

FB Consumption, Number of FB Friends, and Avoidant and Anxious Attachment Styles of Young People as Predictors of FB Relationship Satisfaction

Jonathan C. de la Cerna

University of the Philippines, Cebu, The Philippines

Date Submitted: August 27, 2019

Date Revised: June 15, 2020

Originality: 98%

Plagiarism Detection: Passed

ABSTRACT

The topic of online relationship satisfaction is a new area of interest in Psychology. With limited works exploring this topic, the current study aimed to test the predictive influence of FB Use, Perceived Number of Friends, and Attachment Styles on FB relationship satisfaction. Drawing data from a local University FB study, the current research found that only accessibility to FB, avoidant, and anxious attachment styles predicted FB relationship satisfaction. However, these three predictors were weakly related to FB relationship satisfaction.

Keywords: *FB relationship satisfaction, FB consumption, number of FB friends, avoidant attachment style, anxious attachment style*

INTRODUCTION

Facebook's growth and reach have been unprecedented, such that it has now become a staple information and communication medium alongside traditional mediums. In the first quarter of 2020, Facebook had 2.6 billion monthly active users or those who have logged in to FB during the last 30 days (Facebook, 2020). As a new platform for social interaction, FB provides opportunities for social connectedness (Grieve et al., 2013). Nadkarni and Hofmann (2012) suggested that belongingness is one of the two drivers of FB use. Self-presentation is the other drive. The belongingness drive is evident in several features of the said online platform. One of these is the platform's signature feature, which is "friending" other users. "Friending" involves sending requests to other users and that once accepted, it enables people to view each other's status updates and profiles (Murthy, 2012). Friend requests can be sent to and taken by people a user knows, but there is also request-related behavior revolving around establishing connections with strangers. Additionally, men were more likely to

send friend requests, while women are more likely to receive them (Hampton et al., 2011).

The other feature of FB that supports the drive for belongingness comes in the form of "likes." Liking can signify that one took note of the item and relay to the original poster that someone paid attention to his or her post. Recently, a new wave of updates to the site included the option of specifying your response to a particular comment. By hovering on the "like" feature, you can now choose a reaction—Love, Haha, Wow, Sad, and Angry—that best suits your affective reply to specific content. Also, commenting on status updates and other types of posts is an extensive behavior practiced in FB. There are 510,000 comments posted every minute on this specific Social Networking Site. (Zephora Digital Marketing, 2018).

While FB, its features, and its underlying processes seem to promote social connectedness, there have been mixed empirical results of its impact on its users' social relationships. On the positive side, FB seems to foster social support. große Deters and Mehl (2012) suggest that FB status updates reduce loneliness through the daily increase of social connectedness. Nabi et al. (2013) also found that among 423

undergraduate students, there is a positive correlation between the number of FB friends and the perception of social support. This connection is also associated with reduced stress, which, in turn, is also associated with less illness and greater well-being. Furthermore, for those who reportedly experienced more life stressors, the number of FB friends surfaced as a strong predictor of perceived social support. This result is similar to the finding that FB social connectedness is associated with higher life satisfaction and having lesser probabilities for depression and anxiety (Grieve et al., 2013).

Moreover, Dogruer et al. (2011) also found out that users utilize FB for relationship maintenance (e.g., to come together, to re-establish connection with people they have forgotten, to get in touch with people they know). Filipino FB users also share this social relationship reason (Basilisco & Kyung Jin, 2016). However, Filipinos use FB more for seeking new friends and those they have common interests with, not necessarily for relationship maintenance. This finding suggests that Filipinos are motivated with the desire to meet and to make new friends through FB, as well as keep in touch with old friends and acquaintances. This pattern also supports their collective nature.

On the other side, some studies seem to indicate the downside of FB. For one, there is a negative link between the number of FB friends and self-esteem and poor academic adjustment among college students (Kalpidou et al., 2011). Among romantic partners, the number of FB friends is related to increased jealousy and reduced relationship satisfaction (Elphinston & Noller, 2011). Envy in FB also mediates the relationship between FB use and depression (Tandoc et al., 2005). These are on top of other negative impacts of FB use such as reduced cognitive and affective well-being (Shakya & Christakis, 2017; Kross et al., 2003), more significant stress (Chen & Lee, 2013), and the threat to life satisfaction (Krasnova et al., 2013).

Because of these conflicting results, Hu et al. (2017) coined the term "Facebook Paradox." The label initially came from Kraut and colleagues' (1998) "Internet Paradox" that suggests two conflicting realities of the Internet. As far as

social connectedness is concerned, the "Facebook Paradox" is evident in the Sheldon et al. (2011) study. There are simultaneous links between FB use, and both elatedness-need satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Moreover, Hu and colleagues have provided further evidence of the paradox. They have found that FB use has direct positive effects on users' online social relationship satisfaction and perceived social support. They also have found out that the impact of FB use on psychological well-being is mediated by online and offline social relationship satisfaction, perceived social support, and social interaction anxiety.

