expressed a desire to quit Facebook at one time, or to reduce their frequency of using it. One male Dual Role participant (#113) explained that he despises Facebook and would quit—and he wishes he could—but is unable to due to the Facebook pages that he manages as part of side businesses he is involved in. Through these pages he is tethered. A female Adjunct Faculty member (Participant #115) expressed a desire to limit her usage of Facebook and even deleted it off her phone, but ultimately found a need to add it back on her phone for ease of use in light of pressure to use Facebook for professional obligations. Finally, a female Dual Role participant (#111) explained:

> In the past, like I would get lost in it…and I was like 'Is this really a good use of my time?'

In this last example, the very value of Facebook is questioned. However, with the various professional associations and committees she engages with on the platform, quitting seemed more troublesome in the end. Therefore, based on these examples, self-withdrawal takes another form of wanting to withdraw oneself from the medium—to remove oneself from the never-ending conversation or to at least take a step back. Unfortunately, this isn't always realized.

While context collapse, the blending of personal and professional worlds, and subsequent self-withdrawal is clear to see based on participant data, the threat of context collapse persists and was evident among participants. There appears to be a need to separate and segment audiences, especially based on participants' use of groups and lists within a platform. However, participants did mention avoiding connecting with certain individuals, mostly on Facebook. These individuals included colleagues, bosses and current students, with bosses and current students causing the most controversy. Although, usually former students (alumni) were accepted, but some participants specified they needed to have some type of relationship with them to connect on Facebook.

Surprisingly, only three participants (20%) mentioned avoiding bosses or managers, but those who did felt quite strongly about the subject. One female Dual Role participant (#109) explained that she wants to be monitored and judged for her performance at work while on the job, not on social media (her space for personal life). She said she does not necessarily want her bosses knowing her political preference, religious views, or what businesses she supports. Those things are irrelevant to her office's mission, so they have no business seeing it. Another female Dual Role participant (#102) said she avoided coworkers for a long time until recently, and even

now she only has three. Further, she declared: "I would NEVER friend a boss on Facebook." Therefore, even though some close coworkers are acceptable, a boss or manager would clearly be crossing the line for this participant.

With two-thirds of all participants mentioning it, the most commonly cited group to avoid was current students. For most, this was a hard and fast rule, although a small minority of participants did connect with current students due to the nature of their job. While one female Adjunct Faculty member (Participant #107) said connecting with a current student on Facebook would be a "conflict of interest", another female Dual Role participant (#108) said for her it would be like having "multiple personality disorder…like going out drinking with your students." Therefore, this is clearly perceived as unacceptable behavior, and would lead to much confusion—potentially within and outside of the workplace.

Another female Dual Role participant (#111) explained that connecting with current students on Facebook would be crossing a line. She stated, "It would be like me handing out my cell phone number." For her, adding students would transform the SNS from personal and fun to it feeling more like work. Even though this participant does connect with colleagues and her boss, she draws a clear line in the sand for connecting with current students.

While many participants were effectively juggling various audiences on their SNS platform, they realized how connecting with certain parties would dramatically impact their overall behavior:

- I think it would change the experience completely. I think I would feel a little bit more uncomfortable only because I would have to be way more guarded, more cautious. (Participant #108)

- I think I would feel like I had to be more 'on'…like I would always be working even on the Internet. (Participant #111)
- I would probably post a lot less because it would feel less like I'm talking to family and friends and more like somebody is invading my personal space. (Participant #102)
- I would probably just avoid it. I probably wouldn't use Facebook much at all. It would probably die of extinction. (Participant #109)

What's clear to see from these participant quotes is that one major result of mixing in unwanted individuals (e.g. bosses, students, colleagues) on Facebook is self-withdrawal. Participants explained their guard would go up, their sense of privacy would be invaded, and they would post much less—to the extent of their account going extinct. The threat of context collapse—particularly the blurring of personal and professional boundaries—is real and carries significant ramifications for one's *personal* social media account, though it doesn't always appear to be perceived.

Finally, perhaps one participant best demonstrates the concept of self-withdrawal. A female Adjunct Faculty member (Participant #115) uses Facebook for both personal and professional reasons. She is a Trustee for a professional association and, as part of her role, she posts, shares and promotes a lot of content on Facebook on behalf of the association. She does not use groups or lists when promoting, however, she posts everything to her general Facebook feed. When asked about feeling any pressure, she admitted that she does feel pressure and is explicitly encouraged to use Facebook in this way by the leaders in the association.

As a result, her personal persona has been overthrown by her professional persona on Facebook, from which she has expressed concern over only being known for her professional

image. Beyond her image, she expressed concern over another serious consequence, "I have to be on [Facebook for professional reasons], I feel, so that's what's kind of frustrating too because I feel like it takes away from my personal relationships at times." As one can see, this participant (#115) is fully embodying self-withdrawal, and, as a result, her motivation to use Facebook has decreased and her personal relationships have suffered. The scale has tipped in the direction of her professional persona.

What's clear from the research sample studied is that context collapse and the blending of personal and professional spheres has become quite common on social media, even for those who claim to value a separation between their professional and personal lives. Consequentially, the SNS itself morphs into a hybrid space of work and leisure, though the result is a new format altogether with many participants sanitizing content they post—a sign of self-withdrawal. Many adjunct faculty and staff participants exhibited both feelings and behaviors of self-withdrawal, in various forms, and acknowledged a threat of a further collapsing of audiences and contexts online.

Discussion

Findings from this study reveal that context collapse and blurring personal and professional boundaries pose significant challenges with important consequences. This was especially evident by the spectrum of behavior that emerged across the data, including: Strict Separators, Savvy Segmenters, Positive PG Posters, and Reluctant Participants. However, additional audience segmentation strategies, including Facebook groups and lists, were uncovered to allow for appropriate self-presentation. In addition, study results suggest a need to expand the concepts of context collapse, self-presentation, and the hyperpersonal model,

especially in light of SNSs and segmentation affordances. Overall the strategies discussed in the present study begin to establish best practices for those faced with using SNSs for both personal and non-personal purposes.

Most of the participants in the present study encountered some blurring of personal and professional worlds, even if at a minimum by those who work to maintain a division. However, many of the participants who were experiencing context collapse employed a variety of strategies to manage these various, sometimes opposing, audiences blending on social media. These strategies include using Facebook groups and lists, using different SNS platforms differently to engage with different audiences, and even creating different accounts on the same platform. In addition, another common strategy that was used, whether actively realized or not, was sanitizing or censoring one's content on social media. In this way, content was filtered to be appropriate for all potential viewers—sometimes despite the actual presence of those who might pose the biggest threat. This study complements current literature by adding the strategies of closed groups and lists as ways to manage context collapse.

