IN THIS
ISSUE

Facebook:
Changing the Face of
Communication Research

Paul A. Soukup, S.J.

Santa Clara University

Table of Contents

Facebook: Changing the Face of Communication Research

Facebook:
Changing the Face of Communication Research

Paul A. Soukup, S.J.

psoukup@scu.edu

The ubiquitous social networking site, Facebook, registered over one billion active users in 2012 and continues to grow (Facebook, 2018a). Not surprisingly, communication researchers around the world noticed this phenomenal shift in communication practice, a practice aided by a combination of digital communication tools—easy to access communication networks, low cost bandwidth, smartphones, application features, and so on. These developments transformed the understanding of "social networks," turning them from face-to-face interactions among small groups into world spanning digital connections, from networks of business or professional associations supported by analogue or "old" communication practices (such as letter writing, telephone calls, or conference meetings) into always-on real-time tracking of people's activities.

This review examines 400 articles published between 2006 and 2017 in peer reviewed communication-related journals and listed in the EBSCO Communication Source database. The database returned the initial list of articles to a query using the single search term "Facebook." Subsequent analysis grouped the articles into a number of themes. As we will see, much of the published research that involves Facebook addresses not Facebook itself but Facebook as a source of material or research data on more particular communication topics. In a way, Facebook appears as another medium for communication.

After some introductory comments on the history and prior study of Facebook, this review will present the key themes that appear in the research. These include Facebook in theoretical perspectives, Facebook used in interpersonal communication, Facebook's relationship to journalism, Facebook in education, Facebook in political communication, corporate and organizational use of Facebook, legal and ethical issues arising with Facebook, and other areas of research.

1. Background: History and Prior Reviews

A. History

Historical background on Facebook appears in a number of places, from admiring biographies (McGirt, 2007) to official pages (Facebook, 2018b) to journal articles that draw on these and other materials to provide a fairly detailed history (Alves Ribeiro Correia & Rafael Moreira, 2014, 2015). Most retell the basic story of how Facebook founders Mark Zuckerberg, Dustin Moskovitz, Chris Hughes, and Eduardo Saverin launched Facebook in 2004, expanding it from a college-centric web resource at Harvard University to its public development later in the year. Zuckerberg admits that he hacked into Harvard's student resources for the initial photos and data, but soon, compelled by the university, he took down the site in the interests of student privacy (McGirt, 2007).

Facebook did not originate the concept of a social media site, with predecessors like SixDegrees, launched in 1997; LiveJournal, in 1999; and MySpace, in 2003. In addition, any number of other social networking sites emerged around the same time: IBM Buddy, Friendster, Tribe, LinkedIn, and so on (Alves Ribeiro & Rafael Moreira, 2015). Good (2013) argues for an even longer historical time line, comparing key

features of Facebook to scrapbooking, a print-era medium dating to the 19th century. She identifies two aspects of their common form: "First, a key shared feature is their containment of—and formal dependence on—diverse streams of personal content. . . . [second] both are personal media archives, or sites that house personal media assemblages within a bounded setting, with options for both private viewing and public display" (p. 559). In addition to these formal characteristics, social media network sites also share functional similarities such as documenting friendship, providing tools, and offering ways to accumulate "cultural capital through the expression of class distinctions and personal taste" (p. 561). Al-Suwaidi (2013) suggests a different historical metaphor to underlie the practices of Facebook, likening its users to a tribe, drawing on his own cultural norms in the United Arab Emirates. This understanding of social network users leads to a critical evaluation of "how social media changes marketing strategies, consumer relationships, business models, the rise of e-commerce, the impact on military affairs, legal issues pertaining to copyright violations, the effectiveness of the regulations and policies, and the potential technological developments in the future, including that of social media in shaping society" (Priya, 2014, p. 159).

Miller (2013) offers another cultural and historical look at Facebook: from the perspective of Trinidad, where he argues that the local culture adapts Facebook into existing social networks (reported by Cirucci, 2012). The challenge to the local culture arises not from the tools but from the scope of an expanding network (p. 698). While not focusing specifically on Facebook, Duff (2016) provides a wider historical context of the California Silicon Valley culture to which the Facebook founders turned to develop their ideas and company. After a detailed and helpful literature review of key writing on Silicon Valley culture, Duff presents interviews with key individuals to provide context on the three keys themes of the information revolution, the growth of information capitalism, and "the normative crisis of the information society" (p. 1605). This cultural mix has worked to reshape Facebook and the other Silicon Valley firms even as those companies have redefined "information."

A very different approach to Facebook's history focuses on the technical infrastructure that makes it possible to host over one billion users (Farahbakhsh, Cuevas, Ortiz, Han, & Crespi, 2015).

B. Past reviews

Several past reviews offer a snapshot of Facebook at particular times; these note, however, that the changing nature of Facebook as a platform and as a company makes generalization difficult. Caers, De Feyter, De Couck, Stough, Vigna, and Du Bois (2013) focus their examination on 114 peer reviewed articles that address the economic and psychological areas of Facebook use. After providing a brief history of Facebook (since its opening to the public in 2006) and the general operation of a social networking site, they examine motivations to join Facebook, which include the playfulness of the site, pressure from others as the critical mass of users increased, and the facilitation of social identity (pp. 984–985). They distinguish initial motivations to join from the motivations to stay on Facebook, which they judge understudied. The research team summarize studies of user characteristics, finding gender differences in privacy profiles but not in adoption. Not surprisingly studies conducted between 2006 and 2012 found extroversion and openness to new things positively correlated with social networking membership but conscientiousness and emotional stability negatively correlated (pp. 985–986). The research team urges caution on this since the initial studies had small, mostly convenience samples from U.S. universities. They cite other studies that examine the nature of the social networks (size of networks, similarity of online and offline friends, social attractiveness, etc.). Other psychological traits associated with Facebook users include self-disclosure and what the research team calls "me-marketing" (p. 988). The prevalence of these behaviors varies with age, with self-conscious self-presentation, and for students, with the move into professional careers. Some studies also pair the self-disclosure with privacy concerns and with other effects of Facebook use, with students in the U.S. and Germany reporting jealously and mixed experiences with social capital.

Caers and his colleagues then turn to the economic literature and report on how organizations (mostly for-profit) have begun using Facebook for marketing, branding, and reputation management. In addition, they note how scholars, libraries, and teachers have incorporated Facebook in their work. A few companies at the time of the review managed online recruiting and evaluation through Facebook. Caers and his team conclude by identifying seven areas for future research:
- why non-users avoid Facebook and former users abandon it

- how Facebook behaviors connect with various personality traits
- how online bullying is perceived by friends' networks
- how users deal with privacy concerns and policies
- how organizations use Facebook for recruitment and vetting of candidates
- how organizational image is affected by organizations' use of Facebook for recruiting
- how customers perceive Facebook information about companies as objective, advertising-driven, or branding (p. 995)

Rains and Brunner (2015) reviewed studies of Facebook (primarily, though they included other social networking sites [SNS]); the review focuses on research methods. They describe the review in this way:

The purpose of this review is two-fold. We first report the results of a content analysis examining the SNS brands studied among research published in six interdisciplinary journals. Each of the six journals publishes research about the social implications of communication and information technologies conducted by scholars working in a range of fields across the social sciences. The goal of the content analysis is to determine the degree to which SNS scholarship in these journals has been limited to the study of specific SNS brands such as Facebook. Based on the results of the content analysis, we then consider the implications of conducting research focused on a single brand for advancing scholarship on SNSs more broadly. How might the tendency to focus on a single brand impact the conclusions we can draw from this body of scholarship about the uses and effects of SNSs? Five issues are considered in this essay, including concerns with generalizability, the potential to privilege a particular group, the undue influence of corporate practices, the potential to encourage a focus on features, and the possibility that the SNS of interest may become obsolete. (p. 115)

Their content analysis identified both the most studied networks and the frequency of articles published in the journals between 2006 and 2013, finding a steady increase of articles over the years. They also identified research methods used in the studies: content analysis, ethnography, experiment, focus group, interview, multiple methods, social network analysis, and survey. Of these, the most common were multiple methods (41%) and content analysis (31%). Based on their findings, they note the risks of too strong a focus on Facebook (a lack of generalizability), the potential distraction by specific features (leading to a loss of focus on the more general communication patterns), and the potential skewing of results based on corporate policy. They also discuss the need to expand theory on the uses and effects of social networking sites.

Lincoln and Robards (2014) offer a brief review of 10 years of Facebook research in their introduction to a special issue of *New Media & Society* (volume 16, number 7). They point out:

The scholarship surrounding Facebook emerged relatively quickly, and there is now a substantial body of work on the site on a range of topics and intersections, such as youth (boyd, 2008, 2014; Livingstone, 2008; Robards, 2012), trolling (Karppi, 2013), politics (Lee, 2013), and privacy (Tufekci, 2008). Notably, boyd and Ellison (2007) set out to map a brief history of social network sites up until 2007, and succeeded in creating a point of reference that many scholars still use and critique. In their pre-Facebook history, boyd and Ellison (2007) included sites like LiveJournal, Friendster, and MySpace, but it was clear that the emergence of Facebook—especially from the late 2000s—changed the terrain of the social web dramatically. Scholars from across a range of disciplines, including communications and media studies, sociology, psychology, education, law, and beyond the social sciences were drawn to Facebook as a social phenomenon in itself, but also as a means by which the broader social world could be better understood (Miller, 2011). The treatment of Facebook as a data repository for research has also been critiqued (Zimmer, 2010), mirroring concerns in a more popular discourse around privacy, boundaries and disclosure in the age of the social web. (pp. 1047–1048)

The issue itself provides a wealth of information about research on Facebook, including the essay of Caers and his colleagues cited above.

De Omena and Martins Rosa (2015) offer a brief review of how Portuguese researchers have studied Facebook, structured around research questions that review methodologies, search terms, and user populations. Markham (2016) gives a more focused sense of how researchers can approach Facebook as he reviews three books (Dencik & Leistert, 2015; Trottier & Fuchs, 2014; Uldam & Vestergaard, 2015) dealing with social media and protests.

2. Facebook in Theoretical Perspectives

A great deal of the reported research applies commonly used communication theories or constructs to Facebook. These range from the third person effect, groups, persuasion, discourse studies, diffusion of innovation studies, social interaction, social cognitive theory, social comparison, the two-step flow of information, and various approaches to uses and gratification.

A. Diffusion of innovations

Hofstra, Corten, and van Tubergen (2016) apply diffusion theory to Facebook adoption among adolescents in The Netherlands. Not surprisingly, those with greater online access tend to be early adopters. Similarly, the number of social friends who have accounts predicts adoption, as does an outsider status (non-native teens).

B. Gender

While many studies mention gender, only a few of them focus on it. Oberst, Chamarro, and Renau (2016) begin by noting that adolescent boys and girls use Facebook differently and then ask whether that connects to how they portray themselves on their profile pages. Using the Bem Sex Role Inventory, they asked their 623 participants to rate themselves and others. They found

> that adolescents consider themselves to be less sexually differentiated than a typical adult of their own sex, both in their self-perception and their self-portrayal on Facebook. The study confirms that the psychological well-being of girls decreases considerably with age and that it is associated with a greater degree of masculinity. We conclude that adolescents produce accurate self-representations on their Facebook profiles, and both boys and girls tend to offer a less sexually differentiated self-concept and self-portrayal than that of the typical adult, with a slight preference for masculine traits; moreover, masculinity is associated with a greater degree of psychological well-being. (p. 81)

C. Groups

Despite Facebook's group feature, few have studied it, though many researchers make note of it or of people using the feature. Frisby, Kaufmann, and Beck (2016) compared Facebook, Twitter, and videoconferencing software as group tools in an academic setting, though with a small number of students (N=28). They found little difference among the three tools in terms of the student response and group characteristics. Sormanen, Lauk, and Uskali (2017) studied actual Facebook ad hoc groups in Finland, asking whether they could have an effect on civic engagement. After an initial step of categorizing groups according to their purpose (entertainment, social connection, issue discussion, etc.), they found the "the results show that ambitions and objectives of ad hoc groups differ notably according to their main mission," with marked differences between discussion groups and those seeking to influence society. The latter groups received greater media visibility, often connected to the nature of their content (p. 77).

D. Expectancy violation theory

Fife and his colleagues have suggested that the older interpersonal expectancy violation theory—originally proposed to address nonverbal communication norms—may well usefully apply to some behaviors on social media. They have tested their proposals with focus groups (Fife, Nelson, & Bayles, 2009) and with user surveys (Fife, Nelson, & Zhang, 2012). They note some moderate correlations between reduction in uncertainty and positive evaluations of expectancy violations.

E. Intercultural communication

As a global brand and network, Facebook has the potential to foster intercultural communication. Several studies compared Facebook use across cultures, usually focusing on college students. Using the social information processing theory and the theory of cultural dimensions, Barry and Bouvier (2012) describe cultural differences in Facebook use by students in the United Arab Emirates and Wales, noting variation on things as different as concepts of what Facebook is to issues of privacy. Drawing a contrast between cultural individualism and collectivism, Lin and Sackey (2015) compared U.S. college student Facebook users to Ghanian college student users, finding the Ghanian students more open to online self-disclosure and more likely to use interac-

tive features, but the American students more likely to use the like button. Hamas Elmasry, Auter, and Peuchaud (2014) also compared self-disclosure, but among students from Egypt, Qatar, and U.S., finding clear cultural predictors of level and content of self-disclosure. American students' pages focused more on social life, for example, while those of Egyptian students more on politics. Beginning with the idea of cross-cultural social capital, Jiang and de Bruijn (2014) found an positive association between Facebook use and cross-cultural social capital; follow-up interviews indicated key variables like type of Facebook interaction, the circumstances of Facebook use, and the cultural background of users each played a role.

Croucher and Rahmani (2015) examined intercultural aspects of immigrant users within the dominant group. Their six-year longitudinal study showed that Muslim immigrants to the U.S. who used Facebook for social interaction with their own group showed less motivation to adapt to the majority culture; greater Facebook use with their group also led to more negative perceptions of the U.S. culture. Other groups managed cultural identity. Mao and Qian (2015) interviewed overseas Chinese professionals about their Facebook activities, noting that maintaining their social networks and Chinese cultural identity coincided with their adaptation to their host countries.

F. Psychological variables

The communication practices of Facebook lend themselves to study according to a number of psychological variables. Wright (2012) looked at Facebook use as an emotional support tool by university students in the United States to manage stress. In Colombia, Rivero Ortiz, Gutiérrez, and Baquero Rodríguez (2014) found that students used Facebook as an "affective prosthesis," as a way to externalize their emotions linguistically. Binns (2014) offers an exploratory of study of how U.S. teenage girls create online personae to mask their emotions. Taking the lead from the literature that shows how social interaction affects a sense of well-being, Burke and Kraut (2016) found that specific Facebook activities (like receiving targeted communication) did improve well-being while others (one-click feedback) did not. Panger (2016) offers a reassessment of a 2014 experiment run by Facebook in which it manipulated its users' news feeds to affect their well-being. Though critical of the ethical shortcomings of the study, he points out the importance of the topic and encourages better designed and more ethical approaches. Jung, Pawlowski, and Kim (2017)

offer such a study to test a goal hierarchy approach to well-being. Their interviews with 161 Facebook users showed "relationships between the ultimate goals of Facebook use (e.g., psychological stability, belongingness) and the dimensions of [psychological well-being] (e.g., self-acceptance, autonomy)" (p. 1391). Seo, Kim, and Yang (2016) found a two-step connection: the greater the social interaction on Facebook and the speedier the responses from friends led to an increased sense of social support, which in turn alleviated loneliness and increased a sense of well-being. Similarly, Vitak and Ellison (2013) noted how Facebook use led to a greater sense of social support.

Does Facebook use foster narcissism? McKinney, Kelly, and Duran (2012) cite mixed results in earlier research. Their own study did find that "higher levels of narcissism were associated with a larger number of Facebook friends and with the number of self-focused 'tweets' an individual sends" (p. 108). A number of media factors affect Facebook self-presentation, with a sample of U.S. college students who rated highly in internalization of media stereotypes more likely to adopt more revealing profile pictures (Kapidzic, & Martins, 2015). Similar social comparison effects appeared with variables like self-esteem and closeness of friend relationship factored in (Liu, Li, Carcioppolo, & North, 2016).

