Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

Effects of social support and personality on emotional disclosure on Facebook and in real life

Iryna Pentina & Lixuan Zhang

Published online: 19 Nov 2016.

Submit your article to this journal ☑

View related articles ☑

View Crossmark data ☑

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

Effects of social support and personality on emotional disclosure on Facebook and in real life

Iryna Pentina[a*] and Lixuan Zhang[b*]

[a]Department of Marketing and International Business, The University of Toledo, Toledo, OH, USA; [b]John B. Goddard School of Business & Economics, Weber State University, Ogden, UT, USA

ABSTRACT
This paper focuses on the roles of personality and social support in affecting the extent of emotional disclosure in social media (SM) and compares them to those in face-to-face encounters. Specifically, we consider the effects of the Big Five personality traits and perceptions of social support from friends, significant others, and family on the extent of sharing positive and negative emotions on Facebook (FB) vs. real life (RL). The data are collected via an online survey of a broad demographic range of FB users. Our findings suggest that certain personality traits (extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness), as well as perceived social support from friends, are significantly related to the disclosure of positive emotions on FB. We also report and discuss the differences between drivers of emotional disclosure in SM and RL, as well as offer suggestions for future research.

Introduction

As a specific form of self-disclosure, emotional disclosure focuses on the expression and communication of a personal emotional experience (Duprez et al. 2014). By sharing positive emotions in face-to-face situations, individuals enhance their positive affect far beyond the benefits resulting from the event itself (Langston 1994). Disclosing positive emotions in real life (RL) also strengthens social bonds and improves relational well-being (Gable et al. 2004). Similarly, the benefits of sharing negative emotions include reduced stress and fear (Schachter 1959; Shim, Capella, and Han 2011), greater perceived emotional support (Ainsworth et al. 1978; Beals, Peplau, and Gable 2009), and improved relational intimacy (Graham et al. 2008). It has even been argued that the ability to share emotions is closely related to mental health and social functioning (Jourard 1971; Pennebaker, Zech, and Rimé 2001).

Social media (SM) have provided a new platform for emotional disclosure (Naaman, Boase, and Lai 2010). The social enhancement hypothesis suggests that people's behaviours in SM closely parallel those in RL (Valkenburg, Schouten, and Peter 2005). Studies supporting this hypothesis report that users with stronger RL ties utilise Facebook (FB) more actively to strengthen these ties (Papacharissi and Mendelson 2011). Similarly, those who perceive high social capital in RL are more likely to use FB for expressive information sharing,

companionship, and social interactions (Papacharissi and Mendelson 2011; Giannakos et al. 2013). Additionally, individuals who are more active on FB have more confidants and closer ties to offline networks (French and Read 2013; Johnston et al. 2013).

Studies also find that individuals express more positive emotions on FB than in RL, and appear to others to be happier on FB than in RL (Qiu et al. 2012). These findings support the 'positivity bias' reported in online communications and illustrate the impression management function of SM (Reinecke and Trepte 2014). This view suggests that in order to present a more desirable social image in the digital space, users will avoid disclosing their negative emotional experiences. Positive self-disclosure on social networking sites appears to induce social attraction, perceived intimacy, and psychological well-being (Park, Jin, and Jin 2011; Reinecke and Trepte 2014), while negative self-disclosure is associated with lower social attractiveness and is considered less appropriate (Bazarova 2012). Although FB users with low self-esteem tend to disclose more negative than positive information (Forest and Wood 2012), their negative status updates receive less favourable feedback from others.

Understanding what factors affect the emotional disclosure in SM has become an important research topic. Through analysing SM posts, researchers have investigated how situational factors such as weather (Park

---

et al. 2013), time and location (Golder and Macy 2011), and emotional state (De Choudhury et al. 2013) are related to expressed emotions on FB and Twitter. Only few existing studies have investigated the role of personality in emotional disclosure in social networks (Seidman 2013, 2014). For example, Seidman (2013) found that among the Big Five personality traits, extroversion and neuroticism are significantly related to emotional disclosure. In another paper, it was shown that FB users who want to express their 'true self' are more likely to post emotional content (Seidman 2014). However, both of her studies only addressed negative emotional disclosure.

Several studies have investigated the roles of social network properties in emotional sharing. Lin, Tov, and Qiu (2014) found that FB users with denser network are more likely to disclose both positive and negative emotions and that FB users with larger networks are more likely to disclose positive emotions. Similar results were found among Twitter users (Kivran-Swaine and Naaman 2011). However, Burke and Develin (2016) discovered that people share more positive and negative emotions when their networks are smaller and denser.

Researchers have also studied how various social factors affect general self-disclosure in SM, without specifically focusing on emotional disclosure. Their studies generally find a positive relationship between social support and self-disclosure in general (Lee, Noh, and Koo 2013; Liu and Brown 2014). One study, however, did not find social cohesion as being significantly related to self-disclosure (Hollenbaugh and Ferris 2014).

