

SHADOWY USER BEHAVIOR IN DIGITAL MARKETING: A MANAGEMENT-ORIENTED VIEW ON CYBER POLICY, CULTURAL INFLUENCE, AND ONLINE INTERACTION

Arifah Rachmawati^{1*}, Meiliyah Ariani²

^{1,2}Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama),
Indonesia

*Corresponding Author:

arifahrachmawati@dsn.moestopo.ac.id

Abstract

Online digital systems are driving the growth of economies, but they have also given rise to problematic online user behavior. Online shady practices are a threat to social cohesion, yet they persist and evade legal detection. To promote a healthy and inclusive digital environment, there is a need for further research to understand the interplay between culture, legislation, and online user behavior. This study aims to examine the interrelations between socio-cultural settings, cyber policies, and online user behavior. It explores the effectiveness of current policy measures and posits possible ways for promoting a healthy and inclusive digital environment. The study employs a narrative review of literature to understand the interplay between culture, legislation, and online user behavior. The findings highlight the influence of cultural settings on online user behavior and the interconnectedness of legislation, culture, and online interactions. The emphasis on the need for context-specific approaches and inclusive policymaking methodologies to foster a healthy and inclusive digital environment were the knowledge gaps identified that warrant further research. Understanding the interplay between cultural settings, legislation, and online user behavior provides valuable insights for practitioners and researchers to look more into a culturally sensitive safe digital space.

Keywords: User Behavior, Cyber Law, Policy, Culture

1. Introduction

Social media and e-commerce have significantly contributed to the growth of emerging economies by facilitating social and economic interactions (Ismail & Masud, 2020). The expansion of internet access has further accelerated this process, generating vast amounts of data and enabling new forms of online engagement (World Bank, 2018). However, these developments are accompanied by challenges, particularly problematic user behaviors such as rubble rousing, cancel culture, disinformation, trolling, doxing, spoofing, hacktivism, and the use of fake online identities (Townley & Lubin, 2020; Paterson, 2018; Lim, 2017). These practices undermine social cohesion and democratic values, yet often persist undetected due to the absence of clear legal categorizations (Townley & Lubin, 2020; Paterson, 2018).

Illustrative cases highlight their real-world consequences. In Indonesia, rubble rousing amplified divisive opinions, religious intolerance, and racism, culminating in mass demonstrations between 2016 and 2017 (Paterson, 2018; Lim, 2017). Similarly, in the United States, opposing viewpoints on sensitive issues were amplified online, fueling Islamophobic and racist demonstrations, often involving armed participants (Townley & Lubin, 2020). Investigations revealed the role of fake personas and bots in spreading divisive content, which deepened polarization and threatened democratic principles.

Another prominent phenomenon is cancel culture, in which individuals or groups face collective social pressure and cultural isolation due to perceived misconduct (Norris, 2023). Cancel culture often overlaps with deceptive practices such as hacktivism, trolling, and spoofing. In Indonesia, the case of Prita, who criticized a hospital via email, sparked nationwide support through Facebook fundraising, reflecting the spillover of online activism into real-world legal processes (Lim, 2017). Much of this divisive content originates from questionable sources strategically injected into public discourse.

The multidisciplinary nature of research on problematic online behavior reflects its complexity, involving law (Klonick, 2020; Townley & Lubin, 2020), psychology (Kozyreva et al., 2020), social sciences (Rauschnabel et al., 2019; Ren et al., 2012), communication (Flew et al., 2020), and business (Guo et al., 2020; Chen & Shen, 2015). Despite violating national and international laws, perpetrators frequently evade accountability, partly due to ambiguous legal classifications. Governments and corporations such as Google, Facebook, and Twitter have attempted to regulate these practices through cyber laws and platform policies (Kittichaisaree, 2017; Bohanon, 2016). Yet, the balance between regulation and safeguarding freedoms remains contentious.

In Indonesia, Law No. 11/2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE), revised as Law No. 19/2016, serves as the main legal framework, often applied alongside the Criminal Code (Paterson, 2018; Nugraha & Putri, 2016). Authorities also enhance digital literacy and collaborate with civil society to monitor online activity, while weekly briefings inform the public on harmful content (Paterson, 2018). At the platform level, corporations have revised policies, deactivated accounts, strengthened identity verification, and supported fact-checking with local media.

This study examines the interrelations between socio-cultural and economic contexts, cyber laws, and online user behaviors in emerging economies. It adopts a narrative literature review to analyze these dynamics, using etic research approaches to identify cross-cultural similarities and differences (Guo et al., 2020; Monteagut, 2017). Etic techniques enable the detection of variations that may not emerge within a single setting, highlighting conceptual gaps for future inquiry (Green & White, 2017).

