

account the perception of the respondents about their number of friends, particularly those categorized as closed friends and family members. In terms of attachment, the current works also delves in knowing the respondents' levels of avoidant and anxious attachment styles.

Given these measures, the present study aims to test whether FB consumption (i.e., frequency of FB access and the number of hours of FB daily usage), number of close friends and family members in FB, and attachment styles (i.e., avoidant and anxious attachment styles) are significant predictors of FB relationship satisfaction. Consequently, the study seeks to find the best model predicting levels of FB relationship satisfaction out of these variables.

METHODOLOGY

Data Source

The data of the present work are from the more extensive FB study conducted at a local University in Cebu last October to November 2018. Graduate students of UP Diliman's straight Ph.D. Program in Social Psychology initiated the said research that was a requirement of their course in Psych 287 on Surveys. The author of the current research is part of the team that conducted the FB study.

Sampling and Sample Size

The researchers conducted a census in the said University, particularly of all those enrolled in that semester. The number of respondents

who completed the form totaled 713 (79.31%).

Procedures

The current study employed a mixed-mode of data collection that includes an online instrument through Google form and a pen-and-paper version of the tool. The students completed the survey tools (both online and pen-and-paper) within 30 minutes to an hour.

The researchers surveyed the respondents at the start or the end of their general education and major courses. The teachers' permitted the conduct of the survey in class. Some of the students also answered the online questionnaire in their free time.

Respondents signified their consent by affixing their signatures on a one-page consent form. The completion of the said form signals the respondents' voluntary participation in the survey. The researchers also asked respondents to provide their email addresses in a separate form following the completion of the survey instrument. The use of email addresses is for a raffle of 10 gift certificates as tokens for partaking the study.

Respondents

The official enrolment of the respondents in the semester is the primary inclusion criterion. The succeeding table summarizes the distribution of the respondents in terms of some socio-demographic variables.

Table 1. Frequencies and Percentages Share of the Sample According to Socio-Demographic Variables

	<i>f</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min-Max</i>	<i>N</i>
Age			19.30	1.36	17 - 33	709 ^a
Gender						711 ^a
Female	508	71.20				
Male	196	27.50				
Intersex	7	1.00				
Year Level						711 ^a
First Year	380	53.30				
Fourth Year	302	42.40				
Third Year	28	3.90				
Fourth Year	1	0.10				
Degree						712 ^a
Computer Science	134	18.80				
Biology	126	17.70				
Management	126	17.70				
Psychology	74	10.40				
Political Science	72	10.10				
Mass Communication	52	7.30				
Mathematics	44	6.20				
BFA ^b Product Design	32	4.50				
CFA ^c Studio Arts	29	4.10				
BFA ^b Studio Arts	15	2.10				
CFA ^c Product Design	8	1.10				

^a *N* = 713, however, there were some missing values for some socio-demographic variables;

^b is Bachelor of Fine Arts; ^c is Certificate of Fine Arts.

Measures

FB Relationship Satisfaction (the Dependent Variable). The researchers developed an instrument to measure respondents' level of relationship satisfaction on Facebook. The tool is composed of 6 items. It utilized a 9-point scale where one means "Not True at All" and seven as "Very True." The reliability coefficient of the instrument is .594.

FB Consumption. There are two measures of the FB consumption included in the current

study. These are perceived frequency of access to FB and the number of accumulated hours spent in using FB in a day. The first measure provided respondents with options ranging from daily, 4 to 6 days a week, 2 to 3 days a week, once a week, and 1 to 3 times a month. Meanwhile, respondents chose from the following options for the second measure: less than an hour, 1 to 3 hours, 4 to 6 hours, and more than hours.

The number of FB Friends. The researchers developed a 6-point scale to

estimate the quantity of FB friends the respondents have. It has six options ranging from "none," "a few," "some," "many," "most," and "all." The said measure included seven categories of friends (e.g., people I have something in common with, classmates, close friends, family members, relatives, strangers, and people with shared interest). These categories came from a pre-survey measure. The current study intends to explore the impacts of attachment styles. With this, the researcher employed only two of the seven friend types. These are close friends and family members and are primary attachment partners.

