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Abstract

The existence of social media has changed the landscape of human's relationship. Through social media, people are able to present many versions of themselves in many platforms. In this era of polymediation of the self, the discussion regarding to privacy becomes arguable, moreover, with the presence of *Path*; a social media platform which presents itself as a private social media. Hence, in the sociocultural context of Indonesian society, it is important to see how the definition of privacy is constructed by the existence of *Path*. Therefore, this research is conducted in order to analyze and explore how privacy is perceived by the social media users nowadays, particularly the users of *Path*, and why they perceive it in that certain way. This research is conducted with ethnography as the main method and virtual ethnography as the supporting method. From the research, it is found that users’ way of defining privacy is embodied in two levels: online self-presentation and personal space construction. In the first level, the stages of privacy offered by *Path* have created the fragmented-self among users. This fragmentation has resulted in “the ambivalent self”, “self that desires recognition”, and “self that searches for freedom”. In the second level, the mediality of *Path* has served the users of the ability to construct their own personal space in social media space. This construction of the personal space has resulted in “space of comfort in similarity”, “space of pseudo-liberation”, and “space that demolishes the panoptic”. Henceforth, these findings lead to a conclusion that usage practices of social media has killed the authentic self and created a personal space that gives the sense of the absence of control, hierarchy, and social surveillance. Eventually, privacy for *Path* is defined by the process of exchange of “the self and personal information” with “social recognition, sense of equality, and reciprocal relationship”.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Background

The new media has become a part of Indonesian society’s everyday life, particularly for the *millenials* who grow and are familiar with gadget and Internet technology in their
daily basis. The usage of new media, in particular regarding to access towards social media, has been penetrating into the life of society as a lifestyle that has been considered as prevalent. The emergence of social media becomes one distinct phenomenon, where the context of daily communication becomes mediated digitally and forms the social network built interpersonally in the digital world. People no longer need a long time to connect to one another (through the mail post or telegram), even no longer meet directly to keep up with each other. There are shifting in the pattern of human’s interaction and communication caused by the existence of social media.

Indonesians access towards the social media is directly proportional to the Internet penetration. From the Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, to the Path; forms of media social platforms are welcomed positively and having a place in the life of Indonesian society. Among many existing social network sites, Path has become one of the most popular in Indonesia since 2012. Just like the Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Youtube that has gained many users (Based on data from We Are Social, social media users in Indonesia have reached 106 million by January 2017, with penetration scale on 40%. More data can be accessed in <https://wearesocial.com/special-reports/digital-southeast-asia-2017>), Path is considered as one of social network sites that are favored by Indonesian society in general and the youth in particular. As being compared to other countries, Indonesia is considered as one of the countries with the largest number of Path users, that is more than four million users. (Based on data from The Jakarta Post, Path users in Indonesia have reached more than 4 million. Complete article can be accessed in <https://www.techinasia.com/dave-morin-path-indonesia>)

Different from Facebook and Twitter that began as social media sites accessed through personal computers and laptops, Path began as social network application that can only be accessed through smartphone and tablet, with Android, Windows, and iOS operational system. Based on the served features, Path is indeed not so different from other social media, like “update status” and “photo and video sharing”. However, Path is the first social network that serves the “media sharing” feature, which is an update about media currently accessed by the users, such as movies, television programs, books, and songs. Besides, Path also offers the integration with other social media platforms, such as Facebook, Twitter, and many more. Through the integration, when users upload content on Path, they are able to upload the same exact content to Facebook or Twitter at once. Therefore, the content can reach larger audience through the integration.

One of Path’s distinctions that are promoted by the creator is that Path gives privacy to its users. This “privacy” manifests in the contact limitation that is limited to only 500 accounts; different from the Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram that the limitation
can reach thousands of accounts. Based on survey result released by online survey platform, *Jajak Pendapat* in 2016, it was found that one of the reasons why Indonesian users are using Path is because they think that Path is more private than other social media. This survey was conducted to the majority of Path users, which are youth with the range of age from 20 to 35 year-old.