G. Self-disclosure

Relational closeness presumes a degree of self-disclosure and a number of researchers have explored how Facebook can function as a means of self-disclosure. Ledbetter, Mazer, DeGroot, Meyer, Yuping, and Swafford (2011) tested a model of relational closeness that included online friends. "Results generally supported the model, with the interaction effect between self-disclosure and social connection directly predicting Facebook communication and indirectly predicting relational closeness" (p. 27). As expected from the literature, greater self-disclosure on Facebook led to uncertainty reduction (Palmieri, Prestano, Gandley, Overton, & Zhang, 2012). Duguay (2016) explored a related relationship between self-disclosure and context collapse with a group of young LGBTQ, asking about both their use of social networks and the ways they control their self-disclosure across network contexts. Self-disclosure can occur outside of the context of interpersonal relationships. Hassan, Mydock, Pervan, and Kortt (2016) asked about self-disclosure connected to brands, where communities of user engage in a "brand mediated intimacy." The

researchers judge this to function as a value creating behavior.

H. Third person effect

Long studied in communication, the third person effect describes a phenomenon in which people believe others to be more influenced by media content than they themselves are. Tsay-Vogel (2016) applied the theory directly to Facebook, investigating how users viewed themselves versus other users in terms of the desirability of the social network. Lev-On (2016) conducted similar research in Israel with a representative sample of Facebook users, who indicated that others were more vulnerable to various risks arising from the social network than they themselves. An experiment at a U.S. university on perception of news stories reported on Facebook indicated greater support for the Differential Impact Hypothesis (that personal relevance matters more) than for the third person effect (Schweisberger, Billinson, & Chock, 2014).

I. Uses and gratifications

The general uses and gratifications approach to communication study focuses on audience needs, asking which media a given person or audience employs to satisfy particular needs. Treating Facebook as a medium among others, researchers, often employing survey methods with Facebook participants, have explored how those users regard Facebook. Lai and Yang (2016) explore the motivations to use specific Facebook features (social interaction, social games, etc.) and found motivations that "social needs, enjoyment needs, and trend-following significantly influence the use of the social interaction features on Facebook, while immersion needs and achievement needs significantly influence the use of social games associated with the website" (p. 1310). Park and Lee (2014) compared users' motivations to participate in Facebook to "Facebook intensity" (a measure of user activity), finding that their sample of college students identified five key motives: "entertainment, relationship maintenance, self-expression, . . . communication," and impression management all correlated positively with increased intensity. In anther study of intensity, Dhir and Tsai (2017) found that adolescent and young adult Facebook users (participating in three separate studies) differed in their motivations; that information seeking predicted intensity among young adults but exposure did not; and that process-oriented uses (such as entertainment) predicted greater intensity for both groups. A study of Kashmiri university students highlighted two gratifications sought: promoting global social relationships and entertainment (Ali, Hassan Rashid, & Manzoor, 2015). Examining photo sharing, Malik, Dhir, and Nieminen (2016) identified "six different gratifications, namely, affection, attention seeking, disclosure, habit, information sharing, and social influence" from photo sharing. They also found gender differences among their respondents. Many of the studies also identified some cultural and socio-economic differences, a result confirmed by studies in Jordan (Elananza & Mahmoud, 2016), in Argentina, (Linne, 2014), in Romania (Gherheş & Obrad, 2916), in China (Chen & Hanasono, 2016), and among different university students (Stirling, 2016). Similarly, Ancu (2012) identified different uses and gratifications among older adults, who sought "mood management" through entertainment and emotional connections and "social action" through expressing opinions and establishing friendships (p. 1). Reinecke, Vorderer, and Knop (2014) compared intrinsic and extrinsic motivations in entertainment use of Facebook; based on their work, they propose a theoretical model of entertainment experience. Those with disabilities tend to use Facebook for much the same reasons as do other users—to connect with friends—rather than for advocacy (Shpigelman & Gill, 2014).

Dainton and Stokes (2015) explored a specific use of Facebook (relational management) and jealously. "Results indicate that individuals who are strongly motivated to use Facebook for relationship maintenance are more likely to engage in Facebook assurances and monitoring but that there is a curvilinear relationship between the maintenance motive and the use of online monitoring. Regarding the patterns of relationships among Facebook maintenance and the various forms of jealousy, results indicate that the more that individuals used online monitoring and Facebook openness, the more of all four types of jealousy [trait, cognitive, emotional, and Facebook jealousy] they reported, whereas the use of Facebook positivity and assurances was negatively associated with cognitive jealousy" (p. 365). Joining uses and gratifications study to another well researched area in communication, Hunt, Atkin, and Krisnan (2012) examined the influence of communication apprehension on Facebook use. The found and inverse relationship between communication apprehension and "interpersonal, self-expression, entertainment, and passing time motives" (p. 187). Orchard, Fullwood, Morris, and Galbraith (2015) used a Q methodology to explore

Facebook uses and gratifications in an more open-ended manner. Their participants noted both positive and negative gratifications, some finding Facebook superficial and destructive and others identifying it as a valuable social environment. Even those who might seek a positive gratification such as increasing life satisfaction may experience tension as Facebook use can lead to negative outcomes such as negative social comparison (Vigil & Wu, 2015) or envy (Grigore, 2015), outcomes that lead some to temporarily withdraw from the site, taking a "Facebook vacation" (York & Turcotte, 2015). Portwood-Stacer (2013) examines this phenomenon of "non-consumption" as both a performative and political act.

Vendemia, High, Andrew, and DeAndrea (2017) asked why people "friend" those they dislike. An analysis of their results indicated a number of uses and gratifications reasons, including surveillance, monitoring, and social comparison. Some, however, report a concern for the privacy of their information, even as they use Facebook for surveillance in the social realm (Fulton & Kibby, 2017). Focusing on the Global South, Arora and Scheiber (2017) discovered a different take on privacy in terms of a gratification sought among young Facebook users in India and Brazil: a desire for privacy for romance or for cross-gender friendships.

Two studies contrasted user motivations across social networking platforms within the context of commercial brands. Rubenking and Rister (2016) examined Twitter and Facebook in terms of restaurant brands, attending to information seeking and entertainment. Phua, Jin, and Kim (2017) contrasted the use of Snapchat, Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram for following brands. The other social networks outscored Facebook in a number of use areas: Snapchat in passing time and sharing problems; Twitter for brand community, and Instagram in showing affection and following fashion.

3. Interpersonal communication

Communication researchers paid keen attention to interpersonal communication, seeing the social networks of Facebook as a special case of social networks in general, that is, places where people could engage in interpersonal exchange. These researchers typically regard Facebook as a technology aided social network where the general theories of interpersonal communication apply. Facebook aids in interpersonal constructs such as identity formation as well as in interpersonal relationships themselves, whether friendship, romantic, or family relationships.

A. Identity

A great deal of research addresses how people communicate their identity or form it through communication. How does this occur on Facebook? Du Preez and Lombard (2014) found that, despite Facebook's popular reputation as a place to create identities, little difference appears between online and offline personae. However, others have found more flexibility and experimentation with identity: the creation of a "bricolage identity" reflecting various values among Iranian youth (Kianpour, Adlipour, & Ahmadi, 2014); a ranchero identity among second-generation bilingual Mexican immigrants in the U.S. (Sidury, 2015); and a cultural identity among Filipino nationals in India (Lorenzana, 2016). Lim, Vadrevu, Chan, and Basnyat (2012) studied how Singaporean at-risk youth use Facebook to manage reputation and face, tracking how they used the various features of the social network to express the power dynamics in their groups. Robards (2014) considers Facebook's "look back videos" as a tool for memory that allow users to deepen their understanding of both their online personae and of their identities.

Drawing on Goffman's theories of the presentation of self and symbolic interactionism, several researchers suggest how online identity works. Farquhar's (2013) ethnographic studies "indicate that the Facebookers present over-simplified imagery to reduce ambiguity and align with specific social groups" and that users rely on schemas to guide their interpretation (p. 446). Asking whether texts or images carried more weight in self-presentation, Van Der Heide, D'Angelo, and Schumaker (2012) found that in choice between text and image, users gave priority to text; but when both appeared together, photos more strongly influenced judgments of social orientation. Alfarid Hussain (2015) surveyed a group of young users in Assam; the data indicate that they treat Facebook as a "front stage" for a virtual identity. Dahiya (2016) examined the tools that college stu-

dents in India used to present themselves (images, friends, status updates) and the perceived consequences. Bouvier (2012) noted that college students in Wales present their identity across several categories of nationality, territory, national culture, or lifestyle. Some have found that self-presentations do not always align with the offline world. Consistent with the hyperpersonal model of selective self-presentation, Facebook users "believed that their own profile postings made them come across more positively than reality, but Friends' postings made them come across more negatively than reality" (Toma & Carlson, 2015, p. 93). Factors external of Facebook can influence self-presentation. Burke and Ruppel (2015) looked at the role of social anxiety on self-presentation. Their "results indicated that people reported greater interaction success on days when they reported greater positive Facebook self-presentation motivation and less negative Facebook self-presentation concern in conjunction with less social competence. Moreover, people reported greater negative Facebook self-presentation concerns on the day following reports of high social anxiety" (p. 204).

Others have noted that the process of identity formation involves more than the individual. Based on a comparative study of Facebook and the professional networking site LinkedIn, van Dijck (2013) argues that identity occurs between individual users, their employers, and the platforms themselves, with tools like connectivity and narrative time lines controlling the identities of the users.

Another component of managing one's identity involves impression management: how can one influence how others view oneself? Scott's (2014) experiment with undergraduates showed that his sample connected popularity (as measured by likes) to perception of greater social and physical attractiveness. Hall, Pennington, and Lueders (2014) found that observers could accurately estimate various personality traits (extroversion, agreeableness) from Facebook pages; they conclude that the Facebook users studied succeeded in impression management, at least on these scales. The same applies to corporate users who wish to manage impressions and identity of their companies (Lillqvist & Louhiala-Salminen, 2014). Ciacu, Tasente, and Sandu (2013) include reputation management as part of impression management. In an exploratory study of Facebook pages by Romanian users, they identify the most popular pages and their strategies for reputation management, which include

frequency of posting, stories, and feedback on comments (p. 43).

Group identity also emerges online. Grigoraşi (2015) traces identity formation among members of protest groups in Romania. Coretti and Pica (2015) offer a more general model of how this occurs, but they also note that the online push to centralize group identity leads to a loss of solidarity in the groups. Looking at the Occupy Movement, Kim (2015) describes how local groups use various visual imagery on Facebook to create an identity tied to the history of social movements.

B. Interpersonal relationships

Studies about Facebook address both romantic and friendship-based interpersonal relationships.

Chambers (2017) asks a general question about the possibility of relational intimacy and explores the meaning of Facebook's notion of "friendship." She further explore how social media have redefined ideas of relational intimacy. Craig and Wright (2012) propose a model of relational development and maintenance that takes Facebook into account; their empirical test highlighted relational interdependence, commitment, and predictability as important variables. Drawing on several studies, McEwan, Fletcher, Eden, and Sumner (2014) sketch out a measure of Facebook relational maintenance behaviors among friends. They identified key factors as social contact, response seeking, relational assurances, Facebook intensity, and online social communication. Ellison, Vitak, Gray, and Lampe (2014) also offer a set of relational maintenance behaviors based on a survey of adult users. They included variables such as time on site, demographic variables, number of Facebook friends, and a measure they developed, called Facebook Relational Maintenance Behaviors. Bryant and Marmo (2009) suggest adding the category of surveillance to the standard list of maintenance strategies; they also suggest distinguishing among acquaintance, casual friendship, and close relationships when applying the strategies. In a later study (2012), they used focus groups to develop "friendship rules" for Facebook. These "included rules regarding communication channels, deception and control, relational maintenance, negative consequences for the self, and negative consequences for a friend" (p. 1013). Foster and Thorson (2016) found that stress negatively affected the use of maintenance behaviors such as assessment or messaging about the progression of a relationship, but did not affect other maintenance behaviors such as closeness messages, social contact,

and relational assurances. Nam Mak and Chui (2014) apply various relational management theories to work colleagues' relationships outside their workplace, paying particular attention to how they seek to influence workplace behaviors.

Those involved in romantic relationships use much the same relational maintenance strategies. Stewart, Dainton, and Goodboy (2014) surveyed undergraduate students in romantic relationships about their approaches to maintaining the relationship. They found "that when partners (a) perceived mutual and definitional uncertainty in their relationship they used more FB monitoring to maintain their relationship; (b) when partners reported future and definitional certainty they used more FB assurances and openness; (c) when partners experienced FB jealousy they used more FB positivity, openness, assurances, and monitoring; and (d) when partners were satisfied they used more FB positivity and assurances" (p. 13).

The public quality of online intimacy leads to sometimes mixed judgments. Bazarova (2012) found that her participants judged greater intimacy from private messages but an inappropriateness of public disclosures of intimacy, results she attributes to the "sociotechnical" affordances of Facebook. Working with an Italian group, Farci, Rossi, Boccia, and Giglietto (2017) explored the impact of those affordances on relational intimacy among friends. They identified a number of strategies used by the group: "showing rather than telling, sharing implicit content, tagging, expectation of mutual understanding, and liking." They continue, "These strategies produce a collaborative disclosure that relies on others' cooperation to maintain the boundaries between private and public space" (p. 784). From this they suggest a model of strategies to manage online intimacy.

Given the international and intercultural nature of Facebook, Eslami, Jabbari, and Kuo (2015) explored the practice and role of compliments in the online forum, with a focus on the Persian culture.

> The findings revealed that online medium of communication and technological affordances on Facebook have brought new norms of communication into existence. The findings also suggested that some emerging sociocultural factors such as cyber-feminism might have impacted the participants' preferences for more egalitarian patterns of language use when responding to compliments from an opposite gender. More importantly, the findings showed how marginalized groups such as women in Iran benefit from

> virtual spaces . . . to assert a linguistic identity of self that is not easily possible to share publically in real life settings. (p. 244)

On the other hand, Facebook can also give rise to negative emotions. Fleuriet, Cole, and Guerrero (2014) manipulated Facebook posts in order to ask their respondents about negative emotions such as jealousy. Experiencing negative emotions correlated with "preoccupied attachment" (vs. dismissive attachment) and gender (with females more likely to experience negative emotion). Hoffman and DeGroot (2014) found a positive relationship between time spent on Facebook and feelings of jealousy, as well as communicative responses such as increased monitoring.

In addition to negative emotions, relationship management must deal with transgressions. Samp and Palevitz (2014) set up an experiment where individuals in dating relationships completed a measure of dependence power and Facebook use and then rated hypothetical partner transgressions expressed on a screenshot. Participants indicated how they might respond (verbal face-to-face) or nonverbal (monitoring or other maintenance behavior). The researchers did not find a link between dependence power and monitoring.

Relationships, both off-line and online do end. Using the relational dissolution model, LeFebvre, Blackburn, and Brody (2015) investigate how people behave online after a breakup. Working with college students, they identified several actions: changing their relational status, unfriending the former partner, and limiting profile access. Lukacs and Quan-Haase (2015) add to this understanding through a mixed-methods study that explored the link between surveillance and breakup distress.

C. Family

One key area of interpersonal communication occurs within the family. Facebook can supplement this, as young adults friend their parents or use the platform to maintain family connections. Kanter, Afifi, and Robbins (2012) found that having a parent on Facebook did not lead to a sense of a loss of privacy and, in fact, decreased family conflict even among those who reported conflict before Facebook sharing. Ball, Wanzer, and Servoss' (2013) survey of college students found that female students were more likely to friend their parents and report more family communication. Those who adjust their privacy settings after connecting with parents report fewer family conversations. However, using Communication Privacy

Management theory to guide their analysis of survey responses, Miller, Danielson, Parcell, Nicolini, and Boucher (2016) found several themes related to family conflict after Facebook adoption, including setting limits on information ownership and creating inappropriate assumptions based on private information.

