

Review of: "Nigerian Youths' Perception of Privacy and their Self Disclosure on Social Media"

Raffael Meier¹

¹ The Schwyz University of Teacher Education

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study is very exciting and addresses a topic that is relevant to the field. Social platforms, which are under high pressure in Europe with regard to privacy and data protection settings, are developing rapidly, and the privacy paradox is highly topical. It's nice to see how the topic is explored in specific contexts. Nevertheless, in my view, there are also many potential areas for further development of the text.

The following is a non-exhaustive, constructively benevolent compilation of some findings that I noticed while reading through the text, which I hope will be useful.

1. Title: The title would benefit from a reference to the methods used.
2. Abstract: What is a "negative perception of privacy"?
3. Introduction: The "rapid increase in the extent of youths' self-disclosure on social media» is founded on sources of 2010, 2011, 2012, 2016, 2010, etc. – this maybe seems a bit outdated considering the rapid development of social media (e.g., TikTok reached international audiences in late 2017). In general, there is a gap in literature between 2018 and nowadays (about 5 years). Also, some essential literature is missing (e.g., Adhikari, K., & Panda, R. K. (2018). Users' Information Privacy Concerns and Privacy Protection Behaviors in Social Networks), and some is not really very relevant. About the privacy paradox, there is another up-to-date study revealing interesting factors influencing users' decisions for data disclosure: Arzoglou, E.; Kortensniemi, Y.; Ruutu, S.; Elo, T. The Role of Privacy Obstacles in Privacy Paradox: A System Dynamics Analysis. *Systems* 2023, 11, 205. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems11040205>

I would try to condense the literature references.

1. A "Materials" section would be desirable, as a questionnaire and, in the case of interviews, semi-structured interview guidelines or other materials may have been used.
2. I do not understand the sampling logic: "Youths in these universities represented Nigerian youths, and the total population size was 42,264». Does this mean there are 42,264 youths in total in Ilorin, or in Kwara State, or in Nigeria, and what is the exact definition of "youths" (Ages min/max? grades?) "Multistage stratified sampling of the probability sampling technique» is not clear. What were the stages and entities, and which criteria were used? "Enable the researchers to assess their Facebook pages for a period of 2 weeks": Has authorization been granted to view the previous two weeks or the next two weeks from the date of authorization? Did the participants know at the time of posting that the scientists were analyzing the posts? This would be a methodological limitation, as the posts may then

be socially desirable and e.g. contain "more" privacy considerations.

3. How were the scales used in the questionnaire formed? Are they based on existing scales from previous authors, or were they self-generated? Were reliability and validity tests carried out?
4. I do not see a clear description of the response scale used for the perception and concerns items. Is it "SA", "A", "U", "SD", "D"? What was that exactly? Strongly agree, agree, undecided, strongly disagree, disagree? Was the order of the answering options in tables 1 and 2 arranged incorrectly? (SD before D)?
5. I can't see an exact description of the qualitative methodology (deductive vs. inductive, qualitative text analysis Mayring, Kuckartz).
6. The "Findings" section obviously jumps back and forth between quantitative and qualitative results, which is sometimes confusing, as statements are not clearly assigned to the quantitative or qualitative methodology ("This explains why one of the respondents shared her mother's mobile number on the platform with less regard for "who" viewed it, what the information may be used for, and what negative consequences she might face due to this unconcerned privacy behaviour. However, this category of people was in the minority; [What exact "category"?] a majority of the respondents had some concerns about their privacy on social media.").
7. The sentence "The analysis indicated that 0.531 is higher than 0.0, which is the alpha value for the correlation test» explains a concept too thoroughly, which can be taken for granted by the readers. It is sufficient to summarize the entire section, e.g.: "We emphasize that there is no correlation between the degree of concern for a person's privacy and the extent of their self-disclosure on social media."
8. There is no discussion? The purpose of the discussion section is to review the findings and put them into the context of the overall research. It brings together all the sections that came before it and allows a reader to see the connections between each part of the research paper. The "Conclusion" section is therefore way too short and on the surface.
9. The study was conducted in Nigeria and is explicitly labelled Nigeria. This would lead one to expect that a minimum of intercultural references is discussed. Unfortunately, the authors do not elaborate on the specifics of the results in an international context (e.g., how social networks are used in Nigeria, which topics are sensitive information in a cultural context, etc.).
10. There is no "Limitations" section at all - it would be very pleasing to see the authors reflecting on themselves. This would also help to understand the methodological shortcomings of the study and facilitate follow-up research.
11. It would be enjoyable if the data material, or at least the quantitative data sets, and the full questionnaire with preface, etc., were made available via OSF.

All in all, the topic is exciting, and I think that more research in this area is very welcome. The methodology used also seems very promising to me, even if it is not yet clearly comprehensible and replicable in the current text. In my view, quite a bit of editing is needed to turn the valuable work done so far into a high-quality article.