Attachment Styles. The researcher used Fraley's (2015) Relationship Structures (ECRS) Questionnaire to measure two types of insecure attachment styles, namely, anxious and avoidant attachment style. The scale has nine items. The first six items measure avoidant attachment style while the last three statements measure anxiety attachment style. The attachment tool uses a 7-point option ranging from "Disagree Strongly" to "Agree Strongly." The local reliabilities of these two scales are as

follows avoidant attachment style ($\alpha = .782$) and anxious attachment style ($\alpha = .890$).

Data Analyses

The researcher employed Descriptive statistics to analyze the outcome and demographic variables. The preliminary analyses included the determination of possible predictors of FB Relationship Satisfaction and reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) of the different scales used in the survey. The final statistical procedure is standard multiple regression to determine if the identified dispositional variables were significant predictors of FB relationship satisfaction.

RESULTS

Before proceeding to the analysis of the predictors of relationship satisfaction in Facebook, it is imperative to understand the nature of the respondents. Specifically, it is essential to look into their attachment styles and some of their socio-demographic variables. The table below summarizes their attachment styles scores.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations of the Avoidant and Anxious Attachment Styles in terms of Socio-Demographic Variables

Categorical Variable	Levels of Variations	of Avoidant Attachment ^a			Anxious Attachment ^b		
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Gender	Female	3.95	1.16	508	4.83	1.70	508
	Male	3.61	.98	196	4.42	1.75	196
Year Level	Freshies	3.82	1.15	380	4.76	1.71	380
	Senior	3.92	1.08	330	4.64	1.74	330
College	Humanities	4.01	1.15	135	4.53	1.79	135
	Management	3.88	1.12	126	4.97	1.74	126
	Sciences	3.81	1.11	304	4.55	1.70	304
	Social Sciences	3.84	1.13	146	4.98	1.64	146

Note: ^a is a 13 item measure that uses a 7-point scale, where 1 is "disagree strongly," and 7 is "agree strongly"; ^b is a 3 item measure that uses a 7-point scale, where 1 is "disagree strongly" and 7 is "agree strongly".

Analyzing for significant difference in the levels of Avoidant Attachment Styles between male ($n_1=196$) and female ($n_2=508$), respondents' attachment scores showed a significant result ($t_{(419.115)} = -3.959, p = .000$).

Females reported higher avoidant attachment styles scores than male college students. The same pattern of difference was found in terms of anxious attachment style ($t_{(702)} = -2.886, p =$

.004). Female college students reported being more anxious than male college students. Meanwhile, analyzing for significant difference in the levels of Avoidant and Anxious Attachment Styles between fresh ($n_1=380$) and senior ($n_2=330$) college students, showed inconclusive results ($t_{\text{avoidant}(708)} = -1.170, p = .243, t_{\text{anxious}(708)} = .817, p = .415$).

In terms of the differences of avoidant attachment styles of the four different colleges, the analysis showed inconclusive findings ($F_{(3,707)} = 1.101, p = .348$). However, analysis

of variance showed a significant difference in the levels of anxious attachment styles of the respondents ($F_{(3,707)} = 3.551, p = .014$). Colleges accounted for 1% of the variation in the levels of anxious attachment style. Post hoc analysis using *Tukey HSD* showed a marginally significant difference between only two colleges, namely, the Sciences and the Social Sciences ($p = .059$). Testing for significant differences in the attachments styles between the colleges suggested non-conclusive results.

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Variables

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
FB Relationship Satisfaction	36.84 ^a	7.64	705
Perceived Number of Close Friends in FB	3.98 ^b	1.20	705
Perceived Number of Family Members Friends in FB	3.70 ^b	1.34	705
Avoidant Attachment Style	3.86 ^c	1.12	705
Anxious Attachment Style	4.71 ^d	1.72	705

Note: ^a is a 6 item measure that uses a 9-point scale, where 1 is "not true at all," and 9 is "very true";

^b is 1 item measure that uses a 6-point scale with the following anchoring 1 as "none," 2 "a few," 3 as "some," 4 as "many," 5 as "most", and "6 as "all";

^c is a 13 item measure that uses a 7-point scale, where 1 is "disagree strongly" and 7 is "agree strongly";

^d is a 3 item measure that uses a 7-point scale, where 1 is "disagree strongly" and 7 is "agree strongly";

The respondents reported a high average level of relationship satisfaction in FB. Meanwhile, their perceptions of their number of close and family member friends in FB was

between some and many. In general, they also reported an average level of avoidant attachment style and a high average level of anxious attachment styles.

