

Uncovering the Facebook Experience: Insights into Users' Behavior and Motivations.

Darban Karim¹, Smail Kabbaj¹

*National School of Commerce and Management – Casablanca
Hassan II University of Casablanca*

Dr.karim.darban@gmail.com ; S.kabbaj@encgcasa.ma

Abstract

Academic literature on Facebook in the fields of management, economics and psychology is reviewed in this article, where we focus on users of this social network to understand why they signed up, how they form networks and how they engage, and how companies can exploit and benefit from Facebook. Although many interesting topics have been covered, the study clearly reveals that much of the work done so far has been limited to certain situations, it analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of the studies, and suggests avenues of research for the future.

Keywords: Social-Networks, Social-Media, Internet, Digital-Marketing.

Introduction

One of the most important social trends of the past decade has been the launch and rise of the social network (SR) Facebook. Facebook reports serving over 2.9 billion monthly active members as of January 2022 (Statista 2022). Additionally, Facebook services are available in 70 languages, making it a global platform. Although the accuracy and reliability of these figures are subject to criticism (the number of frequently used accounts may differ from the actual number of people using the platform) and no neutral information is available, it must be agreed that the size of this RS is significant, and its growth rate over the past few years is impressive, thereby attracting the interest of researchers from a wide range of disciplines.

For the purposes of this research, we have identified articles by searching for the term "Facebook" and other keywords such as "marketing", "recruitment", "behavior", "engagement", etc. A set of articles were collected, read and categorized. Articles in this review have either been published in peer-reviewed scientific journals or have been published in peer-reviewed conference proceedings. Facebook research and data are used as suggestions for further study or to offer

data on the number of users. In addition to the key articles by Aimeur et al. (2010), Cross and Parker (2008) and Ernst (2010) on this subject 114 scientific articles were deemed useful for this literature review.

Individuals can create a Facebook account at facebook.com. The new user selects a password and gains access to the account after providing certain personal information (name, date of birth, gender and email address). Facebook uses a fairly consistent user account layout, many features stay in the same area on the screen regardless of which account it is, making it easy to recognize and access needed information. This account has two main pages: home and profile. Users introduce themselves to the profile page, commonly referred to as "the wall". A small profile picture sits next to a large cover photo at the top of the page, below which is the user's name, some basic information, and a few buttons for friends, photos, and "j likes" are displayed. The section below where "status updates" occur. Friends can respond to this note by typing comments or liking it, and users can post whatever they want in their status (shown directly below the status). Users are alerted to status changes and other activities (joining groups or becoming a fan of something they enjoy) of their friends on the homepage, often referred to as a "news feed". As a result, it automatically and chronologically displays highlights of what buddies have been up to in the past few hours.

After creating a profile, the new user can start searching for friends and sending friend invites. When the two people accept the invitation, Facebook connects them by giving them access to each other's profile pages and adds their actions to each other's News Feeds. As a result, Facebook serves as an online application for seeing and being seen (Stroud, 2008) or for "prosuming": simultaneously producing and consuming (Le and Tarafdar, 2009; Ritter and Jurgenson, 2010).

1. Use of Facebook by individuals

Although it is essential to analyze the basic functions of Facebook, it is much more important to consider how and by whom the network is actually used. We explain and discuss why people want (have) to join Facebook, what personality users have, how they develop a network of friends, how and why they reveal personal information and how they interact, in this part which focuses on the psychological literature on Facebook.

1.1 Characteristics of Facebook users

Gender, personality, socio-economic class, age and race have all been linked to variations in Facebook usage in the past.

In terms of gender, Hargittai (2007) found that men were no more likely than women to use Facebook in a large study of 1,060 college freshmen in the United States. Raacke and Bonds-Raacke validated this finding in a small survey of 116 American college students (2008). Lewis et al. (2008) found that women were more likely than men to maintain and maintain a facebook profile, based on a sample of 1,710 US undergraduate students. In conclusion, these studies show that gender differences in Facebook behavior should be a focus of future research. But, so far, this is only a guess, since these studies are all student-centered and conducted in the United States and we did not find any studies conducted on verified samples. Before applying any of these research findings to other countries or demographic groups, we must proceed with caution.

Some studies on Facebook are directly related to personality. For example, Ross et al. (2009) found that extraversion was positively related to Facebook use in a short study of 97 US undergraduate students, which is consistent with more general studies on the topic by Correa et al. (2010) and Wilson et al. (2010). Openness to new experiences has also been linked to the use of SRs, particularly among older people (Correa et al., 2010). However, the use of SRs was inversely related to conscientiousness (Wilson et al., 2010) and emotional stability (Correa et al., 2010). In summary, our understanding of the personality of Facebook users is still limited. Since SRs differ in terms of content, target audiences, and usage, general research on other SRs is unlikely to be easily applied to Facebook. A more detailed investigation of the personality characteristics of Facebook users and non-users can thus facilitate our understanding. Future research should examine other demographic differences between users and nonusers, in addition to gender and personality.

Regardless of the articles cited above, it is clear that more research on the relationship between personal qualities and Facebook usage is needed. Many studies are currently based on a wider range of SRs, limited homogeneous sample numbers, or are only conducted in the United States. This requires caution when extrapolating research results. We must also take into account the year of publication of the articles.

This is a remark that appears in several other sections of this assessment. However, our aim is not to pretend that the conclusions reached in these articles are by definition old and should be ignored. Any remarks on the year of publication should be taken as an invitation to revisit these studies and see if any changes have occurred due to the rapid growth in Facebook subscriber numbers in recent years, frequent changes in features and platform settings, or experiences with the platform. This is especially true when considering personal traits, as early adopters may differ from the early or late majority.