D. Social capital

A number of studies examine Facebook use through the lens of social capital, applying a quasi-economic term to interpersonal relationships. With Facebook inviting users to friend and rate other users, a quantitative mentality can quickly set in. Rashid (2015) reports just such a study of university students in Assam, noting the role of Facebook to enhance the social capital of the students. Aubrey and Rill (2013) also look at undergraduate students from this perspective and report two chief motives for Facebook use: socializing and improving one's status. Jin (2015) "examined how the self-systems of users of the social networking website Facebook (where a self-system comprises four elements—self-efficacy, self-assertion, social presence, and self-esteem) and intensity of use affected the abovementioned social relations and social capital effects. Using data from a survey of Facebook users (N =306), the result revealed that Facebook users' self-systems played an important role in the formation of bridging and bonding social relationships as well as in generating social capital effects" (p. 501). Bohn, Buchta, Hornik, and Mair's (2014) study noted that exaggerated posting and friend requests can lessen social capital but addressed posts prove more successful in increasing it.

Ellison, Gray, Lampe, and Fiore (2014) developed a method to gauge social capital and then apply that to resource requests. They found that those who self-report higher social capital will post more mobilization requests and will more likely respond to friends' requests. Arguing that social capital is inherently a structural concept, Brooks, Hogan, Ellison, Lampe, and Vitak (2014) propose a method to study it based on the topology of Facebook networks. They test the model with employees at a U.S. university. Though not specifically addressing social capital, Dunbar, Arnaboldi, Conti, and Passarella (2015) do compare the structure of online social networks to that of offline networks and propose paying particular attention to network layers.

4. Journalism

Journalism, long a focus of communication study, attracted a good deal of interest from those studying Facebook. Many journalists individually or on behalf of their employers, whether newspapers, news magazines, news broadcasters, or online services, have established Facebook pages as a way to communicate with their respective audiences. In addition Facebook itself offers news by providing information services to its members either on their particular newsfeeds or through links with their friends. A number of the topics that appear in the published studies include how journalists use Facebook, news coverage as reflected in Facebook, agenda setting, and audience engagement with the news or participation on news sites.

Early examination of Facebook and other social media sites, such as Twitter and YouTube noted how these platforms contributed to a "decline in circulation, advertising revenue, and numbers of pages" (Levinson, 2010, p. 1). Others reported how established journalism sought to integrate the online platforms. In the context of Australian regional newspapers, Hess and Bowd (2015) explore the "complex power struggles taking place across these two media platforms [print and Facebook]. On the one hand, Facebook can facilitate public conversation and widen the options for journalists to access information; on the other, it has become a competitor as news outlets struggle to find a business model for online spaces" (p. 19). Sherwood and Nicholson (2013) asked how Australian sports journalists used various platforms, including Facebook. In-depth interviews indicated that "while each is used differently for reporting, sourcing, and researching news, and for interacting with readers, this study found that most sports journalists used this technology within the boundaries of traditional journalistic practices and norms" (p. 942). Lim (2014) reviewed how different Asian news organizations followed institutional practices to establish "functional rules":

As functional platforms, Singapore's and South Korea's news websites embed Facebook and Twitter into news content, whereas China's news website provides local-based social media into the content. In terms of functional individuality, the news websites focus on such individual activities as reply and connect. For functional prominence, the news websites locate the entry point of social media predominantly at the middle of the screen. However, these specific rules vary with the nationality of each news website. (p. 279).

Examining Dutch media practices, Hille and Bakker (2013) found that legacy news media publishers turned to Facebook in order to increase their distribution without adding costs. The strategy was not successful because the "media do not seem to have a clear strategy on using Facebook, which leads to an underperformance on the social media platform with low participation and minimal interaction" (p. 663). Moe (2013) describes a different challenge when public service media such as the Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation turned to Facebook. Here, Moe argues, the use of a private, for- profit company by a public service news entity blurs important lines. Larsson (2017) offers a longitudinal look at Sweden's major newspapers as they incorporated Facebook, finding that even as audience engagement increased (as measured by "likes"), the papers actually cut back on their engagement with audiences.

A number of other studies examine the ways in which news organizations or journalists attempt to engage their audiences and report the news. Almgren and Olsson (2016) describe the use of Facebook plugins so that readers can share journalistic content. Marchi (2012) focuses on teenagers and their information-seeking practices and preferences—looking for opinions as well as objective reporting through the social media sites. Stroud, Scacco, Muddiman, and Curry (2015) ran a field study with local television news staff to engage their Facebook followers in a way to raise deliberative behavioral norms; they found that staff intervention did indeed improve deliberation. Bode (2016) explores the roles that Facebook and Twitter play in disseminating political news, noting that both users and journalists could exploit this in a greater degree. Some journalists do directly use Facebook as part of their reporting as did a Brazilian news organization covering a teachers' strike, by gathering information from audience engagement and comments on the Facebook page (Goulart Massuchin, & Quesada Tavares, 2016). Bashri, Netzley, and Greiner (2012) offer mixed results in their examination of how two major news outlets (CNN and Al Jazeera [English]) gathered information on the Arab Spring uprisings. "The use of social media by Tunisian and Egyptian activists in the uprisings led the researchers to believe that there would be an extensive use of informal channels in both outlets, but that was not the case" (p. 19), with both preferring official sources. In an agenda-setting study, Jacobson (2013), however, offers some evidence that Facebook and other social media may influence coverage. "This study uses a cross-lagged panel analysis to determine to what extent audience conversations on The Rachel Maddow Show's Facebook Page may have influenced the selection of issues covered in the TV broadcast. Results show a positive correlation between stories discussed on Facebook and the subsequent airing of similar stories on TV" (p. 338).

Several studies focus more on the process of news than on journalistic organizations. Facebook's linking feature allows users to share comments and discussion. Jacobson, Myung, and Johnson (2016) compared links to two U.S. cable news programs: one liberal and one conservative. They found support for "previous research that suggests a relatively small number of information resources receive most of the news audience traffic, and . . . some support for other studies that indicate that partisan political discussions on social media are segregated by political orientation" (p. 875). Readers also use Facebook to participate in the news process, often pointing out missed stories, correcting mistakes, and criticizing the journalists, a process documented in a study of Brazilian newspaper pages (Caminada & Christofoletti, 2016). Bolsover (2017), however, criticizes the general research approach to news participation, suggesting that it depends on Western theories such as that of the public sphere. Her analysis of Chinese users' commentaries of political news leads her to call for a new theoretical model.

Finally, even academics studying journalism have incorporated Facebook. Bahfen and Wake (2015) describe a five-year participant observation of their work with former students and journalists to develop both teaching and network resources in the Asia-Pacific region.

5. Education

Whether by accident or design, Facebook has emerged as both an educational venue and an educational tool, something communication researchers have begun to examine. Reid (2015) gives a general introduction to the ambitions of such enterprises in his review of Kent and Leaver's (2014) collection, noting the generally instrumental approaches the authors in the collection take. Cunha, van Kruistum, and van Oers (2016) report on a Brazilian attempt to improve communication between teachers and students through Facebook interaction. Both online and classroom engagement improved when Facebook became part of the class processes. Sheldon (2016), using the theory of reasoned action, asked why university students and faculty would add each other to their Facebook networks, noting that personal attitudes often explained that. Currie and Lee (2015) also report a positive evaluation of Facebook as an online course management system in the U.S. Ha and Shin (2014) also report positive evaluation of Facebook as a learning tool by U.S. students, though some students rated it more cynically. In a different university, a content analysis of student posts in communication classes indicated three generally positive themes: formal learning, resource sharing, and self-promotion (Maben, Edwards, & Malone, 2012). In South Africa, graduate student learning increased through a metacognitive reflection process facilitated by interaction on a closed Facebook page (Fourie, 2015). Also in South Africa, students made an informal learning group out of participation in the Media Works Facebook page (Hyde-Clarke, 2013). Wu and Chen (2015) propose a more intentional use of Facebook, suggesting that identifying factors linked to educational success in Facebook will aid subsequent student learning outcomes. They call attention to promoting an intention to use Facebook, the harnessing of social influence, and the development of information quality. In England, a study of data from the Open University examined how the university could build an academic community among its distance education clientele (Callaghan & Fribbance, 2016). A Slovenian study poses a similar question among primary school pupils. This younger group "use Facebook for learning and they use it primarily as social support, which is seen as exchanging practical information, learning about technology, evaluation of their own and other people's work, emotional support, organizing group work, and communicating with teachers. In using Facebook, pupils acquire bridging and bonding social capital; they maintain an extensive network of weak ties that are a source of bridging capital, and deeper relationships that provide them with emotional support and a source of bonding capital" (Erjavec, 2013, p. 117). A Danish study (Aaen & Dalsgaard, 2016) looked at high school students who organized their own Facebook learning pages, without teacher intervention. The students used Facebook to help one another on assignments and homework, blending social life and academics. A similar outcome occurred in South Africa where a peer collaboration project in language learning led to positive self-efficacy beliefs among the students (Peeters, 2016). In Sweden, students used a closed Facebook page, moderated by a tutor, to help one another integrate into an academic system, providing a co-learning environment (Cuesta, Eklund, Rydin, & Witt, 2016). Barrot (2016) reports positive outcomes in using Facebook as an e-portfolio system for an ESL course, with students indicating improved writing skills. Peeters (2015) also found that Facebook groups helped language learners, by increasing their metacognitive awareness through peer strategies. Teachers, too, offer support for one another through Facebook through developing "topic continuation strategies" (Rashid, 2016).

Facebook has also proven successful to support students in education abroad programs. Lee, Kim, Lee, and Kim (2012) cite Facebook as a way for students to manage stress and maintain cultural identity when abroad. Dressler and Dressler (2016) report on students who use Facebook posts to make sense of an education abroad experience by sharing with their network of friends at home.

Schools use Facebook for co-curricular organization and for providing information. Assad (2015) tracks one attempt in the United Arab Emirates to promote university events and extracurricular activities, noting that the students did not become involved with the pages, treating the material as an information source only. South African universities have incorporated Facebook in their public relations activities, though

without completely integrating the platform as a way to engage their various stakeholders (Mambadja, Conradie, & Van der Waldt, 2015).

The outcomes do not always appear uniformly positive, however. Milošević, Živković, Arsić, and Manasijević (2015) report how a Serbian group of students in Belgrade did find Facebook to improve their education, though reporting conflicting attitudes to it. Souleles (2012) also notes both benefits and pitfalls of embedding Facebook in an undergraduate visual communication course in the U.S. Students reported both an increase in peer-to-peer support and in student-teacher interaction, though they found challenges in setting boundaries in terms of what happens in Facebook groups. Similarly, Coffelt, Strayhorn, and Tillson (2014) report that students who "friend" their

teachers report mixed feelings, with teachers' credibility often decreasing. In a more serious criticism, based on experiences in Serbia, Radovanović, Hogan, and Lalić (2015) note that Facebook use in schools can extend the digital divide and lead to greater stratification, based on "status, politics, and motivations. We interpret educators' reluctance to adopt new technology as a reaction to the technology's capacity to challenge the educators' legitimacy, expertise, and preferred teaching materials. Students compound this situation with both greater familiarity and yet less focus on source credibility" (p. 1733).

Some students have parlayed their Facebook time into learning experiences through internships in which they develop social media as part of their professional immersion (McEachern, 2011).

6. Political Communication

Communication scholars have found in Facebook a rich source of data on political communication. Some have recognized in it a new media form that creates its own discourse and a more visual political communication (Ionescu, 2013) while others have aimed to describe its dynamics in terms of shifting social power in democratic societies (Santos & Ndlovu, 2015) or as a new opportunity for the public sphere (Raimondo Anselmino, Reviglio, & Diviani, 2016). Some have found Facebook a threat to public life (Marechal, 2012), a claim debated by others (Pennington, 2013). However, no one doubts the worldwide impact of Facebook in political discourse. Just the last eight years have seen political communication analyses of the role of Facebook in Argentina (Slimovich, 2016), Chile (Cabalin, 2014), Finland (Sormanen, Lauk, & Uskali, 2017), Germany (Nitschke, Donges, & Schade, 2016), Greece (Theocharis & Lowe, 2016; Theodoropoulou, 2016), Hungary (Bene, 2017), Israel (John & Dvir-Gvirsman, 2015), Italy (Casteltrione, 2016), Iraq (Al-Tahmazi, 2015), Libya (Sommer & Rum, 2013), New Zealand (Ross, Fountaine, & Comrie, 2015), Palestine (Khamis, 2016), Romania (Aparaschivei, 2011), Russia (Pilgun & Gradoselskaya, 2015), South Africa (Bosch, 2013; Ndlovu & Mbenga, 2013; Steenkamp & Hyde-Clarke, 2014), Taiwan (Wen, 2014), Turkey (Öngün, 2015), the United Kingdom (Casteltrione, 2016), the United

States (Hanson, Haridakis, Cunningham, Sharma, & Ponder, 2010; Glassman, Straus, & Shogan, 2015), Zambia (Mkandawire, 2016), and Zimbabwe (Chibuwe & Ureke, 2016; Santos & Ndlovu, 2015).

Scholars have focused on different aspects in considering the impact of Facebook on politics. As noted above, Facebook has created an additional visual element in political communication. Noting that academic study of online campaigns has concentrated on texts, Lee and Campbell (2016) looked at political posters on Facebook, finding that very few received much attention. Rather than posters, Öngün (2015) examined cover photos in official party Facebook pages in Turkey, noting how they function to interpellate the viewer into the party, thus increasing engagement. Hurcombe (2016) offers a content analysis of the themes reflected in the Facebook page of an Australian candidate, noting that they create a "mythic campaign image" focused on "military, heterosexual family, statesmanship, athleticism, and activeness" (p. 19). Studying the 2012 Egyptian election, Khamis and Mahmoud (2013) suggest that the Facebook images literally provided framing of issues and candidates. Sommer and Rum (2013) took a slightly different approach to images on political Libyan Facebook pages, noting how the Libyan Youth Movement used them to create a group identity and community goals during the Libyan revolution. Ionescu (2013) tracks

how image uploads connect to higher voter engagement, particularly in light of the lower cost factors in using Facebook.

Many others have asked the questions of whether and how Facebook use connects to voter engagement, taking perspectives ranging from established political parties to ad hoc groups. Sung Woo Yoo and Gil de Zúñiga (2014) compare the uses of Twitter, Facebook, and other social networking sites for political purposes, finding that education level predicted using Facebook for knowledge of civic activities and issues. Bosch (2013) offers a case study in South Africa among youth to examine the possibilities of "e-democracy." Mihailidis, Fincham, and Cohen (2014) used both surveys and focus groups to explore how young people evaluate the possibility of Facebook for civic dialogue. With findings that contradict some of the optimistic views of youth political engagement, Theocharis and Lowe's (2016) field experiment discovered "that maintaining a Facebook account had clearly negative consequences on reports of offline and online forms of political and civic participation" (p. 1465). Another study by Theocharis found some support for a positive connection between Facebook use and use of politically oriented sites, but that does not carry over to the offline world (Theocharis & Quintelier, 2016). On the other hand, Lin's (2016) study of the 2012 Taiwanese presidential election found that for younger voters (those under 25) pre-elective engagement in political activities on Facebook predicted post-election political participation. Drawing on the relational maintenance literature, Kim, Park, and Im (2015) describe the strategies that U.S. senators used to maintain relationships with their constituents. Of six strategies, they found the greatest use of positivity and openness and the least use of access and assurance. Based on their findings, they suggest ways that politicians can better engage with their constituents.

Casteltrione (2016), using data from Italy and the UK notes that while both high and low engaged citizens look at the Facebook pages of political parties, the highly engaged group "take more advantage of the mobilization affordances of Facebook, whereas less politically active participants employ this social networking site mainly for political information. Activists consider Facebook as a key tool for the organization of political initiatives, enabling them to quickly communicate and coordinate, and to operate independently from traditional political institutions such as parties and trade unions" (p. 177). Chan (2016) applies the "O-S-R-O-R (Orientation–Stimulus–Reasoning–Orien-tation–Response) model of political communication effects" to those affordances offered by Facebook to voters in Hong Kong; he found "that Facebook network size and connections with public political actors exhibit both direct and indirect effects on participation through Facebook news, expression, and efficacy" (p. 430). Danish Members of Parliament take advantage of Facebook to shift political conversation online, a tactic that works as well as or better than the conversation in political meetings (Sørensen, 2016). Others have examined the effectiveness of "get out the vote" campaigns that use Facebook to remind voters to go to the polls (Haenschen, 2016). In their examination of U.S. political campaigns in 2006 and 2008, Williams and Gulati (2013) found that voter engagement through Facebook depended on the literacy levels of voters in the districts of candidates. Acknowledging that researchers have learned a great deal about the people who engage in political uses of Facebook, Kearney (2017) asks instead about the conditions under which they engage, noting that interpersonal and affective reasons predominate.