However, consequences from context collapse certainly arose. Some participants did not post as much about certain topics (e.g. politics) or felt uncomfortable sharing their opinion, some scrutinized their content before posting publicly, some felt tethered to their accounts and questioned how they were spending their time, some felt explicit or implicit pressure to use for work or professionally, and others expressed concern over professional work overtaking the personal nature of the medium, shrinking one's work-life balance. All of this is especially alarming as it takes place on participants' *personal* social media accounts. That is, what was created to be a space of personal pass-time has been infiltrated by job duties and professional networking, which can result in a user experiencing self-withdrawal from the SNS.

What's more, not all participants are aware of the underlying pressure to use SNSs. While some participants mentioned it being explicitly suggested by either their job or professional affiliations, most discussed how social media participation is either expected in general or is necessary to stay up-to-date, particularly in relation to students. By using social media, participants admitted they are better able to relate to students (e.g. by using the same language), or by avoiding becoming antiquated or obsolete. However, after reviewing the data, what has become clear is that most participants do not associate this implicit pressure as being negative—some did not want to label it as pressure but could not come up with an alternative explanation.

This pressure to use social media for work or professional purposes becomes dangerous when adjunct faculty and staff are blind to it. With SNSs being innately personal, especially Facebook, one can forget this comfortable digital space has morphed into a personal/professional hybrid carrying repercussions for highly personal, sensitive or controversial content. It is in situations like these where adjunct faculty and staff members are at risk of losing their jobs or professional reputations, as the link to their personal social media account has already been established.

Spectrum of Behavior

Overall, participants' behavior on social media varied widely, although clusters of behavior types and approaches to self-presentation in regards to collapsed audiences emerged. After reviewing the data, a spectrum of behavior took shape, consisting of four different categories: Strict Separators, Savvy Segmenters, Positive PG Posters, and Reluctant Participants. Each category will be discussed in detail below.

Strict separators. Strict Separators are Adjunct Faculty, Staff and Dual Role participants who maintain a clear division between their personal and professional worlds. These are individuals who would feel an intense invasion of privacy should an unintended audience member gain access to their private social media account (i.e. Facebook). While some did have some coworkers or professional connections on their Facebook account (typically designated for personal connections only), these individuals were carefully vetted before being added. Participants were clear that these individuals had gained the participant's trust, transitioning from strictly work or professional to personal:

They've crossed over into that realm of... they're friends now. (Participant #112)

For Strict Separators, there is a well-defined, regulated boundary separating personal and professional spheres on SNSs, but crossover may happen if the relationship grows beyond professional.

In the final section of in-depth interviews, participants were asked to identify, display and discuss example posts they created or shared when they were thinking of professional audiences, personal audiences, and a post when they were thinking about both simultaneously. Since not all participants had professional connections to discuss (e.g. on Facebook), examples of personal posts will be shared and discussed.

For Strict Separators, one female Dual Role participant (#102) retweeted on Twitter (her professional-oriented SNS) a tweet of a cartoon about not wanting to go to work the next day and thinking of possible excuses. She explained that this post was geared towards a personal audience but was "professional funny." In this example, she is expressing a desire to not go to work, but it is considered safe enough to post among professional connections. This can be contrasted with her level of openness she'll share on her private Facebook page:

> Honestly, I post… 'I want to quit my job' like on Facebook and I don't even care. But then again, I'm not friends with my boss on Facebook. (Participant #102)

One can see how big of an impact separation of audiences can have on a participant's self-presentation.

Strict Separators enjoy some overall freedom of expression that some of the other participants were not able to take advantage of as broadly. Since their Facebook page is carefully vetted and safely guarded, they are able to post more freely with less effort spent on overthinking or worrying about how they are presenting themselves. One female Dual Role Strict Separator (Participant #109) illustrates this well:

- I feel so free with Facebook because I'm not having to edit and manage and control and double think all this stuff.
- I don't have to think that much and I don't think that hard. I really… I don't put a lot of thought into it.

Therefore, by separating personal and professional audiences, these participants are able to enjoy more work-life balance, at least on their personal Facebook page, and worry less about potential ramifications from their personal posts.

Savvy segmenters. Savvy Segmenters are primarily Dual Role participants, with one Staff member, who are encountering context collapse on SNSs but take their participation to the next level by employing strategies to effectively manage such a blending of audiences. These strategies include using Facebook groups and lists. Groups create a walled-off community where individuals can post more freely and express themselves in a way they might not on their general Facebook feed. A Facebook user does not necessarily need to be directly connected with an

individual to be in a group with them. Lists allow an individual to segment their audience by groups of people (e.g. family, high school friends, coworkers) so when they are posting, they can target certain segments of their audience, or, perhaps more importantly, they can block certain lists of people. Both groups and lists give Savvy Segmenters more control when they are posting and interacting with others to effectively navigate context collapse.

When sharing sample posts geared toward personal connections, one male Dual Role participant (#106) by default went to one of his closed groups to show a post where he challenged the whole group to participate in a goal challenge. In this post, he prompted group members to post a specific and achievable goal with a date for completing it. This post might not have worked as well on his general Facebook feed, since the nature of the group is about sharing ideas in regards to student success, personal accountability and reflection. In this way, the message was successfully segmented to the appropriate audience, providing richer results and relevant insights.

Another female Dual Role Savvy Segmenter (Participant #110) who uses Facebook lists mentioned that she has blocked her ex-husband and coworkers in previous posts. She also mentioned that she blocked some of her connections from seeing some of her posts during the 2016 Presidential election. While she could not find an example to share, she did find this to be an effective way to segment and manage her diverse audience on Facebook. Therefore, as illustrated in both examples, Savvy Segmenters have found technological affordances to combat a blending of audiences—especially for Participant #106 who uses Facebook groups extensively for personal and professional purposes, including each college course he teaches. Without these tools, adjunct faculty and staff would not be able to present themselves as appropriately, according to audience.

Positive PG posters. Positive PG Posters are Adjunct Faculty, Staff and Dual Role participants who emphasize only posting positive, uplifting content and avoiding negative or controversial content, such as politics. Some mentioned that Facebook is for fun or entertainment. In addition, participants in this category are also concerned with their posts being appropriate, or "PG" rated. These individuals are not maintaining a strict separation between personal and professional audiences. Therefore, their Positive PG behavior is likely a result of context collapse. With a broader audience—often including students, alumni, colleagues or bosses—participants are less likely to share their personal opinions about serious or controversial topics and sanitize or censor their content overall. In this way, their general public posts typically remain neutral and surface-level.