1.2 Motivations of Facebook users

Sledgianowski and Kulviwat (2009) was one of the first researchers to examine why people wanted to join Facebook. Normative pressure, trust, usefulness and ease of use, perceived enjoyment and critical mass of the site were the main drivers of intentions to join, according to their convenience sample of 289 students from an American university. . The importance of the pressure will later be confirmed by the study. For example, Cheung and Lee (2010) examined a convenience sample of 389 college students and found that social identity (being aware of group membership and attaching emotional significance to it) and subjective norms were both important. Kwon and Wen's (2010) study of 229 Korean participants showed a significant correlation between perceived usefulness and social identity, linking the two studies together. The pressure seems to persist even when users join the RS, as analysis by Skageby (2009) found that users are uncomfortable with pressure from colleagues and employers to accept friend requests.

According to current research, Facebook has been right to focus on making it easier for new users to create friends (achieving critical mass), for example by providing the friend finder functionality, allowing newcomers to browse the list of friends from their phone book, and allowing users to suggest friends to the newcomer.

It is not possible to examine changes in motivation to join due to the short period over which previous research was conducted. Since it is nearly impossible to assess experienced users' initial motivations for joining, future research should focus on current motivations for joining (preferably across multiple countries) and compare them to current research. Since the motivations of early adopters may differ from those of the majority, this could be an important contribution to our understanding. Also, as more and more people use social media, the pressure to respond to co-worker friend requests can be much greater today than it was a decade ago. It might also be important to examine the existing motivations of users to join across countries and demographic groups; European users may sign up for different reasons than African users, for example, and the urge to sign up may be stronger for children than for adults. This is particularly intriguing in light of the results of a large-scale study by Facebook (2012a) of 721

million Facebook users, which found that users' friends were most likely the same age and lived in the same household. country. This implies that heterogeneous groupings can occur. Finally, given the current level of RS brand awareness, a study focusing on why people don't join Facebook will benefit our knowledge.

1.3 Behavior of Facebook users

A. Creation of the “friends” network on Facebook.

There is already a substantial body of research on how Facebook users get to know each other and interact with their friends. As a result, several research results have already been shared. However, we can still see areas where we can improve and expand our understanding.

Facebook indicates that individuals have between one and more than a thousand friends. According to Facebook, the average number of friends is 130. (Facebook, 2012b). Accordingly, it has been argued that online Facebook friends are not necessarily offline Facebook friends and that Facebook's use of the term “friend” has broadened the definition of the term (Wang and Wellman, 2010). However, we only have a rudimentary understanding of the situation.

Lewis and West (2009) found that people with a large number of Facebook friends do not necessarily have the same number of close friends in real life, which supports the hypothesis formulated above. It should be noted that this conclusion is based on 16 interviews with students from a single UK university. Wang and Wellman's (2010) survey of 677 US households, which found both close and (more) distant friends to be online friends, lends credence to this claim. The downside of the study is that it doesn't focus exclusively on Facebook, but rather on having friends online in general.

In addition to this research, Ellison et al. (2007) found that many users add old college or high school buddies with whom they no longer have contact. Users are willing to accept friend requests from people of the opposite sex they don't know, if they meet pre-established social criteria according to Wang et al. (2010), but interact more with friends with whom they have established a relationship offline, according to Pempek et al. (2009) and Subrahmanyam et al. (2008). However, the four previous studies all used small samples of students from a single US university. Reich et al. (2012) used a sample of 126 American high school students to show that people primarily use social networking sites to communicate offline with people they know. It is difficult to extrapolate the results to other contexts because of this. Future research should expand on these findings by including demographic data about the consumers under study. Indeed, research on e-professionalism reveals that American psychologists, for example, are reluctant to add students or patients to their list of friends (Taylor et al., 2010), and may therefore behave differently when adding other users.

In a small sample of 103 students, Orr et al. (2010) found that shy people had fewer Facebook friends, and Buffardi and Campbell's (2009) research of 156 US student profiles indicated that narcissists tended to maximize their number of Facebook friends. Future research should examine the validity of these findings in larger samples from more diverse and global populations. Although many studies in this area are relatively new, so the issue of timing is less of a concern, it would be interesting to compare the new research on friendship behavior to previous articles. Friendship behavior may have evolved due to the opportunity to experience the advantages and disadvantages of sharing information.

Besides the reasons for (not) adding people to his network, it is also not clear what impression a user gives with a large number of Facebook friends. According to Tong et al. (2008) of 153 American college students, there is an inverted U-shaped curvilinear relationship between a user's number of Facebook friends and others' opinions of that person's social attractiveness. Users with around 300 friends had the highest social attractiveness, while those with few or many Facebook friends had the lowest. However, a Dutch study of 124 Hyves users by Utz (2010), which found that having a large number of friends (and extroverts) makes a user more popular, suggests that further research is needed. Manago et al. (2012) reported that having a large number of Facebook friends was favorably related to life satisfaction and perceived social support in a sample of 88 American undergraduate students, Chou and Edge (2012) appear to offer a shade. They found that college students with more Facebook friends they didn't know offline were more likely to agree that others had better lives, based on their study of 425 US undergraduates. These results should be developed in future research.