With the changing offline to online nature of social relationships, it becomes imperative to explore Facebook users' satisfaction with their online connections. Relationship satisfaction is the intensity of an individual's contentment and happiness with his or her relationship (Anderson & Emmer-Sommer, 2006). The authors also suggest a positive correlation between online relationship satisfaction with success and length of the relationship, as a face-to-face or online dyad. Understanding the factors that are involved in online relationship satisfaction will hopefully guide researchers, policymakers, program implementors, and the public of the recommended healthy FB consumption. Despite these potential socio-psychological benefits, there have only been few studies that directly or indirectly explored FB relationship satisfaction in a non-romantic context (e.g., Hu et al., 2017; Dunbar, 2016).

The present study tries to look at some contextual and personality factors and their links with FB relationship satisfaction. These include FB Consumption and Attachment Styles.

FB Consumption. Previous studies that have explored FB consumption has generally utilized frequency of use as its measure. These frequency measures often include the length of FB account maintenance, the daily count of log-in and social media usage, the number of updates, and the quantity of interaction with one's social media contacts (e.g., Shakya & Christakis, 2017; Burke & Kraut, 2016). Frequency is an essential variable in understanding social media use. These types of quantitative data provide a clearer picture of the behavior of FB users. Thus, they

direct more straightforward analyses of online behavior and relationship satisfaction links.

Among Filipino sample of 243 FB users, Basilisco and Kyung Jin (2016) found that the hours spent on Facebook are as follow: 30.9% spend both for 1-2 and 3-4 hours; 28.8% consume more than 5 hours, and 9.5% take less than an hour. Meanwhile, the primary motivations for FB use are seeking friends, social support, entertainment, information, and convenience. These are consistent with Sheldon's (2008) work that utilized the Uses and Gratification Theory and suggested that (1) relationship maintenance and (2) passing time motives positively predicted the number of hours of spend on Facebook. These results indicate that there is a social connection in the online platform.

Given the few works that directly looked into online social relationship satisfaction, the more recent study of Hu and colleagues (2017) has found out the direct link between the intensity of FB use and online social relationship satisfaction. The online social relationship satisfaction is also positively associated with offline relationship satisfaction. Meanwhile, a local qualitative study of dela Vega et al. (2017) has shown that adolescent heavy social media users (i.e., spending at least 3 hours daily) may use these platforms as extended communication avenues with their schoolmates and professors. The adolescent respondents also claimed that social media reinforced face-to-face interactions with their families through updates of current events and trending topics facilitating more conversation at home. The respondents also explained that the impact of social media on social relationships depends on how the heavy-user members utilize it as an escape of social connections or mere diversion of life stressors. Interestingly, there seems to be growing empirical support of FB use and online social relationship satisfaction connection.

Attachment Styles. Attachment orientations play an essential role in individuals' initiation, formation, and maintenance of social relationships with others (Ainsworth et al., 1987; Fraley, 2000). Studies have shown that individuals with secure attachments are comfortable with distance from others and are

willing to depend on others and to let others rely on them. Contrastingly, individuals with avoidant attachment styles are nervous in social interactions, especially when others are too close to them. Lastly, individuals with anxious-ambivalent attachment styles continuously worry about others leaving them and thus frequently desire more intimate relationships. These patterns also characterize offline friendships and romantic relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Fraley, 2000; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Only a few studies have expanded the Attachment Theory into the online setting (Boute et al., 2009; Jenkins-Guarnieri et al., 2012; Oldmeadow et al., 2013). These studies are consistent in suggesting that attachment style predicts online social interaction in the same way it does in an offline context.

Oldmeadow et al. (2013) argue that Facebook serves attachment functions and allows users to approach it with different attachment styles. For example, securely attached individuals are the best situated to become social hubs, exhibiting more extensive networks, and the most social ties with others (Yakoobi & Goldenberg, 2014). Comparably, individuals high in attachment anxiety have more frequent Facebook use and are always concerned about how others perceive them on Facebook. Meanwhile, high attachment avoidance is associated with less Facebook use and less interest in Facebook (Oldmeadow et al., 2013).

In the realm of online relationship satisfaction, there has not been much work done. The seminal work on this topic is Ye's (2007) study that has shown inconclusive findings on the influence of attachment styles on online relationship satisfaction.

The present study delves to understand the dynamics of online social relationship satisfaction among adolescent FB users by looking at the impacts of some predictors, namely, FB consumption, number of FB friends, and attachment styles.

Specifically, this research seeks to identify general level of FB relationship satisfaction of the respondents and their FB consumption (i.e., frequency of FB access and the number of hours of FB daily usage). The study also aims to

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/>.