By addressing the limited literature on the intersection of cyber law, policy, culture, and online behavior, this study contributes to filling a critical gap. It emphasizes the importance of comparative and multicultural perspectives (Guo et al., 2020; Ur & Wang, 2013) and considers various types of online communities, from interest-based groups to collaborative networks (Hsiao & Chiou, 2017; Brodie et al., 2013; Pletikosa & Michahelles, 2013). Expanding the scope of analysis allows a deeper understanding of how legislation, policy, and culture shape online interactions, while also pointing toward strategies for promoting a more inclusive digital environment.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Online User Behaviour and Interaction

Online user behavior and interaction encompass actions, practices, and attitudes individuals exhibit in virtual communities (Pletikosa & Michahelles, 2013). Cultural differences significantly shape these behaviors, as shown in empirical research (Guo et al., 2020) and theoretical studies (Gallagher & Savage, 2013). Culture influences user motivation (Vitkauskaite, 2016), information contribution (Ren et al., 2007), policy perceptions (Wu et al., 2012), and knowledge exchange (Wang & Chen, 2012). Understanding such variations provides insight into online user challenges (Seraj, 2012).

and guides responses for academia, policymakers, and corporations (Rui & Stefanone, 2013).

Etic approaches are also applied to study deceptive actions, aiding intelligence gathering and policy design (Malinen, 2015). Wu et al. (2012) emphasize the need for global collaboration in managing cultural and legal variations, while Bohanon (2016) highlights diverse interpretations of “decency” in online interaction. With growing cross-cultural exchanges, awareness becomes central for organizations seeking to engage globally (Ren et al., 2012).

2.2 Cyber Law, Legislation, and Policy

Cyber law refers to legal frameworks regulating cyberspace (Kittichaisaree, 2017). While many measures stem from governments and intergovernmental bodies, online platforms also play a significant role. In Indonesia, Law No. 11/2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE), revised by Law No. 19/2016, serves as the main regulatory framework (Nugraha & Putri, 2016). Complementary measures include cooperation with companies such as Google, Facebook, and Twitter to counter fake news and disinformation (Paterson, 2018). The Ministry of Information also promotes public awareness through weekly briefings and collaborations with civil society.

Gallagher & Savage (2013) note that Facebook proposed oversight templates, while leaders of New Zealand and France initiated international collaboration against online extremism, supported by multiple states and tech companies. In the U.S., Townley & Lubin (2020) show how divisive online content amplifies demonstrations and counterdemonstrations, concluding that public awareness—exemplified by Finland, Israel, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Ukraine—is essential for combating disinformation.

2.3 Online Community and Culture

The notion of “community” spans groups linked by geography or shared interests (Lara-Hernandez & Chin, 2022; McGinn, 2017). Foster (2013), drawing on Sarason, defines online communities as interest-based groups regulated by norms, laws, and policies through digital systems. Wellman & Gulia (2018) emphasize their evolving goals and hybrid nature, extending into physical contexts. Rebaza (2017) highlights individualistic affiliations distinguishing them from traditional communities, while Barrett (2015) finds solidarity without intimacy, implying fellowship without commitment. Preotjiuc-Pietro & Cohn (2013) critique online communities as diluted constructs.

Network studies link community with social structures (Wellman, 2018), while Johnson et al. (2015) observe transformation into fluid, networked groups. Foster (2013) argues that individualized networking maximizes self-interest, undermining collective meaning. Brodie et al. (2013) highlight the internet’s role in fostering virtual public discourse. Yet, Yuan (2013) notes online discussions are marked by rhetorical community and heightened individualism. Lockard (2013) and Gruzd et al. (2016) call for culture-free conceptualizations of online communities, reflecting Western individualistic frameworks that prioritize rational-choice and self-interest.

This study explores the interplay of cyber policy, law, and culture with dubious online behaviors. It addresses four questions:

- 1) Do cultural settings shape online user behaviors?
- 2) Do legislation, policy, and culture influence online interactions?

- 3) How do these factors interrelate to shape interactions?
- 4) What are the effectiveness and limitations of current policies, and what improvements are needed?

By addressing these questions, the study contributes to understanding the dynamics between culture, legislation, and online user behavior, highlighting overlooked dubious practices that evade regulation and threaten social harmony. Findings are expected to inform policymakers, researchers, and practitioners in fostering inclusive digital environments.

3. Methods

3.1 Literature search and scope

In conducting this literature view, we aimed to find and review scholarly works on online communities and how culture, policy, and legislation influence them. Relevant publications were sought using online academic databases. Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science, SpringerLink, and Science Direct were among them. Only peer reviewed English language publications published between 2012 and the end of 2022 were sought. Keywords and or search phrases used either as a phrase or single word to identify the works from the databases included online community, virtual community, social networking, online culture, cyber law, cyber policy, online user policy. These terms were searched for during October, February and July of 2021/2022. References of the articles that were initially identified in the search were also searched for any other works to be included.

3.2 Selection of Literature Included in the Review

To ensure effective selection and identification of relevant material for reviewing in this study involve using some specific guidelines. Up to 38 works were included in this literature review, they had to meet the following criteria in order to be considered:

- 1) The works are about examining some features of online users and communities and perspectives from two or more different cultural settings, whether via the use of online user data or by the investigation of attitudes on some aspect of online users.
- 2) The works look at data or perspectives on internet user behavior in especially in online communities and social media.
- 3) The study involves looking at areas of cyber law, policy, and regulation that influence online user behavior, whether by using online user data or by the investigation of opinions on some aspect of online user interactions. Generally, governments and or other entities are viewed as policymaking units.
- 4) The factors listed above are applicable to any study subject or idea.

3.3. Analysis Process

Works selected from the search were studied, and important content was then placed into matrices of concepts (Snyder, 2019) for comparison, categorization, and information extraction. The matrix included thematic elements of concepts that were used to seek out similar and different arguments across the studies, such as approaches employed, cultural concepts, policy issues noted, online communities studied, and online user behavioral patterns noted. The studied publications are shown in Table 1. Thematic elements developed from this matrix and its analysis of the selected literature formed the basis for the discussion of this study.