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations of the FB Relationship Satisfaction in terms of Frequency of FB Access and Number of Hours of FB Use

Categorical Variable	Levels of Variations	FB Relationship Satisfaction ^a		
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Frequency of FB Access	Daily	37.15	7.52	584
	Non-daily	35.19	8.03	123
Number of Hours of FB Use	4 hours or more	37.04	7.53	275
	3 hours or less	36.68	7.72	431

Note: ^a is a 6 item measure that uses a 9-point scale, where 1 is "not true at all," and 9 is "very true";

In terms of relationship satisfaction in FB and the frequency of access to the said social media platform, respondents who access their FB account daily reported being more satisfied with their social relationships ($t_{(705)} = -2.605, p$

$= .009$) in the said social media platform. However, FB relationship satisfaction did not significantly vary as a function of the number of hours of FB use in a day ($t_{(704)} = -.616, p = .538$).

Table 5. Zero-Order Correlation Matrix of the Variables

FB Relationship Satisfaction	Frequency of FB Use	Number of Hours of FB Use	Perceived Number of Close Friends	Perceived Number of Family	Avoidant Attachment Style	Anxious Attachment Style
FB Relationship Satisfaction	.098**	.023	.099**	.033	-.270**	-.097**
Frequency of FB Use		.267**	.898**	.336**	-.105**	.067
Number of Hours of FB Use			.250**	.863**	-.061	.113**
Perceived Number of Close Friends				.329**	-.079*	.064
Perceived Number of Family Friends					-.083*	.114**
Avoidant Attachment Style						.075*
Anxious Attachment Style						

* $p < 0.05$, two-tailed; ** $p < 0.01$, two-tailed

The assumptions of the standard multiple regression analysis need to be satisfied to proceed with the final step of the statistical analysis. Clearly, in terms of validities, two predictors (i.e., Number of Hours of FB Use and Perceived Number of Family Friends) were not significantly correlated with the outcome variable, FB relationship satisfaction. The researcher dropped these variables from the analysis. These same variables were also strongly associated with each other, thus failing the assumption on multicollinearity. Also, the Frequency of FB

Use and the Perceived Number of Close Friends were strongly correlated predictors. The researcher used only one of these variables for the regression analysis. Provided that the focus of this paper is on Facebook consumption, the predictor on Perceived Number of Close Friends was also dropped from the study leaving the equation with only three variables, namely, Frequency of FB Use and the two measures of attachments styles (i.e., avoidant and anxious).

Table 6 : Regression Analysis for Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction in FB

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Frequency of FB Use	1.040	.446	.085*	.007
Avoidant Attachment Style	-1.749	.247	-.257**	.066
Anxious Attachment Style	-.375	.161	-.084*	.007

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

The final stage of the analysis involves the standard multiple regression analysis to test if the variables predicted college students' relationship satisfaction in FB. The regression analysis indicated that the three predictors all together explained 8.6% of the variance ($R = .293$, $F_{(3,702)} = 22.019$, $p = .000$). All three variables weakly predicted FB relationship satisfaction.

Given these results, the final regression equation model is:

FB Relationship Satisfaction = 44.408 + 1.040 (*Frequency of FB Use*) - 1.740 (*Avoidant Attachment Style*) - .375 (*Anxious Attachment Style*)

From this model, young people who frequently use their FB, who scored low in both Avoidant and Anxious Attachment Styles measures, are likely to report high levels of FB relationship satisfaction.

DISCUSSION

The present study provides empirical evidence that adolescents find relationship satisfaction in using FB. This finding alongside respondents' perceptions of having between some to many close and family member friends in FB. Furthermore, there is a positive relationship between the frequency of their daily access to this social media platform and their online relationship satisfaction. Meanwhile, the number of hours of FB use in a day had no impact on their online relationship satisfaction.

Generally, the Filipino adolescents in this study also reported an average level of avoidant attachment style and a high average level of

anxious attachment style. Anxiety characterizes the adolescence stage as it goes along the feeling of uncertainty in finding one's identity and independence (Droogenbroeck et al. 2018). Interestingly, female respondents showed higher levels of both avoidant and anxious attachment styles compared to male respondents. This gender difference is attributable to the social pressures that female adolescents experience. Some of these social pressures include being more sensitive and more emotionally affected with relationship-content stressors (e.g., death of a loved one). Several restrictions in their gender roles and terrorizing body issues may also lead to ruminative coping. Lastly, female adolescents are also more prone to family violence, abuse, and academic pressures (e.g., Haugen et al., 2014; Rosenfield & Mouzon, 2013; Matud, 2004). In the Philippine setting, this disadvantaged situation of young female adolescents is evident vis-à-vis a culture that is more accepting and forgiving to the innovative ways of young Filipino men. The "macho" culture remains visible in the socialization process of the young members of Filipino society.

