

Exploratory studies of search and information sharing on Facebook

Indriyani Santoso¹, Rizal Kurniawan², Sartana³, Cahya Suryani⁴

^{1,2}Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia

³Universitas Andalas, Padang, Indonesia

⁴MAFINDO, Indonesia

¹indriyani@fpk.unp.ac.id, ²rizal.kurniawan@fip.unp.ac.id, ³sartana@med.unand.ac.id, ⁴Cahyasuryani01@gmail.com

Artikel history

	<i>Received</i> 2023-07-04	<i>Revised</i> 2023-07-16	<i>Accepted</i> 2023-08-03	<i>Published</i> 2023-08-30
Keyword :	Abstract			
Information search, information, Facebook, Information Search at Facebook Scale (ISFS)	Individuals frequently seek information and then share that information. The research looks into the dynamics of these two behaviors on the social networking site Facebook. The study included 260 students, the average age of whom was 20. The Information Seeking in Facebook Scale (ISFS) categorizes information seeking behavior on Facebook into five types: social searches, social browsing, hedonic productivity, consumer trends, and general erudition. Meanwhile, students' information-sharing behavior was examined based on the frequency with which they shared information links via the Facebook network in the previous three months. The data obtained was analyzed using logistic regression. As a result, it was discovered that social search and social browsing are important types of information searches to determine the likelihood of someone sharing information. The findings of this study contribute to the flow of searching and sharing information, which can change thought patterns and attitudes and create behavior in the general public, particularly students.			

How to cite: Santoso, I., Kurniawan, R., Sartana, & Suryani, C. (2023). Exploratory studies of search and information sharing on Facebook. *Insight: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 25(2), 131-141. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.26486/psikologi.v25i2.3298>

INTRODUCTION

People can not live without social media in today's digital age. The use of social media and advances in communication technology have an impact on human civilization (Permatasari & Wu, 2021). They used social media to gather and disseminate information. Previous research has looked into these two behaviors separately. More research into both behaviors at the same time is required. After searching for something on social media, Internet users frequently share their findings. Search and share as if you were one. Researchers plan to investigate what motivates teens to seek information, what information they share, and whether the motivation they seek influences whether or not they share information with others on Facebook in this study.

Facebook is a popular social media platform in Indonesia. On December 31, 2018, there were 2.32 billion active Facebook users (Facebook, 2019), and Indonesia ranked fourth globally, trailing India, the United States, and Brazil (Statista, 2019). Facebook social media is used for a variety of purposes. According to Quan-Haase & Young (2010) and Oh & Syn (2015) Facebook is mostly used to keep in touch with friends and family. According to Rosen et al. (2013), Facebook is used in daily activities such as sending text messages, playing games, interacting with friends, making friends, calling, and watching videos.

In addition to these various applications, Facebook is frequently used to find information. According to (Sin & Kim, 2013), students studying in foreign countries use Facebook to find information about entertainment and transportation in the area. Facebook is used to share information such as lecture materials and materials (Mazman & Usluel, 2010; Erlin et al., 2017; Asterhan & Bouton, 2017), as well as general knowledge (Eid & Al-Jabri, 2016). Researchers discovered a lot of research on Facebook searching for information, but little recent research has examined Facebook searching and sharing behavior at the same time. Given the importance of Facebook information and the fact that few studies have attempted to reveal its dynamics at the same time. This study investigated information seeking and sharing behavior on Facebook.

In general, there are two types of information providers on social media: dynamic information providers and static information providers. Social media with static information is social media that only conveys information to passive readers. Users can only read without commenting on the information they read. While dynamic information social media is social media that provides information to users and allows them to respond to the information they see (Osatuyi, 2013). Facebook is a dynamic form of social media in which users can view information, create status updates, and respond to it by commenting, liking, or emotionally reacting to it.

In terms of information that can be shared, Osatuyi (2013) categorizes information on social media into four types. First, there is personal information, which is information about personal issues such as health and family issues; second, there is sensational information, which is information that is trending at the time, such as artists who are going viral; third, there is political information, which is information about the government system, such as information about elections; and fifth, there is casual information, which is information shared by someone about their social friends, such as information about celebrities.