Table 1. Recapped results from the matrices of concepts of the literature reviewed

Author(s)	Works	Approaches Employed	Thematic elements
Wu et al. (2012)	The effect of online privacy policy on consumer privacy concern and trust.	Model development and testing	Cultural impact on privacy
Brown and Poellet (2012).	The customary international law of cyberspace.	Law review	International law, Customary law
Seraj, M. (2012)	We Create, We Connect, We Respect, Therefore We Are: Intellectual, Social, and Cultural Value in Online Communities.	Netnography and online ethnography	Community participation, cultural value, intellectual value
Wang and Chen (2012)	Forming relationship commitments to online communities: The role of social motivations.	Hypothesis testing	motivations and commitment in Online communities
Ren et al. (2012)	Building member attachment in online communities: Applying theories of group identity and interpersonal bonds	Social science theory-inspired features	Relationships in online groups
Stuart et al. (2012)	Social transparency in networked information exchange: a theoretical framework.	Model development for social analysis	Social transparency, computer-supported collaboration
Bertot, Jaeger and Hansen (2012)	The impact of polices on government social media usage: Issues, challenges, and recommendations.	Policy review	Policy and regulatory framework, social media use
Hongju Koh, H. (2012)	International law in cyberspace	Law review	International law
Anderson et al. (2013)	Steering user behavior with badges.	Model development and testing	Influencing online user behavior, content moderation
Park (2013).	Digital literacy and privacy behavior online.	Hierarchical regression models to analyze samples	Online behavior, privacy, digital literacy
Gallagher and Savage (2013)	Cross-cultural analysis in online community research: A literature review.	Comparative cross-cultural analysis	Methodological issues in cross-cultural research
Edwards (2013).	Digital social research, social media and the sociological imagination: Surrogacy, augmentation and re-orientation.	Model development for social analysis	Digital social research, Social process, digital social observatory

Author(s)	Works	Approaches Employed	Thematic elements
Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al. (2013)	No country for old members: User lifecycle and linguistic change in online communities.	Conceptual framework development	Participation and behavioral change in online communities
Rui and Stefanone (2013)	Strategic self-presentation online: A cross-cultural study.	Cross-cultural study	Online behavior
Ur and Wang (2013)	A cross-cultural framework for protecting user privacy in online social media.	Analytical framework development and testing	Online cross-cultural privacy, online privacy policy
Braman (2013)	The geopolitical vs. the network political: Internet designers and governance.	Internet design and geopolitical analysis	Internet governance, design, privacy, new citizenship
Zheng et al. (2013)	The impacts of information quality and system quality on users' continuance intention in information-exchange virtual communities: An empirical investigation.	Research framework development	Online user behavior, system quality
Shepherd and Landry (2013)	Technology design and power: Freedom and control in communication networks.	Research and policy review	Interplay between Internet law, policy, control, freedom
Sun, Rau and Ma (2014)	Understanding lurkers in online communities: A literature review.	Model development	Motivation for online group participation
Grabner-Kräuter and Bitter (2015).	Trust in online social networks: A multifaceted perspective.	Concepts on trust and social capital	Role of trust in online communities
Malinen (2015).	Understanding user participation in online communities: A systematic literature review of empirical studies.	Theoretical and conceptual review	Active participation, online communities
Chen and Shen (2015)	Consumers' decisions in social commerce context: An empirical investigation.	Research model development and testing	Social sharing, community commitment, influenced behavior
Vitkauskaite (2016)	Cross-cultural issues in social networking sites: Review of research.	Cross-cultural analysis	cross-cultural issues in social networking
Centivany (2016)	Values, Ethics and Participatory Policymaking in Online Communities.	Participatory policymaking review	Participatory policymaking Interrelationship in platform design, practice, and policymaking

Author(s)	Works	Approaches Employed	Thematic elements
Yardley et al. (2016)	Understanding and promoting effective engagement with digital behavior change interventions.	Model development and testing	Online behavior change, online participation
Rebaza (2017)	Mining user behavior in location-based social networks.	Theoretical development	User behavior analysis
Barth and De Jong (2017)	The privacy paradox– Investigating discrepancies between expressed privacy concerns and actual online behaviour–A systematic literature review.	Review of theories	User behavior, privacy, personal data protection
Klonick (2017)	The new governors: The people, rules, and processes governing online speech.	Law and policy review	Online speech content moderation
Mansell (2017)	Bits of power: Struggling for control of information and communication networks.	Policy review, ethnographic analysis	Policy, institutionalism, network neutrality, citizenship
Gillespie, T. (2018)	Regulation of and by platforms.	Law and policy review	Internet regulation
Mahmoudi, Yaakub, and Bakar (2018)	New time-based model to identify the influential users in online social networks.	Considerations of user engagement over time	Influential users as shapers of behavioral change in online communities
Kim and Hastak (2018)	Social network analysis: Characteristics of online social networks after a disaster.	Social network analysis	Social networks in emergency situations
Wellman and Gulia (2018).	Net-surfers don't ride alone: Virtual communities as communities.	Cross-cultural study	Social ties online
Seering et al. (2019)	Moderator engagement and community development in the age of algorithms.	Model development and testing	Content moderation, online community behavior
Kalia et al. (2019)	Using social networking sites: A qualitative cross-cultural comparison.	Dimensional modeling in cultures and behavior	Cultural influence on online behavior
Rehman et al. (2020)	Identification and role of opinion leaders in information diffusion for online discussion network.	Quantification of user engagement and time	Group opinion leaders influencing other group members
Lubin and Townley (2020)	The International Law of Rabble Rousing.	Legal review	International law, Cyber law