Two studies focused on the 2008 U.S. presidential election. Woolley, Limperos, and Oliver (2010) present the results of a content analysis of Facebook pages devoted to the two candidates (Obama and McCain), noting that membership and activity levels were higher for Obama. Hanson, Haridakis, Cunningham, Sharma, and Ponder (2010) found that social networking correlated negatively with political cynicism and that other factors, such as user background, accounted for the level of use of the sites. Pennington (2013) found differences between party activity and constituent responses in the 2012 Republican party presidential primary elections: "analysis of candidate posts showed a focus on messages to encourage voting, foreign policy, and party politics, all while maintaining a primarily positive tone. Constituent responses to posts indicated a primarily negative tone with frequent flaming" (p. 19).

Facebook use also figures into local political activity. Reddick, Chatfield, and Ojo (2017) provided a theoretical framework to explain local citizen engagement through "double loop learning" where the local government provides both information ("single loop") and encourages citizen posts (the double loop). An initial content analysis of the pages of local

governments in Western Europe found a preponderance of cultural activities, sports, and marketing-type topics, but little response to them by citizens (Bonsón, Royo, & Ratkai, 2015); the researchers noted the impact of different media types (pictures, video, text) on the citizen response rates. Kaigo and Okura (2016) tracked page engagement with the Facebook page of a local community in Japan, noting how different functions of government achieved a greater number of views while badly run government enterprises depress the number. Lovari and Parisi (2015) report an online survey of almost 1200 Facebook users of sites sponsored by local Italian cities; users ranged from those who limited responses of likes to fully interactive users. The majority of users indicated a preference for more interactive exchanges with local officials. Lev-On and Steinfeld (2015) do something comparable with pages sponsored by Israeli cities, attempting to measure levels of engagement based on a variety of characteristics of both place and user. In-depth interviews with 38 young Londoners showed a preference for two divergent goals: networking with friends and family living in distant places and engagement with the local community (Leurs, 2014). In India, Kumar (2014) conducted ethnographic research to track how disadvantaged youth adopt new technologies to engage the community.

The use of Facebook by activists has also caught the attention of researchers, with many recognizing that online social networks have enabled a new approach to organizing political activities in various countries. Harlow (2013) examines Facebook use in the Arab Spring protests, particularly in Egypt. Cabalin (2014) describes the online strategies employed by the Chilean student protest movement, noting that they used the pages to mobilize protests and to document successes. Kang (2012) offers a similar description of the "Boycott Whole Foods" movement in the United States. Katz-Kimchi and Manosevitch (2015) looked at the Facebook strategies used in Greenpeace's "Unfriend Coal" campaign; similar to the Chilean students, the organization used Facebook to mobilize support and to disseminate information. Alende Castro (2015) examines the Facebook strategies of labor organizers in Spain. Treré and Cargnelutti (2014) studied the pages of Movimiento por la Paz con Justicia y Dignidad in Mexico, looking at the balance between information-only pages and pages that promote dialogue. In Finland, Sormanen, Lauk, and Uskali (2017) asked

similar questions of the pages of various ad hoc groups, finding that the groups' mission determined whether the pages supported discussion or the pursuit of societal influence; the mission also determined the extent to which other media institutions quoted the Facebook pages. Using framing analysis, Cmeciu and Coman (2016) studied the pages of groups protesting fracking in Romania by Chevron. The analysis showed "a dominance of 'land struggle' as a collective action frame followed by 'conflict' and 'solidarity' and a salience of photos and video files used as framing devices of cultural relevance for Romanian protesters and of evidence of offline anti-fracking activism" (p. 19). Harlow and Guo (2014) take a less optimistic view of Facebook's role, based on their look at immigration activism in the United States. They conclude, "Analysis suggests technologies are perhaps pacifying would-be activists, convincing them they are contributing more than they actually are. Thus, 'slacktivism,' or 'clicktivism' that takes just a mouse click is potentially diluting 'real' activism" (p. 463). On the other hand, Penney (2015) found a third approach between engagement and slacktivism in his analysis of the Facebook Red Equal Sign (for marriage equality) campaign: a way in which "sympathetic citizens who would not otherwise take on organizational commitments are brought into the circle of participation by contributing to aggregate projects of mediated public advocacy" (p. 52).

The use of Facebook can lead to contradictions within activist groups. Gerbaudo (2017) analyzes various protest groups (Occupy Wall Street, the indignados/15M movement in Spain, UK Uncut, etc.) and discovers a conflict between the libertarian values of the organizations and the leadership structures necessitated by Facebook use. He describes the analysis in this way:

> Various aspects of the internal functioning of vanguards are discussed: (a) their formation and composition; (b) processes of internal coordination; (c) struggles over the control of social media accounts. The article reveals the profound contradiction between the leadership role exercised by social media teams and the adherence of digital activists to techno-libertarian values of openness, horizontality, and leaderlessness. The espousal of these principles has run against the persistence of power and leadership dynamics leading to bitter conflicts within these teams that have hastened the decline of the movements they served. These problems call for a new conceptu-

al framework to better render the nature of leadership in digital movements and for new political practices to better regulate the management of social media assets. (p. 185)

Another use of Facebook for political activism leads to the formation of group identity. Morin and Flynn (2014) track this for the U.S. Tea Party movement; their analysis of pages showed various uses of "polarization language" to distinguish the group from others. Other discursive practices—solidarity language or encouraging engagement—helped maintain the identity of Palestinians in East Jerusalem during the Gaza protests (De Vries, Simry, & Maoz, 2015). Khamis (2016) examines a similar attempt to shape the identity of Palestinian youth by building up a sense of cultural autonomy.

Several scholars apply discourse analysis to political pages on Facebook. Al-Tahmazi (2015) explores how people reposition political actions and discourse in Iraqi politics as ethnic or cultural discourses. Slimovich (2016) looks at the 2011 Argentinian presidential election, noting how Facebook pages appropriate the discourse of television. Theodoropoulou (2016) raises the question of the translation challenges encountered in cultural and political discourse. Examining the Greek Aganaktismenoi (indignants) movement, she proposes a functional variationist model. Chibuwe and Ureke (2016) tracked a trend in which Facebook discourse of Zimbabwe's political classes led to attacks that other media picked up. Rowe (2015) explores whether news organization's attempt to move discourse to a more polite discussion by using Facebook, which bans anonymous posts, rather than their own pages that allow anonymity. He "finds that political discussion on *The Washington Post* website is significantly more likely to be uncivil than discussion of the same content on *The Washington Post* Facebook page. Moreover, the incivility and impoliteness on *The Washington Post* website are significantly more likely to be directed towards other participants in the discussion compared to *The Washington Post* Facebook page" (p. 121).

What kinds of content will have the greatest influence? Bene (2017), studying viral memes in the 2014 Hungarian election, found that negative emotion-filled posts achieved the greatest public reactions. Larsson's (2015) study of Norwegian politicians reinforces the sense that politicians do not yet know how to maximize Facebook for political purposes: "the types of content least provided by the politicians—acknowledging the support of others or criticizing the actions by political peers or media actors—emerge as the most popular in this regard. Results further show that the most common type of feedback is likes—a finding that suggesting that a reassessment of the viral qualities of Facebook for purposes like these is necessary" (p. 459). Steenkamp and Hyde-Clarke (2014) came to similar conclusions in their study of South African political uses of Facebook. Others find that it may be too early to track the influence of Facebook for official political communication. Glassman, Straus, and Shogan (2015) tracked two months of Facebook use by members of the U.S. Congress, finding only few of them widely followed and effective. Trying to better understand how politicians can use Facebook Larsson (2016) contrasts Norway and Sweden during election and non-election cycles, tracking an "election effect" of heightened use of Facebook. But, politicians may not know how to or wish to influence their constituencies through dialogue. Ross, Fountaine, and Comrie (2015) noted that most politicians in New Zealand used Facebook merely as another way to broadcast their positions.

Trying to understand what politicians do, Pilgun and Gradoselskaya (2015) introduce their work to classify Russian social networks and the ways that various actors attempt to influence public opinion on Facebook. Nitschke, Donges, and Schade (2016) examined the influence strategies of German political organizations and found two general approaches: linking and mobilization. Several studies look specifically at influence and activism in the context of peace efforts between Israel and Palestine: Simons (2016) reviewing the work of Ta'ayush (an online anti-Occupation group); and Mor, Ron, and Maoz (2016), that of "Tweeting Arabs." Where influence fails, users with weak ties to each other will likely break off contact with those with whom they disagree, something that John and Dvir-Gvirsman (2015) found among Israelis during the Israel-Gaza conflict of 2014. Ndlovu and Mbenga (2013) hold out more hope based on their study of youth in South Africa, that their use of Facebook can enrich the public sphere of politics.

7. Examining Corporate Facebook Use

Both businesses and non-profit organizations have quickly moved onto Facebook and in so doing indirectly provide communication researchers with access to their corporate communication strategies. Some companies have their own Facebook pages and seek to build communities of their followers—a public relations use; others use more traditional advertising but with the ads appearing on Facebook rather than in other media—an advertising use.

Some studies of public relations aim for a more descriptive approach, asking what companies actually do in their public relations. Loureiro and Gomes (2016) compared corporate Facebook pages for companies in Portugal and Brazil, noting that the Portuguese companies provide more materials while the Brazilian ones received more comments from customers. Pérez Dasilva, Genaut Arratibel, Meso Aierdi, Mendiguren, Galdospín, Marauri Castillo, Iturregui Mardaras, Rodríguez González, and Rivero Santamarina (2013) similarly compare Facebook use by three Spanish companies, identifying the strategies used by each in responding to customer complaints. Fraustino, and Connolly-Ahern (2015) offer a content analysis of Fortune 500 companies' Facebook presence, identifying posts or Facebook wall designs that feature combinations of corporate ability and corporate social responsibility (CSR).

Noting that Facebook allows more or less direct access to stakeholders, Ji, Li, North, and Liu (2017) conducted a content analysis of stakeholder engagement with Fortune 500 companies. They conclude, "Active stakeholders' Facebook-based interactions as leaving positive or negative comments with a company are significant predictors of the company's reputation score" (p. 201). Crijns, Hudders, Cauberghe, and Claeys (2015) were not able to predict a reputation score for Belgium companies, based on their content analysis of Facebook pages; however, they did find that users shared public relations content more than marketing content, even though they made more comments on the marketing materials. Companies also communicated with stakeholders via Facebook in crisis communication situations (DiStaso, Vafeiadis, & Amaral, 2015).

As a special case of public relations, Cho, Furey, and Mohr (2017) examined CSR postings from 46 of Fortune's "World's Most Admired Companies" list, finding that the companies more often posted noncorporate social responsibility information, using an informing strategy that did garner user engagement more than for the corporate social responsibility messages. Kim, Kim, and Sung (2014) also examined a set of postings by Fortune 100 companies dealing with CSR and found that those posts that sought specific actions received a greater engagement through likes and responses. Similarly, user engagement increased with the frequency in which the corporations responded to those user comments.

Krishna and Kim (2015) look at the "dark side" of corporate communication—comments made by employees, classifying them into three general groups: angry posts complaining about the companies, positive posts expressing pride or gratitude, and petitions to change behaviors. Einwiller and Steilen (2015) examine how companies handle such complaints, but focus on customer complaints. Their results indicate a number of approaches:

> Results reveal that the companies are not fully embracing the opportunities of social media to demonstrate their willingness to interact with and assist their stakeholders. Organizational responsiveness is only moderate, and companies often try to divert complainants away from the social network site. The most frequently applied response strategy is asking complainants for further information which does not appease complainants. Response strategies that foster complaint satisfaction are used less often. They comprise offering a corrective action, connecting the complainant with someone who can provide a problem solution, and thanking the complainant. (p. 195)

As a kind of outlier in the corporate world, Park, Lee, Yoo, and Nam (2016) describe governmental public relations efforts by local governments to promote tourism in Korea. Many of the same features appear as on tourism industry pages.

The use of Facebook for branding provides a kind of hybrid between direct public relations and marketing or advertising uses since brands promote user identification of or with the company. Carah, Brodmerkel, and Hernandez (2014) offer a case study of Australian alcohol brands. They argue "that Facebook works not just as a platform to harvest data but also as a platform to manage the circulation of affect and creation of social connections around brands" (p. 259). Shen and Bissell (2013) offer a content analysis of Facebook use in branding by six beauty products companies, exploring in particular viral media campaigns. Ho (2015) asks, in terms of brands, whether users identify more with Facebook communities or with the companies, finding that engagement with the community can enhance identification with the companies.

Firms still seek to find their way in terms of advertising on Facebook, a fact reflected in a number of mostly exploratory studies. Mochon, Johnson, Schwartz, and Ariely (2017) specifically ask whether Facebook presence can affect customer offline behavior. In a field experiment they discovered that "no effect of acquired page likes is found when customers interact organically with the firm's page, but a significant effect is found when the firm pays to boost its page posts and thus uses its Facebook page as a platform for paid advertising" (p. 306). However, Morris, Choi, and Ju (2016), in a survey of undergraduate students about their attitudes towards advertising, attempted to judge emotional response. They found that their sample of college users reacted more positively to ads "re-promoted" from friends rather that those coming directly from the sponsor. A Korean study examined the best spots to place ads (home page ad, social impression ad, organic impression ad), finding that organic impression ads linked to friends carried greater weight among users (Jung, Shim, Jin, & Khang, 2016). A large (N=3,500) study of South African millennials (Duffett, 2015) found that Facebook advertising had a positive effect on intention to purchase. Alhabash, McAlister, Quilliam, Richards, and Lou (2015) studied young adults' responses to marketing alcohol on Facebook, seeing it as creating a social norm for alcohol consumption that in turn led to greater consumption.

In a case study of the publishing industry, Criswell and Canty (2014) reviewed over 10,000 posts, matching them to sales data over time. They note that social media marketing works best with an already established community of readers and not so well with new authors. Phua and Ahn (2016) tested a model in which likes, friends' likes, and Facebook intensity all interacted to predict attitudes to marketing. Studies in other industries—radio (Díaz-Campo & Segado-Boj, 2013) and dairy (Linné, 2016)—indicate that visualization leads to stronger customer bonds. Heyman and Pierson (2013) discuss the impact of firms' using personal information gained from Facebook to tailor their marketing messages, making those messages more effective.

Non-profit organizations also use Facebook for communication and marketing. As with the corporate use of Facebook, many studies offer a survey of online activities. Lo and Waters (2012) and Waters and Lo (2012) describe how religious organizations and other non-profits in China manage their Facebook interaction to better fit into traditional Chinese culture (religious organizations) or to break with that culture to seek social benefit (public benefit organizations). Education and health care groups draw from both sets of values. The global nature of Facebook also works to blur such cultural boundaries. Cho, Schweickart, and Haase (2014) note different levels of engagement with non-profit sites, depending on the public relations model chosen. Bürger (2015) found that few German foundations use social media, but do use Facebook to promote events. Saxton and Waters (2014) explored the dynamics of Facebook use, asking what leads to greater engagement (a question on the minds of all corporate users). They write, "A content analysis of 1,000 updates from organizations on the Nonprofit Times 100 list indicates that, based on what they comment on and like, individuals prefer dialogic, as well as certain forms of mobilizational, messages; however, they are more likely to share one-way informational messages with their own networks" (p. 280).

Brown and Vaughn (2011) discuss the pros and cons of a very different corporate use of Facebook: as an information provider to the HR department for use in hiring decisions. Noting a paucity of empirical evidence about these practices, they present the dangers of potential discrimination based on using information drawn from Facebook profiles as well as the potential benefit of learning job-relevant information.