Tabel 1. Categories Types of Information Shared on Facebook

Information Category	Kind
Entertain	Commercial Entertainment
Knowledge	News Reference
Personal	Personal Light Information
Politics dan Religion	Politic Religion

Flanagin and Metzger (2000) classified information into four categories. There is commercial information, which is information related to product buying and selling activities; entertainment information, which is information that provides various types of entertainment such as music, videos, and funny stories;

news information, which is information that serves as a notification about something factual; and reference information, which is factual but not news, such as general knowledge. On Facebook, the types of information proposed by (Flanagin & Metzger, 2000) and Osatuyi (2013) overlap, creating new categories. As entertainment categories, the study will use commercial and entertainment information. Knowledge includes various types of news and reference information. Personal categories include types of personal information and light information, while political and religious categories include types of political and religious information. Table 1 contains more information on the categories in this study. The study's second goal was to discover what kind of information Facebook users share.

After searching for and discovering important information, social media users frequently take the next step, which is to share their discoveries. As a result, it is hoped that others will see and use the information they share. This is consistent with the definition proposed by Wang et al. (2014) of knowledge-sharing behavior as providing information and knowledge to assist and collaborate with others to solve problems, develop new ideas, or implement policies and procedures. Sharing information on social media is a very common practice. Social media is the primary means of communicating with family, colleagues, friends, and even colleagues.

On social media platforms, three main activities occur: social interaction, knowledge seeking, and knowledge contribution (Mutambik et al., 2022). The term "social interaction" refers to one's interactions with others in society. In addition to seeking knowledge, social media users look for items that are relevant to their needs, activities, and interests. While contributing to knowledge, social media users share their discoveries with others or communities.

Following that, Qun and Xiaocheng (2012) discuss indicators of how far someone will go to share information on social media. This contribution can take many forms, such as posting important information, responding to other social media users' questions with appropriate answers, sharing personal opinions, and providing feedback or solutions to problems. This finding confirms the importance of sharing on social media as a means of contributing to information dissemination.

METHOD

The study included 260 students (85% of whom were female). The respondents' average age was 20 years, with a range of 18 to 24 years. Students are first asked if they want to participate. Students who participated in the study received no monetary compensation.

The motivation for seeking various types of information on Facebook reveals the behavior. The information seeking in Facebook scale Asghar (2015), is used to assess ISFS or information seeking behavior on Facebook. ISFS is divided into five subscales that assess social search, hedonic productivity, social browsing, consumer trends, and general erudition. Item number 15, which has negative discriminatory power and is not used in the following process, is shown in the appendix based on the psychometric analysis. Cronbach's alpha was used to estimate reliability, and the result was $\alpha = .88$.

The question, "In the last three months, have you shared information on Facebook?" reveals information-sharing behavior. Respondents were given two options: never and never again. If the respondent said yes, there is a follow-up question asking, "What information do you share?" In order to determine the type of information provided by respondents, the second question was coded.

The R version 3.4.4 (Team, 2021) was used to analyze the data obtained in this study. Revelle (2017) employs the soul pack version 1.7.8 to investigate the psychometric properties of the ISFS scale. While using the GPArotation package to perform factor analysis (Bernaards & Jennrich, 2005). Using logistic regression analysis, determine which types of motivation play the most important role in explaining information-sharing behavior.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3 shows the ISFS scale factor analysis with the value KMO =.89. According to Keiser in (Field et al., 2012), the value of KMO =.8 is considered very good. These findings also suggest that the sample size is adequate for factor analysis. The varimax rotation discovered that up to 23 items were grouped into five factors. Each of these variables can be used to characterize social search, hedonic productivity, consumer trend information, general erudition, and social browsing. Table 2 contains more detailed results.

Tabel 2. Descriptive Statistics of Information Search Behavior

Descriptive Statistics of Information Searching Behavior		
<i>Motivation to find information on Facebook</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Social search	3.84	.70
General erudition	3.05	.70
Hedonic proclivity	3.01	.72
Consumer trend information	2.86	.70
Social browsing	2.98	.70

Table 2 provides an overview of the results of information-searching behavior motivation on Facebook. Students' motivation for searching for information on Facebook is dominated by social searching, with a mean value of 3.84. With a mean value of 2.86, they have low consumer trend information motivation when searching for information on Facebook. Based on these findings, students are more likely to search for information on specific accounts when using Facebook. They rarely look for information on the latest fashions.