Path users in Indonesia are dominated by users in the range of age between 20 and 35 year-old. This range of age is often dubbed as the “youth”. In the context of social media usage, “youth” is often being referred as the group in the society that is active users of the social media; from the age of teenagers to the young adults, with the wide range of profession from students to workers. The youth is marked as the generation that motors the life of Internet and social media, from the creator, active content producer, to the passive user. This generation is also found to be the group that dominates the Path users.

The exclusivity approach by limiting the connected friends for every user account is considered as the main attraction of Path; that Path is considered giving the private room wanted by the social media users. Moreover, Path has the stages of privacy served, starting from the outermost layer, it is that (1) users can upload content to all friends in Path as well as integrating with other social network platforms, (2) users upload content to all friends is Path without integrating it with other platforms, (3) users upload content to the selected friends in the “Inner Circle” in Path, and (4) users upload content that can only be seen by themselves through their own account only. However, with the stages of privacy and the offer of information security served by Path, there are still emerging problems regarding to the content uploaded by users.

With the sense of security from the guaranteed the privacy of the information uploaded to social media has made some users make use of the platform to express their personal opinion in the social network. Even when the opinion contains some negative sentiments towards some people, users keep on doing it because they think that they have the rights towards anything they upload on their personal (or at least, what they think is personal) account. In the end of 2014, there was the case of Florence Sihombing, a student of Faculty of Law, Gadjah Mada University, who was prosecuted legally for uploading a content that was insulting the citizens of Yogyakarta. This case was viral in the social media. It began with Florence uploading a status in her Path account, containing a mocking towards the city of Yogyakarta because of an unfortunate event she had at the gas station. One of Florence's acquaintances in Path was somehow screen capturing the posting and sharing it on other social media.
platforms. Some people who were offended by Florence's statement in the posting were suing her legally in the court.

The case of Florence Sihombing was only one of many cases that were caused by the social network, particularly in regards to the privacy in social media usage itself. Social networks have been presenting the paradox of privacy or things that are considered as "private" by the social media users. Other cases that were not exposed by the mainstream media, such as friends or lovers' quarrel caused by some posting in social media were happening a lot in the society; as well as some people who were patronized by some other people because their posting contains some sensitive issues. In one side, media social gives the freedom towards users to present anything they like through their account to the public. In the other side, they don't have control upon the content that has been uploaded to the Internet. Though Path is offering the control, what happens is the other way around, because no matter how users limit their peer, that peer is connected to other peers, and so on. The emerging of cases regarding to privacy in social media in Indonesian society has created a big question about the idea of "privacy" itself in the context of socio-cultural in Indonesia.

Therefore, the issue regarding to privacy in social media in the context of Indonesia is considered as significant to be discussed, moreover with the penetration of communication and information technology, as well as the globalization that allows the acculturation to occur in the daily cultural practice, including the social media usage. Understanding the paradox of privacy that occurs in social media usage, particularly Path, can be accomplished by understanding how Path users define the privacy. With the high intensity of social media usage among Indonesian youth, as well as the many cases caused by misunderstanding or different point of views toward privacy in social network, hence it becomes essential to understand how privacy is defined by Path users.

1.2. Methodology

This research is conducted with ethnography as the main method and virtual ethnography as the supporting method. Ethnography is used for studying the perspective and behavior of Path users in defining privacy, because using Path is a part of their activities in a daily basis (lived realities), without abandoning the context that daily practice is not free from the value of social discourse in the society. Therefore, the new ethnography that was put forward by Saukko (2003: 55-73) gives the chance to study the phenomenon of privacy in Path usage. This method enables researcher to
analyze the dialogic shifting between researcher and the perspectives of the subjects involved in this research. Therefore, researcher and informants involve mutually with the purpose to search for resemblance and to see the existing differences (Saukko, 2003: 64-67). Researcher and subjects’ views are told through the dialogue that is meeting one another instead of erasing. Nonetheless, one of the natures of ethnography, it cannot be denied that the researcher’s perspective plays a defining role. However, the diversity of opinions and arguments, as well as the polyvocality, will be the manifestation of being truer to lived realities.