The current study suggests that the frequency of interaction (i.e., the quantity of daily access to FB) only weakly predicts online relationship satisfaction. This finding runs consistently with Basilisco and Kyung Jin's (2016) study on Filipinos motivation of using FB. These researchers found out that Filipinos use FB more for seeking new friends and those they have common interests with, not necessarily for relationship maintenance. This motivation does not significantly contribute to the level of satisfaction that Filipinos have with the relationships they form online.

Furthermore, the number of online friends does not directly lead to relationship satisfaction. While interaction is vital for the formation of relationships, quality over quantity matters more (Mehl et al., 2010). Substantive conversations are likely associated with a greater sense of well-being and, consequently, relationship satisfaction. There may be a lot of things that could influence online social interactions. For example, Anderson and Emmers-Sommer (2006) have identified six predictors of relationship satisfaction for both online and face-to-face dyads. These predictors include perceived similarity, trust, commitment, intimacy, communication satisfaction, and attributional confidence. Small talks of what is trending in the online worlds are also salient in online interaction. These superficial interactions do not foster more intimate social connections, thereby leading to relationship satisfaction. In a recent study by Milek et al. (2018), small talks were negatively related to well-being.

The limitation of the online world may also bring about challenges to fostering relationship satisfaction. Brown (2011) suggested that the natural and virtual distance that social media creates also makes it easier to do "techno brush-off" or using technology for impersonal interactions. Further, words do not contain the nuances of non-verbal cues (Emmers-Sommer, 2004). Emoticons, GIFs, and other communication elements cannot capture the emotional aspects of conversations. Also, activities that bring about shared experiences that are likely to foster relationship satisfaction is irreplaceable.

In terms of the role of attachment styles to relationship satisfaction in FB, the weak predictive power of both avoidant and attachment styles may have been affected by other factors. Ye (2007) pointed out the vital role of relationship type to online relationship satisfaction. His study found out that when people reach a particular level of their online relationship, the communication patterns become more intimate regardless of attachment style. Further, attachment style did not result in differences in relationship satisfaction. One explanation for this is the unique characteristics

of online reality (e.g., absence of non-verbal cues and perceived similarity), can function as a leveler of the influence of attachment styles. Collins and Feeney (2004) refer to this as the deactivation of the attachment style in specific contexts. The virtual setting does have some cues for such deactivation to occur (e.g., better to trust the relationship partner that remains anxious given the distance, communicate more than avoid due to time differences, etc.).

Limitations

The current study faces the problem of the nature of the dependent variable. Relationship satisfaction in FB is a general construct. A specific context, like the relationship satisfaction of the family or close friends, would have made it better. Research suggests the importance of social connectedness type to the link between communication patterns and relationship satisfaction in online relationships (Ye, 2007). Ye also argued that once people develop a particular type of online relationship, relationship partners feel more comfortable with intimate topics. This more focused characterization of the dependent variable can also reduce the disintegration of the construct.

CONCLUSION

While some may question the benefits of online social relationships, the present study supports that relationship satisfaction does exist in such a non-traditional venue of social connectedness. Just like studies in offline social relations (e.g., dela Vega et al., 2017; Dunbar, 2016; Anderson & Emmers-Sommer, 2006), frequency of interaction, measured in terms of daily FB access, remarkably remains an essential component in relationship satisfaction. Indeed, FB is a platform where people interact, continue to be socially connected, and defy physical distance, time, culture, and other possible boundaries.

Furthermore, attachment styles also continue to play an important role in relationship satisfaction. Both types of insecure attachment styles (i.e., avoidant and anxious) are negatively associated with online relationship satisfaction. Quite possibly, this

finding may point to the importance of a secure working model in fostering online relationship maintenance, an area that is fertile for inquiry. Thus, future researchers may look into the other components of this attachment style, namely trust, commitment, view of the self, relationship expectancies, etc. and explore how these factors impact online social relationships.