Tabel 3. ISFS Scale Factor Analysis

Information						
No	Items	Social Search	Hedonic Tendency	User Trend Information	Common Erudition	Social Browsing
21	News, quotes and scientific facts shared on Facebook give me a lot of information.	.79				

135

to share information, while 44.2% do not. According to these findings, more than half of students shared information on Facebook in the previous three months. Men and women mostly share information based on gender. Men shared information at a rate of 8.1%, while women did not share at all. In the meantime, 47.7% of women share information and 44.2% do not.

Most students spend more than three hours per day online. However, they only use Facebook for 30 minutes to an hour. These findings indicate that students not only open the Facebook social media application while online, but also other social media.

Tabel 4. An Overview of Online Behavior and Information Sharing

	Information Sharing	
	Yes(%)	No(%)
Information Search	145(55.8)	115(44.2)
Gender		
· Woman	124(47.7)	96(36.9)
· Man	21(8.1)	19(7.3)
length of time online per day		
· 1-30 minutes		
· 31 minutes – an hour	31(11.9)	24(9.2)
· 1 – 2 jam	35(13.5)	37(14.2)
· more than 3 hours	38(14.6)	25(9.6)
length of using Facebook per day	41(15.8)	29(11.2)
· 1-30 minutes		
· 31 minutes – an hour	24(9.2)	
· 1 – 2 jam	80(30.8)	12(4.6)
· more than 3 hours	33(12.7)	79(30.4)
	8(3.1)	22(8.5)
		2(0.8)

The majority of students who share information on Facebook are those who are online for 30 minutes to an hour. These findings suggest that sharing information on Facebook can be offline for a short period of time. They could have done it on other social media platforms besides Facebook, but when they discovered something interesting, they shared it on Facebook. Many online applications, such as online news, have special buttons that allow users to easily share information on various existing social media platforms.

Information of the type of knowledge is more frequently shared on Facebook by students (40.7%) than other types of information. Lecture assignments, lecture materials, and information about other lectures are examples of knowledge information shared. Students shared the least amount of information about politics and religion (10.3%). Table 5 shows the complete results.

Tabel 5. An Overview of The Types of Information Being Shared

Information Shared	Frequence (%)
Knowledge	59 (40.7)
Personal	54 (37.2)
Entertain	17 (11.7)
Politic dan Religion	15 (10.3)

Logistic regression was used to determine which types of ISFS motivation could predict student Facebook information sharing behavior. According to the findings, the value of $2(5) = 25.39$ with $p.001$ indicates that the five aspects of ISFS can significantly predict information sharing behavior. Only social searching and social browsing motivation could significantly explain student information sharing behavior, according to the significance test results for each aspect. The beta value of social browsing motivation is significant, with a value of $b = -.09$ and a significance level of $p.05$. These findings suggest that the more someone wants to search for general information on various Facebook pages, the less likely he is to share information with others.

Someone's desire to have fun (hedonic), look for the latest brands and models of a product (consumer trend), seek knowledge (general erudition), and seek information on specific accounts has no bearing on the likelihood of students sharing information on Facebook. Table 6 displays the complete logistic regression estimation results.

Tabel 6. Estimation of Information Sharing Behavior
Based on Types of InformationSearch on Facebook

Motivation to seek information	B	SE	Z	Sig.
Social search	.07	.07	1.09	.27
Hedonic proclivity	.07	.04	3.64	.07
Social browsing	-.09	.05	-2.17	.02
Consumer trend information	.07	.08	.95	.95
General erudition	.10	.05	1.89	.06

Cox and Snell (.201); Nagelgerke (.210); $\chi^2(5) = 25.385$ $p < 0.001$; Z = Wald; B = beta; SE = Standard Error.

The purpose of this study is to investigate information searching and sharing behavior. In this study, information-seeking behavior is observed by looking at what information adolescent Facebook users seek and share. In this study, the motivations for information-seeking were social browsing, social searching, hedonic productivity, consumer trends, and general erudition (Asghar, 2015).

The first finding of this study indicates that the most common types of information shared by respondents are knowledge, personal information, hedonic, social, and political. Everyone has rules for deciding what information to share (Kim & Hastak, 2018).

The information shared describes things relevant to their lives; for example, the motivation for Facebook in teenage students is dominated by their daily activities, such as discussing school activities and the media to determine meeting schedules with other friends (Tanta et al., 2014).