Whether Facebook is used as a supplement or replacement for face-to-face interaction is also controversial. Kujath's (2011) research on 183 American college students suggests that it could be a complement to some and a replacement for others, but further research (eg, integration of personality factors) is still needed.

B. Sharing personal information on Facebook

Facebook is often characterized as a platform for seeing and being seen (Pempek et al., 2009), expressing one's identity (Lee, 2012) and highlighting the details of one's life (Yau and Schneider, 2009). According to two studies, at least some personal marketing seems to be involved. For starters, according to Zywicki and Danowski's (2008) study of 614 American undergraduate students, introverts who “are not popular in real life” and have “low self-esteem” strive to appear popular. on Facebook to compensate. Second, the previously cited research by Buffardi and Campbell (2008) reveals that self-marketing is sometimes involved, as “narcissists” have been observed to more frequently post photographs of themselves in different places or events as their profile picture. . Carpenter (2012) conducted a study on

a convenience sample of 292 American Facebook users (74% of whom were students) and found empirical support for the link between narcissism and self-promotional activities on Facebook.

In contrast, a study by Back et al. (2010) on 236 American and German participants of Facebook suggests that the information shared by users is true and represents the true personality of its latter (not an idealization of self). The study found that strangers viewing the subject's Facebook page rated the user's attributes the same way the user rated themselves and their friends. This is supported by findings from Walther et al's (2009) study of 115 US undergraduate students, which found that users trust comments made by friends more than statements made by users. Users who attempt to portray themselves in too favorable a light will be thwarted by their friends, resulting in realistic Facebook accounts. The finding by Weisbuch et al. (2009) that users who share a lot of personal information on Facebook also do so in face-to-face interviews tends to support the second hypothesis, but the study was limited to 37 US undergraduate students.

Alter and Oppenheimer (2009) found that an RS's font height and spacing were related to the level of information sharing, in a small-scale research of 67 US Facebook members. This font has the ability to increase or decrease sharing, but it is unclear if this translates to more or less accurate information posted on the Facebook page. Other studies on the level of sharing, such as Karl et al's (2010) survey of RS communication among 346 American students and 290 German students, show the same trend. Nosko et al. (2010) examined 400 publicly accessible US Facebook pages and found that although information sharing was negatively related to age, the nature of information sharing was not sufficiently considered. Christofide et al. (2009) found that those who needed popularity shared more, and Moreno et al. (2011) found that users who referenced their mental states and received positive responses from their friends about it were more likely to re-share their situation and progress.

Research by Grasmuck et al. (2009) on 83 Facebook profiles suggest that African-American, Latino, and Indian-descent students more frequently and intensely post cultural content than European-descent students, thus conveying a stronger sense of cultural group belonging. Future research may be able to refine the results taking into account the critique of Ross et al (2009) when looking at the level and content of information sharing, it is also good practice to look at demographic groups additional beyond just university students. Age and gender differences should also be considered.

However, this analysis points to two other avenues for prospective research. For starters, it's worth noting the scant attention paid to user demographics and suggestions for who should or shouldn't be added as a friend. This can, however, be critical when trying to properly explain the information-sharing behavior of Facebook users.

Peluchette and Karl (2010) found that users actively consider the image they present of themselves on Facebook, and that those who think they present a professional image are less likely to post inappropriate information than those who think an attractive image. Mattingly et al. (2010) provide further evidence of the connection between friends and information sharing, demonstrating that physicians and pharmacists face heightened expectations to act professionally, soon after graduation, which necessitates e- professionalism and can influence their behavior on SRs. However, new US pharmacy students still need training in e-professionalism, according to Cain et al. (2009). Taylor et al. (2010) found that 695 American psychology students and psychologists generally agree on the need to deny student and patient friend requests to avoid information sharing. Ferdig et al. (2008), Guseh et al. (2009) and Hawn (2009) provide guidelines for clinicians, while Foulger et al. (2009) provide guidelines for educators. According to a study by West et al. (2009), what is private and what is public on Facebook is perceived as somewhat unclear and non-dichotomous by survey respondents, but only 16 US college students participated in the study. Future research should focus on expanding this line of inquiry to include other users from various professions and regions.

Second, differences in attitudes towards privacy can influence the content and level of information sharing. So far, we have focused on voluntary information sharing of personal information on Facebook. However, the information may be shared with third parties without the user's consent.

From the mid-2000s, privacy issues on social networking sites became a major research topic (Boyd and Ellison, 2007). Hunter (2008), then Mansfield-Devine (2008) and Aimeur et al. (2010), listed all of Facebook's potential privacy issues and stated that users were at risk of being monitored (Ybarra and Mitchell, 2008), hacked (Greiner, 2009), and victims of online identity theft (Lauren, 2009). Surendra and Peace (2009) stated that broadcast information about a group a user has joined can infringe the user's privacy, and Zorkadis and Karras (2009) identified the mobile transfer of personal information to Facebook as a security issue.

The research on how users react to this has the same flaws as the previous research. Fogel and Nehmad (2009) found that women use privacy controls and restrict personal information more often than men in a small sample of 205 US college students. Note that the information was collected in May 2007 and Facebook's usual privacy settings have been changed several times since then. Hoy and Milne (2011) found that while both men and women are concerned about third parties' use of personal information, women are significantly more concerned. There is also evidence that women are more proactive in terms of privacy protection than they were ten years ago. It should be noted, however, that this study used a snowball technique, with American college students asking their Facebook friends to participate. There is still a need for more investigation in various circumstances.