8. Legal and Ethical Issues

A. Surveillance and privacy

Some issues that attracted the attention of communication researchers seem more specific to Facebook's features. These include issues of privacy and surveillance, as well as issues of legal restrictions or guidelines. With its networks of users and the amount of personal information (ranging from photos, activities, preferences, "friends," and so on), Facebook lends itself to surveillance uses; in its case, though, users voluntarily surrender a measure of privacy, widely broadcasting their activities, for example, to anyone who cares to observe. Several scholars offer a theoretical consideration of surveillance. Some liken the Facebook world to Jeremy Bentham's panopticon prison where jailers can constantly observe inmates (Trottier, 2012; Lin, 2013; Penney, 2014); others develop this construct with an appeal to Foucault's contemporary extension of the idea as a site that controls its users (Gilchrist, 2013). Netchitailova (2012) goes a step further by examining the question from both the theoretical and the empirical sides, adding user interviews. She divides the surveillance issue into user and the corporate sides, as "social" or "institutional." "The social focuses on the control of personal information, while the institutional focuses on the data usage by corporations, such as Facebook. . . . [U]sers care about both social and institutional privacy, but while, in most cases, they are quite aware and concerned about the surveillance aspect of Facebook's usage, the benefits of using the network at this moment are too strong to either leave Facebook or switch to an alternative medium" (p. 683). Hull (2015), conscious of Foucault's approaches, presents a more detailed philosophical and social critique of what he calls the "privacy paradox."

> The real question, then, is why privacy self-management occupies such a prominent position in privacy law and regulation. Borrowing from Foucault's late writings, I argue that this failure to protect privacy is also a success in ethical subject formation, as it actively pushes privacy norms and practices in a neoliberal direction. In other words, privacy self-management isn't about protecting people's privacy; it's about inculcating the idea that privacy is an individual, commodified good that can be traded for other

market goods. Along the way, the self-management regime forces privacy into the market, obstructs the functioning of other, more social, understandings of privacy, and occludes the various ways that individuals attempt to resist adopting the market-based view of themselves and their privacy. (p. 89)

Several others have offered similar broad interpretations of what Facebook has done to ideas of privacy. Fuchs (2012) approaches the question from the standpoint of political economy, noting that Facebook depends on the commodification of users' data. Bechmann (2014) analyzes how the "consent culture" of Facebook leads users to accept policies through the End-User License Agreement that in effect become non-informed consent, coerced through the social pressure to join the network.

Ivana (2013) asks the question slightly differently, interviewing Romanian users about their understanding of both self-presentation and peer monitoring on Facebook and their reasons for joining the social network despite their knowledge of the surveillance they accept. Gadekar and Pant (2015) similarly survey users about their knowledge of and attitudes to privacy on Facebook and their use of the privacy settings, finding only a tenuous link between knowledge and action. Venkat, Pichandy, Barclay, and Jayaseelan (2014) found even less knowledge about privacy on Facebook among users in North and South India, where those surveyed largely did not know that their data were open to the public. Chamarro Lusar, Bertran Martí, Oberst, and Torres Rodríguez (2016) identified three patterns of privacy among teens: exposed (information available to all), restrictive (open to invitations), and protective (open only to friends), noting that these teen users become more sophisticated over time in regards to their privacy. Butler, McCann, and Thomas (2011) asked whether Facebook users know about the various privacy settings, particularly as these change over time with Facebook's policies. While most thought that they knew the settings and policies, the study found that most did not. Others found that, among college students, attitudes toward privacy and gender mattered more than knowledge about Facebook's privacy settings in a user's choice of enacting the privacy settings

(Gadekar & Pant, 2015). Perhaps not surprisingly, a different class of users—information professionals in Turkey—did know the privacy settings policies and actively changed them (Külcü & Henkoğlu, 2014). Other users actively block the sharing of information, applying the privacy settings more intentionally (Öngün & Demirağ, 2014).

Several researchers applied Communication Privacy Management Theory to Facebook. Waters and Ackerman (2011) asked college students about their reasons for using Facebook and their attitudes to voluntary disclosure of information, finding that most disclosed information for the sake of distant friends, as a way of keeping up with each other. Child and Westermann (2013) asked young adults about friend requests from parents and learned that those they surveyed made few restrictions in granting parents access to their Facebook pages. The results indicate that this group sees no privacy dilemma in sharing with their parents, even though a power differential exists. Child, Duck, Andrews, Butauski, and Petronio (2015) focused on young adults' communication with family members. They note, "the interior family privacy orientation and Facebook privacy management practices significantly predicted variations of online and offline Facebook communication with siblings, parents, and grandparents about social media" (p. 349). They further suggest some changes to the Communication Privacy Management theory in the light of Facebook's straddling the boundaries between kinds of privacy. Miller, Danielson, Parcell, Nicolini, and Boucher (2016) discovered a shifting social dynamic in regards to privacy and family communication on Facebook. They noted four themes among their 80 respondents about dealing with family conflict: "(1) desiring limits on information co-ownership, (2) desiring expansion of co-ownership rights, (3) creating inappropriate assumptions based on limited private information, and (4) encountering privacy breakdowns" (p. 4). Their respondents indicated greater ambivalence about sharing information with parents than those in the other studies mentioned here. Though not specifically referencing the theory, Marwick and boyd (2014) note that theories of privacy have not kept up with the digital world. "Traditional models of privacy are individualistic, but the realities of privacy reflect the location of individuals in contexts and networks. The affordances of social technologies, which enable people to share information about others, further preclude individual

control over privacy" (p. 1051). This public private world has led teen users, especially, to re-think their understanding of privacy.

B. Free speech

A number of other, non-privacy, issues that touch on Facebook's policies have also appeared in communication research. Carr (2017) reviews claims that Facebook blacklists certain stories. Facebook has also appeared in U.S. court cases over free speech. Sarapin and Morris (2014) review a case in which a judge ruled against a public-sector employee who lost his job for clicking "like" on a Facebook page. The judgement concluded that clicking on a web page did not qualify as "sufficient" speech to merit protection. "Employing relevance theory, [the researchers] explored whether Facebook users' attitudes and practice indicate the expectation of free-speech protection" and found that a vast majority of their sample thought that clicking is indeed communication (p. 131).

Johnson (2016) offers a theoretical analysis of the nature and possibilities of free speech via Facebook. He argues

> that Facebook is furthering an "aggregational" theory of freedom of expression, whereby primacy is given to the sheer capacity or potential for individuals to communicate using platforms such as Facebook, rather than the quality or importance of that speech. Under this free speech paradigm, Facebook projects itself as benevolent compared to repressive state actors that wield the legal authority to censor speech, while failing to address its own power as an arbiter of global freedom of expression. Such an approach is problematic for two reasons. First, the quantity of online voices does not automatically translate into quality of online discourse—strict norms would cramp the range of discourse on Facebook regardless of the number of active daily users. Second, valuing quantity over quality could lead individuals to be more forgiving of Facebook's arbitrary and capricious methods of governing user content. (p. 19)

C. Corporate policy

Facebook as a company has had to develop various policies as it confronts various legal demands—an ongoing challenge for the company and for regulators. Montgomery (2015) argues for added protection for teens in terms of privacy, particularly as big

data practices of consumer data collection touch them. She bases her argument on the nature of teen development: impulsiveness and emotional volatility. One proposed protection resulted in Facebook's "real names" policy, which banned anonymous users. MacAulay and Moldes (2016) criticize the policy: "Using approaches from queer theory, internet studies, surveillance scholarship, and social theory, we argue that real names policies are not about promoting safety but about rendering users transparent to markets and the state" (p. 6). On a different front, Hendus (2015) notes that Facebook's language policy (behind its "See Translation" button) rests on largely unstated criteria, operating beyond the explicit choices of users.

Regulators and public officials must also confront new privacy questions with Facebook. How private are their posts? Burkell, Fortier, Wong, and Simpson (2014) note that law enforcement agencies have used Facebook posts, judging no expectation of privacy and thus no civil protections. Their study of user behavior indicates that users do treat Facebook as a public space, even if they intend a somewhat limited audience. Russomanno (2016) discusses a United States Supreme Court reversal of a conviction of a man posting threatening messages on Facebook (Elonis v. United States); in so doing, the Court did not consider First Amendment (rights of freedom of expression) issues, but limited itself to a narrower reading of the statute under which the lower courts convicted the man. Russomanno argues that the Court missed an opportunity to better define the lines between free expression and threatening discourse.

Slaughter, (2015) identifies another potential gap in Facebook's terms of service agreements: the rights of fiduciaries dealing with the online materials of deceased clients. He argues that the U.S. Stored Communications Act has not kept up with current practices and that Facebook should update its terms of service to allow access by fiduciaries.

D. Ethics

As with any new technology, Facebook and its practices have raised a number of ethical concerns, ranging from the specific—its autoplay feature streaming the on-air murder of two journalists (Davisson, 2017; Jones, 2017)—to the more general, such as the use of "public" Facebook data in research. Zimmer (2010) presents a case study in which researchers collected "anonymized" data on a cohort of college students whose identities were quickly revealed by sophisticated users. Zimmer "articulates a set of ethical concerns that must be addressed before embarking on future research in social networking sites, including the nature of consent, properly identifying and respecting expectations of privacy on social network sites, strategies for data anonymization prior to public release, and the relative expertise of institutional review boards when confronted with research projects based on data gleaned from social media" (p. 313). In the context of studies of a protest movement in Northern Ireland, Reilly and Trevisan (2016) suggest ethical guidelines to protect the privacy of those posting on the movement's Facebook page, distinguishing between public figures and rank and file members.

The blurring of public and private can have negative ethical consequences. Weijs, Majowicz, Coe, Desmarais, and Jones-Bitton (2017) present the case of some Canadian health care workers. While most refrained from posting about work, between 12% and 25% felt it appropriate to mix their worlds, a situation that the researchers judged might damage the credibility of public health concerns. A similar blurring of public and private occurs with law enforcement's use of Facebook for evidence in criminal proceedings. Burkell, Fortier, Wong, and Simpson (2014) review privacy practices and, based on user information, conclude that most people have no legal expectation of online privacy, even though they may not realize how public their postings are.

Tello (2013) also raises the issue of privacy, but in terms of Facebook's changes to its privacy policy. She suggests that such changes, as well as practices like aggregating user data or users' unfounded presumption of greater protection, damages "intimacy" privacy.

From a theoretical perspective Bonenfant and Farmer (2014) explore how the affordances of Facebook affect various kinds of freedom (freedom as duty, freedom as satisfaction) based on Kant's deontological ethics, Foucault's ethics, and Bentham and Mill's utilitarian approach. Taking a different starting point—one rooted in our growing dependence on technology—Bondar (2015) asks how we might include ethical guidelines in our online cultures, lest we risk losing our humanity to technological practice.

9. Other Areas of Research

A. Health communication

Given its nature as a social media site open to all, Facebook has featured a number of health-related pages or groups. Health communication researchers have examined these from a number of perspectives. Several have assessed diabetes-related pages (Hunt, 2015; Hunt & Koteyko, 2015), cancer screening (Kee, Sparks, Struppa, Mannucci, & Damiano, 2016), breast cancer (Abramson, Keefe, & Chou, 2015); sexual health practices in religiously or culturally conservative countries (Khawaja, Ali, & Khan, 2017), and Thoracic Outlet Syndrome (Walker, 2014). Eichenberg, Schott, and Aden (2016) take a slightly different approach to their study of how counseling institutions use Facebook resources for psychosocial problems. They note, "With regard to the presence of psychosocial counseling services on Facebook it shows on one hand, that many institutions already have their own presence, and on the other hand they differ considerably in terms of activity, informativeness, and kind of organization. The needs of users are thereby met only partially" (p. 34). Syn and Kim (2016) investigate how college students, who may lack access to health information, seek or share health information. The "findings showed that college students are willing to read and post health-related information on Facebook when the health topic is not sensitive. In addition, there are clear differences in preferences between professional sources and personal sources as health information sources" (p. 743).

Facebook holds out great promise for pharmaceutical companies to address people directly about health management. Geoghegan and Monseau (2011) provide a case study of Johnson & Johnson's Facebook efforts to establish online communities for those with or caring for those with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. They also discuss the policy issues, particularly in light of the fact that, as of their writing in 2011, the United States Food and Drug Administration had not issued any guidelines.

B. Language

Language also offers a rich area of research for communication scholars interested in Facebook. Facebook users themselves manifest various approaches to language, either through bilingualism or ideology. Young bilinguals in Wales help shape attitudes towards their language in their Facebook groups, which Cunliffe, Morris, and Prys (2013) attribute to a number of factors, both the affordances of the social network and offline policies. National language policies based on various ideologies can also affect Facebook, a situation explored by Phyak (2015) in terms of the competing uses of Nepali and English in Nepalese Facebook groups. Sherman and Švelch (2015) consider language management on Czech Facebook pages where "grammar Nazis" enforce standard written Czech through humor. They argue that the practice results from a language ideology even though the country does not have a formal language policy. Turkey does, however, have such a policy, first enforced with the establishment of the secular state and the adoption of the Roman alphabet. Yazan (2015) explores "the textual and visual cultural artifacts produced, reconstructed, and disseminated in seven focal Facebook groups which have been created to maintain the use of Ottoman Turkish script and vocabulary. The recurrent themes centering on language policing in these virtual environments indicate that the postings are usually used to convince the group members that they need Ottoman Turkish to secure their ties and reconnect with their ancestors' cultural heritage, to provide them with instructional support and practice opportunities, and to reach out to or align the group with macro language policing practices" (p. 335).

Facebook groups also provide space for "autochthonous heritage" languages, such as Low German, a regional language in northern Germany (Reershemius, 2017) or Albanian as spoken in Pristina, Kosovo (Conforti, 2016). Facebook also provides a space—though with challenges—for speakers of a primarily oral language to communicate. Tahiri (2016) offers a case study of speakers of Tarifit, a language of the Rifian Berbers in Morocco. This group chooses not to use the Arabic scripts taught in the Moroccan schools, but experiments with Latin characters supplemented with Arabic numerals.

Nartey (2013) takes a different approach and applies speech act theory to the Facebook pages of Ghanaian university students. He notes that of the five

characteristic speech acts, directives and assertives appear most frequently. "The study also revealed that the messages are informed and conditioned by multiple pragmatic notions, and reflect the socio-cultural variation and culture-specificity of language use . . . " (p. 114).

C. Grief

Facebook has become a public memorial site for those grieving or remembering the dead. Sabra (2017) charts the use of various norms in Danish mourners' sites, suggesting a difference in "netiquette" between mourning and memorialization. Mourning, particularly that involving deep emotion best occurs in private spaces (p. 36), while memorials should include life-affirming accounts and positive memories of the deceased, with few expectations of sympathy or support (p. 37). Pennington (2017) also investigates the value of Facebook in times of loss through a survey and identifies key variables (time since death, relation to the deceased, Facebook use) that influence whether users find Facebook as helpful or hurtful in mourning.

Memorial pages form part of the grieving process, but these pages too can merit different evaluations. Marwick and Ellison (2012) examine 37 memorial pages and note how the affordances of Facebook allow wider audiences to participate but at the cost of a loss of context. In addition, page users often must engage in impression management of the deceased. Rossetto, Lannutti, and Strauman (2015) acknowledge the difficulties of what they call a "coping paradox," as users simultaneously use Facebook for information dissemination, community support, and preservation of memories. While death is universal, mourning follows cultural norms. Al-Shboul and Maros (2013) explore those norms in the context of condolences expressed in Jordanian Arabic. Using speech act theory applied to 678 posted comments after the death of a Jordanian actor, they identify seven strategies: "praying for God's mercy and forgiveness for the deceased, reciting Quranic verses, enumerating the virtues of the deceased, expressing shock and grief, offering condolences, realizing death is a natural part of life; and using proverbs and sayings" (p. 151).

D. Negative aspects of Facebook

Online social networks, like any human networks, afford people the opportunity to behave badly. Communication researchers have looked into a number of negative experiences on Facebook. Kopecký (2016) offers an overview of online dangers to children, based on a survey of Czech children and young people (8–17 year olds), and finds that most reported cyberbullying, sexting, and online dating issues. Ging and O'Higgins Norman (2016) looked at the link between gender and online bullying or aggression through an empirical study of teen girls at an Irish secondary school. They note that such conflict is both part of the girls' lives and often misunderstood. Rachoene and Oyedemi's (2015) digital ethnography among college students in South Africa found "that attacks on intelligence and physical appearance, sexting and outing, insults and threats are common bullying types," with the use of sexually explicit pictures common among the group studied (p. 302). Less serious than cyberbullying, mockery is also common on line. Maíz-Arévalo (2015) found such language common across cultures in her datasets of British English and peninsular Spanish groups. However, she noted that the groups use framing strategies to soften the language and restrict it to certain discourse types, as for example in replying to bragging.