The current study extends this emerging research stream and contributes to the literature by simultaneously investigating the roles of personality traits and social support that were earlier identified as separate important antecedents to both self-disclosure in general and emotional disclosure in particular. Both negative and positive emotional disclosure are examined. Additionally, we compare this combined influence of personality and social support on emotional disclosure in SM with that in the RL context, adding further insight to the research domain. More specifically, we determine the roles of perceived social support from friends, family, and significant others and the Big Five personality traits in the incidence of positive vs negative sentiments expressed in posts on FB compared to RL.

Literature review

Social support

Social support is defined as 'an exchange of resources between at least two individuals perceived by the

provider or the recipient to be intended to enhance the well-being of the recipient' (Schumaker and Brownell 1984, 13). It operates as a coping resource provided to the individual by significant others to relieve stress and negative emotions (Thoits 1995). Perceived social support has been consistently associated with reduced impacts of major life events and chronic strains on physical and mental health (Cohen and Wills 1985). It has been suggested that reassurance provided by family members, friends, and significant others bolsters self-esteem, improves the sense of identity, and sustains competence. On the contrary, negative interaction with family members, lack of close relationship, and inadequate parenting are associated with lower self-esteem. Social support is believed to operate through encouragement, monitoring and regulation, or co-participation in desirable behaviours (Thoits 1995). Social support plays an important role in engendering positive emotional experiences and reducing the negative effects of stress, thus enhancing self-esteem and a sense of control over the environment (Zimet et al. 1998). These findings suggest that individuals who perceive greater social support would be more willing to disclose both negative and positive emotions in face-to-face situations. Therefore we propose:

> H1a: Greater perceived social support is positively related to both positive and negative emotional disclosures in RL.

In SM, social support is one of the most important elements of interactions (Park, Kee, and Valenzuela 2009), an important factor for engaging in commerce on SM (Shin 2013) and a major reason for online social networking (Oh, Ozkaya, and LaRose 2014). SM heightens users' awareness of the activities and resources of their social ties as a result of fast and short exchanges on SM platforms (Hampton, Lee, and Her 2011; Hampton 2016). When a FB user updates his/her status or posts on the wall, he/she is conducting an act of self-disclosure. The feedback to the status update and wall post, which may come in the digital forms of likes and comments, or offline communication such as phone calls or face-to-face conversions (Lu and Hampton, in press) leads to the user's awareness of his/her social support. This awareness provides a clue to the FB user on how to deal with 'audience problem' (Hampton 2016) and assess the level of social support from each audience. It is found that FB users share more intense and less positive messages in private messages than in status updates (Bazarova et al. 2015).

Although there have been conflicting results on the relationship between perceived social support and the intensity of FB use (Vitak, Ellison, and Steinfield 2011;

Lu and Hampton, in press), positive correlation was reported between the perceptions of social support from FB friends and positive emotions experienced after supportive interactions. Additionally, a positive association was found between emotional content sharing and expected social support (Buechel and Berger 2012).

Studies have shown that individuals express more positive emotions on FB than in RL, and appear to others to be happier on FB than in RL (Qiu et al. 2012). These findings underscore the impression management function of SM, suggesting that in order to present a more desirable social image in the digital space, users will avoid disclosing their negative emotional experiences. Existing studies, however, have not identified any significant relationship between perceived social support and negative emotional disclosure in SM. The characteristics of SM may impact how people share negative emotions. First, since channels such as status updates and wall posts are publically visible, the messages are not targeted at anyone in particular. SM users are aware that a general public may view the negative message content. In addition, since a wall post may lead to comments from network members, the audience may easily expand beyond an imagined targeted audience (Bazarova and Choi 2014). Under these circumstances, the effect of perceived social support from significant others, family, and friends may diminish on negative emotional disclosure when the audience is not visible or ill-defined. Therefore, we do not hypothesise any effect of perceived social support on negative emotional disclosure in SM.

H1b: Greater perceived social support is positively related to positive emotional disclosures in SM.

Extroversion

A number of propositions exist regarding the effect of the Big Five personality traits on experiencing and sharing emotions in RL. Generally, extroversion is associated with positive emotionality, energy, and interpersonal warmth or gregariousness (Costa and McCrae 1992). In addition, extroverted individuals have a greater tendency to be sociable and should be more likely to share both negative and positive emotions in face-to-face situations (Larsen and Ketelaar 1991). On the other hand, introverts, characterised by shyness and self-consciousness in social situations, may be more sensitive to potential rejection cues from others (Melchior and Cheek 1990; Henderson and Zimbardo 2001). This sensitivity may lead them to suppress emotional expression and sharing in face-to-face situations (Ayduk et al. 2000). Extroverts are more likely to join FB (Ryan and Xenos

2011), have more FB friends (Landers and Lounsbury 2006), join groups on FB (Ross et al. 2009), and disclose more personal information (Hollenbaugh and Ferris 2014). Extroversion is also positively related to negative emotional disclosure on FB (Seidman 2013). Therefore, we hypothesise the difference in the extent of emotional sharing between extroverts and introverts for both face-to-face and FB contexts:

H2: Extroverts are more likely to disclose emotions (both positive and negative) in RL and SM than introverts.