While sharing example posts while thinking of their personal audience, three out of the four participants in this category shared a photo on Facebook with family members. However, the fourth Positive PG Poster (Participant #113) uses Twitter primarily and described this SNS like a "diary." He explained that he posts for himself, whether his followers like his content or not. As an example, the sample tweet he pulled up was a photo of an antique mail chute from a hotel he recently visited. He says of this tweet:

> It's just a diary moment…. This may mean nothing to anybody but me and that's OK because it's what I remember… I think that when I post things like this I'm not looking to engage people, I'm more looking to document this moment. (Participant #113)

While he does tweet often to engage others for various side businesses, he also tweets for himself. However, even though he describes his Twitter account as a diary, it is actually more of a sanitized diary because he is aware it is a public account and explains he does not want to offend anyone.

From this example, one can see how with multiple audiences blending together the result is a sanitized, censored version of one's personal self—with an emphasis on positive and uplifting content. While these Positive PG Posters express themselves on SNSs, it tends to be more at a surface level and in a way that is more cautious or guarded. In order to maintain a "PG" rating, participants in this category may expend more thought in determining what is appropriate, and what is not appropriate, for how they present themselves among a collapsed audience online.

Reluctant participants. The final category, Reluctant Participants, are two Adjunct Faculty participants who are currently using Facebook but are exhibiting strong signs of self-withdrawal. These participants are either not using Facebook in the way they'd ideally like to be using Facebook (i.e. more professionally than personally), are using it too frequently based on external pressure they are feeling from others, or are heavily concerned about using Facebook due to privacy and security reasons. However, as a result of such felt pressure, they are tied to the SNS and feel an obligation to post—whether personally or professionally.

The first Reluctant Participant is a female Adjunct Faculty member (Participant #107) who has strong concerns over her and her children's privacy. She admitted to not enjoying posting (or having others post) pictures of herself and even mentioned not wanting to post too many pictures of her children in order to avoid having them grow up fully online. She explained that she limits when she posts pictures of her kids, usually to special occasions, so her family abroad can see them:

> I only pick certain times to post pictures of them like birthdays or Christmas, Halloween. And it's the privacy thing for them as well; they don't want their whole life on Facebook. (Participant #107)

However, she admitted she does get pressure from family members to post more frequently and sometimes feels guilty for not posting often enough. An example post she shared was a photo of her daughter, though she admitted she did not really want to share it. When asked why she did, she responded, "Because I haven't posted anything. I feel bad because I didn't send out Christmas cards this year..." She explains that usually when she does make an effort to take family photos, it is specifically for her mother-in-law who requests them. Otherwise, she feels guilty. She reluctantly participates in the SNS norms set for her, despite her concerns about privacy for herself and her children.

As detailed previously, the second Adjunct Faculty Reluctant participant (#115) experiences self-withdrawal differently. On her Facebook page, her content has become mostly professional in nature through her promoting, posting and sharing about a professional association of which she is a member. Therefore, her professional persona has overshadowed her personal persona online. Since she holds a Trustee position as part of this professional association, she is directly encouraged to participate in Facebook in this manner. In this way, she has become an organizational ambassador who has lost sight (and control) of her personal Facebook page. Instead, what was created to serve as her personal Facebook account has morphed into something that acts, looks and feels completely different—like work.

The result has been somewhat of a polarization, turning her Facebook activity into a chore and a duty, rather than it being for fun or for personal pleasure. While sharing an example of a personal post, she discussed an article that featured her daughter's medical treatment at a

local hospital. As someone who works in the healthcare field, she expressed pride in her daughter while describing the post, but also thought about her experience as a professional within the field:

> We have a lot of medically compromised patients…So I just thought that would be kind of…educational also for healthcare professionals. (Participant #115)

Therefore, it seems evident that this mindset of promotion permeates into her personal life as well. Perhaps since Facebook has become a space for professional duties, it has become hard for her to turn off that mentality. Spreading awareness and educational content has become habit. Even though this Reluctant Participant has openly admitted to wanting to limit her use of Facebook, she is tethered by her professional obligation to promote and reluctantly participates.

Overall, while participants fall into separate categories, the common thread running through each type that relates to subsequent behavior is that of the audience. Strict Separators have a clear division between personal and professional worlds, Savvy Segmenters use audience segmentation tools to re-establish context, Positive PG Posters maintain a sanitized and appropriate profile, and Reluctant Participants continue apprehensively while appeasing others. With separate audiences, Strict Separators are able to enjoy the most freedom while posting and expressing themselves. However, Savvy Segmenters follow closely behind in terms of freedom of expression by creating closed off communities or blocking unwanted viewers from their posts. Both of these groups appear to be successfully avoiding or managing context collapse, resulting in less indicators of self-withdrawal.

However, the remaining two groups are not as fortunate. Positive PG Posters are experiencing significant context collapse, resulting in their posting behavior becoming stripped of personal opinions—whether of a serious or potentially controversial nature. Their posts

remain surface-level and severely limited. Finally, Reluctant Participants also experience context collapse, and unfortunately have negotiated control over their posting behavior due to external pressure. In one case, personal relatives push the participant beyond her comfort zone, while in the other case the participant's professional persona overshadows her personal one. Both participate reluctantly, beyond their ideal level, due to external sources influencing their behaviors.

Therefore, audience composition is key, and audience separation or segmentation are important factors for appropriate self-presentation and personal fulfillment from one's personal social media account. When context collapse occurs on a SNS, without segmentation tools in place, one's behavior changes and signs of self-withdrawal become more prevalent. It seems clear that self-withdrawal is associated with broader, diverse audiences (especially blurred personal and professional ones), while narrower audiences foster greater self-expression and an openness in sharing content below surface level.

Self-Presentation Theory on SNSs

Goffman (1959) proposed a theory of self-presentation where individuals, or actors, perform differently in front of different audiences. He explained the way an individual may perform for one audience might be starkly different from how the same individual performs for another. Further, he identified three important spaces related to an actor's performance. Goffman distinguished between the front stage where a performance takes place, and the backstage where an actor rests from a performance and prepares for future performances. In the backstage space, an actor might share that space with fellow actors as well, who are also resting from the same show.

Additionally, Goffman identifies one final space: the outside of a performance. This outside space is where actor and unintended audiences collide, leading to impromptu performances *outside* of the performances to which they are accustomed. This has the potential for obvious ramifications. Importantly, he also emphasizes audience segmentation and the definition of a situation as being vital factors for presenting oneself appropriately.

Joshua Meyrowitz (1985) builds on Goffman's theory of self-presentation proposing the deep back region, the forefront region, and the middle region. This middle region appears to be especially relevant, as it refers to an audience somehow witnessing the actor in a partial front stage and partial backstage performance, or by the actor being caught in-between the two (similar to Goffman's idea of the "outside" of a performance). Meyrowitz describes this concept as an "overlapping of situations and audiences" (1985, p. 50), which appears to be increasingly more common on social media.