The virtual ethnography method is used as the effort to investigate the Internet usage that has meaning for the life of society. At this point, interactive media is understood as the culture itself as well as the cultural artifact (Hine, 2000: 14-38). Using virtual ethnography has made it possible for researcher to see the mediated interaction both in the virtual and physical field. Moreover, the boundary between “virtual” and “real” cannot be considered as the thing that comes as it is (or taken for granted). Looking at the context in this research, since Path can be understood as cultural artifact which has shaped or been shaped by the culture itself. This method enables researcher to involve directly with subjects in the decided term of time, even periodically, without being have to drown in a long term. Virtual ethnography must be partial (Hine, 2000: 83-116), hence accounts used by researcher are based on strategic relevance to answer the research question instead of objective reality of true representation. In order to learn the Internet and social media, researcher must involve within it and conduct ethnography as the user of social media itself. Henceforth, this ethnography is at, in, and through the Internet. Therefore, this method is considered as the closest method to find answers of the formulated research question.

2. Result and Discussion

Path is a social media, which the main function is to mediate the communication and interaction process of people with their social environment. However, as the social media that facilitates one of human’s basic needs to interact with their surroundings, Path exists with an offer of another human’s basic needs: the needs for personal space. Path becomes the social media platform that intentionally puts on a slogan “the private social media” as its main attraction for gaining users. In the context of Indonesian society, the issue of “privacy” is commonly debated in society. However, there are neither specific nor articulate academic terms that could define the “privacy” itself, moreover in context of social media usage. It is defined differently according to someone’s personal
background story; how someone defines privacy could be very different from the way someone else defines it. Particularly, there are still limited Indonesian scholars who put concern in the matters of privacy in social media usage, in which being a part of both media culture and psychology media. The sociocultural background in Indonesia has shaped some differences from other countries regarding to how people define “privacy”. In the result of this research, we will see how the existence of Path in the landscape of social media has given new colors in the practice of defining privacy by Indonesian users. The defining privacy manifests in two points: the self-presentation of Path users and the construction of personal space built in there.

2.1. Fragmented self in the stages of privacy

The polymediated self in cyber space has become one of the aspects that make the practice of defining privacy complex (Tyma, 2015: 10). Privacy is no longer just an effort to gain self-autonomy by doing isolation or exclusivity towards personal information, but rather a dialectic process between self-disclosure and self-boundary (Eldred, 2013: 127). Hence, discussing about privacy is as well as discussing about publicity (Capurro, Eldred & Nagel, 2013: 9). Among Indonesian social media users, it is a common thing to have an account in more than just one social media platform. The condition creates the fragmentation of the self, moreover, Path offers stages of privacy which enable the self-fragmentation of users is multiplying in a more complex way.

Through the self-fragmentation, Path users in this research have shown the tendency of “ambivalence self”, where this ambivalence occurs in some points that is centered in the paradox of their self-expression. In one side, they desire to have privacy, while on the other side they want publicity. The desire towards publicity is showed through the neglect of private or closed account setting in the social media platforms aside from Path, such as Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter. In other words, they have public or open account that can be accessed by anyone even though they are not connected as “friends” in those social media platforms. Besides, this research also shows that there is a tendency of Path users for having more than just one account in the Twitter and Instagram; where there is one account using their real identity or name, and other accounts are using fake name or pseudonym or even anonym. In this point, they want to present “a certain self” from themselves, but they have some fears or insecurities upon people’s views toward that “certain self”, hence they choose to use anonym or pseudonym.
Paradox of Path users’ self-presentation in this research is seen through the practice of Path usage. On one side, the motivation for using Path is to build a personal space where they connect with only their closest peer, as well as to show the up close and personal side of themselves, but when the Path offers an even more private room in that personal space (“Inner Circle” and “Private Post” feature), they tend to ignore it. When they’re intentionally not using the most private features, on the other side they also tend to ignore the most public feature (“Share to Other Social Media” feature), when they can actually use it if what they want is to gain publicity as wider as possible.