Toma (2017) examined the prevalence of deception among those young people seeking romance through Facebook. After reviewing the relevant literature she describes the cues people use to detect deception and the accuracy of those tools. Other uses seem less successful in resisting phishing (the attempt to obtain sensitive information through online fraud). Vishwanath (2015) found that habitual Facebook use and a lack of awareness make people more vulnerable to such attacks. Matamoros-Fernández (2017) coins the term "platformed racism" to describe online racism abetted by Facebook and other social networks. Using a case study from Australia, she notes that such hate speech not only occurs on the online platform, but also involves the infrastructure and policies of the platforms.

Bode and Vraga (2015) propose a method to correct misinformation reported though Facebook: the use of a link to related stories that correct the misinformation.

Another danger arises with overuse of Facebook. Tang, Chen, Yang, Chung, and Lee (2016) explored the determinants of "Facebook addiction" in a Taiwan-based study. While only a small number of the college students surveyed fell into their "addict" category, they estimated 17% were in danger, spending over eight hours a day on the site. They note that interpersonal relationships and online social support predicted the extent of addiction.

E. Entertainment

Facebook provides a number of modes of entertainment. Chen, Shen, and Ma (2012) explore Facebook's online games in terms of functionality and usability through interviews with experts and a survey of gamers. They noted the types of appeal of the games (such as ease of play or social interaction) and gamer preferences. They conclude that the appeal of Facebook games results from game designs that satisfy user needs. A case study in Brazil, organized around a telenovela, explores the practice of co-viewing, connecting Facebook groups with television watching and this creating a kind of hybrid form of entertainment (Pires de Sá & Roig, 2016).

F. Research

As is evident from so many studies cited here, communication researchers often turn to Facebook in their research. Rains and Brunner (2014) provide a review of the literature of research on social network sites, as mentioned above. Their concerns for the issues of generalizability, potential privileging of one source of data, a focus on a few features, and the obsolescence of findings bear further reflection. Other researchers suggest that we direct attention to specific research methods. Baltar and Brunet (2012) describe sampling methods to use with Facebook groups, then apply their work to a case of Argentinean entrepreneurs in Spain. Robertson (2014) offers more general advice on data mining on Facebook and other social networks. Wells and Link (2014) encourage the use of large data sets based on probability sampling to obtain more representative results. Initial analysis of their data indicates that "Facebook users are significantly more likely to be women, teens, whites, and adults with at least a high school diploma" (p. 1042). Parra, Gordo, and D'Antonio (2014) propose a specific use of the "big data" from Facebook to inform social research. They apply their method to a study of people at risk of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

In a more theoretical piece Bouvier (2015) describes a discourse studies approach applied to social media that would shed light on "how language, identity, cross-cultural social relations and power play out in the rapidly evolving landscape of social media" (p. 149). Another theoretical piece (Allmer, 2014) encourages emancipatory research based on critical theory and political economy.

Van Loon and Unsöld (2014) propose a way for scholars to study Facebook and other social networks, while avoiding the problems of applying Actor-Network Theory to network processes. By suggesting a different conceptual approach to the idea of a network, they offer a way to combine empirical study with virtual spaces. Several other researchers have proposed network analysis methods as a way to better understand Facebook loyalty and the development of social networks in general (Barnett & Benefield,, 2017; Chiu, Cheng, Huang, & Chen, 2013).

10. Conclusion

This review has highlighted some of the ways in which communication researchers have examined Facebook. For many of these scholars, Facebook offers a found resource, something they could use to explore what they planned. These studies typically apply existing communication theories to show how Facebook users act consistently with those theories, whether to engage in interpersonal communication (relationship development or maintenance), in political communication (working for the election of a given candidate), in organizational communication, or in some other area. All of those uses and findings appear more or less predictable based on what we already know about communication behavior. Relatively few of the studies take into account the affordances provided by Facebook, though some scholars mention those affordances as they describe how Facebook works in or alongside of one or another aspect of communication practice. But few articles in communication examine Facebook itself, that is, few of these pay attention to the larger picture.

Here the media ecology approach might prove helpful. Media ecology asks us to consider the ecosystem in which the media function. Much like in the biological metaphor it draws upon, those elements of communication—whether the communication hardware, software, or the ideas communicated—function within a much more complex system of culture and

society, of technology and ideology. This wider approach might allow researchers to get a better sense of how Facebook interacts with other communication providers and tools, for example. Facebook has indeed disrupted some traditional practices of communication but redefined others. We find, for example, many people turning to Facebook to receive the news or to engage in a political communication or to find entertainment. And yet how Facebook has the influence it has remains somewhat under-researched. This kind of a concern has taken on greater interest with the various accusations of how one or another group influenced elections in countries other than their own through the manipulation of social media groups. Facebook seems particularly given to the spread of rumor or other unsubstantiated claims. In fact some very recent research indicates that falsehoods will spread much more quickly on social media than true statements or even the attempts to correct those falsehoods (Vosoughi, Roy, & Aral, 2018).

How do the affordances of Facebook work together to create the effect that it has? What are the affordances? Why has Facebook taken on such a powerful role throughout the world? Certainly network effects play a role, with people wishing to be on the same social network as friends or family. But why has Facebook expanded to so many other functions and begun representing so many other groups?

Communication researchers would do well to stand back and try to understand Facebook within the larger context or larger environment. The communication technology alone cannot explain the forces that have situated Facebook. One should also consider factors as wide-ranging as users' personal qualities (issues of self-esteem or a desire for social contact), historical issues, economic forces, regulatory and other structures inherited from older media, the connection between entertainment and Facebook's substitution of other activities as entertainment (games, envy of others, gossip, etc.), the seeming empowerment that one can accomplish things through clicking on Facebook button rather than through other kinds of activities, other social factors, and the intended and unintended consequences of engineering design decisions (such as the addictive quality of Facebook use, developed through various forms of psychological reinforcement).

A second trend emerging from this research appears in the origin of the work. Perhaps not surprisingly in an interconnected age, but still somewhat remarkable, is the number of researchers from the num-

ber of countries who have turned their research attention to Facebook. Facebook, of course, represents a multinational company, which has over a billion users scattered throughout the world. But the similarity in the use of Facebook across these many cultures—journalistic, political, educational, organizational, and so on—does seem surprising. One might expect more cultural difference across the users of Facebook. Why has this communication technology become so culturally homogenous? Is there some something rooted in the technology itself that directs the users only to certain approaches and functions? How has corporate policy shaped the way people use Facebook? Does that policy make the platform available to people in different countries only in certain ways? This similarity suggests that Facebook differs from other communication technologies that saw greater regional differences as they took root. Researchers appear to take other things for granted as well. Few studies, at least of those reviewed here, ask about the linguistic differences on Facebook. Facebook does allow various language postings and even translates them. Still, how have human users become so homogenized in their approaches to and discussion of this new technology?

A third point of reflection that emerges from this review has to do with the way that Facebook itself seems to have become transparent or disappeared from the research. Very few studies examine the company. Very few studies look at the infrastructure that lies behind Facebook and the structured use of the platform's affordances. Instead, for many researchers, Facebook seems to become simply another communication medium. Few people question the nature of that medium or how the various affordances of the medium may interact to create particular attitudes and approaches, even among researchers. One looks for research that makes Facebook itself much more visible.

Even when people note that Facebook fulfills traditional functions of communication, no one seems to ask how those functions differ when they appear on Facebook—more typically people ask how the functions work in the same way or how companies or journalists employ them to accomplish existing goals. If Facebook displaces or replaces or complements existing communication practices, one should acknowledge the fact that Facebook must be similar enough to existing communication that users can quickly learn Facebook and its processes and methods; at the same time, it must be different enough to attract users by features unavailable in other places.

Fourth, few of the studies reviewed here apply critical theory to Facebook. People have observed that, like other media, the owners sell their users/viewers/listeners to advertisers. Some (Karakayali & Kilic, 2013) note that social network users perform "analytic labor" for the networks.

Fifth, the great majority of studies reviewed here make use of relatively small convenience samples. These provide some grounds for exploratory studies and explanations, but others should not generalize them to the entire population without further study. Much of what gets reported should realistically be limited to undergraduate students.

Despite the great number of articles published in the relatively recent years about Facebook, much remains to be studied. Communication researchers will find a great deal of richness in Facebook, both for those who use Facebook simply as sources of data, but perhaps even more importantly for those who would begin to study Facebook as both a company and a platform, as something too often taken for granted.

References

Aaen, J., & Dalsgaard, C. (2016). Student Facebook groups as a third space: Between social life and schoolwork. *Learning, Media & Technology, 41*(1), 160–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2015.1111241

Abramson, K., Keefe, B., & Chou, W.-Y. S. (2015). Communicating about cancer through Facebook: A qualitative analysis of a breast cancer awareness page. *Journal of Health Communication, 20*(2), 237–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2014.927034

Alende Castro, S. (2015). Estrategia de comunicación para la inserción laboral en Facebook. Grupos de empleo [Communication strategy in Facebook for the entrance into the labor market]. *Employment Groups., 13*(1), 151–179. https://doi.org/10.7195/ri14.v13i1.742

Alfarid Hussain, S. M. (2015). Presentation of self among social media users in Assam: Appropriating Goffman to Facebook users' engagement with online communities. *Global Media Journal: Indian Edition, 6*(1&2), 1–14.

Alhabash, S., McAlister, A. R., Quilliam, E. T., Richards, J. I., & Lou, C. (2015). Alcohol's getting a bit more social: When alcohol marketing messages on Facebook increase young adults' intentions to imbibe. *Mass Communication & Society, 18*(3), 350–375. https://doi .org/10.1080/15205436.2014.945651

Ali, R., Hassan Rashid, M. A. ul, & Manzoor, M. M. (2015). Facebook as a tool for promoting global social relationships. *Global Media Journal: Pakistan Edition, 8*(1), 21–30.

Allmer, T. (2014). (dis)like Facebook? Dialectical and critical perspectives on social media [(Ne) Všečkaš Facebook? Dialektični in Kritični Pogledi Na Družabne Medije]. *Javnost–The Public, 21*(2), 39–55.

Almgren, S. M., & Olsson, T. (2016). Commenting, sharing and tweeting news. *NORDICOM Review, 37*(2), 67–81. https://doi.org/10.1515/nor-2016-0018

Al-Shboul, Y., & Maros, M. (2013). Condolences strategies by Jordanians to an obituary status update on Facebook. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 13*(3), 151–162.

Al-Suwaidi, J. S. (2013). *From tribe to Facebook: The transformational role of social networks.* Abu Dhabi: Emirates Centre for Strategic Studies and Research.

Al-Tahmazi, T. H. (2015). The pursuit of power in Iraqi political discourse: Unpacking the construction of sociopolitical communities on Facebook. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 10*(2), 163–179. https://doi .org/10.1080/17447143.2015.1042383

Alves Ribeiro Correia, P. M., & Rafael Moreira, M. F. (2014). Novas formas de comunicação: história do Facebook - Uma história necessariamente breve [New communication forms: History of Facebook — A necessarily brief history]. *Alceu: Revista de Comunicação, Cultura e Política, 14*(28), 168–187.

Alves Ribeiro Correia, P. M., & Rafael Moreira, M. F. (2015). Três grandes marcos da primeira década de história dos sites de redes sociais de larga escala: Friendster, MySpace, Facebook e a sua atomização em sites de redes sociais de nicho [Three milestones of the first decade of the history of large scale social networking sites: Friendster, MySpace, Facebook, and the atomization into niche social networking sites]. *Alceu: Revista de Comunicação, Cultura e Política, 15*(30), 104–116.

Ancu, M. (2012). Older adults on Facebook: A survey examination of motives and use of social networking by people 50 and older. *Florida Communication Journal, 40*(2), 1–12.

Aparaschivei, P. A. (2011). The use of new media in electoral campaigns: Analysis on the use of blogs, Facebook, Twitter and YouTube in the 2009 Romanian presidential campaign. *Journal of Media Research, 4*(2), 39–60.

Arora, P., & Scheiber, L. (2017). Slumdog romance: Facebook love and digital privacy at the margins. *Media, Culture & Society, 39*(3), 408–422. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443717691225

Assad, A. (2015). How do private colleges in United Arab Emirates use Facebook to promote their extracurricular activities? *Amity Journal of Media & Communications Studies (AJMCS), 5*(1/2), 35–39.

Aubrey, J. S., & Rill, L. (2013). Investigating relations between Facebook use and social capital among college undergraduates. *Communication Quarterly, 61*(4), 479–496. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2013 .801869

Bahfen, N., & Wake, A. (2015). Tweeting, friending, reporting. *Pacific Journalism Review, 21*(2), 173–184.

Ball, H., Wanzer, M. B., & Servoss, T. J. (2013). Parent-child communication on Facebook: Family communication patterns and young adults' decisions to "friend" parents. *Communication Quarterly, 61*(5), 615–629. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2013.822406

Baltar, F., & Brunet, I. (2012). Social research 2.0: Virtual snowball sampling method using Facebook. *Internet Research, 22*(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1108/10662241211199960

Barnett, G. A., & Benefield, G. A. (2017). Predicting international Facebook ties through cultural homophily and other factors. *New Media & Society, 19*(2), 217–239. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815604421

Barrot, J. S. (2016). Using Facebook-based e-portfolio in ESL writing classrooms: Impact and challenges. *Language, Culture & Curriculum, 29*(3), 286–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2016.1143481

Barry, W. A., & Bouvier, G. (2012). Cross-cultural communication: Arab and Welsh students' use of Facebook. *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research, 4*(2/3), 165–184. https://doi.org/10.1386/jammr.4.2-3.165_1

Bashri, M., Netzley, S., & Greiner, A. (2012). Facebook revolutions: Transitions in the Arab world, transitions in media coverage? A comparative analysis of CNN and Al Jazeera English's online coverage of the Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions. *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research, 5*(1), 19–29. https://doi.org/10.1386/jammr.5.1.19_1

Bazarova, N. N. (2012). Public intimacy: Disclosure interpretation and social judgments on Facebook. *Journal of Communication, 62*(5), 815–832. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01664.x

Bechmann, A. (2014). Non-informed consent cultures: Privacy policies and app contracts on Facebook. *Journal of Media Business Studies, 11*(1), 21–32.

Bene, M. (2017). Go viral on the Facebook! Interactions between candidates and followers on Facebook during the Hungarian general election campaign of *2014. Information, Communication & Society, 20*(4), 513–529. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1198411

Binns, A. (2014). Twitter city and Facebook village: Teenage girls' personas and experiences influenced by choice architecture in social networking sites. *Journal of Media Practice, 15*(2), 71–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/14682753.2014.960763

Bode, L. (2016). Political news in the news feed: Learning politics from social media. *Mass Communication & Society, 19*(1), 24–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2015.1045149

Bode, L., & Vraga, E. K. (2015). In related news, that was wrong: The correction of misinformation through related stories functionality in social media. *Journal of Communication, 65*(4), 619–638. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12166

Bohn, A., Buchta, C., Hornik, K., & Mair, P. (2014). Making friends and communicating on Facebook: Implications for the access to social capital. *Social Networks, 37*, 29–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2013.11.003

Bolsover, G. (2017). Harmonious communitarianism or a rational public sphere: A content analysis of the differences between comments on news stories on Weibo and Facebook. *Asian Journal of Communication, 27*(2), 115–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2016.1214743

Bondar, A. A. (2015). The Facebook network and the young people of modern age. *International Journal of Communication Research, 5*(4), 289–293.

Bonenfant, M., & Farmer, Y. (2014). Foucault, Facebook and freedom. *Ethical Space: The International Journal of Communication Ethics, 11*(3), 14–24.

Bonsón, E., Royo, S., & Ratkai, M. (2015). Citizens' engagement on local governments' Facebook sites. An empirical analysis: The impact of different media and content types in Western Europe. *Government Information Quarterly, 32*(1), 52–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2014.11.001

Bosch, T. (2013). Youth, Facebook and politics in South Africa. *Journal of African Media Studies, 5*(2), 119–130. https://doi.org/10.1386/jams.5.2.119_1

Bouvier, G. (2012). How Facebook users select identity categories for self-presentation. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 7*(1), 37–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2011.652781

Bouvier, G. (2015). What is a discourse approach to Twitter, Facebook, YouTube and other social media: Connecting with other academic fields? *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 10*(2), 149–162. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2015.1042381

boyd, d. (2008). Why youth heart social network sites: The role of networked publics in teenage social life. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media* (pp. 119–142). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

boyd, d. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

boyd, d. & Ellison, N. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13*(1), 210–230.