Adjunct faculty and staff in the present study presented themselves in a variety of ways. What appears to be central to the way in which a participant performed was the audience. Specifically, who was comprised in the audience—potential viewers. Based on the results in this study, context collapse appears to be quite common on social media, at least among the sample studied. However, the way participants managed such collapsing of contexts, or a lack of management, had a significant impact on their self-presentation.

For participants who used audience segmentation via Facebook groups or lists (i.e. Savvy Segmenters), they appeared to be more successful at performing according to the situational definition at hand. That is, they knew who their audience was so they adjusted their self-presentation accordingly and appropriately. With a narrower audience, and with unintended viewers excluded, participants had a clearer sense of what would be appropriate to disclose and

how it would be perceived. Closed group and list segmentation strategies allowed these participants to have more control over who was seeing their content (to a certain extent, of course) and to possibly feel more comfortable and confident in what they were disclosing. By using Facebook groups or lists, rather than performing for their entire Facebook network, the participant's performance was only displayed for relevant audiences to see, with the curtain drawn for any unwanted audiences. The same is also true for participants who used platforms differently to engage with different audiences (i.e. Strict Separators), or who used more than one account on the same platform.

However, when audience segmentation was not employed, participants appeared to be caught outside of a performance—or perhaps more appropriately, outside of multiple performances—or, using Meyrowitz' (1985) term, caught in the middle region. This middle region is not one participant's performance, or a combination of two, but rather becomes a *new* performance altogether. Therefore, when context collapse occurred—particularly the blending of personal and professional boundaries—with a lack of audience segmentation, the adjunct faculty or staff member assumed a new role and performed a different show in light of a blended audience. Typically, this behavior was characterized as positive and appropriate for all ages and audiences—a sanitized, censored version of their personal self. This hybrid space with overlapping situational definitions yielded neutral and diluted behavior, where participants avoided openly expressing opinions that might be perceived as offensive or controversial—at least among their most sensitive viewers.

Contrary to Litt & Hargittai's (2016a) conclusion that SNS users tend to think about their most accepting and agreeable viewers, this study found support for Marwick & boyd's (2011) theory of the nightmare reader. That is, when imagining their audience, participants experiencing

context collapse did appear to commonly think of their most critical connections, including professional or work-related contacts (e.g. bosses, students, colleagues, etc.). It seems these audience members are always in the back of their mind while posting. Therefore, there is no denying that a blurring of personal and professional worlds on SNSs changes the environment altogether, in effect limiting how individuals behave and express themselves. One's personal persona dwindles and is feared to be at constant risk without effective segmentation or separation strategies in place.

Another possible outcome of not properly segmenting one's audience is reluctant participation. Specifically, when personal and professional worlds collide, one might become co-opted into an organizational ambassador on one's *personal* social media account. In such a scenario, an individual's personal persona becomes overthrown by their professional one, despite the innate personal nature of SNSs. Unfortunately, such situations carry negative repercussions, including a loss of work-life balance, pressure to use the SNS more frequently than desired or in unwanted ways (further decreasing one's work-life balance), and a tendency to constantly be and feel "on." While a work shift typically has an end time, social media does not. Therefore, one's personal relationships can suffer in the process as an individual forever chases the next opportunity to post or re-share for work or professional purposes. An employees' clock-in button is indefinitely engaged. In this middle region performance, one role dominates and overshadows all others, resulting in an individual's "participatory reluctance" (Cassidy, 2016, p. 2614). The results of this study clearly demonstrate that the presence of context collapse, without audience segmentation, threatens one's personal self and space on social media.

However, in direct contrast to this scenario of collapsed audiences is one in which personal and professional worlds are distinct from each other, where a clear divide exists

between an actor's opposing roles. There is no (or minimal) blurring, and the actor once again gains control of how he or she self-presents. With a limited and narrow audience, these participants are able to freely express themselves openly and honestly, where there is a reduced threat to their job or professional reputation. By carefully guarding access to their personal SNS account(s), a less complicated presentation of self is afforded and the risk of unwanted viewers is significantly reduced. Additionally, a narrow, segmented audience also allows for greater work-life balance; less thought, effort, and scrutinizing over posts one shares with their whole network; and greater authenticity in one's self-presentation. This has the potential to allow for greater enjoyment and satisfaction in one's dedicated personal space.

Therefore, it seems essential to employ audience segmentation techniques to successfully present oneself and to get the most out of one's personal social media experience. This study adds to existing literature by expanding audience segmentation strategies being used. Specifically, in addition to "splitting identities" (LaPoe et al., 2017) by targeting messages to specific social spheres, using different platforms differently to engage with different audiences, and maintaining multiple accounts on a single platform, participants also effectively managed context collapse by using Facebook closed groups or lists. Therefore, SNSs not only allow for context collapse to occur, but platforms (specifically Facebook) provide necessary tools to successfully manage collapsing contexts. As a result, this study challenges the current definition and understanding of context collapse, demonstrating a need for further research and expansion of the concept.

As a start, social circles may converge and collide on social media, but those same social media platforms provide its users with audience segmentation tools to manage the collapse and recover previously existing contexts. That is, by using Facebook groups and lists, users are able

to seamlessly switch roles and perform appropriately according to the audience segment that has been afforded access. In this way, a SNS user is able to perform various roles on many different stages enabled through closed groups and segmented lists. According to this updated understanding of context collapse, the user is given control to segment various audiences, via tools afforded by the SNS platform, and combat context collapse by pulling the curtains up or down according to the appropriate or desired viewers. Therefore, rather than the concept only considering SNS platforms as sites where audiences converge, it should also account for audience segmentation tools made available by the platform itself.

This updated understanding of context collapse also begs for an updated understanding of Goffman's (1959) theory of self-presentation, especially as it is applied to digital spaces of SNSs. As alluded to earlier, with audience segmentation tools of Facebook groups and lists, the concept of the front stage performance space becomes pluralized. That is, SNS users are not always performing one role to their entire network of connections, but they may perform various roles on many different stages enabled through closed groups and lists of connections. Online, one does not just have one stage, but is afforded the possibility of occupying potentially countless mini stages, each with its own appropriate role and set of viewers.

For example, in this study, one participant had a co-ed health and fitness group, a men's health and fitness group (where he admitted to behaving differently, in a more relaxed way, compared to the co-ed group), and professional or work-oriented groups, such as for each one of the classes he teaches or for networking contacts he has met at professional conferences. On each of these closed-off stages, he performs a different role based on audience composition. His behavior is altered depending on potential viewers, and SNSs allow him to present himself appropriately for intended audience members only. While context collapse may still occur on

one's general feed, it is minimized through the creation and management of multiple stages (using groups or lists). In this way, one can comfortably commit to each role knowing unwanted or unintended viewers have been excluded. Therefore, an expanded definition of self-presentation theory on SNSs is in order to include pluralized front stages.