Even though users accentuate their needs to have more than one account in other social media platforms, in Path, users do not sense the need to have more than one account, or even to have anonymous or pseudonymous account. Therefore, it can be stated that they have the sense of security in being their “self” that is presented in Path, because they use Path to gain personal space in cyber space. However, if users are aiming for privacy, the ambivalence occurs in the point where the neglect towards more private room offered by Path. If what they aim is publicity, ambivalence occurs in the point where the neglect towards more public room offered by Path. In the development of it, it is found that Path users have the tendency to look for balance between their needs of personal space for the self and their needs to interact with social environment and build relation with others. Existing ambivalence in the self-fragmentation of users occurs because of the efforts of the individual in order to balance their needs of privacy and publicity, moreover, though their self is being fragmented in the social media, there is this need from within their self to be their authentic self.

With the awareness they have upon what they choose to present in Path will actually shape their “self” in that particular social media, whether they are conscious or not, they are tied to certain “standards” constructed by the social relation in Path. In considering uploading certain content, the decision is not fully based on users’ preferences. The study towards Path users has shown the tendency that they have awareness upon considerations regarding to which social media platforms where they are going to upload certain content, the people who will be able to access that certain content, and even the kind of interaction that they may gain from the uploading of that certain content. At this point, the ambivalence of the self occurs between “the self that has the needs to become the authentic self” and “the self that is demanded to fulfill the standard of social environment”, because even the self that they think is their authentic self, consciously or not, has a certain purpose in the shaping of it.

Fragmentation of the self of users in social media has also shown the tendency of “the self who desires for recognition”. At this point, social media becomes a private
showroom, where they have the sense that they find freedom to present the self that they consider as authentic. Generally, Path users in this research have the tendency to be recognized as a person who “broadminded” and “able to share important and update information” related to their preferences and hobbies, hence they can gain some distinction that defines and gives character upon their self among their close peers.

In Path, the recognition that users want to achieve is the acknowledgement that comes from the closest peer that they have selected to be connected with them in there. That closest peer contains of people whom they really know directly in their daily life. “The sense of acknowledgement” becomes a significant thing for Path users because that is the thing that puts them into the maps of their imagine-social-relation. When they get the recognition from their closest peer, which is when they get the sense that their existence is giving meaning and contribution toward social environment where they live. Path users in this research have shown that the self-recognition they want to achieve is materialized in the form of self-approval from their closest peer; hence the reaction given by their closest peer becomes something very significant for users. Therefore, it is important for them to get some comment, symbolic reaction such as likes and emoticon, or any kind of possible feedbacks. For users, those reactions given by their closest peer become the sign of acceptance towards their self. Indonesian society is built on collectivity rather than individuality. This condition has shaped the self of Indonesian people as the self who longs for recognition from their social environment as the embodiment of their self-actualization. Hence, acknowledgement becomes a very significant thing in social relationship among Indonesian.

The self-disclosure done by Path users in this research is anchored to some expectations they think they need to keep up with. Considerations they have while uploading some content to the Path are showing the tendency where they tend to choose to upload content which can define their self as the self that has some cultural capital towards the audience that they have chosen based on their offline closest peer. Kramer dan Haferkamp (2011: 127) adopted Bourdieu’s concept of capital (1993: 55-56), in which they stated that social media has become the “arena” of symbolic battle, where someone’s action in the social situation is affected by some sets of social relation with certain purpose. There is also this tendency of Path users in this research that the showroom is also the form of their self-expression on having some distinction from other members of their closest peer, as well as having a high status in the classes of collective intelligent among their closest peer. This distinction, as stated by Bourdieu (1993: 69-70), is needed in order to legitimate their ownership of the capital.
Besides, in the self of Path users in this research, there is the tendency that they have the needs for feeling “exist”, which in the case of Path is materialized through the confirmation from their closest peer in the form of positive impression and interaction. That interaction brings the sense of being “present”. Therefore, they are able to manifest their self actualization as an individual. At this point, the self that desires for recognition is encountering dilemma between the needs for being the authentic self from within their self and the demand for fulfilling some standards from their social environment, because their existence cannot be apart from the network they build in there and the mediality of social media platform they use.