Brooks, B., Hogan, B., Ellison, N., Lampe, C., & Vitak, J. (2014). Assessing structural correlates to social capital in Facebook ego networks. *Social Networks, 38*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2014.01.002

Brown, V. R., & Vaughn, E. D. (2011). The writing on the (Facebook) wall: The use of social networking sites in hiring decisions. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 26*(2), 219–225. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9221-x

Bryant, E. M., & Marmo, J. (2009). Relational maintenance strategies on Facebook. *Kentucky Journal of Communication, 28*(2), 129–150.

Bryant, E. M., & Marmo, J. (2012). The rules of Facebook friendship: A two-stage examination of interaction rules in close, casual, and acquaintance friendships. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships, 29*(8), 1013–1035. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407512443616

Bürger, T. (2015). Use of digital advocacy by German non-profit foundations on Facebook. *Public Relations Review, 41*(4), 523–525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.07.007

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. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12162

Burke, T. J., & Ruppel, E. K. (2015). Facebook self-presentational motives: Daily effects on social anxiety and interaction success. *Communication Studies, 66*(2), 204–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2014.884014

Burkell, J., Fortier, A., Wong, L. Y. C., & Simpson, J. L. (2014). Facebook: Public space, or private space? *Information, Communication & Society, 17*(8), 974–985. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2013.870591

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

Cabalin, C. (2014). Online and mobilized students: The use of Facebook in the Chilean student protests [Estudiantes Conectados y Movilizados: El Uso de Facebook En Las Protestas Estudiantiles En Chile]. *Comunicar, 22*(43), 25–33. https://doi.org/10.3916/C43-2014-02

Caers, R., De Feyter, T., De Couck, M., Stough, T., Vigna, C., & Du Bois, C. (2013). Facebook: A literature review. *New Media & Society, 15*(6), 982–1002. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813488061

Callaghan, G., & Fribbance, I. (2016). The use of Facebook to build a community for distance learning students: A case study from the Open University. *Open Learning, 31*(3), 260–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2016.1229176

Caminada, T., & Christofoletti, R. (2016). O erro anotado: um estudo dos comentários de leitores no Facebook sobre falhas jornalísticas. *Estudos Em Comunicação, 22*, 51–66. https://doi.org/10.20287/ec.n22.a03

Carah, N., Brodmerkel, S., & Hernandez, L. (2014). Brands and sociality: Alcohol branding, drinking culture and Facebook. *Convergence: The Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 20*(3), 259–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856514531531

Carr, D. (2017). Facebook: Friend or foe? *Media Development, 64*(1), 22–23.

Casteltrione, I. (2016). Facebook and political participation: Virtuous circle and participation intermediaries. *Interactions: Studies in Communication & Culture, 7*(2), 177–196. https://doi.org/10.1386/iscc.7.2.177_1

Chamarro Lusar, A., Bertran Martí, E., Oberst, Ú., & Torres Rodríguez, A. (2016). Gestión de la Privacidad de los Perfiles de Facebook de Adolescentes [Privacy management in Facebook profiles of adolescents]. *Pixel-Bit, Revista de Medios y Educacion, 48*, 197–208. https://doi.org/10.12795/pixelbit.2016.i48.13

Chambers, D. (2017). Networked intimacy: Algorithmic friendship and scalable sociality. *European Journal of Communication, 32*(1), 26–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323116682792

Chan, M. (2016). Social network sites and political engagement: Exploring the impact of Facebook connections and uses on political protest and participation. *Mass Communication & Society, 19*(4), 430–451. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2016.1161803

Chen, K.-H., Shen, K.-S., & Ma, M.-Y. (2012). The functional and usable appeal of Facebook SNS games. *Internet Research, 22*(4), 467–481. https://doi.org/10.1108/10662241211250999

Chen, L., & Hanasono, L. K. (2016). The effect of acculturation on Chinese international students' usage of Facebook and Renren. *China Media Research, 12*(1), 46–59.

Chibuwe, A., & Ureke, O. (2016). 'Political gladiators' on Facebook in Zimbabwe: A discursive analysis of intra-Zimbabwe African National Union - PF cyber wars; Baba Jukwa versus Amai Jukwa. *Media, Culture & Society, 38*(8), 1247–1260. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716671492

Child, J. T., Duck, A. R., Andrews, L. A., Butauski, M., & Petronio, S. (2015). Young adults' management of privacy on Facebook with multiple generations of family members. *Journal of Family Communication, 15*(4), 349–367. https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2015.1076425

Child, J. T., & Westermann, D. A. (2013). Let's be Facebook friends: Exploring parental Facebook friend requests from a communication privacy management (CPM) perspective. *Journal of Family Communication, 13*(1), 46–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2012.742089

Chiu, C.-M., Cheng, H.-L., Huang, H.-Y., & Chen, C.-F. (2013). Exploring individuals' subjective well-being and loyalty towards social network sites from the perspective of network externalities: The Facebook case. *International Journal of Information Management, 33*(3), 539–552. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2013.01.007

Cho, M., Furey, L. D., & Mohr, T. (2017). Communicating corporate social responsibility on social media: Strategies, stakeholders, and public engagement on corporate Facebook. *Business & Professional Communication Quarterly, 80*(1), 52–69. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329490616663708

Cho, M., Schweickart, T., & Haase, A. (2014). Public engagement with nonprofit organizations on Facebook. *Public Relations Review, 40*(3), 565–567. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.01.008

Ciacu, N., Tasente, T., & Sandu, M. (2013). Facebook pages and the effects of reputation management. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Communicatio, 7*(1), 33–44.

Cirucci, A. M. (2012). Tales from Facebook. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56*(4), 697–698. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.732149

Cmeciu, C., & Coman, C. (2016). Activismo cívico digital en Rumanía: La comunidad de Facebook en las protestas on-line contra Chevron [Digital civic activism in Romania: Framing anti-Chevron online protest community of Facebook]. *Comunicar, 24*(47), 19–28. https:// doi.org/10.3916/C47-2016-02

Coffelt, T. A., Strayhorn, J., & Tillson, L. D. (2014). Perceptions of teachers' disclosures on Facebook and their impact on credibility. *Kentucky Journal of Communication, 33*(2), 25–43.

Conforti, E. (2016). Osservazioni Sulla Varietà Linguistica Scritta Dei Kosovari Su Facebook. *Lingue e Linguaggi, 19*, 135–152. https://doi.org/10.1285/i22390359v19p135

Coretti, L., & Pica, D. (2015). The rise and fall of collective identity in networked movements: Communication protocols, Facebook, and the anti-Berlusconi protest. *Information, Communication & Society, 18*(8), 951–967. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1043317

Craig, E., & Wright, K. B. (2012). Computer-mediated relational development and maintenance on Facebook®. *Communication Research Reports, 29*(2), 119–129. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2012.667777

Crijns, H., Hudders, L., Cauberghe, V., & Claeys, A.-S. (2015). Facebook als corporate–communicatietool voor bedrijven? [Facebook as a corporate communication tool for companies? A content analysis of the communication strategies of reputable Belgian companies on the social network site]. *Tijdschrift voor Communicatiewetenschap, 43*(1), 39–63.

Criswell, J., & Canty, N. (2014). Deconstructing social media: An analysis of Twitter and Facebook use in the publishing industry. *Publishing Research Quarterly, 30*(4), 352–376. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-014-9376-1

Croucher, S. M., & Rahmani, D. (2015). A longitudinal test of the effects of Facebook on cultural adaptation. *Journal of International & Intercultural Communication, 8*(4), 330–345. https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2015.1087093

Cuesta, M., Eklund, M., Rydin, I., & Witt, A.-K. (2016). Using Facebook as a co–learning community in higher education. *Learning, Media & Technology, 41*(1), 55–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2015.1064952

Cunha, F. R. da, van Kruistum, C., & van Oers, B. (2016). Teachers and Facebook: Using online groups to improve students' communication and engagement in education. *Communication Teacher, 30*(4), 228–241. https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2016.1219039

Cunliffe, D., Morris, D., & Prys, C. (2013). Young bilinguals' language behaviour in social networking sites: The use of Welsh on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 18*(3), 339–361. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12010

Currie, C., & Lee, J. M. (2015). Facebook as course management system: A different perspective. *Florida Communication Journal, 43*(1), 57–72.

Dahiya, D. S. (2016). Real vs ideal self: A study of identity creation and desired images on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Journalism & Media Studies, 5*(1), 85–102. https://doi.org/10.1386/ajms.5.1.85_1

Dainton, M., & Stokes, A. (2015). College students' romantic relationships on Facebook: Linking the gratification for maintenance to Facebook maintenance activity and the experience of jealousy. *Communication Quarterly, 63*(4), 365–383. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2015.1058283

Dasilva, J. Á. P., Arratibel, A. G., Aierdi, K. M., Galdospín, T. M., Castillo, I. M., Mardaras, L. I., … Santamarina, D. R. (2013). Companies on Facebook and Twitter. Current situation and communication strategies. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social, 68*, 676–695. https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2013-996en

Davisson, A. (2017). Autoplaying murder. *Journal of Media Ethics, 32*(2), 132–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/23736992.2017.1294886

de Omena, J. J. C., & Martins Rosa, J. (2015). Estudos no Facebook em Portugal: Revisão sistemática dos métodos de investigação. *Estudos Em Comunicação, 19*, 15–33.

De Vries, M., Simry, A., & Maoz, I. (2015). Like a bridge over troubled water: Using Facebook to mobilize solidarity among East Jerusalem Palestinians during the 2014 war in Gaza. *International Journal of Communication, 9*, 2622–2649.

Dencik, L., & Leistert, O. (Eds). (2015). *Critical perspectives on social media and protest: Between control and emancipation.* London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dhir, A., & Tsai, C.-C. (2017). Understanding the relationship between intensity and gratifications of Facebook use among adolescents and young adults. *Telematics &*

Informatics, 34(4), 350–364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2016.08.017

Díaz-Campo, J., & Segado-Boj, F. (2013). La radio en Facebook: Análisis de los perfiles de las principales emisoras y programas radiofónicos en España [Radio and Facebook: An analysis of the main Spanish networks and programmes profiles]. *Icono 14, 11*(2), 209–228. https://doi.org/10.7195/ri14.v11i2.517

DiStaso, M. W., Vafeiadis, M., & Amaral, C. (2015). Managing a health crisis on Facebook: How the response strategies of apology, sympathy, and information influence public relations. *Public Relations Review, 41*(2), 222–231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.11.014

Dressler, R., & Dressler, A. (2016). Linguistic identity positioning in Facebook posts during second language study abroad: One teen's language use, experience, and awareness. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*(2), 22–43.

du Preez, A., & Lombard, E. (2014). The role of memes in the construction of Facebook personae. *Communicatio: South African Journal for Communication Theory & Research, 40*(3), 253–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/02500167.2014.938671

Duff, A. S. (2016). Rating the revolution: Silicon Valley in normative perspective. *Information, Communication & Society, 19*(11), 1605–1621. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1142594

Duffett, R. G. (2015). Facebook advertising's influence on intention-to-purchase and purchase amongst Millennials. *Internet Research, 25*(4), 498–526. https://doi.org/10.1108/IntR-01-2014-0020

Duguay, S. (2016). "He has a way gayer Facebook than I do": Investigating sexual identity disclosure and context collapse on a social networking site. *New Media & Society, 18*(6), 891–907. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814549930

Dunbar, R. I. M., Arnaboldi, V., Conti, M., & Passarella, A. (2015). The structure of online social networks mirrors those in the offline world. *Social Networks, 43*, 39–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2015.04.005

Eichenberg, C., Schott, M., & Aden, J. (2016). Psychosoziale Beratung im Zeitalter des Web2.0: Angebot und Nachfrage von Beratungseinrichtungen auf Facebook. *E–Beratungsjournal, 12*(1), 34–46.

Einwiller, S. A., & Steilen, S. (2015). Handling complaints on social network sites—An analysis of complaints and complaint responses on Facebook and Twitter pages of large US companies. *Public Relations Review, 41*(2), 195–204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.11.012

Elananza, A. A. H., & Mahmoud, A. E.-B. A. H. (2016). Uses and effects of companies' Facebook pages among Jordanian users. *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research, 9*(2), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1386/jammr.9.2.207_1

Ellison, N. B., Gray, R., Lampe, C., & Fiore, A. T. (2014). Social capital and resource requests on Facebook. *New Media & Society, 16*(7), 1104–1121. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543998

Ellison, N. B., Vitak, J., Gray, R., & Lampe, C. (2014). Cultivating social resources on social network sites: Facebook relationship maintenance behaviors and their role in social capital processes. *Journal of Computer- Mediated Communication, 19*(4), 855–870. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12078

Erjavec, K. (2013). Informal learning through Facebook among Slovenian pupils [Aprendizaje Informal a Través de Facebook Entre Alumnos Eslovenos]. *Comunicar, 21*(41), 117–126. https://doi.org/10.3916/C41-2013-11

Eslami, Z. R., Jabbari, N., & Li-Jen Kuo. (2015). Compliment response behaviour on Facebook: A study with Iranian Facebook users. *International Review of Pragmatics, 7*(2), 244–277. https://doi.org/10.1163/18773109-00702005

Facebook. (2018a). About us. Retrieved February 10, 2018 from https://www.facebook.com/pg/facebook/about/

Facebook. (2018b). Our history. Retrieved February 7, 2018 from https://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/

Farahbakhsh, R., Cuevas, A., Ortiz, A. M., Han, X., & Crespi, N. (2015). How far is Facebook from me? Facebook network infrastructure analysis. *IEEE Communications Magazine, 53*(9), 134–142. https://doi.org/10.1109/MCOM.2015.7263357

Farci, M., Rossi, L., Boccia Artieri, G., & Giglietto, F. (2017). Networked intimacy. Intimacy and friendship among Italian Facebook users. *Information, Communication & Society, 20*(5), 784–801. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1203970

Farquhar, L. (2013). Performing and interpreting identity through Facebook imagery. *Convergence: The Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 19*(4), 446–471. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856512459838

Fife, E. M., Nelson, C. L., & Bayles, K. (2009). When you stalk me, please don't tell me about it: Facebook and expectancy violation theory. *Kentucky Journal of Communication, 28*(1), 41–54.

Fife, E., Nelson, C. L., & Zhang, K. (2012). A new horizon for a classic perspective: Facebook and expectancy violation theory. *Journal of the Communication, Speech & Theatre Association of North Dakota, 25*, 13–23.

Fleuriet, C., Cole, M., & Guerrero, L. (2014). Exploring Facebook: Attachment style and nonverbal message characteristics as predictors of anticipated emotional reactions to Facebook postings. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 38*(4), 429–450. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-014-0189-x

Foster, J. E., & Thorson, A. R. (2016). "I'm too stressed to 'like' your post!": Exploring the connections among Facebook relational maintenance, stress, and closeness. *Iowa Journal of Communication, 48*(1/2), 76–95.

Fourie, C. (2015). Lowering the threshold for online learning with Facebook. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 154–173. https://doi.org/10.1075/dujal.4.2.02fou

Fraustino, J. D., & Connolly-Ahern, C. (2015). Corporate associations written on the wall: Publics' responses to Fortune 500 ability and social responsibility Facebook posts. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 27*(5), 452–474. https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2015.1098543

Frisby, B. N., Kaufmann, R., & Beck, A.-C. (2016). Mediated group development and dynamics: an examination of video chatting, Twitter, and Facebook in group assignments. *Communication Teacher, 30*(4), 215–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2016.1219038

Fuchs, C. (2012). The political economy of privacy on Facebook. *Television & New Media, 13*(2), 139–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476411415699

Fulton, J. M., & Kibby, M. D. (2017). Millennials and the normalization of surveillance on Facebook. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 31*(2), 189–199. https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2016.1265094

Gadekar, R., & Pant, S. (2015). Exploring Facebook users' privacy knowledge, enactment and attitude: A study on Indian youth. *International Journal of Communication Research, 5*(4), 273–283.