Emotional stability

Emotional stability (ES) assesses one's capacity to maintain emotional balance under stressful circumstances. Individuals high on ES are not prone to high levels of negative affect and, therefore, may be less overwhelmed by their negative emotions. As a result, more emotionally stable individuals are better able to regulate their emotional disclosure and tend to disclose less than those low on ES in RL (John and Cross 2004). Users characterised by low ES are more likely to use the Internet for communication (Wolfradt and Doll 2011), to avoid loneliness (Melchior and Cheek 1990), and to post accurate personal information in anonymous SM (Amichai-Hamburger, Wainpel, and Fox 2002). Recent research finds that ES is negatively associated with social use of FB (Hughes et al. 2012) and emotional disclosure on FB (Seidman 2013), possibly helping less stable individuals to avoid loneliness (Butt and Phillips 2008). ES also negatively correlates with the frequency of FB status updates and the emotional content of these updates (Buechel and Berger 2012).

H3: More emotionally stable individuals will disclose fewer positive and negative emotions in RL and SM than less emotionally stable individuals.

Openness to experiences

Individuals who are open to new experiences often have broad interests, seek novelty, and avoid conventional wisdom (Costa and McCrae 1992). People who are more open to new experiences are more likely to consider new technologies easier to use (Svendsen et al. 2013). Researchers find that being open is a double-edged sword, since open individuals experience positive and negative emotions more intensely than others (Costa and McCrae 1984) and thus are more likely to share their experiences and feelings (O'Brien and DeLongis 1996). On the Internet, individuals who are highly open to new experiences are more sociable on

FB (Ross et al. 2009), disclose more information, post more frequently (Buechel and Berger 2012), and discuss a wider variety of topics (Hollenbaugh and Ferris 2014). Therefore, we hypothesise that:

> H4: Individuals characterised by greater openness to new experiences will disclose more positive and negative emotions both in RL and in SM than those characterised by lower openness.

Conscientiousness

Individuals with a high level of conscientiousness tend to be careful, hard-working, and purposeful. Those high in conscientiousness (characterised by self-discipline, dutifulness, deliberation, and self-control) would disclose fewer emotions due to the realised need to control emotional sharing (Lopes, Salovey, and Straus 2003). In SM, individuals characterised by greater conscientiousness disclose less in-depth information (Hollenbaugh and Ferris 2014), and in general avoid using FB, potentially to dedicate more time to other pursuits (Ross et al. 2009). They were also found to have more friends and upload fewer pictures (Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky 2010; Moore and McElroy 2012). Therefore, it is hypothesised that individuals characterised by greater conscientiousness will disclose fewer emotions than those characterised by lower conscientiousness.

> H5: Individuals characterised by greater conscientiousness will disclose fewer positive and negative emotions both in RL and in SM than those characterised by lower conscientiousness.

Agreeableness

Agreeableness reflects a disposition to be good-natured, courteous, sympathetic, and warm (Costa and McCrae 1992). In face-to-face environments, agreeableness is associated with positive affect (McCrae and Costa 1991) as well as with positive emotions derived from intimate social relationships (Shiota, Keltner, and John 2006). In SM, those who are more agreeable usually disclose less information, but with greater depth, and also cover a broader variety of topics (Hollenbaugh and Ferris 2014). Additionally, people high in agreeableness are more likely to post about their life and upload more pictures on SM (Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky 2010; Moore and McElroy 2012). We hypothesise that the disposition to be good-natured and kind may lead to more positive emotional disclosure and less negative emotional disclosure, both in RL and on FB.

> H6a: Individuals characterised by greater agreeableness will disclose more positive emotions, both in RL and in SM, than those characterised by lower agreeableness.

> H6b: Individuals characterised by greater agreeableness will disclose fewer negative emotions, both in RL and in SM, than those characterised by lower agreeableness.

Method

Given the dominant role of FB in the SM domain, the investigation was limited to surveying FB users. Data were collected from students who are FB users enrolled in two public universities in the mid-Western USA using an online survey. We also asked students to pass on the survey to any FB users who are aged 40 years or older for greater age representation in the sample. After removing questionnaires with too many missing values, 293 questionnaires were retained for subsequent analysis. Among the respondents, 157 were males (53.6%) and 134 (43.7%) were females. The majority of participants (75.1%) were Caucasian. In all, 162 respondents (53.2%) were between 18 and 25 years old, 50 respondents (17.1%) were between 26 and 40 years old, and 78 respondents (26.6%) were over 40 years old. The respondents had a mean of 540 followers (min = 2, max = 2876), and spent on average 29 minutes per day on FB during the past week (min = 0, max = 120). On average, they have used FB for 5.3 years (min = 1 month, max = 10 years).