Individuals are viewed as superrational and selective beings in the uses and gratification theory, with a shift in the process of sending messages to receiving messages. According to Morrison et al., (2013), audiences or media users are aware of their own needs. They are in charge of selecting media that can meet their needs. Students' information is limited to knowledge, personal information, and social politics because they use Facebook media based on the needs and objectives of the information needed. According to Ramaswami's research, students will share information such as health, product reviews related to personal information, work-related or school-related (Ramaswami et al., 2014). Meanwhile, Nurrahmi & Syam (2020) discovered that as a form of student movement, Indonesian students actively discuss and share political news.

According to the findings of this study, the content shared by students on the Facebook page was a type of knowledge content. This finding is consistent with previous research, which found that knowledge-targeting behavior (KTB) is influenced by user functionality (Shwartz-Asher et al., 2020). Because the subjects in this study are students who are involved in the academic world, the content they share is knowledge-based.

Facebook is a simple social media platform to use; in addition to expanding your network of friends, it is also simple to find and share knowledge content. Many students use it to share information about what they do. The motivation to follow social media and find useful information, then filter it, is related to the motivation to share knowledge with students on Facebook media.

According to Oh & Syn (2015), ten motivational factors to use social media include, among other things: pleasure (using social media as a hobby to find information and share it with those who need it); self-efficacy (a sense of accomplishment); learning (updating oneself with information on topics of interest); personal gain (business-related information); altruism (the desire to help others without expecting anything in return); empathy (providing social and emotional support to each other); social engagement (communicating with peer users or collaborating with others).

Based on a review of major motivational theories and models, social media users are motivated by community interests (discussing specific community topics), reciprocity (sharing information to repay the kindness they receive from others), and reputation (seeing an increase in the number of friends or followers or being recognized as a top contributor). This statement is consistent with (Alt, 2015) research on student respondents' use of Facebook for social engagement, news information engagement, and commercial information engagement, which was conducted the same year. Meanwhile, Eid & Al-Jabri (2016) discovered that students used social media more for interacting with one another, sharing knowledge, and entertainment and enjoyment with student learning.

Tanta et al.,(2014) found that sharing knowledge content on social media increased student satisfaction. According to the claims, using Facebook satisfies their needs for integration, social interaction, information, and understanding of their social environment. It is clear that students prefer to share content in the form of self-satisfying interactions because this allows them to participate in social interactions. Satisfaction with sharing knowledge is also reinforced in relation to the discovery that

information is everything; so that others perceive someone who discovers information as having power and control over others (Masele, 2022).

According to the findings of this study, someone with social browsing motivation, namely the user's desire to find general information on Facebook, is less likely to share that information. According to the findings of Chang & Heo (2014) research, a person's social motive for using Facebook is to seek sensitive information.

The study's main challenge was that not all students shared information from Facebook pages. ISFS only assesses motivation to search for information on Facebook pages. Meanwhile, information sharing can be more than just posting it on a Facebook page. It is possible to share information from other social media platforms or news websites. This assumption is supported by the findings of this study. Most students spend more than three hours per day online, but only about one hour of that time is spent on Facebook. These findings imply that students can share information obtained from social media or other websites. Some social media and online sites include menus on their pages to facilitate sharing.

CONCLUSION

This study discovered that Facebook users (in this study, students) engaged in simultaneous information seeking and sharing on four major topics: knowledge, personal information, hedonic, and social politics. Further research can be conducted with respondents using other social media platforms, such as Instagram or Tiktok, to determine the motivations for seeking information, the topics sought, and the dynamics in sharing information, all of which have distinct patterns. Furthermore, the ease of sharing search results with shortcut keys on news sites can be a topic of further research in terms of student motivation and needs.

REFERENCE

- Alt, D. (2015). College students' academic motivation, media engagement and fear of missing out. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 49, 11-119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.02.057>
- Asghar, H. M. (2015). Measuring information seeking through Facebook: Scale development and initial evidence of Information Seeking in Facebook Scale (ISFS). *Computers in Human Behavior*, 52, 259-270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.005>
- Asterhan, C. S. C. & Bouton, E. (2017). Teenage peer-to-peer knowledge sharing through social network sites in Secondary Schools. *Computers & Education*, 110, 16–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMPEDU.2017.03.007>
- Bernaards, C. A. & Jennrich, R. I. (2005). Gradient projection algorithms and software for arbitrary rotation criteria in factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 65(5), 770–790. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164404272507>
- Chang, C. W. & Heo, J. (2014). Visiting theories that predict college students' self-disclosure on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 30, 79-86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.07.059>