In addition, it appears that findings from the present study not only expand Goffman's (1959) theory of self-presentation, but also extend Walther's (1996) hyperpersonal model. This CMC model "posits that CMC users take advantage of the interface and channel characteristics that CMC offers in a dynamic fashion in order to enhance their relational outcomes" (Walther, 2007). The model suggests that individuals engaging in CMC will develop exaggerated, stereotyped perceptions (positive or negative) of their communicative partners, based on minimal cues. Further, CMC affords the development of relations equal to those afforded in FTF interactions, or even exceeding FTF.

Specifically, the model discusses selective self-presentation. That is when one presents an idealized or desirable version of oneself. Support for this concept can be found in two ways from the present study. First, through participants self-censoring on SNSs. Specifically, some participants (i.e. Positive PG Posters) either avoided sharing personal opinions about politics or religion in an effort to avoid offending certain segments of their audience. This led to a sanitization of some participants' personal persona. Additionally, some participants only shared posts from their life's highlight reel (e.g. special occasions, accomplishments, travel, etc.). SNSs allow for the additional layer of editing and curation in one's self-presentation, which is out of reach in the faster-paced format of FTF interactions. Second, some participants took advantage of audience separation (i.e. Strict Separators) and segmentation (i.e. Savvy Segmenters) strategies to present oneself appropriately based on the relevant audience. In this way, some

participants were able to use SNS affordances to effectively and selectively self-present before the appropriate audience, while avoiding inappropriate self-presentation among unintended viewers.

Considering these methods of selective self-presentation, the question arises about what sort of an impact this has on relationships formed and maintained via SNSs. Some of the data suggests that for those participants maintaining a positive, sanitized profile (indicating self-withdrawal), their interactions lack the relational depth they reserve for other channels (over the phone or in-person). That is, some users seek out other channels to hash out debates or engage in more serious or lengthy conversations. Therefore, for this handful of participants, Facebook was found as more of a relational maintenance tool with surface-level disclosures, versus as a space to engage in more serious, involved discourse. This puts obvious limits on the level relationships may develop on SNSs. However, for other users, closed groups did allow for deeper dialogue and more openly expressed disclosures. Therefore, perhaps appropriate audience segmentation encourages authenticity and deeper connection, potentially strengthening relationships forged online. Overall, while this theory was not a central focus of this study, supporting data is limited and not generalizable. More research should be conducted to explore the hyperpersonal model on SNSs and its impact on relationships.

Therefore, results from the present study suggest an extension of the hyperpersonal model by examining its application and implication on SNSs, especially as users selectively self-present. On social media, users have more control over their self-presentation, especially by self-censoring or sanitizing their disclosures, sharing exclusively from their highlight reel, or by separating and segmenting their audiences with Facebook groups and lists, using different platforms to engage with different audiences, and managing multiple accounts on a single

platform. Selective self-presentation can impact relationships on SNSs, which is deserving of further study.

Along with theoretical implications, this study also uncovered some practical applications as well. Individuals' harmonious separation of personal and professional worlds is threatened when employees are pressured, expected or encouraged to use their personal social media accounts for non-personal reasons. While social media may be a necessary component for one's job, there is also a growing pressure, or expectation, to maintain a digital presence. In this way, one's professional persona appears to only exist once it is searchable online. Further, by institutions of higher education creating social media policies for their employees, faculty (particularly adjunct faculty) and staff members' *personal* social media accounts become sites of inspection and policing, ultimately transforming it from a space of the personal realm to one of the professional. By implementing such policies, institutions of higher education are overreaching into their employees' personal lives. The result is a shrinking of one's true personal space and performance, and a domination of one's professional persona or mutated personal self.

The results in this study offer tools and strategies for all working professionals to incorporate on their personal social media accounts to protect their personal space and identity by employing appropriate and effective self-presentational performances. Whether one is fortunate enough to maintain a clear division between personal and professional worlds, or is in need of successful audience segmentation strategies, these findings begin to identify and describe best practices for navigating SNSs. By following such strategies, employees are afforded ways to maintain context in online networking spaces, present themselves appropriately, and receive greater satisfaction and personal fulfillment from their SNS experiences.

Limitations

The biggest limitation of the present study is the small sample size, and even smaller cohort sizes. With the emergent third cohort of Dual Role participants, this shrank the anticipated two cohorts for the study. Therefore, this made it hard to make comparisons between adjunct faculty and staff members due to the existence of a third cohort, where participants encompass both roles, and with the adjunct faculty and staff cohorts only being comprised of four members each. Further, only four participants occupied primary adjunct faculty roles, meaning the majority of participants were primary staff members. Adjunct faculty members (only) were most challenging to recruit. Another limitation to this study is with the sample itself. Since this is a convenience sample, all participants were a part of the same university system.

One strength of the present sample is that representatives from regional campuses were included. However, overall representation skewed heavier in favor of one regional campus compared to the other campus locations. Finally, since this study explored both Facebook and Twitter, it was difficult to draw some comparisons and conclusions, especially for the final section where participants identified and discussed sample posts. Beyond cohort size, this further limited the comparisons that could be made as some participants pulled example posts from their Twitter account while others pulled from Facebook, although the majority shared examples from Facebook as this was nearly all participants' (93%) primary SNS platform of choice.

Future Research

Much more research should be conducted to explore how adjunct faculty and staff are using social media. Specifically, the blurring of personal and professional boundaries should be explored, especially in light of higher education professionals losing their jobs over content they

post to their *personal* social media account. This blending of personas and spheres can have significant ramifications including professional careers and reputations, work-life balance, personal self-expression, and personal relationships. Therefore, it's clear this is an important area that should be studied further. In addition, empirical research should be conducted to add to the level of understanding and knowledge about adjunct faculty and staff members' experience using social media. Specifically, scholars should examine how higher education professionals are managing context collapse—including using Facebook groups and lists—and measure their satisfaction or dissatisfaction of their overall SNS experience.

Further, while this study originally sought to examine two cohorts—adjunct faculty and staff members—a third cohort emerged: Dual Role participants. These individuals should be studied further, as they uniquely occupy both roles of faculty and staff. With little to no attention paid to them in existing research, this presents a gap for future researchers to fill. Additionally, little research exists for adjunct faculty as a whole, which also presents an area for future study. More research should also be conducted to expand the current definition and understanding of context collapse in light of segmentation tools, and of self-presentation theory on SNSs, specifically concerning a pluralized conception of front stages. In addition, more scholars should explore how the hyperpersonal model applies and impacts relationships within SNS communities. Finally, future research should specifically recruit individuals who report experiencing context collapse—in particular a blending of personal and professional spheres—to gain deeper insights about its impact, especially in regards to self-withdrawal.