Measures for emotional self-disclosure were borrowed from Snell, Miller, and Belk (1988). To reduce the analysis complexity and to better focus on positive and negative categories, as opposed to individual emotions, out of the eight types of emotion identified by Snell, Miller, and Belk (1988) (depression, happiness, jealousy, anxiety, anger, calmness, apathy, and fear), we selected two positive (happiness and calmness) and two negative (jealousy and anxiety) emotions. The respondents were asked how willing they are to talk with their friends when they feel each of these emotions. For FB disclosure, they were asked how willing they are to post on their FB wall. Emotional disclosure was measured on a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 was 'not at all willing to' and 5 was 'totally willing to'. The four dimensions exhibited good reliability (Cronbach's alphas range from 0.75 to 0.83). Perceived social support was measured by the multidimensional scale of perceived social support (Zimet et al. 1998) that had been previously validated on college student populations, and shown to contain three dimensions: perceived support by family, friends, and significant others. In our data, all the three sub-dimensions showed consistently high reliabilities (Cronbach's alphas range from 0.92 to 0.95) and were included into further

analysis by averaging the respective indicator variables. The Ten-item Personality Inventory (TIPI) was used to measure personality (Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann 2003). All constructs are listed in the appendix.

Results

To test H1 through H6, a total of eight multiple linear regressions were run with personality and social support as independent variables and emotional disclosure dimensions as dependent variables, both in RL and on FB. When the dependent variables are emotional disclosure variables in FB, gender (1 = Female, 0 = Male) and age (1 = age between 18 and 25 years, and 0 for otherwise) are used as control variables. When the dependent variable is emotional disclosure on FB, an additional variable is added as control – total number of FB friends. Since the variable is not normally distributed, its logarithmic value is used. All models are statistically significant, except the one where the dependent variable is 'calmness on FB'. We also notice that the independent variables explain much larger variance in emotional disclosure in RL than on FB, as indicated by adjusted R-squares. The results are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

In support of H1a, perceived social support from friends has a positive significant relationship with all four types of emotional disclosure in RL. Social support from family and significant others did not exhibit any role in RL emotional sharing, potentially due to the wording of the question that only contained sharing with friends. Perceived social support is not related to positive emotional disclosure on FB; therefore, H1b is not supported. Interestingly, social support from significant others has significant negative relationships with expressing anxiety ($p < .05$) and jealousy ($p < .1$) on FB .

H2 is partially supported. Extroverts are more likely to express both positive (happiness) and (marginally) negative emotions (jealousy) than introverts in RL and on FB. H3 is not supported: there is no difference in emotional disclosure between individuals characterised by high vs. low ES on FB. In RL, ES is marginally significantly related to calmness. H4 is not supported: there is no difference in emotional disclosure between individuals characterised by high vs. low openness on FB. In RL, openness is marginally significantly related to happiness. H5 is partially supported. Conscientious individuals express less negative emotions than those characterised by lower conscientiousness on FB. Contrary to our hypothesis, in RL, individuals characterised by greater conscientiousness express more happiness than those characterised by lower conscientiousness. We find partial support in H6a in the fact that there is a positive association between agreeableness and sharing happiness on FB. In RL, individuals characterised by greater agreeableness express less jealousy than those characterised by lower agreeableness.

Discussion and future research directions

The study addressed the important issue of social and personality-based drivers of emotional expressiveness in online social networks and compared their effects to those in RL. Perceived social support from friends plays an important role in disclosing both negative and positive emotions in RL, but not on FB, potentially signalling greater trust in face-to-face confidants. This finding appears to confirm the roles of social support for both coping with negative events and strengthening social bonds (Rimé 2007). Contrary to expectations, perceptions of social support are not correlated with sharing

Table 1. Regression results for RL emotional disclosure.

	Happiness	Calmness	Jealousy	Anxiety
Control variables				
Gender	0.11*	−0.04	0.03	0.11*
Age	−0.03	−0.07	0.02	−0.00
Main variables				
Extroversion	0.12**	0.03	0.11*	0.09
Emotional Stability	0.08	0.10*	0.01	−0.02
Openness	0.11*	0.06	0.07	0.07
Conscientiousness	0.13**	0.06	0.01	0.07
Agreeableness	0.03	0.02	−0.15**	−0.10
Social support from significant others	0.03	0.01	0.03	−0.04
Social support from family	−0.01	0.03	−0.04	−0.02
Social support from friends	0.28***	0.21***	0.25***	0.36***
F-statistics	*9.79****	*3.49****	*3.40****	*5.82****
Adjusted R-square	*23.30%*	*7.90%%*	*7.60%*	*14.30%*

*$p < .1$.
**$p < .05$.
***$p < .01$.

Table 2. Regression results for FB emotional disclosure.