The “self that is searching for freedom” appears as the tendency in self-fragmentation of Path users in this research. The sense of freedom is practically under the cover of pseudo individuality, because the mediality of Path as the media actor in the cultural industry has constructed the self of its users. In the efforts for achieving the self-individuality, Path users use many features offered by Path to present their authentic self. Mainly, they try to build their authentic self through showing their tastes and preferences (music, film, etc.), as well as daily activities (what they do, where they are at, with whom, etc.). Nonetheless, the expression of self-individuality has indeed shaped by the media industry, or in this case, by the Path as social media platform that becomes the actor in shaping the industry. Therefore, the self-individuality is considered as pseudo individuality because they feel like they have choices when the choices they have are actually in some certain limitations shaped by the media. The concept of pseudo individuality was adapted by Cook (1996: 42) from Adorno and Horkheimer (1972: 212), to depict the condition where people feel like they have choices upon their media preferences in the context of popular culture; while on the contrary, the choices themselves have been shaped by media industry.

Path has been shaping pseudo individuality through users’ preferences based on contemporary and popular culture. The music catalogue in Path, for example, only has newer Indonesian songs (released after year 2000) and some popular older songs (released before the year 2000). Besides, the major label produces all of those songs, which is the dominant player in Indonesian music industry. It is exactly the same for other Asian songs, such as South Korea, Japan, and Thailand. However, the Western songs, particularly American, are different. Path’s catalogue has a lot more complete Western songs than Asian songs. Therefore, it can be seen that the music preference constructed by Path is the Western-minded music preference. The Western-mindedness of media catalogue is also found in the catalogue of films, television programs, and books. There is this common view among Indonesian youth that people who consume
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Western popular culture are considered as ‘cool’, in which is actually one of the products of imperialism in the history of this country. This common view has in a way also shaped the taste of Indonesian youth. Hence, it’s not only the matter of media’s domination in shaping the preference, but also the cultural reference that is herited by the society towards the particular human agency as well.

Ironically, Path users in this research show the tendency that they have the sense of getting some freedom in Path, because of the sense of power in choosing people who are connected to them in there and have access to their Path account. This condition has built some sense of belief within users that they are able to become their authentic self without getting negative sentiments from their social environment, because they have control to present their self towards people who have the ability to accept their authentic self. As stated by Trepte and Reinecke (2011: 65), people on social media have the needs to express their authentic self. On the other side, there are some collision between the freedom and the social environment that is actually indirectly strangling them. The interaction that is taking place in Path, though it occurs with selected people, has shaped some demands toward their self to become the “self that is imagined by the social environment”. At this point, what they actually get is not freedom, but rather “the sense of having freedom”; hence there is no authentic self, but rather “the self that is considered as authentic”.

The conception of the “self” that appears from the self fragmentation of Path users is leading up to the great narration of “the lost of the self-that-is-considered-as-authentic” through the paradoxes appeared in the dialectic between privacy and publicity in the social media usage. However, users do not argue that the lost of the self-that-is-considered-as-authentic is having the same meaning as the lost of the autonomy upon their self, because the “privacy” is then defined in the spectrum of exchange to gain certain social recognition that they want. In other words, they think that their privacy is not violated as long as they achieve something they want in return. At this point, privacy in the social media is defined as in how the self releases certain personal information in order to gain some certain social recognition.

Exchange process conducted by individuals in the efforts of fulfilling the needs for privacy is related to the personal space they construct in order to manifest that desire. In the context of social media, this problem becomes complex because of the blurred boundary between personal space and public space in social media platforms. Therefore, the efforts of fulfilling the desire of the “self” to balance privacy and publicity in the practice of social media usage cannot set aside the “space” as the aspect that brings significance towards defining the privacy itself.
2.2. The manifest of privacy in social media space

Through the construction of personal space conducted by Path users in this research, it is found that they tend to build “comfortable space in similarities”. That space is the space where they find the sense of “equality” with other accounts that are connected to them in there, which is built, based on “similarity”, hence the occurring crowd in there is the personal crowd in the social space that they create by themselves. The similarities manifest not only in forms of preferences, hobbies, tastes, perspectives, ideology, and views of life, but also in forms of cultural frame and reference. The cultural frame and reference is materialized in the way they respond to some certain situation, as well as the usage of some language terms in the conversation that can only be understood by their closest peer.

