CSCW Summary of Changes

We appreciated the reviewers' constructive suggestions. We are glad that the reviewers found this work to be very interesting and relevant. The main suggestions provided by the reviewers are clarifying our explanations and framing of the differences between the U.S. and China, and more clearly presenting statistical analyses. We have incorporated all of these suggestions into our revision, and we believe the paper has become even stronger. The following tables summarize the changes we made.

Explanations for the differences and framing

Items	Reviewers' comments	Responses
Explanation about cultural differences	It may also be the explanation of the variance may lie more within the culture/design of Twitter and Weibo, where the norms of use in Weibo allow for more anonymous microblogging. The explanations given by the authors regarding some of the differences seem more in line with political differences and freedom of expression. That's not to say that culture doesn't include these factors, but it is not necessarily the type of low-context/high-context distinction that is typically drawn in research papers. (R1)	We totally agree with this. We tend to think that culture is an integration of various factors such as cultural characteristics, economic and politic status, and IT development; and they co-evolve and shape one another. In particular, how Twitter/Weibo are designed would be influenced by these interactions, and how Twitter/Weibo are used and perceived would be further influenced by all these cultural factors and how they are designed. According to the literature on cultural studies, many cultural characteristics can be traced back and connected to the low- and high-context distinction, and it is one of the primary dimensions in analyzing cultural characteristics and mostly related to people's information perception process—thus related to how feature cues affect people perceiving tweets' credibility. However, there are other cultural factors in addition to context that play roles in shaping people's perception, as we discussed in the Related Work/Hypotheses/Discussion. To make our point clearer and avoid misinterpretation, in this revision, we added discussion on how these cultural factors interact, and we enhanced our explanations of the differences: in particular, we added more discussion about our understanding of the complex integration of cultural factors in the Introduction (page 1), added a paragraph in Related Work to discuss this in more depth (page 3), and enhanced the rationale and added references in hypotheses, for example, in H1a, another cultural dimension "masculinity" is also integrated. We also modified the paper's title, replacing the term "cross-cultural" with the term "comparing the U.S. and China," to avoid misinterpretation.
Conflation of "culture" with high/low context	In the introduction, the authors describe several dimensions that scholars have used to distinguish among (national) cultures but the presentation seems to suggest that these can be collapsed into	Again, we completely agree, and like the comment immediately above, we note that we have a) added a number of points (page 1 and page 3) and references ([8][14][26][29][40][42][56]) to the introduction and background that provide detail about cultural influences, and b) de-emphasized the notion that all of these cultural

	low and high context, which is not the case. (R2)	differences can be collapsed into the high/low context distinction (which was not our intention). Our intention was to use the high/low context distinction as a mechanism for connecting cultural differences to communicating and processing information in social contexts, and to show that the findings are consistent with the high/low context distinction. Hopefully that is now clear, particularly in light of the paragraph we added at the end of the related work section (page-3, the third paragraph) that discusses in more detail the variety of factors that can influence a national culture, and clarifies our interpretation of the word "culture" as used in the remainder of the paper.
Possible difference in credibility evaluation	The authors should consult Harkness for information about how to ensure that participants from two different countries are using the scale in an equivalent way (R2)	This is a very interesting question worthy of discussing. We had similar concern but we should have discussed about this in depth. From the rating itself, it is difficult to know whether the difference on the credibility rating is from the real difference in credibility perception or from the difference of using the scale, or both. However, we tend to believe that the difference in credibility perception is existing and significant, because the higher ratings of Chinese respondents are consistent with their more frequent usage of microblogs and heavier reliance on microblogs as an information source. We have added a paragraph to the end of the "Experimental Results: General Cultural Attitudes" sub-section, where we acknowledge this as a limitation of the method, and discuss our rationale on assessing the differences.
Hypotheses	H2a is inconsistent with some earlier research on SNS (which is ok but should be explained) and H3a is inconsistent with people's experiences with RenRen (also ok, but needs to be explained). H5a is somewhat plausible and more clearly related to the introductory framing of the paper, but needs bolstering. H6 seems like a stretch; this needs more support/citations. (R2)	We have done several things to improve the theoretical framing: • We realize that the previous structure that separated the introduction and motivations of predictor factors and hypotheses might leave the hypotheses isolated and insufficiently-supported. We integrated these two sections, following the "Related Work" that introduced previous work on which the current study is based. Thus the hypotheses now are much more clearly motivated and supported. • H2a has been removed because we felt the interaction between culture and user name-style might be complex and driven by different directions. Instead we added an exploratory analysis around a more nuanced picture of the relationship between user name, topic, and culture. • More supports and citations ([21][34][61][64]) have been added to enhance hypotheses H3~H6, for example, previous work on cultural difference in profile presentations in SNS and the cultural dimension "masculinity"
Framing	Reviewer two also points out that the authors need to reference previous CSCW research that compares US and China with respect to online and social media sites.	Added references on cultural differences of profile presentation in SNS in both Related Work (page 3, last paragraph on the left) and Hypotheses (page 4, the 4th paragraph).
Color-	"Although a quick investigation	The association of blue to male and pink to female is common

coding	suggests that the pink/blue distinction will be appropriate in China, this should have been mentioned in the paper since many color meanings are different across cultures." (R2)	in both the U.S. and China. We have added a sentence to our explanation of the image stimulus construction to clarify this.

Presentation of statistical analyses

Items	Reviewers' comments	Responses
ANOVA test	"It is not possible to tell whether the proper ANOVA was conducted" (R2)	Thanks for pointing out this lack of clarity. We did use a Multi-way ANOVA with a mixed design: segregating between-subjects variables (e.g., respondents' age, country, testing-topic) and within-subjects (tweets' features in the experiment). We added this explanation in the revision (both in the introduction about the analysis, page-7).
Controlling factors	"there is little reporting on controlling for other differences that may potentially be as or more salient than national culture" (R1)	In addition to age and gender, we re-ran the analysis adding the controlling factor job-role, which resulted in slight modifications in the result table. The significant results were unchanged, with the job-role effect much smaller than that for age (as we discussed in the paper). We did not collect data on educational level and Internet access to limit the length of the survey, with the belief that we did the best control by studying subjects from the same IT company where people share very similar technical background, are all highly educated, and have good Internet access in office and home.
Result table	"The statistical tests need to be presented in their full correct format" (R2)	The result table was a partial copy from the original R-ANOVA printout but did not included Df values (since all our predictor factors are 2-level categorical, Df =1, for space reason). In this revision, we added Df column and unified the p-values to make the table clearer. .
Digits format	"there is no reason to use both asterisks and exact p values, and these exact values are difficult to read" (R2)	Very good suggestion to make the paper clearer! We have deleted all asterisks and unified the numbers of decimals across the paper. We have also deleted the mini-tables that replicate the data in the result table into the text of the findings.
Mean-value	"Greek characters are used for population values, not the sample values. M is the right character for the sample mean." (R2)	Thanks for pointing out! We have changed it to "M."

Formatting issues

Items	Reviewers' comments	Responses
Citation	The citation style of bold number in the paper body is not common in CSCW paper. (R3)	Thanks! We changed according to the template style.

Figure 1	“missing of Figure 1” (R3)	We are not sure what was meant by this comment, since Figure 1 (which displays the sample tweets used in the experiment) appeared in the original document (and remains in the revision, of course!).
Typo	There is a typo in the first paragraph on the top of p. 10. “algorithms incorporate additional content and social dimensions. (R1)	Fixed, thanks!