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Description

In laying out the results, we give explanations on the connection of the key elements and make comparisons in the reviewed studies with focus on the aspects of policy, cultures, and online communities. Initially we bring out more broad topics and progress to explore results of relevance and offer a categorization of the literature based on the analysis. We reviewed 42 works in total that we found satisfactory from the earlier noted selection criteria. Table 1 presents a summed-up arrangement of the reviewed studies highlighting the author(s) and year of publication, the approaches employed in the study, and the thematic considerations relevant to this review. For purposes of noting any conceptual progressions over time, the works were arranged in chronological order (years only) considering the earlier published first. Most of the thematic elements in many of the studies reviewed revealed interplays and relationships between culture, policy, law and online user behavior. As a result, the reviewing was guided by the three thematic elements of policy, culture, and online user behavior, which also served as the basis for the discussion of this study and central to the questions this research seeks to address. The results of the review are explained in the sections that follow.

Cultural settings significantly influence online user behavior, shaping the practices and attitudes exhibited by individuals. Different cultural issues were examined through thematic and conceptual areas as previously mentioned. Most of the reviewed studies ($n = 18$) had mainly cultural themes interrelating with other aspects such as social ties, privacy, trust, commitment, and participation. Culture, legislation, and online user behavior are interconnected, and their interplay influences online interactions. The results indicated that in analyzing cultural issues in online communities, cross-cultural research approaches were used in 23 of the works reviewed either as a main concept or as a subtle point of reference. This demonstration of this approach reaffirms the key role of examining issues across diverse cultures given that the internet cuts across many cultures and the possibility of having members from diverse cultures in online communities is very high.

Laws and policies play a crucial role in shaping online behaviors and practices within virtual communities, but their effectiveness may vary across different cultural contexts. The other reviewed studies ($n = 14$) used internet policy-oriented themes that were interlinked with aspects such as policymaking, law, regulatory frameworks, control, governance, privacy, and content moderation. From the results, issues of policy and law were referred to in 19 of the studies reviewed. This is because in a basic sense, every online platform will always have policies, rules, and regulations to ensure guidance of the online activities, therefore it may be difficult to have any online forums going without some policies in place.

Current policy measures have limitations in promoting a healthy and inclusive digital environment, and there is a need for context-specific approaches that consider cultural nuances. It was found that the 5 studies that mainly featured policy pointed out that the governance and control aspect is a threat to online freedom.

Culture, legislation, and online user behavior are interconnected, and their interplay influences online interactions and the challenges faced within virtual communities. The rest of the literature reviewed ($n = 10$) had a blend of the themes mainly linking with internet user behavior and interrelating with policy and regulation, content moderation, cultural influences, participation, trust, and commitment. In the results, the topic of the online behavior aspect appeared repeatedly in many of the works reviewed. Both

community or group behavior and individual behavior were interrelated with many other aspects such as commitment, content moderation, participation, privacy etc. The behavioral element was one of the most cross-cutting aspect discussed in the literature reviewed, and it is also a core aspect in the structure of this study.

4.2 Discussion

Cultural settings influence online user behavior, shaping the practices and attitudes exhibited by individuals. Seraj (2012) also agrees and points out that social-cultural factors that affect how members perceive social externalities and social norms of an online community are vital to their participatory behavior patterns in online interactions. Etic research approaches as employed by Guo et al. (2019) were instrumental in examining cross-cultural analysis explaining interrelations between aspects revealing that rules, regulations and norms are intrinsic to culture, which shapes online user behavior. More to that, Seraj (2012) points out that community members' commitment to a community directly relies on social norms, social interaction ties, and interpersonal trust in online communities. This is similar to the position held by Seering et al. (2019) and Rehman et al. (2020) that a community moderator's role to invoke frequency in member participation in online community activities impacts their behavior. Anderson, et al. (2013) concurs that members of online communities tend to have recommended behavior which may create a norm, this brings new members to the community and inspire them to participate frequently this kind of peer pressure also contributes to behavior in online communities. Much as cultural aspects are central in influencing online user behaviour, this review found that various other factors interrelate with cultural factors to influence and impact online user behavior and interactions. There are some externalities and subjective norms that are antecedental to online behavior, social interactions and ties. Wang and Chen (2012) concur with this point of view by noting that technological factors are crucial in influencing online user behavior. Technological perspectives, such as ease-of-use, enhance interactions and behavior in online communities. However, Foster's (2013) study slightly differs with this position by asserting that conceptually, society manifests through the lens of individualism and rationalism as opposed to the embedded mutual dependency inherent in the common definition of community. Since cultural norms are definitive of community, Foster here suggests that online communities despite their innate rules and norms may have little to no influence on the actions of their members. This can be construed that it is an individual online user's choice to act and behave in a particular way, not necessarily influenced by the cultural settings of their community.