It is unclear to what extent users are aware of and deal with these security risks. Fuchs' (2010) study of 674 Austrian students found that public information and public debate could affect users' critical information behavior, but the study was not limited to Facebook. Debatin et al.'s (2009) study of 119 US college students focused on Facebook and found that following privacy breaches, Facebook users adjusted their privacy settings, but not after heard of invasions of the privacy of others. Finally, when privacy settings appear to be changed, Hoadley et al. (2010) emphasize public outcry, citing perceived loss of control as the main reason.

But, in addition to the impact of previous privacy breaches on information-sharing intentions, it's also important to consider their level of understanding of their own privacy settings. Again, the literature is unclear on the extent of this awareness. On the one hand, recent research of 102 UK students by Butler et al. (2011) found that given Facebook's ongoing changes to its privacy regulations, people who did not inquire about these changes were more likely to have different privacy policies than they did. imagined having. On the other hand, a somewhat older study by Boyd and Hargittai (2010) of 1115 US college students found that only 10% of users inquired about their privacy settings in 2009. Unfortunately, the authors did not match reported privacy settings with actual privacy settings, and the study only involved a group of US college students.

In conclusion, research on information sharing seems very scattered. Research combining the level of information sharing with the content of messages, as well as taking into account users' perceptions of friendship activities and their attitudes towards privacy violations, could greatly improve our understanding. Due to regular changes to Facebook's privacy settings, it's also worth reviewing past studies of privacy issues to ensure they're up-to-date. The essay by Stutzman et al. (2012) could be an excellent starting point. The article presents a basic model that suggests a link between privacy behavior (having a public profile, friends-only privacy settings, or privacy settings) and information sharing, as well as a link between privacy beliefs (risks such as cyberbullying and hacking and concerns about sharing private information publicly) and information sharing. Despite this paper addressing the concerns raised above, it is evident that causality cannot be determined because the model merely assesses baseline linkage and has not been rigorously controlled, and the model has low power. explanatory. Additionally, information sharing is only measured using a four-item scale, stated privacy settings have not been mapped to actual settings, and the ratio of true friends and total number of friends, although calculated and used for various purposes, is not sufficiently used to explain information sharing intentions and actions.

C. Implications of sharing personal information on Facebook

What people post on their Facebook accounts seems to matter in many ways. Musee et al. (2009) found that behavior on Facebook can trigger jealousy and create feelings of lack or recognition of needs from exposure to ostentatious content in a sample of 308 American and German college students. It was also found that this type of information encourages people to use Facebook more, creating a Facebook-related activity loop (Muisse et al., 2009). This effect may be particularly noticeable in "extroverted" users (Wilson et al., 2010). Additionally, simply reading friends' status updates was found to help users with lower social communication skills while having no effect on users with above average social communication skills. (Burke et al., 2011). Burke et al. (2010) found that seeing individuals interacting was associated with feelings of loneliness. Both results underline the importance of distinguishing uses and users in Facebook studies, in addition to taking into account the heterogeneity of Facebook users (age, geography, number of friends, etc.). Joinson's (2008) early study, which used exploratory factor analysis to provide insight into the uses and gratifications of Facebook, as well as the more recent study by Stutzman et al., may serve as an appropriate starting point (2012). The latter is intriguing because it shows that individuals with a Facebook profile that is only visible to friends and a high ratio of actual Facebook friends to total Facebook friends have higher levels of perceived social capital. .

However, research on the effects of Facebook use has not been limited to social capital. According to Zhang et al. (2010), the use of RS and interpersonal communication have a favorable impact on civic participation. Valenzuela et al. (2009) found that the use of Facebook groups can predict political activity in a study of 2603 American college students, Park et al. (2009) found similar results.

1. Using Facebook in Organizations

Although Facebook started out as a social networking site for individuals, businesses now have the ability to create fan pages for themselves or their products. Therefore, the RS could become an additional tool for communicating with stakeholders.

2.1 Using Facebook to Recruit Customers

A growing number of businesses believe that having their brand or business on Facebook could help them increase or maintain sales. Through the Facebook News Feed, individuals submitting company information in their status updates can allow the brand to be seen by thousands of potential buyers. Widgets (buttons allowing users to share items discovered on the Internet on their Facebook profile page by clicking on them) also seem to have a significant impact on this question. Funny videos, product references, and other content can simply be shared on someone's Facebook profile page. When

it comes to products, RSs are used to quickly disseminate information. An obvious downside is that it can also work negatively. Although there is no official research by Facebook, Jansen et al. (2009) discovered this type of electronic word of mouth (eWOM) on Twitter. Editors reviewed 150,000 tweets and found that 20% were about a company or brand. Almost half of these tweets made a positive comment, while the other half made negative statements. This does not mean, however, that consumers always trust the opinions of others on social media sites. They may nevertheless be critical, wondering if a company is trying to persuade them to buy its product. Still, it would be interesting to see how Facebook groups like “I bet I can find 1,000,000 people who despise Heineken” have an impact (Casteleyn et al., 2009). More empirical studies on the effectiveness of eWOM, especially on Facebook, are therefore needed (Trusov et al., 2009). Fan et al. (2009) found that service quality variables have a varied effect on Korean and American online consumers accessing SRs in a cross-cultural study comparing Korean and American online consumers accessing SRs. Therefore, cultural influences must be taken into account.