Indeed, online social relationship satisfaction is a complex phenomenon. The consideration of some contextual and personality variables in this current study is an attempt to understand its processes. More importantly, the present work proves that there is an online social connectedness that brings about relationship satisfaction. For the adolescents sampled in the study, there is worth in “adding friends up.”

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., et al. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: a psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Anderson, T. & Emmers-Sommer, T. (2006). Predictors of relationship satisfaction in online romantic relationships. *Communication Studies*, 57(2), 153-172. doi:10.1080/10510970600666834.
- Bartholomew, K. & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 61, 226-244.
- Basilisco, R. & Kyung, Jin, C. (2016). Uses and Gratification Motivation for Using Facebook and the Impact of Facebook Usage on Social Capital and Life Satisfaction among Filipino Users. *International Journal of Software Engineering and Its Applications*, 9 (4),181-194.
- Brown, A. (2011). Relationships, community, and identity in the new virtual society. *Futurist*, 45(2), 29-34.
- Buote, V. M., Wood, E., & Pratt, M. Exploring similarities and differences between online and offline friendships: the role of attachment style. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25, 560-567.
- Burke, M. & Kraut, R. E. (2016). The relationship between Facebook use and well-being depends on communication type and tie strength. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 21(4), 265-281. Doi: <https://10.1111/jcc4.12162>.
- Chen, W., & Lee, K.-H. (2013). Sharing, liking, commenting, and distressed? The pathway between Facebook interaction and psychological distress. *Cyberpsychology and Behavioral Social Network*. 16, 728-734. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2012.0272.
- Collins, N. L., & Feeney, B. C. (2004). An attachment theory perspective on closeness and intimacy. In D. J. Mashek & A. Aaron (Eds.), *Handbook of Closeness and Intimacy* (pp.163-188). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- dela Vega, M. G. A., Flores, R. B., & Magusib, A. J. M. (2017). ‘Connected ka pa ba?: A study on how social media usage affects face-to-face interactions within the home. *Asian Journal of Media and Communication*, 1(1), 83-92.
- Dogruer, N., Eyyam, R. & Manevis, I. (2011). The Use of the Internet for Educational Purposes. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 606-611. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.115>.
- Droogenbroeck, F. V., Spruyt, B., & Keppens, G. (2018). Gender differences in mental health problems among adolescents and the role of social support: Results from the Belgian health interview surveys 2008 and 2013. *BMC Psychiatry*, 18(6), 1-9. doi: 10.1186/s12888-018-1591-4.
- Dunbar, R. I. M. (2016). Do online social media cut through the constraints that limit the size of offline social networks? *Royal Society Open Science*, 3(1), 1-9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.150292>.
- Elphinston, R. A., & Noller, P. (2011). Time to face it! Facebook intrusion and the implications for romantic jealousy and relationship satisfaction. *Cyberpsychology Behavioral Social Network*, 14, 631-635. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2010.0318.
- Emmers-Sommer, T. M. (2004). The effects of communication quality and quantity indicators on intimacy and relationship satisfaction.

- Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24,399-411.
- Facebook (2020, April 29). *Facebook Report First Quarter 2020 Results*. Retrieved from Facebook Investor Relations: <https://investor.fb.com/investor-news/press-release-details/2020/Facebook-Reports-First-Quarter-2020-Results/default.aspx>.
- Fraley, R. C. & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General Psychology*, 4, 132–154.
- Grieve, R., Indian, M., Witteveen, K., Tolan, G. A., & Marrington, J. (2013). Face-to-face or Facebook: Can social connectedness be derived online? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 604–609. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.11.017>.
- große Deters, F., & Mehl, M. R. (2012). Does posting Facebook status updates increase or decrease loneliness? An online social networking experiment. *Social Psychology and Personality Science*, 4, 579–586. doi: 10.1177/1948550612469233.
- Hampton, K., Goulet, L. Rainie, L., & Purcell, K. (2011). *Social Networking Sites and Our Lives*. Pew Internet and American Life Project, Washington DC.
- Haugen, T., Johansen, B. T., & Ommundsen, Y. (2014). The role of gender in the relationship between physical activity, appearance evaluation, and psychological distress. *Child Adolescents Mental Health*, 19, 24-30.
- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 52:511–524.
- Hu, X., Kim, A., Siwek, N. & Wilder, D. (2017). The Facebook Paradox: Effects of Facebooking on an individual's social relationships and psychological well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(87). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00087.
- Jenkins-Guarnieri, M. A., Wright, S. L., & Hudiburgh, L. M. (2012). The relationship between attachment style, personality traits, interpersonal competency, and Facebook use. *Journal of Applied Development Psychology*, 33, 294-301. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2012.08.001>.
- Kalpidou, M., Costin, D., & Morris, J. (2011). The relationship between Facebook and the well-being of undergraduate college students. *Cyberpsychology and Behavioral Social Network*, 14, 183–189. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2010.0061.
- Krasnova, H., Wenninger, H., Widjaja, T., & Buxmann, P. (2013). Envy on Facebook: a hidden threat to users' life satisfaction? *Wirtschaftsinformatik*, 92, 1–16.
- Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyah, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, 53(9), 1017–1031. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.53.9.1017.
- Kross, E., Verduyn, P., Demiralp, E., Park, J., Lee, D. S., Lin, N., et al. (2013). Facebook use predicts declines in subjective well-being in young adults. *PLoS ONE*, 8(e69841). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0069841.
- Matud, M. P. (2004). Gender differences in stress and coping styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 1401-1415.
- Mehl, M.R., Vazire, S., Holleran, S.E., & Clark, S. (2010). Eavesdropping on happiness: Well-Being Is Related to Having Less Small Talk and More Substantive Conversations. *Psychological Science*, 29, 529-531.
- Milek, A., Butler, E. A., Tackman, A. M., Kaplan, D. M., Raison, C. L., Sbarra, D. A., Vazire, S., & Mehl, M. R. (2018). "Eavesdropping on happiness" revisited: A pooled, multisample replication of the association between life satisfaction and observed quantity and quality. *Psychological Science*, 29(9), 1451-1462.
- Murthy, D. (2012). Towards a Sociological Understanding of Social Media: Theorizing Twitter. *Sociology*, 46(6), 1059-1073. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038511422553>.
- Nabi, R. L., Prestin, A., & So, J. (2013). Facebook friends with (health) benefits? Exploring social

- network site use and perceptions of social support, stress, and well-being. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 16 (10) doi: 10.1089/cyber.2012.0521.
- Nadkarni, A., & Hofmann, S. G. (2012). Why do people use Facebook? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 243–249. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.007.
- Oldmeadow, J. A., Quinn, S., & Kowert, R. (2013). Attachment style, social skills, and Facebook use amongst adults. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, 1142–1149. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.1006>.
- Rosenfield, S. & Mouzon, D. (2013). Gender and mental health. In C. S. Aneshensel, J. C. Phelan, and A. Bierman (Eds.). *Handbook of the Sociology of Mental Health*. Springer, pp. 277–296. Springer: Netherlands.
- Shakya, H. B. & Christakis, N. A. (2017). Association of Facebook uses with compromised well-being: A longitudinal study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 185(3), 203–211. doi: 10.1093/aje/kww189.
- Sheldon, P. (2008). Student favorite: Facebook and motives for its use. *Southwestern Mass Communication Journal*, 23(2), 39–53.
- Sheldon, K. M., Abad, N., & Hinsch, C. (2011). A two-process view of Facebook use and relatedness need-satisfaction: disconnection drives use, and connection rewards it. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 766–775. doi: 10.1037/a0022407.
- Tandoc, E. C., Ferrucci, P., & Duffy, M. (2015). Facebook use, envy, and depression among college students: Is Facebooking depressing? *Computers and Human Behavior*, 43, 139–146. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2014.10.053.
- Yaakobi, E. & Goldenberg, J. (2014). Social relationships and information dissemination in virtual social network systems: an attachment theory perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 38, 127–135.
- Ye, J. (2007). Attachment style differences in online relationship involvement: An examination of interaction characteristics and relationship satisfaction. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 10(4), 605–607. doi:10.1089/cpb.2007.9982.
- Zephora Digital Marketing. (2018, July 9). *The Top 20 Valuable Facebook Statistics – Updated July 2018*. Retrieved from Zephora Digital Marketing: <https://zephoria.com/top-15-valuable-facebook-statistics/>.
- Zephora Digital Marketing (2020, April 29). *The Top 20 Valuable Facebook Statistics – Updated May 2020*. Retrieved from Zephora Digital Marketing: <https://zephoria.com/top-15-valuable-facebook-statistics/>.