The similar cultural frame and references are, for Path users in this research, tending to create an understanding between them and their closest peer; hence they have the confidence to disclose their self. At this point, personal space in social media has become “echo chamber” where similar opinions are justified, as if there was an unwritten rule that “likes for likes”, which for every content that is uploaded by a user will be responded positively by another user, and vice versa, a user will give positive response towards another user’s uploaded content. In other words, that space is a space that is filled with a group of people who interact reciprocally. This concept of echo chamber was first coined by Sunstein (2001: 74), in which later was adopted by Hampton, Shin, and Lu (2017: 1095) in order to illustrate how someone’s participation in social media is highly motivated by the sense of confidence that their opinion will be more acceptable in the echo chamber.

Based on the experiences of Path users in this research, personal space in Path tends to be “a space of pseudo-liberation”, where there is control shifting from family relation (kinship) in offline reality to the friends-based relation (friendship). In the efforts to build a space that enables them to interact reciprocally with their closest peer, Path users in this research were building the relation in the space based on friendship. Path users choose the friendship kind of relation because it gives them the sense of liberation from social control that can threaten their personal space. In the social real life, Indonesian tends to attach and be tied with their kinship. It is a common thing that even at the adult age Indonesian is still living under the same roof with their parents, as the root perspective in this country is that someone is considered as an adult if they are married. Hence, if they are not married yet, even though they are already in their 30s or 40s, it's a common thing that they still live with their parents. Therefore, the
sense of control from the parents is always there. This common way-of-thinking among Indonesian has created the needs of children to gain their own personal space without parents’ intervention. This condition, nonetheless, has shaped the way people define privacy and the way they behave towards the issue of privacy.

There is the tendency that Path users in this research create a space where they will not feel susceptible towards certain social assessment or judgment, particularly from their parents; hence they decide to erase the relation (with their parents) in their personal space in social media. However, in practice, the control is shifting to the friendship, where Path users tend to consider how their friends will respond towards certain content they upload. At this point, social environment holds the control but Path users are not aware about it. Therefore, the freedom they achieve in that space is actually just a sense, or in another word, pseudo.

As a form of self defense against threats upon violation towards their personal space, Path users in this research have shown tendency in creating some certain distance and proximity, which enables them to not only being just an object, but also as a subject who supervise. In this matter, personal space in social media becomes “a space that deconstructs the panopticon”. “Panopticon” itself is a concept coined by Foucault (1995: 202-203) by borrowing from Jeremy Bentham (An architect who applied the panopticon system in the design of jail, in order to put control system towards the prisoners) to depict the condition where there is certain social control system that builds the sense of ‘being watched’ in every person; hence, their action is actually controlled by this system. However, there is no single supervisor in the personal space in social media, instead, one another are watching over each other. The process of watching-over-one-another in the personal space is in the spectrum of certain distance and proximity which brings the sense of security for Path users to share their personal information. The proximity is manifested through the shaping of “echo chamber” of similar selves to gain the sense of equality; meanwhile Path users gain the sense of security through the distance created by the social media space, where there is no physical presence there.

The conceptions of “space” lead up to one great narration that the personal space becomes a semi-transparent room that is constructed in the efforts of diminishing certain forms of hierarchy, control, and surveillance from certain people (in this matter is particularly the parents or family). However, the hierarchy, control, and surveillance still exist in another forms from other people (in this matter is the friendship), though it is not defined by the users as the lost of personal space that they would like to have. In other words, they feel that their personal space is not violated as long as they gain
the sense of equality in the form of friendship. At this point, privacy in social media is defined as in how users perceive the personal space; not as a space for self-isolation, but rather as the contestation arena of fulfilling the desire upon privacy and publicity in order to gain reciprocity in the relationship.

In the end, defining privacy in the frame of social media usage, particularly Path, is being narrowed to two main points: “self” and “space”. At the point of the “self”, privacy becomes the transaction where the risk of losing the self-that-is-considered-as-authentic to some extent is being exchanged with individual’s potential to gain certain social recognition that they want. At the point of the “space”, privacy becomes the efforts to build a semi-transparent personal room as the contestation arena of the exchange process in order to achieve a reciprocal relationship. In that frame of defining, users do not find their privacy is violated as long as they gain the sense of social recognition, equality, and reciprocity in the space of social media.