Conclusion

Overall, adjunct faculty and staff in the present study behave differently on social media and, as a result, have different experiences. While some maintain strict separation between personal and professional audiences, others use tools to better navigate the collapsing of various audiences. Context collapse continues to persist on a user's general SNS feed, but context can be restored by using Facebook groups and lists. However, those who maintain audience separation appear to present themselves a bit freer overall than those who encounter context collapse, especially when no segmentation tools are employed. Therefore, it seems clear that audience segmentation truly is key to success and satisfaction, especially on social media where the threat of collapsing contexts and co-optation by one's professional affiliations persist. An appropriately separated or segmented audience is recipe for effective SNS self-presentation and optimal personal enjoyment.

Technology is ever-changing, and practice and theory need to keep up. Results from the present study suggest a need for updated conceptualizations of the theories of context collapse and self-presentation. Context collapse should consider audience segmentation tools afforded by SNS platforms to combat collapse and restore context, rather than SNSs merely serving as sites of collapsing contexts, and self-presentation should evolve for application on SNSs to account for multiple mini performance stages. In addition, the hyperpersonal model should be extended and applied to SNSs, especially the construct of selective self-presentation. Finally, this study begins to develop best practices for navigating SNSs used for both personal and professional reasons, especially with audience segmentation tools of Facebook groups and lists.

References

Altman, I. (1975). *The environment and social behavior: Privacy, personal space, territory, crowding.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso Books.

Bauer-Wolf, J. (2017, July 11). Social media storm. *Insider Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/07/11/after-news-reports-tweets-queer-advocate-fired-claremont-colleges.

Baumer, E. P. S., Adams, P., Khovanskaya, V. D., Liao, T. C., Smith, M. E., Sosik, V. S., & Williams, K. (2013). Limiting, leaving, and (re)lapsing: An exploration of Facebook non-use practices and experiences. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI 2013).* Paris, France. 3257-3266. DOI: 10.1145/2470654.2466446

Bernstein, M. S., Bakshy, E. Burke, M, & Karrer, B., (2013). Quantifying the invisible audience in social networks. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI 2013).* Paris, France. 21-30. DOI: 10.1145/2470654.2470658

Cassidy, E. (2016). Social networking sites and participatory reluctance: A case study of Gaydar, user resistance and interface rejection. *New Media & Society, 18*(11), 2613-2628. DOI: 10.1177/1461444815590341

Das, S., & Kramer, A. (2013). Self-Censorship on Facebook. *Proceedings of the Seventh International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media.*

Davis, J. L., & Jurgenson, N. (2014). Context collapse: theorizing context collusions and collisions. *Information, Communication & Society, 17*(4), 476-485, DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2014.888458

Dienlin, T., & Metzger, M. J. (2016). An extended privacy calculus model for SNSs: Analyzing self-disclosure and self-withdrawal in a representative U.S. sample. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 21*, 368-383. DOI: 10.1111/jcc4.12163

Duffy, B. E., Pruchniewska, U., & Scolere, L. (2017, July). Platform-specific self-branding: Imagined affordances of the social media ecology. In *Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Social Media & Society*. DOI: 10.1145/3097286.3097291

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.

Greenwood, S., Perrin, A., & Duggan, M. (2016, November 11). *Social media update 2016.* Retrieved from Pew Research Center: http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/11/11/social-media-update-2016/

Hancock, J. T., & Dunham, P. J. (2001). Impression formation in computer-mediated communication revisited: An analysis of the breadth and intensity of impressions. *Communication Research, 28*(3), 325-347. DOI: 10.1177/009365001028003004

Hogan, B. (2010). The presentation of self in the age of social media: Distinguishing performances and exhibitions online. *Bulletin of Science Technology & Society*, 30, 377-386. DOI: 10.1177/0270467610385893

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. Qualitative health research, 15(9), 1277-1288.

Jaschik, S. (2015, January 2). A mixed report on Salaita controversy. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/01/02/u-illinois-faculty-panel-issues-mixed-report-aborted-hiring-steven-salaita

LaPoe, V. L., Olson, C. C., & Eckert, S. (2017). "Linkedin Is My Office; Facebook My Living Room, Twitter the Neighborhood Bar": Media scholars' liminal use of social media for peer and public communication. *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 41*(3), 185-206. DOI: 10.1177/0196859917707741

Litt, E. (2012). Knock, knock. Who's there? The imagined audience. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56*(3), 330-345. DOI: 10.1080/08838151.2012.705195

Litt, E., & Hargittai, E. (2016a). The imagined audience on social network sites. *Social Media & Society*, *2*(1), 1-12. DOI: 10.1177/2056305116633482

Litt, E., & Hargittai, E. (2016b). "Just cast the net, and hopefully the right fish swim into it": Audience management on social network sites. *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing (CSCW '16).* San Francisco, California, USA. 1488-1500. DOI: 10.1145/2818048.2819933

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d. (2011). I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society 13*(1), 114-133. DOI: 10.1177/1461444810365313

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d. (2014). Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social media. *New Media & Society, 16*(7), 1051-1067. DOI: 10.1177/1461444814543995

Meyrowitz, J. (1985). *No sense of place: The impact of electronic media on social behavior.* New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

Ong, W. J. (2013). *Orality and literacy*. Routledge.

Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of television.* New York: Viking.

Quintana, C. (2017, June 28). Under fire, these professors were criticized by their colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from: https://www.chronicle.com/article/Under-Fire-These-Professors/240457

Rainie, L., & Perrin, A. (2017). *10 facts about smartphones as the iPhone turns 10*. Retrieved from Pew Research Center: http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/06/28/10-facts-about-smartphones/

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

Sugimoto, C., Hank, C., Bowman, T., & Pomerantz, J. (2015). Friend or faculty: Social networking sites, dual relationships, and context collapse in higher education. *First Monday*, *20*(3), 2 March 2015. DOI: 10.5210/fm.v20i3.5387

Tufekci, Z. (2008a). Can you see me now? Audience and disclosure regulation in online social network sites. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 28*(1), 20-36. DOI: 10.1177/0270467607311484

Tufekci, Z. (2008b). Grooming, gossip, Facebook and Myspace. *Information, Communication & Society*, *11*(4), 544-564. DOI: 10.1080/13691180801999050

Utz, S. (2010). Show me your friends and I will tell you what type of person you are: How one's profile, number of friends, and type of friends influence impression formation on social

network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 15*, 314-335. DOI: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2010.01522.x

Veletsianos, G., & Kimmons, R. (2013). Scholars and faculty members' lived experiences in online social networks. *Internet and Higher Education*, 16, 43-50. DOI: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.01.004

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

Vitak, J., Blasiola, S., Patil, S., & Litt, E. (2015). Balancing audience and privacy tensions on social network sites. *International Journal of Communication (19328036), 9*, 1485-1504.

Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. Communication Research, 23, 3–43.

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. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2006.05.002

Walther, J. P., Loh, T., & Granka, L. (2005). Let me count the ways: The interchange of verbal and nonverbal cues in computer-mediated and face-to-face affinity. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 24*(1), 36-65. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X04273036

Appendix A

Information Sheet for Research
University of Cincinnati
Department: Communication
Principal Investigator: Katelyn Ritchie
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Nancy Jennings

Title of Study: SNS in Higher Education

Introduction:
You are being asked to take part in a research study. Please read this paper carefully and ask questions about anything that you do not understand.

Who is doing this research study?
The person in charge of this research study is Katelyn Ritchie of the University of Cincinnati (UC) Department of Communication.

She is being guided in this research by Dr. Nancy Jennings.

What is the purpose of this research study?
The purpose of this research study is to explore higher education professionals' use of social media among mixed audiences.

Who will be in this research study?
About 20 people will take part in this study. You may be in this study if you are an adjunct faculty member, or staff member who works with alumni or students on at least a weekly basis, and are currently employed at an institution of higher education. In addition, you must currently use either Facebook or Twitter, or both.

What if you are an employee where the research study is done?
Taking part in this research study is not part of your job. Refusing to be in the study will not affect your job. You will not be offered any special work-related benefits if you take part in this study.

What will you be asked to do in this research study, and how long will it take?
You will be asked to first complete a Pre-Survey to collect background information and general social media use data. It will take about 10 minutes. The Pre-Survey will take place online using SurveyMonkey.

Then, in an interview, you will be asked to answer questions about your social media use. It will take about 1-1.5 hours. The interview will take place in a meeting room on your campus, or at a similar location that is convenient for you.

Are there any risks to being in this research study?
The risk is not expected to be more than you would have in daily life.

Are there any benefits from being in this research study?
You will probably not get any benefit because of being in this study. But, being in this study may help researchers better understand adjunct faculty and staff social media use.

What will you get because of being in this research study?
You will not be paid to take part in this study.

Do you have choices about taking part in this research study?
If you do not want to take part in this research study you may simply not participate.

How will your research information be kept confidential?
Information about you will be kept private by using a study ID number instead of the participant's name on the research forms, and keeping the master list of names and study ID numbers in a separate location from the research forms.

Your information will be kept either in a locked cabinet in Nancy Jenning's campus office, or in a secure folder on the website Box for three years. After that it will be destroyed by shredding paper research files when the study is complete and by permanently deleting computerized records.

The data from this research study may be published; but you will not be identified by name.

Agents of the University of Cincinnati may inspect study records for audit or quality assurance purposes.

The researcher cannot promise that information sent by the internet or email will be private.

What are your legal rights in this research study?
Nothing in this consent form waives any legal rights you may have. This consent form also does not release the investigator, the institution, or its agents from liability for negligence.

What if you have questions about this research study?
If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, you should contact Katelyn Ritchie at Katelyn.Hainline@uc.edu, or by phone at 513.900.7406.

Or, you may contact Nancy Jennings at Nancy.Jennings@uc.edu, or by phone at 513.556.4456.

The UC Institutional Review Board reviews all research projects that involve human participants to be sure the rights and welfare of participants are protected.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, complaints and/or suggestions about the study, you may contact the UC IRB at (513) 558-5259. Or, you may call the UC Research Compliance Hotline at (800) 889-1547, or write to the IRB, 300 University Hall, ML 0567, 51 Goodman Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0567, or email the IRB office at irb@ucmail.uc.edu.

Do you HAVE to take part in this research study?

No one has to be in this research study. Refusing to take part will NOT cause any penalty or loss of benefits that you would otherwise have.

You may start and then change your mind and stop at any time. To stop being in the study, you should tell Katelyn Ritchie at Katelyn.Hainline@uc.edu, or by phone at 513.900.7406.

BY TURNING IN YOUR COMPLETED PRE-SURVEY YOU INDICATE YOUR CONSENT FOR YOUR ANSWERS TO BE USED IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY.

PLEASE KEEP THIS INFORMATION SHEET FOR YOUR REFERENCE.

Appendix B

Adult Consent Form for Research
University of Cincinnati
Department: Communication
Principal Investigator: Katelyn Ritchie
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Nancy Jennings

Title of Study: SNS in Higher Education

Introduction:
You are being asked to take part in a research study. Please read this paper carefully and ask questions about anything that you do not understand.

Who is doing this research study?
The person in charge of this research study is Katelyn Ritchie of the University of Cincinnati (UC) Department of Communication.

She is being guided in this research by Dr. Nancy Jennings.

What is the purpose of this research study?
The purpose of this research study is to explore higher education professionals' use of social media among mixed audiences.

Who will be in this research study?
About 20 people will take part in this study. You may be in this study if you are an adjunct faculty member, or staff member who works with alumni or students on at least a weekly basis, and are currently employed at an institution of higher education. In addition, you must currently use either Facebook or Twitter, or both.

What if you are an employee where the research study is done?
Taking part in this research study is not part of your job. Refusing to be in the study will not affect your job. You will not be offered any special work-related benefits if you take part in this study.

What will you be asked to do in this research study, and how long will it take?
You will be asked to answer questions about your social media use. It will take about 1-1.5 hours. The interview will take place in a meeting room on your campus, or at a similar location that is convenient for you.

Are there any risks to being in this research study?
Possible risks from being in this research study include the following: 1) Physical risk of discomfort for sitting during the duration of the testing, or 2) Risk of frustration for completing a long testing period.

Are there any benefits from being in this research study?
You will probably not get any benefit because of being in this study. But, being in this study may help researchers better understand adjunct faculty and staff social media use.

What will you get because of being in this research study?
You will not be paid to take part in this study.

Do you have choices about taking part in this research study?
If you do not want to take part in this research study you may simply not participate.

You have a choice whether or not to take part in the audiotaping of the interview. There is a place at the end of this paper to mark your choice.

How will your research information be kept confidential?
Information about you will be kept private by using a study ID number instead of the participant's name on the research forms, and keeping the master list of names and study ID numbers in a separate location from the research forms.

Your information will be kept either in a locked cabinet in Nancy Jenning's campus office, or in a secure folder on the website Box for three years. After that it will be destroyed by shredding paper research files when the study is complete and by permanently deleting computerized records.