	Happiness	Calmness	Jealousy	Anxiety
Control variables				
Gender	0.11*	0.04	0.00	0.035
Age	−0.08	−0.146**	−0.10	−0.11*
Total Number of FB friends	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.08
Main variables				
Extroversion	0.16**	0.09	0.11*	0.08
Emotional Stability	0.03	0.06	0.02	−0.08
Openness	0.07	−0.04	−0.08	0.05
Conscientiousness	0.07	0.02	−0.14**	−0.11*
Agreeableness	0.12*	0.07	−0.07	0.10
Social support from significant others	−0.04	−0.06	−0.14*	−0.21***
Social support from family	−0.04	0.01	0.02	0.03
Social support from friends	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.07
F-statistics	*3.25****	*1.14*	*1.84****	*1.89****
Adjusted R-square	*7.90%*	*0.50%*	*3.10%*	*3.33%*

*$p < .1$.
**$p < .05$.
***$p < .01$.

of positive emotions on FB, possibly implying reduced need for strong emotional cohesion in weak-tie social networks (Rimé 2007). Interestingly, those who perceive less social support from significant others are more likely to share anxiety with their FB friends. The latter finding tentatively supports the role of social networks as a coping resource and warrants further investigation into the importance of weak-tie broad public networks and their nuanced role in offering social support to their participants.

Confirming our expectations, extroversion contributed to greater sharing of happiness and (marginally) jealousy, both in RL and on FB. Such similarity in the role of extroversion in stimulating both positive and negative sharing via different channels is in accord with the social enhancement hypothesis, positing SM as an extension of RL expressive communications. In support of our findings, earlier studies report extroverts to belong to more groups (Ross et al. 2009), to use FB more frequently (Seidman 2013), and to disclose the most personal information (Hollenbaugh and Ferris 2014). Given a greater role of extroversion in fostering positive emotional sharing, and the greater virality of positively charged messages, future research should investigate the impact of this personality trait on other possible emotional valences.

According to our results, low ES does not trigger greater positive or negative emotional sharing in RL or on FB. In fact, more emotionally stable individuals tend to express (marginally) greater calmness in RL. The recent reduction of privacy in social networks and lack of anonymity do not allow less emotionally stable individuals to feel in control of their shared emotions, possibly making them unwilling to express themselves in social networks. An interesting area deserving attention, thus, would be exploring the roles of personality traits in perceptions of privacy, and the resulting changes in SM disclosures.

We found no significant effect of openness to new experiences on the extent of emotional expression on FB, and a marginal positive effect on expressing happiness in RL. It is possible that FB participation is not considered a novel and stimulating experience any more, and those characterised by greater openness are migrating to more innovative venues of self-expression (Seidman 2013). This explanation is partially reflected in the findings by Ross et al. (2009), who report that higher levels of openness correlate with lower levels of FB commenting. Future research should test our supposition by examining personality roles in other SM venues. Our results also show the positive role of conscientiousness in sharing happiness in RL, and its negative role in sharing jealousy on FB. Both results are

unexpected and deserve greater attention by researchers. Finally, agreeableness is positively related to the sharing of happiness and negatively related to the sharing of anxiety on FB and sharing jealousy in RL. These findings underscore the important role of agreeableness in emotional sharing and warrant research on its role in promoting social support in SM.

Our findings suggest that certain personality traits (extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) as well as perceived social support from friends promote the disclosure of positive emotions on FB. These results underscore the importance for SM developers and FB marketers and advertisers to encourage FB users to share positive emotions in conversations with their friends and with brands. Provided that positively charged messages are more viral, encouraging their sharing should increase user engagement and traffic to the platforms, making them more attractive to advertisers. Other proposed efforts to increase traffic and interactivity include activating such personality traits as extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, as well as promoting group cohesive activities to increase the perceptions of social support.

Limitations

Some limitations of this study warrant caution in generalising our results to broader contexts and populations. First, a combination of convenience and snowball sampling techniques was used that, although acceptable at this early stage of investigation, does not offer reliable representativeness of the population of interest. Random sampling should be used in future studies to confirm the reported findings. Second, the study's survey instrument relied on self-reported measures, which often raises the concern of potential response bias and inaccuracy. It may be possible to utilise semantic text analysis software in future studies to evaluate the degree of actual positive and negative emotional content posted by SM users. Third, the study employed a cross-sectional survey design, from which causal inferences cannot be drawn. Future studies could use experiments or a longitudinal design to test the proposed relationships. Fourth, the wording of the question to measure RL emotional disclosure was mainly limited to disclosure to friends and, therefore, may have affected the significance of other dimensions of perceived social support. Finally, we used the TIPI to measure personality (Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann 2003). Each of the five dimensions was measured by two items. The instrument was chosen due to its conciseness. Although the instrument was shown to offer good predictive validity, test–retest reliability, and convergence with the existing

measurements in earlier studies (Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann 2003), it may be advisable to utilise more exhaustive measures of personality in future research.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

Ainsworth, M. D., M. Blehar, E. Waters, and S. Wall. 1978. *Patterns of Attachment: A Psychological Study of the Strange Situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Amichai-Hamburger, Y., and G. Vinitzky. 2010. "Social Network Use and Personality." *Computers in Human Behavior* 26 (6): 1289–1295.

Amichai-Hamburger, Y., G. Wainpel, and S. Fox. 2002. "'On the Internet No One Knows I'm an Introvert': Extroversion, Neuroticism, and Internet Interaction." *CyberPsychology and Behavior* 5 (2): 125–128.