3. Conclusion

Speaking in the context of Indonesian users, the fragmentation of the self in the stages of privacy offered by social media is in the spectrum of intertwining between the needs of individual to gain privacy and the desire to make publicity. That intertwining has emerging the ambivalence self as the result of individual’s efforts to balance those two paradox needs. Besides, the paradox in the practice of social media usage regarding to the privacy issue is occurring at the point where there is the needs to present authentic self on one side, but there is also the desire to achieve social acknowledgment from the social environment on another side. Also, the mediality of the Path has created pseudo-individuality on one side, while the users try to search for freedom in the social media space on the other side.

Based on the result of this research, it can be concluded that there is the tendency that in the fragmentation of the self in the stages of privacy in social media, the self-that-is-considered-as authentic has gone. The lost of the self-that-is-considered-as authentic itself could possibly be submerged into: (1) the pull and push between self-disclosure and self-boundary that is presented by users, (2) the dialectic of self presentation which is trapped in the desire to gain social recognition, and (3) pseudo-individuality that is constructed by the mediality of Path as the media actor in the cultural industry. At this point, individual’s needs for gaining the authentic self in the space of social media are a difficult goal to achieve.
In the practice, though, based on the disclosure from Path users in this research, “the
lost of the self-that-is-considered-as authentic” is not in the spectrum of their awareness.
They think that in the middle of self-ubiquity that is fragmented in the social media
space, at one point they have autonomy towards their self to present their authentic
self. Therefore, they feel that they have fulfilled their needs for privacy in social media,
because on one side they define it as the power to gain something, which is the social
recognition, by presenting the self that they think, is authentic. With the lost of the
authentic self, discussing about privacy in social media becomes a discussion about an
exchange process in needs of individuals, for between personal information and social
recognition.

The construction of personal space in social media space is built on the tug-of-war
spectrum between the desire to fulfill the needs for personal space and the needs to
be a part of public space in the social media network society. The dialectic has shaped
a space that is able to create the sense of comfortableness through similarities among
people in one closest peer network, in order to afford the sense of equality. In the
efforts to diminish the hierarchy and achieve the liberty, that space is built based on
friendship-relationship, as well as vanishing the family/kinship-relationship, particularly
with parents; and this matter is creating control shifting from the kinship to the friendship.
Besides, there is some certain distance and proximity that support the personal space,
which later creates the effect of the fallen of surveillance and panopticon.

Based on the result of this research, it can be concluded that there is the tendency
that a paradox is created in the construction of personal space in social media. They feel
that they build “personal space”, while what they really build actually is “public space that
they differ from other social media platforms”. The manifestations of “appointed public
space” are: (1) the crowd in a narrower scoop which is similar, where they feel that there
is no hierarchy there, (2) building relationship that is based on friendship hence they
feel that there is no control there, and (3) the transparent room with certain distance and
proximity where they feel that there is no surveillance there. They try to build a semi-
transparent room where they have the sense of control upon how open or how close
the room is, hence that room becomes “the space they consider as personal”. They will
open and close the room in order to afford the purpose they have in mind regarding
to the personal space, which is the absence of hierarchy, control, and surveillance.
However, the space that is considered as personal is actually not free from hierarchy,
control, and surveillance.

In the practice, though, based on the disclosure from Indonesian Path users in this
research, “the existence of hierarchy, control, and surveillance in the space that they
consider as personal” is not in their spectrum of awareness. They think that in the network society in social media, at one point they have autonomy towards personal space that they are able to construct. Therefore, they feel that they have fulfilled their needs for privacy in social media, because on one side they define it as the power to build a personal space, while on the other side they define it as the power to gain something, which is the two-way relationship with their closest peer based on the selection process they do, hence they achieve the sense of equality. With the existence of the sense of equality and two-way relationship in the space they consider as a personal space, discussing about privacy issue in social media becomes a discussion about creating a reciprocal relationship needed by individual, which is achieved in the two-way relationship with the social environment that they consider as equal.
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