The data from this research study may be published; but you will not be identified by name.

Agents of the University of Cincinnati may inspect study records for audit or quality assurance purposes.

The researcher cannot promise that information sent by the internet or email will be private.

What are your legal rights in this research study?
Nothing in this consent form waives any legal rights you may have. This consent form also does not release the investigator, the institution, or its agents from liability for negligence.

What if you have questions about this research study?
If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, you should contact Katelyn Ritchie at Katelyn.Hainline@uc.edu, or by phone at 513.900.7406.

Or, you may contact Nancy Jennings at Nancy.Jennings@uc.edu, or by phone at 513.556.4456.

The UC Institutional Review Board reviews all research projects that involve human participants to be sure the rights and welfare of participants are protected.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, complaints and/or suggestions about the study, you may contact the UC IRB at (513) 558-5259. Or, you may call the UC Research Compliance Hotline at (800) 889-1547, or write to the IRB, 300 University Hall, ML 0567, 51

Goodman Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0567, or email the IRB office at irb@ucmail.uc.edu.

Do you HAVE to take part in this research study?
No one has to be in this research study. Refusing to take part will NOT cause any penalty or loss of benefits that you would otherwise have.

You may start and then change your mind and stop at any time. To stop being in the study, you should tell Katelyn Ritchie at Katelyn.Hainline@uc.edu, or by phone at 513.900.7406.

Agreement:
I have read this information and have received answers to any questions I asked. I give my consent to participate in this research study. I will receive a copy of this signed and dated consent form to keep.

__ YES, you may audiotape my interview

__ NO, I do NOT want you to audiotape my interview

Participant Name (please print) ____

Participant Signature ____ Date _______

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent _______________________________ Date _______

Appendix C

Interview Guide

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview.

Today, we are going to discuss your experience using social networking services (SNSs). First, we will start off with some questions. Then, later on, I will ask you to login to either your Facebook or Twitter account to share and discuss some example posts. Remember that this study is completely voluntary so you can choose to discontinue this interview at any time. Are you ready to begin?

Section 1: General SNS Use
First, I'd like to discuss your general use of SNSs.

1. I saw from your pre-survey that you use [insert: Facebook/Twitter]. **Could you tell me about** why and how you use [insert SNS]? How do you use [insert SNS] for professional reasons? For personal reasons? Do you have more than 1 account? Why?

2. **[If applicable:]** You mentioned using [insert SNS] for professional reasons. Can you tell me about if this is required for work and in what ways? Do you feel any pressure to use [insert SNS] for work? Why, or why not? How do you feel about that? What do you think would happen with your work if you didn't have a Facebook account? Twitter?

*****[Repeat Q1-2 for Twitter] Transition: I see that you also use [insert SNS]. I have similar questions for this SNS.**

Section 2: Audience/Context Collapse
Now, let's turn to discuss who you are engaging with on Facebook & Twitter. One way to divide up social circles is Personal (including family and friends) and Professional or Work-Related (including work peers, bosses, professional contacts, students & alumni).

1. Could you briefly describe all of the different types of social groups, or social circles, you're currently connected with on Facebook? Twitter?

2. Are there any specific people or groups you avoid connecting with on Facebook? Twitter? Why, or why not? What might happen if you did connect with them?

3. On SNS platforms, varying social circles often converge. On Facebook, how do you manage such a blending of social circles? Twitter? How do you target certain messages toward specific groups, if at all? Can you explain if you use any SNSs differently to engage with different social groups?

4. When personal and professional social circles blend on Facebook or Twitter, does it impact your overall behavior? In what ways? Do you post/share/like/comment any differently among a blended audience? Why, or why not?

Section 3: Created Content/Self-Withdrawal
Now, I'd like to discuss the content that you generate on Facebook & Twitter.

1. Could you tell me about whether or not you enjoy posting/creating content on Facebook? Twitter? Why, or why not?

2. Tell me about why you might not post/share content on Facebook or Twitter. What hindrances are there? What makes you hesitate to post or share something? Why? How often does this happen? What types of things in particular will you NOT post on Facebook? Twitter? Why not?

3. Can you tell me if thinking of any particular social circle has ever discouraged you from posting/sharing content on Facebook? Twitter? Which ones? Does this happen often?

4. Can you tell me about a time you started to type/post something, but then, after thinking of potential readers, decided against it? F/T? Why? Does this happen often?

5. Thinking beyond Facebook & Twitter, have you ever had any issues arise at work, or professionally, from any of your SNS accounts? What happened? What was the result? How did it impact your SNS use?

6. Can you tell me about a time when you saw a co-worker's post/tweet and reacted negatively, or it made you think of that person differently? What was the result of that situation? How did it impact your SNS use, if at all?

Section 4: Self-Presentation
Now, I'd like to ask about your public persona on Facebook & Twitter.

1. How do you decide what is appropriate to post/share on Facebook? Twitter? What factors do you consider? Are any social groups a typical measure for you?

2. How closely do you feel your online self matches your offline self on Facebook? Twitter? What is similar? What is different? What reasons are there for the differences? Tell me about when your online self matches your offline self the closest.

3. Now thinking beyond Facebook & Twitter, is your persona the same across all SNS platforms? What differences are there? What factors lead to these differences? What is the same?

Section 5: Imagined Audiences
To finish, I'm going to ask you to login to either your Twitter or Facebook account. Then, I'm going to read you a series of prompts. For each prompt, please identify an example post from your personal feed, based on the particular social circle you had in mind while creating or sharing that post. In this section, some screenshots will be taken of your SNS feed. As a

reminder, your responses are kept anonymous and this study is voluntary, meaning you can choose to stop at any time. Are you ready to continue on to this final section?

[IF YES:] You can go ahead and log in to either Twitter or Facebook. [Participant logs in]

1. Thinking about your **professional or work-related connections**, show me a recent example of when you thought about this social group while you were posting/sharing content, if any. Can you tell me a little bit about this, and what were you thinking when you posted this? Did you have any other social groups in mind when you posted this? Was this post linked, or shared, to any other SNS account? Why, or why not?

2. Thinking about your **personal connections**, show me a recent example of when you thought about this social group while you were posting/sharing content, if any. Can you tell me a little bit about this, and what were you thinking when you posted this? Did you have any other social groups in mind when you posted this? Was this post linked, or shared, to any other SNS account? Why, or why not?

3. Now, can you show me a recent example of when you thought about **both your professional and personal connections** in the same post/shared content? Can you tell me a little bit about this? What were you thinking when you posted this? Did you have any other social groups in mind when you posted this? Was this post linked, or shared, to any other SNS account? Why, or why not?

Last Question: Do you have any questions for me, or any final thoughts or comments you would like to share that we have not already discussed?