Ayduk, O., R. Mendoza-Denton, W. Mischel, G. Downey, P. K. Peake, and M. Rodriguez. 2000. "Regulating the Interpersonal Self: Strategic Self-regulation for Coping with Rejection Sensitivity." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79: 776–792.

Bazarova, N. N. 2012. "Public Intimacy: Disclosure Interpretation and Social Judgments on Facebook." *Journal of Communication* 62: 815–832.

Bazarova, N., and Y. H. Choi. 2014. "Self-disclosure in Social Media: Extending the Functional Approach to Disclosure Motivations and Characteristics on Social Network Sites." *Journal of Communication* 64: 635–657.

Bazarova, N. N., Y. H. Choi, V. S. Sosik, D. Cosley, and J. Whitlock. 2015. "Social Sharing of Emotions on Facebook: Channel Differences, Satisfaction, and Replies." In *Proceedings of Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, March 14–18, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 164–174.

Beals, K. P., L. A. Peplau, and S. L. Gable. 2009. "Stigma Management and Well-Being: The Role of Perceived Social Support, Emotional Processing, and Suppression." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 35 (7): 867–879.

Buechel, E., and J. Berger. 2012. "Facebook Therapy? Why Do People Share Self-relevant Content Online?" In *Presentation at Association for Consumer Research Conference*, Vancouver, BC, 203–208.

Burke, M., and M. Develin. 2016. "Once More with Feeling: Supportive Responses to Social Sharing on Facebook." In *Proceedings of Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, San Francisco, CA, 1462–1474.

Butt, S., and J. G. Phillips. 2008. "Personality and Self reported Mobile Phone Use." *Computers in Human Behavior* 24 (2): 346–360.

Cohen, S., and T. A. Wills. 1985. "Stress, Social Support, and the Buffering Hypothesis." *Psychological Bulletin* 98 (2): 310–357.

Costa, P. T. Jr., and R. R. McCrae. 1984. "Personality as a Lifelong Determinant of Well-being." In *Affective Process in Adult Development and Aging*, edited by C. Z. Malatesta and C. E. Izard, 141–157. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Costa, P. T. Jr., and R. R. McCrae. 1992. "Four Ways Five Factors Are Basic." *Personality and Individual Differences* 13: 653–665.

De Choudhury, M., M. Gamon, S. Counts, and E. Horvitz. 2013. "Predicting Depression via Social Media." In *Proceedings of 7th ICWSM*, Boston, MA, 128–137.

Duprez, C., V. Chrisophe, B. Rimé, A. Congard, and P. Antonie. 2014. "Motives for the Social Sharing of an Emotional Experience." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. doi:10.1177/0265407514548393.

Forest, A. M., and J. V. Wood. 2012. "When Social Networking Is Not Working: Individuals with Low Self-esteem Recognize But Do Not Reap the Benefits of Self-disclosure on Facebook." *Psychological Science* 23 (3): 295–302.

French, A. M., and A. Read. 2013. "My Mom's on Facebook: An Evaluation of Information Sharing Depth in Social Depth in Social Networking." *Behaviour & Information Technology* 32 (10): 1049–1059.

Gable, S. L., H. T. Reis, E. A. Impett, and E. R. Asher. 2004. "What Do You Do When Things Go Right? The Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Benefits of Sharing Positive Events." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87 (2): 228–245.

Giannakos, M. A., K. Chorianopoulos, K. Giotopoulos, and P. Vlamos. 2013. "Using Facebook out of Habit." *Behaviour & Information Technology* 32 (6): 594–602.

Golder, S. A., and M. W. Macy. 2011. "Diurnal and Seasonal Mood Vary with Work, Sleep, and Daylength Across Diverse Cultures." *Science* 333: 1878–1881.

Gosling, S. D., P. J. Rentfrow, and W. B. Swann. 2003. "A Very Brief Measure of the Big-Five Personality Domains." *Journal of Research in Personality* 37 (6): 504–528.

Graham, S. M., J. Y. Huang, M. S. Clark, and V. S. Helgeson. 2008. "The Positives of Negative Emotions: Willingness to Express Negative Emotions Promotes Relationships." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 34: 394–406.

Hampton, K. N. 2016. "Persistent and Pervasive Community: New Communication Technologies and the Future of Community." *American Behavioral Scientist* 60: 101–124.

Hampton, K. N., C. J. Lee, and E. J. Her. 2011. "How New Media Affords Network Diversity: Direct and Mediated Access to Social Capital Through Participation in Local Social Settings." *New Media & Society* 13: 1031–1049.

Henderson, L., and P. Zimbardo. 2001. "Shyness, Social Anxiety, and Social Phobia." In *From Social Anxiety to Social Phobia: Multiple Perspectives*, edited by Stefan G. Hofmann and Patricia Marten DiBartolo, 46–85. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hollenbaugh, E. E., and A. L. Ferris. 2014. "Facebook Self-disclosure: Examining the Role of Traits, Social Cohesion, and Motives." *Computers in Human Behavior* 30: 50–58.