Legislation, Culture, and online user behavior are interconnected, and their interplay influences online interactions and the challenges faced within virtual communities. Broadhurst and Chang (2013) pointed out that policy 'resides' at the very top of internet regulation governance and control as it influences platform design and inline group/community formation. They further noted that many cyber laws are derived from national and international policies for example all Asian and pacific countries signatories to the 2001 Council of Europe (CoE) Budapest Convention on Cybercrime that created legal foundation for enforcing cybercrime through aligning with local legislation and policies in individual countries. This links local cyber policy to international policy. Centivany (2016) noted that approaches to internet policy provide complementary avenues for dealing with the moral and ethical components of user interaction with online systems. Morals and ethics are aspects present in both culture and law, which also link

with behavior. In the same light, Zhang et al. (2020) noted that policymaking procedures, especially during times of controversy, have been found to give key hints about the interplay of values and ethics in the development of current online systems. Zhang et al. (2020) continues that the mechanisms of policymaking can be used to unravel and reverse search how online systems development evolved, which reveals how they impact user choices and online behaviour. An online community without a user policy, control, governance and moderation is comparable to a country without a legal system (Klonick, 2017). It is difficult to sustain a culture if its participants do not understand its philosophy and limitations. As a result, it is vital for an online community culture to explicitly define its regulations and cultural norms for reference and self-government purposes (Seraj, 2012). The trust that this fosters in social interactions enhances the likelihood that members will remain loyal to and of commendable conduct in their communities and attain value from them. This includes influencing members' online behavior and interactions.

Laws and policies play a crucial role in shaping online user behaviors and practices in virtual communities, but their effectiveness may vary across different cultural contexts. In an empirical study, Wu et al. (2012) found that policy and social interaction have a significant impact on whether values warrant sensitivity and attention or how those concerns translate into action and practice. Approaches to internet policy provide complementary avenues for dealing with the moral and ethical components of our common user interaction with online systems. In the same light, Zhang et al. (2020) noted that policymaking procedures, especially during times of controversy, have been shown to give key hints about the interplay of values and ethics in the development of current online systems. More to that, Centivany (2016) put it that the mechanisms of policymaking can be used to unravel and reverse search how online systems development evolved, which reveals how they impact user choices and behaviour online. This also explains the rationale behind online user behaviour. Online group moderators' actions have a lot with impacting online behaviour.

Current policy measures have limitations in promoting a healthy and inclusive digital environment, and there is a need for context-specific approaches that consider cultural nuances. Moreover, interventions to institute tighter measures have been interpreted as infringement of freedom of expression, a compromise of personal data, and an infringement on privacy. The studies of Land (2013), Zheng (2013), Soldatov (2017), Meserve and Pemstein (2020) have revealed that many countries around the world censor the internet, block or restrict access to certain platforms and or the internet because of political, moral, religious or ethical reasons, such blockings are often part of the law of the land. On a similar note, Akgül and Kırıldoğ (2015), Land (2013) and Zheng (2013) note that Countries like China, North Korea and Iran are known for blocking certain websites and platforms mainly for political reasons, and Saudi Arabia, Turkey Indonesia, Somalia and many others block access to adult content websites for moral and religious reasons. In many instances governments in India, Ethiopia and Uganda completely shut down internet connections for certain periods or in particular regions of their territory for political reasons and 'national security' reasons (Soldatov, 2017; Meserve, & Pemstein, 2020). These kinds of actions are also accompanied by prosecutions and or persecutions of users for what they interact online even if they are located in different countries. The law in such countries is used to control online users' behaviours as users have to carefully choose who they interact with and how or what they interact about, these choices may not be of the users free will but conditioned (Barth & De Jong, 2017). Iosifidis (2014) asserted

that the issue of others deciding how users should behave is a rather controversial notion in this current state of the world where inclusiveness is held in high regard. However, controversial issues set off thoughts and means of interplaying the complexities in policy, morals, values, ethical issues, and digital technological design elements, and how they influence internet users, online communities and external critics (Centivany, 2016). Controversial issues make a possible starting point for the adaptation of inclusive policymaking methodologies, with the goal of contributing to a better understanding of the complex interrelations between cultural issues and policy (Centivany, 2016). Corbett and Walker (2013) examined the role of inclusiveness and the impact of participatory policymaking approaches discovered that inclusive participatory initiatives serve as information providers for the policymaking process that enables policymakers reach informed decisions. This is reaffirmed by Mansell (2017) who put it that the opinions of online communities have unconditional influence in deciding the administration of an online platform, participatory policymaking will have come full circle as this will represent the integration of the community's values into online platform design.

Builders believe that freedom of expression is a fundamental value on their platform, so a user has a choice to engage or avoid objectionable content, which is a relatively small price to pay for providing a free and open online platform for social interaction. In such a situation, users have a choice of what content or other users to interact with. However, the same choices are not open to users in some countries who cannot even access some platforms or an internet connection because of their countries' laws and policies.

The studies of Lubin and Townley (2020), Paterson (2018) and Lim (2017) have demonstrated that dubious online behavior persists and practiced in realms where cyber legislation and rules exist implying that local and international legislation or platform policies and rules do little to compel online users to behave in a particular way. This is in line with Foster's (2013) assertion that individualism and rationalism always have a heavy hand in online user behavior. Foster here suggests that online communities despite their innate rules and norms may have little to no influence on the actions of their members.