Users can also use Facebook to search for businesses, products, and services. Therefore, a Facebook profile can be useful for businesses. In this regard, Casteleyn et al. (2009) provide a framework for analyzing the nature and marketing opportunities of Facebook Groups, and Agnew and Sindhav (2009) examine Facebook's marketing opportunities from a business model perspective. Vorvoreanu (2009) used focus groups to study perceptions of businesses on Facebook among 35 American college students. Although the study's sample size was limited and only American college students participated, the results imply that if users want to become Facebook fans of businesses and articles to express their identity, they are less interested in the organizations behind them, engaging with them alone a lot on Facebook. These ideas should be tested in larger and more diverse groups in future studies.

Future research should focus on how users interpret organization marketing on Facebook, how their attention is captured and retained, and why users want to join groups or become fans of products and organizations, in addition to 'eWOM. Despite their obvious importance, studies on this topic have so far been limited.

2.2 Using Facebook to Recruit Employees

The rise of millions of people posting personal information online in a standardized style has understandably sparked interest from the company to see if social media sites can help or even improve the recruitment and selection of candidates (Roberts and Roach, 2009).

It's surprising how few posts have addressed Facebook's involvement in the recruitment and selection process. All fans of the organization can be instantly notified of job

opportunities by simply creating an organization-specific fan page and posting the openings on the profile. However, to our knowledge, there is little academic research on how organizations should seek to achieve critical mass, or what impressions these Facebook pages can give candidates. We are also left with theories about how users would behave if their employers asked them to post job vacancies on their profiles, as Deloitte did in a test case in Australia (Ernst, 2010). Calvó-Armengol and Jackson (2004) found that US employees were beginning to use RS to convey information about job openings they were not interested in, but the specific use of Facebook has yet to be studied. It's also unclear how often Facebook is used by companies to aggressively recruit new employees. For now, rely on Cross and Parker's (2008) assertion that e-recruitment via social media sites has become popular with both job seekers and employers in the United States. Further investigation is required.

Research on personnel selection is also scarce. Brown and Vaughn (2011) and Caers and Castelyns (2011) are two notable outliers (2011). From a theoretical point of view, Brown and Vaughn (2011) describe the use of RS to filter applications. They say incorporating information from social media sites could lead to an imbalance in the amount of information accessible about each candidate, putting interviewers in a position where they are already making preference decisions early in the recruitment process. . They also advise that an interviewer's selection decision can be influenced by a candidate's profile picture or photos of their friends. Caers and Castelyns (2011) conduct empirical research on this topic using Facebook as a case study. In a survey of 398 Belgian employees in charge of recruitment and personnel selection, 44% of decision-makers said they consult the Facebook profiles of candidates and believe that profile pictures provide reliable signals about their level of extroversion and maturity (Caers and Castelyns, 2011) . Future research should determine whether these associations exist and extend the findings to other countries, keeping in mind the previous point about whether or not Facebook profiles contain personal marketing goals. Kluemper and Rosen (2009) found that 63 raters were able to distinguish high performers from low performers after witnessing their SR and were consistent in their rates, indicating that reliable assessments may be possible.

Conclusion and Avenues of Research

This research work reveals that previous research on Facebook has covered a wide range of intriguing questions and that our understanding is growing rapidly. The review also demonstrates that our knowledge is still fragmented, with nuances that distinguish different situations, nations and missing demographic characteristics. Now is the time to take scientific research on Facebook to the next level by incorporating elements and control factors from previous studies into new, even better study designs, as well as expanding those designs to include new other nations and

demographic groups. This review has highlighted these differences and provided recommendations for future studies, both in terms of scope and research topics.

The amount of articles based on American student samples, often with small numbers of respondents, is remarkable. With millions of users worldwide, Facebook search should be expanded to include many countries and settings, as well as the integration of study results. It is also clear how many convenience samples were used, typically of students in the same year at the same university, and how using random sampling designs to obtain respondents could improve the universality of the results of this study. the research. Apart from this, there are seven critical directions for further research. To begin with, it is essential to understand why non-users continue to refuse to create accounts and why previous users have chosen to terminate their accounts. This could reveal some perspective on Facebook's (perceived) shortcomings, its image, and how SRs may evolve. Second, it is important to study how behavior on Facebook relates to personality, as well as how this complements offline communication between users and between users and non-users. Third, surveys of how users deal with privacy on the network in its current form, how privacy concerns differ across demographics and nationalities, and the correlation between reported privacy settings and the actual parameters can help the literature.

It is also important to examine how the use of Facebook for recruiting affects candidates' perception of the company in terms of employer branding, as well as how organizations can successfully recruit and engage with employees. short-term and long-term candidates. Research on employer branding and psychological contracts should be linked to this. Finally, future research should examine how customers interpret user- and organization-focused communication on institutional Facebook pages as unbiased data, how ads on SR can capture and maintain consumer attention, what impact Facebook pages containing negative remarks about an organization's products have on its sales, the effectiveness of eWOM, and how and to what extent users prefer to interact with organizations through Facebook. These findings could provide businesses with useful insights while protecting Facebook users from unwanted or poor business interactions.

Bibliography

Agnew J and Sindhav B (2009) An e-commerce business model of peer-to-peer interactions among consumers. *Journal of Cases on Information Technology* 11(2):12–21.

Aimeur E, Gambs S and Ho A (2010) Towards a privacy-enhanced social networking site. In: Conference paper, 5th international conference on availability, reliability and security, 15–18 February 2010, Cracow, Poland.

Alter A and Oppenheimer D (2009) Suppressing secrecy through metacognitive ease: cognitive fluency encourages

self-disclosure. *Psychological Science* 20(11): 1414–1420.