Hughes, D. J., M. Rowe, M. Batey, and A. Lee. 2012. "A Tale of Two Sites: Twitter vs. Facebook and the Personality Predictors of Social Media Usage." *Computers in Human Behavior* 28 (2): 561–569.

John, O. O., and J. J. Gross. 2004. "Healthy and Unhealthy Emotion Regulation: Personality Processes, Individual Differences, and Life Span Development." *Journal of Personality* 72: 1301–1334.

Johnston, K., M. Tanner, N. Lalla, and D. Kawalski. 2013. "Social Capital: The Benefit of Facebook 'Friends'." *Behaviour & Information Technology* 32 (1): 24–36.

Jourard, S. M. 1971. *Self-disclosure: An Experimental Analysis of the Transparent Self*. Oxford: John Wiley.

Kivran-Swaine, F., and M. Naaman. 2011. "Network Properties and Social Sharing of Emotions in Social Awareness Streams." In *Proceedings of Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing 2011*. ACM Press, 379–382.

Landers, R. N., and J. W. Lounsbury. 2006. "An Investigation of Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits in Relation to Internet Usage." *Computers in Human Behavior* 22: 283–293.

Langston, C. A. 1994. "Capitalizing on and Coping with Daily-Life Events: Expressive Responses to Positive Events." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67 (6): 1112–1125.

Larsen, R. J., and T. Ketelaar. 1991. "Personality and Susceptibility to Positive and Negative Emotional States." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61: 132–140.

Lee, K., M. Noh, and D. Koo. 2013. "Lonely People Are No Longer Lonely on Social Networking Sites: The Mediating Role of Self-disclosure and Social Support." *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 16 (6): 413–418. doi:10.1089/cyber.2012.0553.

Lin, H., W. Tov, and L. Qiu. 2014. "Emotional Disclosure on Social Networking Sites: The Role of Network Structure and Psychological Needs." *Computers in Human Behavior* 41: 342–350.

Liu, D., and B. B. Brown. 2014. "Self-disclosure on Social Networking Sites, Positive Feedback, and Social Capital among Chinese College Students." *Computers in Human Behavior* 38: 213–219.

Lopes, P. N., P. Salovey, and R. Straus. 2003. "Emotional Intelligence, Personality, and the Perceived Quality of Social Relationships." *Personality and Individual Differences* 35 (3): 641–658.

Lu, W., and K. N. Hampton. in press. "Beyond the Power of Networks: Differentiating Network Structure from Social Media Affordances for Perceived Social Support." *New Media & Society*.

McCrae, R. R., and P. T. Costa. 1991. "Adding Liebe und Arbeit: The Full Five-Factor Model and Well-Being." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 17: 227–232.

Melchior, L. A., and J. M. Cheek. 1990. "Shyness and Anxious Self-preoccupation During a Social Interaction." *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 5: 117–130.

Moore, K., and J. C. McElroy. 2012. "The Influence of Personality on Facebook Usage, Wall Postings, and Regret." *Computers in Human Behavior* 28 (1): 267–274.

Naaman, M., J. Boase, and C.-H. Lai. 2010. "Is It Really about Me?: Message Content in Social Awareness Streams." In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, Savannah, GA, 189–192.

O'Brien, T. B., and A. DeLongis. 1996. "The Interactional Context of Problem-, Emotion-, and Relationship-Focused Coping: The Role of the Big Five Personality Factors." *Journal of Personality* 64: 775–813.

Oh, H. J., E. Ozkaya, and R. LaRose. 2014. "How Does Online Social Networking Enhance Life Satisfaction? The Relationships among Online Supportive Interaction, Affect, Perceived Social Support, Sense of Community, and Life Satisfaction." *Computers in Human Behavior* 30: 69–78.

Papacharissi, Z., and A. Mendelson. 2011. "Toward a Newer Sociability: Uses, Gratifications and Social Capital on Facebook." In *Media Perspectives for the 21st Century*, edited by Stylianos Papathanassopoulos, 212–230. Abingdon: Routledge.

Park, N., B. Jin, and S. A. Jin. 2011. "Effects of Self-disclosure on Relational Intimacy in Facebook." *Computers in Human Behavior* 27: 1974–1983.

Park, N., K. F. Kee, and S. Valenzuela. 2009. "Being Immersed in Social Networking Environment: Facebook Groups, Uses and Gratifications, and Social Outcomes." *CyberPsychology and Behavior* 12 (6): 729–733.

Park, K., S. Lee, E. Kim, M. Park, J. Park, and M. Cha. 2013. "Mood and Weather: Feeling the Heat?" In *Proceedings of 7th ICWSM*, Cambridge, MA, 709–712.

Pennebaker, J., E. Zech, and B. Rimé. 2001. "Disclosing and Sharing Emotion: Psychological, Social and Health Consequences." In *Handbook of Bereavement Research: Consequences, Coping, and Care*, edited by M. Stroebe, W. Stroebe, R. O. Hansson, and H. Schut, 517–539. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Qiu, L., H. Lin, A. K.-Y. Leung, and W. Tov. 2012. "Putting Their Best Foot Forward: Emotional Disclosure on Facebook." *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 15 (10): 569–572.