4.3 Limitations in the Reviewed literature and Recommendations

There were some methodological considerations worth noting when studying cultural influences. Certain issues in the analysis of cultural aspects in online user behavior and communities, including aspects like the research samples, country selection, number of cultures examined, participant types, and data interpretation cannot be taken as sufficiently representative of all the parameters necessary for better analysis of the topic at hand. The review found that in many studies, countries were chosen as the standard unit of culture, which may not accurately represent the overall online user population. This methodological limitation could hinder the accurate assessment of changes in perceived online user behavior resulting from these studies. For example, investigating cultural and economic elements in France and Kenya would reveal numerous distinctions, encompassing social, economic, ethnic, tribal, belief, and geographic factors.

The review also identified patterns in the data used, with a high number of studies relying on data sets and online user metrics compiled by online platforms. Government data or data from independent bodies not affiliated with online platforms or policymakers were rarely utilized. While these online user metrics are publicly available, it would be interesting to compare the results with data independent from platforms or policy makers to gain a more comprehensive understanding of user engagement and behavior online.

Future studies should consider incorporating online user metrics provided independently by non-online policymaking authorities.

Some studies selected communities based on their level of online community engagement, often favoring larger and more active communities over smaller groups. While larger communities can be ideal research data sources, smaller and more isolated groups can provide valuable insights into user engagement, behavior, and interaction. Further studies should give more consideration to analyzing small online groups. The number of online communities selected can also influence the research outcomes regarding online user behavior.

Furthermore, many studies in the literature relied on employees as study participants, which may result in a limited representation of socio-cultural diversity. Comparing subgroups from different cultural communities can lead to mismatches in variables. Future investigations should consider a diverse range of participants to ensure a more comprehensive understanding of the cultural influences on online behavior in online communities.

Future research should focus on countries that share similar sociocultural, economic, and geographical aspects to facilitate a more realistic analysis of the factors influencing online behavior. It is recommended that future studies include more than two communities to avoid overemphasizing or underemphasizing differences. Analyzing three or more communities allows for a more comprehensive examination of cultural influences on online behavior and facilitates better predictability and inferential analysis.

5. Conclusion

This review highlights the contribution of cultural settings, legislation, and social interactions in shaping online user behavior and interactions. Cultural factors, such as social norms and values, play a vital role in determining participatory behavior patterns and community members' commitment to online communities. The study also emphasizes the importance of policy and social interaction in influencing values, sensitivity, and attention given to certain concerns, as well as translating those concerns into action and practice.

However, it is important to recognize the limitations of current policy measures in promoting a healthy and inclusive digital environment. Context-specific approaches are needed, taking into account cultural nuances and avoiding infringement on freedom of expression and privacy. The interplay between morals, values, ethics, and digital technological design elements further complicates the understanding of online user behavior and its impact on online communities. Controversial issues serve as starting points for the adaptation of inclusive policymaking methodologies, aiming to better understand the complex interrelations between cultural issues and policy.

The studies reviewed indicate that legislation and platform policies alone may not be sufficient to compel online users to behave in a particular way. Individualism and rationalism heavily influence online user behavior, suggesting that online communities' rules and norms may have limited influence on their members' actions. This implies that online users have a certain degree of choice and agency in their behavior, regardless of the cultural settings of their communities.

Future research should consider methodological considerations, such as capturing the diversity within cultures and exploring countries with similar sociocultural, economic, and geographical aspects. Diverse participant demographics, including smaller online

groups, should also be considered to gain insights into specific cultural traits that contribute to behavior within online communities.

Understanding the interplay between cultural settings, legislation, and social interactions provides valuable insights into online user behavior and interactions. By considering cultural nuances, adopting inclusive policymaking methodologies, and recognizing the limitations of current approaches, researchers and practitioners can work towards fostering a healthy, inclusive, and culturally sensitive digital environment.

References

- Akgül, M., & Kırıldoğ, M. (2015). Internet censorship in Turkey. *Internet Policy Review*, 4(2), 1-22.
- Anderson, A., Huttenlocher, D., Kleinberg, J., & Leskovec, J. (2013, May). Steering user behavior with badges. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web* (pp. 95-106).
- Barrett, G. (2015). Deconstructing community. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 55(2), 182-204.
- Barth, S., & De Jong, M. D. (2017). The privacy paradox–Investigating discrepancies between expressed privacy concerns and actual online behavior–A systematic literature review. *Telematics and informatics*, 34(7), 1038-1058.
- Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Hansen, D. (2012). The impact of polices on government social media usage: Issues, challenges, and recommendations. *Government information quarterly*, 29(1), 30-40.
- Bohanon, A. L. (2016). Tweeting the Police: Balancing Free Speech and Decency on Government-Sponsored Media Pages. *Minn. L. Rev.*, 101, 341.
- Braman, S. (2013). The geopolitical vs. the network political: Internet designers and governance. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 9(3), 277-296.
- Broadhurst, R., & Chang, L. Y. (2013). Cybercrime in Asia: trends and challenges. *Handbook of Asian criminology*, 49-63.
- Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of business research*, 66(1), 105-114.
- Brown, G., & Poellet, K. (2012). The customary international law of cyberspace. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 6(3), 126-145.
- Centivany, A. (2016). Values, ethics and participatory policymaking in online communities. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 53(1), 1-10.
- Chen, J., & Shen, X. L. (2015). Consumers' decisions in social commerce context: An empirical investigation. *Decision Support Systems*, 79, 55-64.
- Corbett, S., & Walker, A. (2013). The big society: Rediscovery of 'the social' or rhetorical fig-leaf for neo-liberalism?. *Critical Social Policy*, 33(3), 451-472.
- Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, C., West, R., Jurafsky, D., Leskovec, J., & Potts, C. (2013, May). No country for old members: User lifecycle and linguistic change in online communities. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web* (pp. 307-318).
- Edwards, A., Housley, W., Williams, M., Sloan, L., & Williams, M. (2013). Digital social research, social media and the sociological imagination: Surrogacy, augmentation and re-orientation. *International journal of social research methodology*, 16(3), 245-260.