- Eid, M. I. M. & Al-Jabri, I. M. (2016). Social networking, knowledge sharing, and student learning: The case of university students. *Computers and Education*, 99, 14-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.04.007>
- Erlin, Susandri, & Fitri, T. A. (2017). We are Different but Alike: A Comparative Analysis between Students' and Teachers' Use of Facebook. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 801(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/801/1/012091>
- Facebook. (2019). *Newsroom*. Retrived April 3, 2019, from <https://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/>.
- Field, A., Miles, J. & Field, Z. (2012). *Discovering statistics using R*, chapter 10. Washington DC: SAGE.
- Flanagin, A. J. & Metzger, M. J. (2000). Perceptions of internet information credibility. *JbMC Quarterly*, 77(3), 515-540. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900007700304>
- Kim, J. & Hastak, M. (2018). Social network analysis: Characteristics of online social networks after a disaster. *International Journal of Information Management*, 38(1), 86-96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2017.08.003>
- Masele, J. J. (2022). Information sharing in the social media era. *University of Dar Es Salaam Library Journal*, 16(2), 202–222. <https://doi.org/10.4314/udslj.v16i2.14>
- Mazman, S. G., & Usluel, Y. K. (2010). Modeling educational usage of Facebook. *Computers and Education*, 55(2), 444-453. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.02.008>
- Morrison, M. A., Cheong, H. J., & McMillan, S. J. (2013). Posting, lurking, and networking: Behaviors and characteristics of consumers in the context of user-generated content. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 13(2), 97-108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2013.826552>
- Mutambik, I., Lee, J., Almuqrin, A., Halboob, W., Omar, T., & Floos, A. (2022). User concerns regarding information sharing on social networking sites: The user's perspective in the context of national culture. *PLoS ONE*, 17(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0263157>
- Nurrahmi, F. & Syam, H. M. (2020). Perilaku informasi mahasiswa dan hoaks di media sosial. *Communicatus: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 4(2), 129-146. <https://doi.org/10.15575/cjik.v4i2.9215>
- Oh, S. & Syn, S. Y. (2015). Motivations for sharing information and social support in social media: A comparative analysis of Facebook, Twitter, Delicious, YouTube, and Flickr. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(10), 2045-2060. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23320>
- Osatuyi, B. (2013). Information sharing on social media sites. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(6), 2622-2631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.07.001>
- Permatasari, N. M. & Wu, M. (2021). The relationship between the narcissistic tendencies and cyberbullying behavior among university students. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 23(1), 126-134. <https://doi.org/10.26486/psikologi.v23i1.1146>
- Quan-Haase, A. & Young, A. L. (2010). Uses and gratifications of social media: A comparison of Facebook and Instant Messaging. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 30(5), 350–361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467610380009>
- Qun, Z. & Xiaocheng, Z. (2012). The design of individual knowledge sharing platform based on blog for online information literacy education. *Physics Procedia*, 33, 1426-1432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phpro.2012.05.233>

- Ramaswami, C., Murugathan, M., Narayanasamy, P., & Khoo, C. (2014). A survey of information sharing on Facebook. *Information Research*, 19(4).
- Revelle, W. (2017). Psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research. R Package Version 1.0-95. *The Personality Project View Project Geographical Psychology View Project*. Retrived April 3, 2019, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281345624>
- Rosen, L. D., Whaling, K., Carrier, L. M., Cheever, N. A., & Rokkum, J. (2013). The media and technology usage and attitudes scale: An empirical investigation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(6), 2501-2511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.06.006>
- Shwartz-Asher, D., Chun, S., Adam, N. R., & Snider, K. L. (2020). Knowledge sharing behaviors in social media. *Technology in Society*, 63, 101426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101426>
- Sin, S. C. J. & Kim, K. S. (2013). International students' everyday life information seeking: The informational value of social networking sites. *Library and Information Science Research*, 35(2), 107–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2012.11.006>
- Wolff, H. N. (2019). Most used social media platforms Indonesia 2022. Retrived April 3, 2019, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1343136/indonesia-most-used-social-media-platforms/>
- Tanta, I., Mihovilović, M., & Sablić, Z. (2014). Uses and gratification theory - Why adolescents use Facebook? *Medijska Istrazivanja*, 20(2), 85-110.
- Team, R. C. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Wang, S., Noe, R. A., & Wang, Z. M. (2014). Motivating knowledge sharing in knowledge management systems: A quasi-field experiment. *Journal of Management*, 40(4), 978-1009. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311412192>