Reinecke, L., and S. Trepte. 2014. "Authenticity and Well-Being on Social Network Sites: A Two-Wave Longitudinal Study on the Effects of Online Authenticity and the Positivity Bias in SNS Communication." *Computers in Human Behavior* 30: 95–102.

Rimé, B. 2007. "The Social Sharing of Emotion as an Interface Between Individual and Collective Processes in the Construction of Emotional Climates." *Journal of Social Issues* 63 (2): 307–322.

Ross, C., E. S. Orr, M. Sisic, J. M. Arseneault, M. G. Simmering, and R. R. Orr. 2009. "Personality and Motivations Associated with Facebook Use." *Computers in Human Behavior* 25 (2): 578–586.

Ryan, T., and S. Xenos. 2011. "Who Uses Facebook? An Investigation into the Relationship Between the Big Five, Shyness, Narcissism, Loneliness, and Facebook Usage." *Computers in Human Behavior* 27 (5): 1658–1664.

Schachter, S. 1959. *The Psychology of Affiliation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Schumaker, S. A., and A. Brownell. 1984. "Toward a Theory of Social Support: Closing Conceptual Gaps." *Journal of Social Issues* 40 (4): 11–36.

Seidman, G. 2013. "Self-presentation and Belonging on Facebook: How Personality Influences Social Media Use and Motivations." *Personality and Individual Differences* 54: 402–407.

Seidman, G. 2014. "Expressing the "True Self" on Facebook." *Computers in Human Behavior* 31: 367–372.

Shim, M., J. N. Cappella, and J. Y. Han. 2011. "How Does Insightful and Emotional Disclosure Bring Potential Health Benefits? Study Based on Online Support Groups for Women With Breast Cancer." *Journal of Communication* 61 (3): 432–454. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01555.x.

Shin, D.-H. 2013. "User Experience in Social Commerce: In Friends We Trust." *Behaviour & Information Technology* 32 (1): 52–67.

Shiota, M., D. Keltner, and O. P. John. 2006. "Positive Emotion Dispositions Differentially Associated with Big Five Personality and Attachment Style." *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 1: 61–71.

Snell, W. E., R. S. Miller, and S. S. Belk. 1988. "Development of the Emotional Self-disclosure Scale." *Sex Roles* 18: 59–73.

Svendsen, G. B., J. K. Johnsen, L. Almås-Sørensen, and J. Vittersø. 2013. "Personality and Technology Acceptance: The Influence of Personality Factors on the Core Constructs of the Technology Acceptance Model." *Behaviour & Information Technology* 32 (4): 323–334.

Thoits, P. 1995. "Stress, Coping, and Social Support Processes: Where Are We? What Next?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* (Extra Issue): 53–79.

Valkenburg, P. M., A. R. Schouten, and J. Peter. 2005. "Adolescents' Identity Experiments on the Internet." *New Media and Society* 7: 383–402.

Vitak, J., N. B. Ellison, and C. Steinfield. 2011. "The Ties That Bond: Re-examining the Relationship Between Facebook Use and Bonding Social Capital." In *44th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, Kauai Island, HI, 1530–1605.

Wolfradt, U., and J. Doll. 2001. "Motives of Adolescents to Use the Internet as a Function of Personality Traits, Personal and Social Factors." *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 24 (1): 13–27.

Zimet, G. D., N. W. Dahlem, S. G. Zimet, and G. K. Farley. 1988. "The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support." *Journal of Personality Assessment* 52: 30–41.

Appendix

1. Emotional Disclosure Items

How willing will you to talk with your close friends [post on Facebook wall] when you feel scale: 1 = not at all willing to discuss [post], 5 = totally willing to discuss [post]).

Happiness	Calmness	Jealousy	Anxiety
Happy	Calm	Jealous	Anxious
Cheerful	Quiet	Possessive	Troubled
Joyous	Serene	Envious	Worried
Delighted	Tranquil	Suspicious	Uneasy

2. Perceived social support

The following items inquire about your perception to various aspects of your current life and your perceptions of potential future outcomes. For each of the following items, please select only one answer scale: 1 – strongly disagree, 7 – strongly agree).

1. There is a special person who is around when I am in need.
2. There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.
3. My family really tries to help me.
4. I get the emotional help and support I need from my family.
5. I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me.
6. My friends really try to help me.
7. I can count on my friends when things go wrong.
8. I can talk about my problems with my family.
9. I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.
10. There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings.
11. My family is willing to help me make decisions.
12. I can talk about my problems with my friends.

3. Personality

I see myself as scale: 1 – strongly disagree, 7 – strongly agree).

1. Extraverted, enthusiastic
2. Critical, quarrelsome
3. Dependable, self-disciplined
4. Anxious, easily upset
5. Open to new experiences, complex
6. Reserved, quite
7. Sympathetic, warm
8. Disorganized, careless
9. Calm, emotionally stable
10. Conventional, uncreative