- Flew, T., Martin, F., & Suzor, N. (2019). Internet regulation as media policy: Rethinking the question of digital communication platform governance. *Journal of Digital Media & Policy*, 10(1), 33-50.
- Foster, D. (2013). Community and identity in the electronic village. In *Internet culture* (pp. 23-37). Routledge.
- Gallagher, S. E., & Savage, T. (2013). Cross-cultural analysis in online community research: A literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 1028-1038.
- Gillespie, T. (2018). Regulation of and by platforms. *The SAGE handbook of social media*, 254-278.
- Grabner-Kräuter, S., & Bitter, S. (2015, January). Trust in online social networks: A multifaceted perspective. In *Forum for social economics* (Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 48-68). Routledge.
- Green, R. T., & White, P. D. (2017). Methodological considerations in cross-national consumer research. In *Language in International Business* (pp. 20-32). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Gruzd, A., Jacobson, J., Wellman, B., & Mai, P. (2016). Understanding communities in an age of social media: the good, the bad, and the complicated. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19(9), 1187-1193.
- Guo, C. J., Warkentin, M., Luo, X. R., Gurung, A., & Shim, J. P. (2020). An imposed etic approach with Schwartz polar dimensions to explore cross-cultural use of social network services. *Information & Management*, 57(8), 103261.
- Hongju Koh, H. (2012). International law in cyberspace. *Harvard International Law Journal*, 54.
- Hsiao, C. C., & Chiou, J. S. (2017). The social influence of online collaborative community: the moderating effect of achievement. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 36(3), 269-280.
- Iosifidis, P. (2014). Social Media, Democracy and Public Service Media. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 4, 71-88.
- Ismail, N. A., & Masud, M. M. (2020). Prospects and challenges in improving e-commerce connectivity in Malaysia. *E-commerce Connectivity in ASEAN*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia, 78-98.
- Johnson, S. L., Safadi, H., & Faraj, S. (2015). The emergence of online community leadership. *Information Systems Research*, 26(1), 165-187.
- Kalia, P., Ben Dahmane Mouelhi, N., Tebessi Hachana, S., Malek, F., & Dahmen, M. (2019, February). Using social networking sites: A qualitative cross-cultural comparison. In *International Conference on Emerging Technologies in Computer Engineering* (pp. 269-285). Springer, Singapore.
- Kim, J., & Hastak, M. (2018). Social network analysis: Characteristics of online social networks after a disaster. *International journal of information management*, 38(1), 86-96.
- Kittichaisaree, K. (2017). *Public international law of cyberspace* (Vol. 32). Cham: Springer.
- Klonick, K. (2017). The new governors: The people, rules, and processes governing online speech. *Harv. L. Rev.*, 131, 1598.
- Klonick, K. (2020). The Facebook Oversight Board: Creating an independent institution to adjudicate online free expression. *Yale Law Journal*, 129(2418).