Back M, Stopfer J, Vazire S, et al. (2010) Facebook profiles reflect actual personality, not self-idealization. *Psychological Science* 21(3): 372–374.

Bortree D and Seltzer T (2009) Dialogic strategies and outcomes: an analysis of environmental advocacy groups' Facebook profiles. *Public Relations Review* 35(3): 317–319.

Boyd D and Ellison N (2007) Social network sites: definition, history and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13(1): 210–230.

boyd d and Hargittai N (2010) Facebook privacy settings: who cares? *First Monday* 15(8): 22 pp.

Branch J (2009) Practicing what we preach: information literacy for teacher-librarians in the 21st century. *Congratulate* 55(3): 98–100.

Brown V and Vaughn D (2011) The writing on the (Facebook) wall: the use of social networking sites in hiring decisions. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 26: 219–225.

Bryson A, Gomez R and Willman P (2010) Online social networking and trade union membership: what the Facebook phenomenon truly means for labor organizers. *Labor History* 51(1): 41–53.

Buffardi L and Campbell W (2008) Narcissism and social networking websites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 34(10): 1303–1314.

Burke M, Kraut R and Marlow C (2011) Social capital on Facebook: differentiating uses and users. In: ACM CHI conference on human factors in computing systems. 7–12 May 2011, Vancouver. Burke M, Marlow C and Lento T (2010) Social network activity and social well-being. In: ACM

CHI conference on human factors in computing systems. April 10–15, 2010, Atlanta.

Butler E, McCann E and Thomas J (2011) Privacy setting awareness on Facebook and its effect on user-posted content. *Human Communication* 14(1): 39–55.

Caers R and Castelyns V (2011) LinkedIn and Facebook in Belgium: the influences and biases of social network sites in recruitment and selection procedures. *Social Science Computer Review* 29(4): 437–448.

Cain J, Scott D and Akers P (2009) Pharmacy students' Facebook activity and opinions regarding accountability and e-professionalism. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 73(6):1–6

Calvó-Armengol A and Jackson MO (2004) The effects of social networks on employment and inequality. *American Economic Review* 94(3): 426–454.

- Carey S (2009) Museums and social media. *Documentation and Libraries* 55(4): 117–187.
- Carpenter C (2012) Narcissism on Facebook: self-promotion and anti-social behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences* 52(4): 482–486.
- Casteleyn J, Mottart A and Rutten K (2009) How to use Facebook in your market research. *International Journal of Market Research* 51(4): 439–447.
- Cheung CMK and Lee MKO (2010) A theoretical model of intentional social action in online social networks. *Decision Support Systems* 49(1): 24–30.
- Chou H and Edge N (2012) “They are happier and having better lives than I am”: the impact of using Facebook on perceptions of others' lives. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 15(2): 117–121.
- Christofides E, Muise A and Desmarais S (2009) Information disclosure and control on Facebook: are they two sides of the same coin or two different processes? *Cyberpsychology & Behavior* 12(3): 341–345.
- Connell R (2009) Academic libraries, Facebook and MySpace, and student outreach: a survey of student opinion. *Portal-Libraries and the Academy* 9(1): 25–36.
- Correa T, Hinsley A and de Zuniga H (2010) Who interacts on the web? The intersection of users' personality and social media use. *Computers in Human Behavior* 26(2): 247–253.
- Cross R and Parker A (2008) *The Hidden Power of Social Networks*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Curtis L, Edwards C, Fraser K, et al. (2010) Adoption of social media for public relations by non-profit organizations. *Public Relations Review* 36(1): 90–92.
- Debatin B, Lovejoy J, Horn A, et al. (2009) Facebook and online privacy: attitudes, behaviors, and unintended consequences. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 15(1): 83–108.
- Derven M (2009) Social networking: a force for development? *T+D* 63(7): 58–63.
- Donath J (2007) Signals in social supernets. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13(1): 231–251.
- Ellison N, Steinfield C and Lampe C (2007) The benefits of Facebook “Friends”: exploring the relationship between college students' use of online social networks and social capital. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12(3): 1143–1168.
- Epperson A and Leffler J (2009) Social software programs: student preferences of librarian use. *New Library World* 110(7/8): 366–372.
- Fan Q, Lee J and Park Y (2009) Do online social networks in international regions function the same or differently? Based on Korean and US social network customers. *Journal of Korea Trade* 13(4): 89–110.
- Ferdig R, Dawson K, Black E, et al. (2008) Medical students' and residents' use of online social networking tools: implications for teaching professionalism in medical education. *First Monday* 13(9): <http://www.uic.edu/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/2161/2026>.
- Fernandez P (2009) Balancing outreach and privacy in Facebook: five guiding decision points. *Library Hi Tech News* 26(3/4): 10–12.
- Fogel J and Nehmad E (2009) Internet social network communities: risk taking, trust, and privacy concerns. *Computers in Human Behavior* 25(1): 153–160.
- Foulger T, Ewbank A, Kay A, et al. (2009) Moral spaces in Myspace: preservice teachers' perspectives about ethical issues in social networking. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education* 42(1): 1–28.
- Fuchs C (2010) Social networking in the surveillance society. *Ethics and Information Technology* 12(2): 171–185.
- Gonzales A and Hancock J (2011) Mirror, mirror on my Facebook wall: effects of exposure to Facebook on self-esteem. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 14(1–2): 79–83.
- Graham J, Faix A and Hartman L (2009) Crashing the Facebook party: one library's experiences in the students Psila domain. *Library Review* 58(3): 228–236.
- Grasmuck S, Martin J and Zhao S (2009) Ethno-racial displays on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 15(1): 158–188.
- Greiner L (2009) Hacking social networks. *Networker* 13(1): 9–11.
- Guseh J, Brendel R and Brendel D (2009) Medical professionalism in the age of online social networking. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 35(9): 584–586.
- Hargittai E (2007) Whose space? Differences among users and non-users of social networking sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13(1): 276–297.
- Hawn C (2009) Take two aspirin and tweet me in the morning: how Twitter, Facebook, and other social media are reshaping healthcare. *Health Affairs* 28(2): 361–368.
- Hoadley C, Xu H, Lee J, et al. (2010) Privacy as information