- Kozyreva, A., Lewandowsky, S., & Hertwig, R. (2020). Citizens versus the internet: Confronting digital challenges with cognitive tools. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 21(3), 103-156.
- Land, M. (2013). Toward an international law of the internet. *Harv. Int'l LJ*, 54, 393.
- Lara-Hernandez, J. A., & Chin, J. J. Y. (2022). Sense of Community and Spatial Agency: Key Elements of Resilient Communities. In *Resilient Communities and the Peccioli Charter* (pp. 59-64). Springer, Cham.
- Lim, M. (2017). Freedom to hate: social media, algorithmic enclaves, and the rise of tribal nationalism in Indonesia. *Critical Asian Studies*, 49(3), 411-427.
- Lockard, J. (2013). Progressive politics, electronic individualism and the myth of virtual community. In *Internet culture* (pp. 219-231). Routledge.
- Lubin, A., & Townley, H. (2020). The International Law of Rabble Rousing. 45 *Yale Journal of International Law Online* 1 (March 2020).
- Mahmoudi, A., Yaakub, M. R., & Bakar, A. A. (2018). New time-based model to identify the influential users in online social networks. *Data Technologies and Applications*.
- Malinen, S. (2015). Understanding user participation in online communities: A systematic literature review of empirical studies. *Computers in human behavior*, 46, 228-238.
- Mansell, R. (2017). Bits of power: Struggling for control of information and communication networks. *The Political Economy of Communication*, 5(1).
- McGinn, K. L. (2017). History, structure, and practices: San Pedro longshoremen in the face of change. In *Exploring positive relationships at work* (pp. 265-276). Psychology Press.
- Meserve, S. A., & Pemstein, D. (2020). Terrorism and internet censorship. *Journal of peace research*, 57(6), 752-763.
- Monteagut, L. E. (2017). Etic approach to qualitative research. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, 1-2.
- Norris, P. (2023). Cancel culture: Myth or reality?. *Political studies*, 71(1), 145-174.
- Nugraha, L.K. & Putri, D.A. (2016). "Mapping the Cyber Policy Landscape: Indonesia." *Global Partners Digital*, (November): 1-28.
- Park, J. H., Gu, B., Leung, A. C. M., & Konana, P. (2014). An investigation of information sharing and seeking behaviors in online investment communities. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 31, 1-12.
- Paterson, T. (2019). Indonesian cyberspace expansion: a double-edged sword. *Journal of Cyber Policy*, 4(2), 216-234.
- Pletikosa Cvijikj, I., & Michahelles, F. (2013). Online engagement factors on Facebook brand pages. *Social network analysis and mining*, 3(4), 843-861.
- Preotiuc-Pietro, D., & Cohn, T. (2013, May). Mining user behaviours: a study of check-in patterns in location based social networks. In *Proceedings of the 5th annual ACM web science conference* (pp. 306-315).
- Rauschnabel, P. A., Sheldon, P., & Herzfeldt, E. (2019). What motivates users to hashtag on social media?. *Psychology & Marketing*, 36(5), 473-488.
- Rebaza, J. C. V. (2017). Mining user behavior in location-based social networks (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade de São Paulo).
- Rehman, A. U., Jiang, A., Rehman, A., Paul, A., & Sadiq, M. T. (2020). Identification and role of opinion leaders in information diffusion for online discussion network. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing*, 1-13.

- Ren, Y., Harper, F. M., Drenner, S., Terveen, L., Kiesler, S., Riedl, J., & Kraut, R. E. (2012). Building member attachment in online communities: Applying theories of group identity and interpersonal bonds. *MIS quarterly*, 841-864.
- Ren, Y., Kraut, R., & Kiesler, S. (2007). Applying common identity and bond theory to design of online communities. *Organization studies*, 28(3), 377-408.
- Rui, J., & Stefanone, M. A. (2013). Strategic self-presentation online: A cross-cultural study. *Computers in human behavior*, 29(1), 110-118.
- Seering, J., Wang, T., Yoon, J., & Kaufman, G. (2019). Moderator engagement and community development in the age of algorithms. *New Media & Society*, 21(7), 1417-1443.
- Seraj, M. (2012). We create, we connect, we respect, therefore we are: intellectual, social, and cultural value in online communities. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26(4), 209-222.
- Shepherd, T., & Landry, N. (2013). Technology design and power: Freedom and control in communication networks. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 9(3), 259-275.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of business research*, 104, 333-339.
- Soldatov, A. (2017). The taming of the internet. *Russian Social Science Review*, 58(1), 39-59.
- Stuart, H. C., Dabbish, L., Kiesler, S., Kinnaird, P., & Kang, R. (2012, February). Social transparency in networked information exchange: a theoretical framework. In *Proceedings of the ACM 2012 conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work* (pp. 451-460).
- Sun, N., Rau, P. P. L., & Ma, L. (2014). Understanding lurkers in online communities: A literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 38, 110-117.
- Ur, B., & Wang, Y. (2013, May). A cross-cultural framework for protecting user privacy in online social media. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on World Wide Web* (pp. 755-762).
- Vitkauskaitė, E. (2016). Cross-cultural issues in social networking sites: Review of research. *Business Challenges in the Changing Economic Landscape-Vol. 2*, 293-307.
- Wang, E. S. T., & Chen, L. S. L. (2012). Forming relationship commitments to online communities: The role of social motivations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(2), 570-575.
- Wellman, B. (2018). The network community: An introduction. In *Networks in the global village* (pp. 1-47). Routledge.
- Wellman, B., & Gulia, M. (2018). Net-surfers don't ride alone: Virtual communities as communities. In *Networks in the global village* (pp. 331-366). Routledge.
- World Bank. (2018). *Poverty and shared prosperity 2018: Piecing together the poverty puzzle*.
- Wu, K. W., Huang, S. Y., Yen, D. C., & Popova, I. (2012). The effect of online privacy policy on consumer privacy concern and trust. *Computers in human behavior*, 28(3), 889-897.
- Yardley, L., Spring, B. J., Riper, H., Morrison, L. G., Crane, D. H., Curtis, K., ... & Blandford, A. (2016). Understanding and promoting effective engagement with digital behavior change interventions. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 51(5), 833-842.

- Yuan, E. J. (2013). A culturalist critique of 'online community in new media studies. *New media & society*, 15(5), 665-679.
- Zhang, A. X., Hugh, G., & Bernstein, M. S. (2020, October). Policy Kit: building governance in online communities. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (pp. 365-378).
- Zheng, H. (2013). Regulating the internet: China's law and practice. *Beijing L. Rev.*, 4, 37.
- Zheng, Y., Zhao, K., & Stylianou, A. (2013). The impacts of information quality and system quality on users' continuance intention in information-exchange virtual communities: An empirical investigation. *Decision support systems*, 56, 513-524.