- access and illusory control: the case of the Facebook News Feed privacy outcry. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications* 9(1): 50–60.
- Hoy M and Milne G (2011) Gender differences in privacy-related measures for young adult Facebook users. *Journal of Interactive Advertising* 10(2): 28–45.
- Hunter P (2008) Social networking: the focus for new threats-and old ones. *Computer Fraud & Security* 2008(7): 17–18.
- Idris Y and Wang Q (2009) Affordances of Facebook for learning. *International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Life-Long Learning* 19(2/3): 247–255.
- Jansen B, Zhang M, Sobel K, et al. (2009) Twitter power: tweets as electronic word of mouth. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 47 60(11): 2169–2188.
- Jo S and Kim Y (2003) The effect of web characteristics on relationship building. *Journal of Public Relations Research* 15(3): 199–223.
- Joinson A (2008) 'Looking at', 'looking up' or 'keeping up with people'? Motives and uses of Facebook. In: ACM CHI conference on human factors in computing systems. 5–10 April 2008, Florence.
- Karl K, Peluchette J and Schlaegel C (2010) Who's posting Facebook faux pas? A cross-cultural examination of personality differences. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 18(2): 174–186.
- Kluemper D and Rosen P (2009) Future employment selection methods: evaluating social net-working websites. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 24(6): 567–580.
- Kujath C (2011) Facebook and MySpace: complement or substitute to face-to-face interaction? *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 14(1–2): 75–78.
- Kwon O and Wen Y (2010) An empirical study of the factors affecting social network service use. *Computers in Human Behavior* 26(2): 254–263.
- Laursen L (2009) Fake Facebook pages spin web of deceit. *Nature* 458(7242): 1089–1089.
- Le TT and Tarafdar M (2009) Business ecosystem perspective on value co-creation in the Web 2.0 era: implications for entrepreneurial opportunities. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing* 1(2): 112–130.
- Lee E (2012) Young, black, and connected: Facebook usage among African American college students. *Journal of Black Studies* 43(3): 336–354.
- Lewis J and West A (2009) 'Friending': London-based undergraduates' experience of Facebook. *New Media & Society* 11(7): 1209–1229.
- Lewis K, Kaufman J and Christakis N (2008) The taste for privacy: an analysis of college student privacy settings in an online social network. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 14(1): 79.
- McAllister S (2012) How the world's top universities provide dialogic forums for marginalized voices. *Public Relations Review* 38: 319–327.
- Manago A, Taylor T and Greenfield P (2012) Me and my 400 friends: the anatomy of college students' Facebook networks, their communication patterns, and well-being. *Developmental Psychology* 48(2): 369–380.
- Mansfield-Devine S (2008) Anti-social networking: exploiting the trusting environment of Web 2.0. *Network Security* 11:4–7.
- Mattingly T, Cain J and Fink J (2010) Pharmacists on Facebook: online social networking and the profession. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association* 50(3): 424–427.
- Moreno M, Jelenchick L, Egan K, et al. (2011) Feeling bad on Facebook: depression disclosures by college students on a social networking site. *Depression and Anxiety* 28: 447–455.
- Muise A, Christofides E and Desmarais S (2009) More information than you ever wanted: does Facebook bring out the green-eyed monster of jealousy? *Cyberpsychology & Behavior* 12(4): 441–444.
- Nosko A, Wood E and Molema S (2010) All about me: disclosure in online social networking profiles: the case of Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior* 26(3): 406–418.
- Orr E, Ross C, Simmering M, et al. (2009) The influence of shyness on the use of Facebook in an undergraduate sample. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior* 12(3): 337–340.
- Park N, Kee K and Valenzuela S (2009) Being immersed in social networking environment: Facebook groups, uses and gratifications, and social outcomes. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior* 12(6): 729–733.
- Pasek J, More E and Hargittai E (2009) Facebook and academic performance: reconciling a media sensation with data. *First Monday* 14(5). <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2498/2181>
- Peluchette J and Karl K (2010) Examining students' intended image on Facebook: "What were they thinking?" *The Journal of Education for Business* 85: 30–37.
- Pempek TA, Yermolayeva YA and Calvert SL (2009) College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 30(3): 227–238.
- Raacke J and Bonds-Raacke J (2008) Myspace and Facebook:

- applying the uses and gratifications theory to exploring friend-networking sites. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior* 11(2): 169–174.
- Reich S, Subrahmanyam K and Espinoza G (2012) Friending, IMing, and hanging out face-to-face: overlap in adolescents' online and offline social networks. *Developmental Psychology* 48(2): 356–368.
- Ritzer G and Jurgenson N (2010) Production, consumption, prosumption – the nature of capitalism in the age of the digital 'prosumer'. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 10(1): 13–36.
- Roberts SJ and Roach T (2009) Social networking web sites and human resource personnel: suggestions for job searches. *Business Communication Quarterly* 72(1): 110–114.
- Ross C, Orr E, Sisic M, et al. (2009) Personality and motivations associated with Facebook use. *Computers in Human Behavior* 25(2): 578–586.
- Schleyer T, Spallek H, Butler B, et al. (2008) Facebook for scientists: requirements and services for optimizing how scientific collaborations are established. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 10(3): e24.
- Shippert L (2009) Thinking about technology and change, or, “what do you mean it's already over?” *PNLA Quarterly* 73(2): 4–26.
- Singer P (2009) Follow us on Facebook! *Solid State Technology* 52(12): 3–3.
- Skageby J (2009) Exploring qualitative sharing practices of social metadata: expanding the attention economy. *Information Society* 25(1): 60–72.
- Sledgianowski D and Kulviwat S (2009) Using social network sites: the effects of playfulness, critical mass and trust in a hedonic context. *Journal of Computer Information Systems* 49(4): 74–83.
- Statistia 2022:
<https://www.statista.com/statistics/268136/top-15-countries-based-on-number-of-facebook-users/#:~:text=As%20of%20the%20third%20quarter,most%20popular%20social%20media%20worldwide>.
- Steiner H (2009) Reference utility of social networking sites: options and functionality. *Library Hi Tech News* 26(5–6): 4–6.
- Steinfeld C, Ellison N and Lampe C (2008) Social capital, self-esteem, and use of online social network sites: a longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 29(6): 434–445.
- Stroud D (2008) Social networking: an age neutral commodity – social networking becomes a mature web application. *Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice* 9: 278–292.
- Stutzman F, Vitak J, Ellison N, et al. (2012) Privacy in interaction: exploring disclosure and social capital in Facebook. In: *Proceedings of international conference on weblogs and social media (ICWSM '12)*, 4–7 June 2008, Dublin, Ireland. Subrahmanyam K, Reich SM, Waechter N, et al. (2008) Online and offline social networks: use of social networking sites by emerging adults. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 29(6): 420–433.
- Surendra N and Peace A (2009) A conceptual analysis of group privacy in the virtual environment. *International Journal of Networking and Virtual Organizations* 6(6): 543–557.
- Taylor L, McMinn M, Bufford R, et al. (2010) Psychologists' attitudes and ethical concerns regarding the use of social networking websites. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 41(2): 153–159.
- Tong S, Van Der Heide B, Langwell L, et al. (2008) Too much of a good thing? The relationship between number of friends and interpersonal impressions on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13(3): 531–549.
- Torres-Salinas D and Delgado-Lopez-Cozar E (2009) Strategies to improve the dissemination of research results with the Web 2.0. *Profesional de la Informacion* 18(5): 534–539.
- Trusov M, Bucklin RE and Pauwels K (2009) Effects of word-of-mouth versus traditional marketing: findings from an internet social networking site. *Journal of Marketing* 73: 90–102.
- Utz S (2010) Show me your friends and I will tell you what type of person you are: how one's profile, number of friends, and type of friends influence impression formation on social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 15(2): 314–335.
- Valenzuela S, Park N and Kee K (2009) Is there social capital in a social network site? Facebook uses and college students' life satisfaction, trust, and participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 14(4): 875–901.
- Vorvoreanu M (2009) Perceptions of corporations on Facebook: an analysis of Facebook social norms. *Journal of New Communications Research* 4(1): 67–86.
- Walther J, Van Der Heide B, Hamel L, et al. (2009) Self-generated versus other-generated state-ments and impressions in computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research* 36(2): 229–253.
- Wang H and Wellman B (2010) Social connectivity in America: changes in adult friendship network size from 2002 to 2007. *American Behavioral Scientist* 53(8): 1148–1169.
- Wang SS, Shin-il M, Kwon KH, et al. (2010) Face off:

implications of visual cues on initiating friendship on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior* 26(2): 226–234.

Waters R, Burnett E, Lamm A, et al. (2009) Engaging stakeholders through social network- ing: how nonprofit organizations are using Facebook. *Public Relations Review* 35(2): 102–106.

Weisbuch M, Ivcevic Z and Ambady N (2009) On being liked on the web and in the “real world”: consistency in first impressions across personal webpages and spontaneous behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 45(3): 573–576.

West A, Lewis J and Currie P (2009) Students' Facebook 'friends': public and private spheres. *Journal of Youth Studies* 12(6): 615–627.

Wilson K, Fornasier S and White K (2010) Psychological predictors of young adults' use of social networking sites. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 13(2): 173–177.

Xia Z (2009) Marketing library services through Facebook groups. *Library Management* 30(6/7): 467–478.

Yau N and Schneider J (2009) Self-surveillance. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 35(5): 24–30.

Ybarra M and Mitchell K (2008) How risky are social networking sites? A comparison of places online where youth sexual solicitation and harassment occurs. *Pediatrics* 121(2): 350–357.

Zhang W, Johnson T, Seltzer T, et al. (2010) The revolution will be networked: the influence of social networking sites on political attitudes and behavior. *Social Science Computer Review* 28(1): 75–92.

Zorkadis V and Karras D (2009) On privacy-enhancing architectures for distribution of real time performance demanding mobile services. *International Journal of Electronic Security and Digital Forensics* 2(4): 377–386.

Zywica J and Danowski J (2008) The faces of Facebookers: investigating social enhance- ment and social compensation hypotheses. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 14(1): 1–34.