Geoghegan, T., & Monseau, M. (2011). Moving from 2.No: Building strategic consensus to create communities for attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder awareness on Facebook®. *Journal of Communication in Healthcare, 4*(1), 4–12. https://doi.org/10.1179/175380611X12950033990052

Gerbaudo, P. (2017). Social media teams as digital vanguards: The question of leadership in the management of key Facebook and Twitter accounts of Occupy Wall Street, Indignados, and UK Uncut. *Information, Communication & Society, 20*(2), 185–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1161817

Gherheş, V., & Obrad, C. (2016). The role and importance of Facebook among students in Timişoara. *PCTS Proceedings (Professional Communication & Translation Studies), 9*, 21–26.

Gilchrist, B. (2013). Surfing Foucault's panopticopolis: Facebooking our way to a panoptic world. *Explorations in Media Ecology, 11*(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1386/eme.11.1.45_1

Ging, D., & O'Higgins Norman, J. (2016). Cyberbullying, conflict management or just messing? Teenage girls' understandings and experiences of gender, friendship, and conflict on Facebook in an Irish second-level school. *Feminist Media Studies, 16*(5), 805–821. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2015.1137959

Glassman, M. E., Straus, J. R., & Shogan, C. J. (2015). Social networking and constituent communications: Members' use of Twitter and Facebook during a two-month period in the 112th Congress. *Journal of Current Issues in Media & Telecommunications, 7*(4), 435–447.

Good, K. D. (2013). From scrapbook to Facebook: A history of personal media assemblage and archives. *New Media & Society, 15*(4), 557–573. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812458432

Goulart Massuchin, M., & Quesada Tavares, C. (2016). Cobertura da greve paranaense no Facebook: engajamento dos leitores na página da Gazeta do Povo [Strike media coverage on Facebook: Reader's engagement on the Gazeta Do Povo's fanpage]. *Revista FAMECOS - Mídia, Cultura e Tecnologia, 23*(2), 250–272. https://doi.org/10.15448/1980-3729.2016.2.22334

Grigoraşi, C. (2015). Investigating identity formation in the virtual public sphere: The case of Piaţa Universităţii Facebook page. *Journal of Media Research, 8*(1), 54–80.

Grigore (Isbăşoiu), A.-P. (2015). Consumption exposure on Facebook: What do we share in the online environment? *Journal of Media Research, 8*(2), 68–83.

Ha, J., & Dong Hee Shin. (2014). Facebook in a standard college class: An alternative conduit for promoting teacher-student interaction. *American Communication Journal, 16*(1), 36–52.

Haenschen, K. (2016). Social pressure on social media: Using Facebook status updates to increase voter turnout. *Journal of Communication, 66*(4), 542–563. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12236

Hall, J. A., Pennington, N., & Lueders, A. (2014). Impression management and formation on Facebook: A lens model approach. *New Media & Society, 16*(6), 958–982. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813495166

Hamas Elmasry, M., Auter, P. J., & Peuchaud, S. R. (2014). Facebook across cultures: A cross-cultural content analysis of Egyptian, Qatari, and American student Facebook pages. *Journal of Middle East Media, 10*, 27–60.

Hanson, G., Haridakis, P. M., Cunningham, A. W., Sharma, R., & Ponder, J. D. (2010). The 2008 presidential campaign: Political cynicism in the age of Facebook, MySpace, and YouTube. *Mass Communication & Society, 13*(5), 584–607. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2010.513470

Harlow, S. (2013). It was a "Facebook revolution": Exploring the meme-like spread of narratives during the Egyptian protests [Fue Una "Revolución de Facebook": Explorando La Narrativa de Los Meme

Difundidos Durante Las Protestas Egipcias]. *Revista de Comunicación, 12*, 59–82.

Harlow, S., & Guo, L. (2014). Will the revolution be tweeted or Facebooked? Using digital communication tools in immigrant activism. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*(3), 463–478. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12062

Hassan, M., Mydock, S., Pervan, S. J., & Kortt, M. (2016). Facebook, self-disclosure, and brand-mediated intimacy: Identifying value creating behaviors. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 15*(6), 493–502. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1586

Hendus, U. (2015). "See translation": Explicit and implicit language policies on Facebook. *Language Policy, 14*(4), 397–417. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9349-4

Hess, K., & Bowd, K. (2015). Friend or foe? Regional newspapers and the power of Facebook. *Media International Australia, 156*, 19–28.

Heyman, R., & Pierson, J. (2013). Blending mass self-communication with advertising in Facebook and LinkedIn: Challenges for social media and user empowerment. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics, 9*(3), 229–245. https://doi.org/10.1386/macp.9.3.229_1

Hille, S., & Bakker, P. (2013). I like news. Searching for the 'Holy Grail' of social media: The use of Facebook by Dutch news media and their audiences. *European Journal of Communication, 28*(6), 663–680. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323113497435

Ho, C.-W. (2015). Identify with community or company? An investigation on the consumer behavior in Facebook brand community. *Telematics & Informatics, 32*(4), 930–939. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.05.002

Hoffman, T. K., & DeGroot, J. M. (2014). Communicative responses to perceived Facebook jealousy. *Journal of the Communication, Speech & Theatre Association of North Dakota, 27*, 15–22.

Hofstra, B., Corten, R., & van Tubergen, F. (2016). Who was first on Facebook? Determinants of early adoption among adolescents. *New Media & Society, 18*(10), 2340–2358. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815584592

Hull, G. (2015). Successful failure: what Foucault can teach us about privacy self-management in a world of Facebook and big data. *Ethics & Information Technology, 17*(2), 89–101. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-015-9363- z

Hunt, D. (2015). The many faces of diabetes: A critical multimodal analysis of diabetes pages on Facebook. *Language & Communication, 43*, 72–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2015.05.003

Hunt, D., Atkin, D., & Krishnan, A. (2012). The influence of computer-mediated communication apprehension on motives for Facebook use. *Journal of Broadcasting &*

Electronic Media, 56(2), 187–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.678717

Hunt, D., & Koteyko, N. (2015). "What was your blood sugar reading this morning?" Representing diabetes self-management on Facebook. *Discourse & Society, 26*(4), 445–463. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926515576631

Hurcombe, E. (2016). The making of a captain: The production and projection of a political image on the Tony Abbott Facebook page. *Communication, Politics & Culture, 49*(1), 19–38.

Hyde-Clarke, N. (2013). Facebook and public debate: An informal learning tool for the youth. *Journal of African Media Studies, 5*(2), 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1386/jams.5.2.131_1

Ionescu, N. (2013). Online political communication: The role of image upload on Facebook. *Romanian Journal of Journalism & Communication / Revista Romana de Jurnalism Si Comunicare– RRJC, 8*(1), 53–58.

Ivana, G.–I. (2013). A postmodern panopticon: Lateral surveillance on Facebook. *Global Media Journal: Mediterranean Edition, 8*(1), 1–14.

Jacobson, S. (2013). Does audience participation on Facebook influence the news agenda? A case study of *The Rachel Maddow Show*. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 57*(3), 338–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2013.816706

Jacobson, S., Myung, E., & Johnson, S. L. (2016). Open media or echo chamber: the use of links in audience discussions on the Facebook pages of partisan news organizations. *Information, Communication & Society, 19*(7), 875–891. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1064461

Ji, Y. G., Li, C., North, M., & Liu, J. (2017). Staking reputation on stakeholders: How does stakeholders' Facebook engagement help or ruin a company's reputation? *Public Relations Review, 43*(1), 201–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.12.004

Jiang, Y., & de Bruijn, O. (2014). Facebook helps: A case study of cross-cultural social networking and social capital. *Information, Communication & Society, 17*(6), 732–749. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2013.830636

Jin, C.-H. (2015). The role of Facebook users' self-systems in generating social relationships and social capital effects. *New Media & Society, 17*(4), 501–519. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813506977

John, N. A., & Dvir-Gvirsman, S. (2015). "I don't like you any more": Facebook unfriending by Israelis during the Israel-Gaza conflict of 2014. *Journal of Communication, 65*(6), 953–974. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12188

Johnson, B. G. (2016). Facebook's free speech balancing act. *Journal of Media Law & Ethics, 5*(3/4), 19–37.

Jones, H. A. (2017). From the murder to the medium: Displaced ethical engagement on Twitter. *Journal of*

Media Ethics, 32(2), 135–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/23736992.2017.1294889

Jung, J., Shim, S. W., Jin, H. S., & Khang, H. (2016). Factors affecting attitudes and behavioural intention towards social networking advertising: A case of Facebook users in South Korea. *International Journal of Advertising, 35*(2), 248–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2015.1014777

Jung, Y., Pawlowski, S. D., & Kim, H.-W. (2017). Exploring associations between young adults' Facebook use and psychological well-being: A goal hierarchy approach. *International Journal of Information Management, 37*(1a), 1391–1404. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.10.005

Kaigo, M., & Okura, S. (2016). Exploring fluctuations in citizen engagement on a local government Facebook page in Japan. *Telematics & Informatics, 33*(2), 584–595. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.07.011

Kang, J. (2012). A volatile public: The 2009 Whole Foods boycott on Facebook. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56*(4), 562–577. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.732142

Kanter, M., Afifi, T., & Robbins, S. (2012). The impact of parents "friending" their young adult child on Facebook on perceptions of parental privacy invasions and parent-child relationship quality. *Journal of Communication, 62*(5), 900–917. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460–2466.2012.01669.x

Kapidzic, S., & Martins, N. (2015). Mirroring the media: The relationship between media consumption, media internalization, and profile picture characteristics on Facebook. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 59*(2), 278–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2015.1029127

Karakayali, N., & Kilic, A. (2013). More network conscious than ever? Challenges, strategies, and analytic labor of users in the Facebook environment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 18*(2), 61–79.

Karppi, T. (2013). 'Change name to No One. Like people's status': Trolling and managing online personas. *The Fibreculture Journal, 22.* Retrieved March 7, 2018 from http://twentytwo.fibreculturejournal.org/ fcj-166-change-name-to-no-one-like-peoples-status-facebook-trolling-and-m anaging-online-personas/

Katz-Kimchi, M., & Manosevitch, I. (2015). Mobilizing Facebook users against Facebook's energy policy: The case of Greenpeace Unfriend Coal campaign. *Environmental Communication, 9*(2), 248–267. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2014.993413

Kearney, M. W. (2017). Interpersonal goals and political uses of Facebook. *Communication Research Reports, 34*(2), 106–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2016.1250069

Kee, K. F., Sparks, L., Struppa, D. C., Mannucci, M. A., & Damiano, A. (2016). Information diffusion, Facebook clusters, and the simplicial model of social aggregation: A computational simulation of simplicial diffusers for community health interventions. *Health Communication, 31*(4), 385–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2014.960061

Kent, M., & Leaver, T. (Eds.). (2014). *An education in Facebook.* New York: Routledge.

Khamis, L. E. (2016). Social media and Palestinian youth culture: The impact of new information and media technologies on cultural and political development in Palestine. *Journal of Development Communication, 27*(2), 30–46.

Khamis, S., & Mahmoud, A. E.-B. A. H. (2013). Facebooking the Egyptian elections: Framing the 2012 presidential race. *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research, 6*(2/3), 133–155. https://doi.org/10.1386/jammr.6.2-3.133_1

Khawaja, Z., Ali, K. I., & Khan, S. (2017). Using Facebook for sexual health social marketing in conservative Asian countries: A systematic examination. *Journal of Health Communication, 22*(2), 111–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2016.1222031

Kianpour, M., Adlipour, S., & Ahmadi, H. M. (2014). Interaction in Facebook and its impact on modern identity of the youth in Isfahan. *Global Media Journal: Persian Edition, 9*(2), 33–34.

Kim, J. Y., Park, J. M., & Im, J. S. (2015). Relationship maintenance strategies on the Facebook pages of current US Senators. *Journal of Communication Management, 19*(3), 224–238. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-11-2012-0089

Kim, S., Kim, S.-Y., & Sung, K. H. (2014). Fortune 100 companies' Facebook strategies: Corporate ability versus social responsibility. *Journal of Communication Management, 18*(4), 343–362. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-01- 2012-0006

Kim, T.-S. (2015). Defining the Occupy movement: Visual analysis of Facebook profile images posted by local Occupy movement groups. *Visual Communication Quarterly, 22*(3), 174–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/15551393.2015.1069192

Kopecký, K. (2016). Czech children and Facebook – A quantitative survey. *Telematics & Informatics, 33*(4), 950–958. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2016.02.008

Krishna, A., & Kim, S. (2015). Confessions of an angry employee: The dark side of de-identified "confessions" on Facebook. *Public Relations Review, 41*(3), 404–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.03.001

Külcü, Ö., & Henkoğlu, T. (2014). Privacy in social networks: An analysis of Facebook. *International Journal of Information Management, 34*(6), 761–769. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.07.006

Kumar, N. (2014). Facebook for self-empowerment? A study of Facebook adoption in urban India. *New Media &*

Society, 16(7), 1122–1137. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543999

Lai, C.-Y., & Yang, H.-L. (2016). Determinants and consequences of Facebook feature use. *New Media & Society, 18*(7), 1310–1330. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814555959

Larsson, A. O. (2015). Pandering, protesting, engaging. Norwegian party leaders on Facebook during the 2013 'Short campaign.' *Information, Communication & Society, 18*(4), 459–473. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.967269

Larsson, A. O. (2016). Online, all the time? A quantitative assessment of the permanent campaign on Facebook. *New Media & Society, 18*(2), 274–292. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814538798

Larsson, A. O. (2017). In it for the long run? *Journalism Practice, 11*(4), 438–457. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2015.1121787

Ledbetter, A. M., Mazer, J. P., DeGroot, J. M., Meyer, K. R., Yuping Mao, & Swafford, B. (2011). Attitudes toward online social connection and self-disclosure as predictors of Facebook communication and relational closeness. *Communication Research, 38*(1), 27–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650210365537

Lee, B., & Campbell, V. (2016). Looking out or turning in? Organizational ramifications of online political posters on Facebook. *International Journal of Press/Politics, 21*(3), 313–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161216645928

Lee, J. W. Y, Kim, B., Lee, T. L., & Kim, M. S. (2012). Uncovering the use of Facebook during an exchange program. *China Media Research, 8*(4), 62–76.

Lee, N. (2013). *Facebook nation: Total information awareness*. Dordrecht: Springer.

LeFebvre, L., Blackburn, K., & Brody, N. (2015). Navigating romantic relationships on Facebook: Extending the relationship dissolution model to social networking environments. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships, 32*(1), 78–98. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407514524848

Leurs, K. (2014). Digital throwntogetherness: Young Londoners negotiating urban politics of difference and encounter on Facebook. *Popular Communication, 12*(4), 251–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2014.960569

Levinson, P. (2010). What's newer than new new media. *Global Media Journal: Persian Edition*, 1–9.

Lev–On, A. (2017). The third-person effect on Facebook: The significance of perceived proficiency. *Telematics & Informatics, 34*(4), 252–260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2016.07.002

Lev–On, A., & Steinfeld, N. (2015). Local engagement online: Municipal Facebook pages as hubs of interaction. *Government Information Quarterly, 32*(3), 299–307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.05.007

Lillqvist, E., & Louhiala-Salminen, L. (2014). Facing Facebook: Impression management strategies in company–consumer interactions. *Journal of Business & Technical Communication, 28*(1), 3–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651913502359

Lim, J. (2014). A model of functional rules for social media in the networked news sphere. *Asian Journal of Communication, 24*(3), 279–294. https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2013.877041

Lim, S. S., Vadrevu, S., Chan, Y. H., & Basnyat, I. (2012). Facework on Facebook: the online publicness of juvenile delinquents and youths-at-risk. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56*(3), 346–361. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.705198

Lin, J.–H. (2016). Differential gains in SNSs: effects of active vs. passive Facebook political participation on offline political participation and voting behavior among first-time and experienced voters. *Asian Journal of Communication, 26*(3), 278–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2016.1148184

Lin, Y. (2013). Privacy and publicity according to Facebook. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 28*(3), 219–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/08900523.2013.805574

Lin, Y., & Sackey, E. (2015). Use of Facebook: A comparative study of U.S. American and Ghanaian college students. *Communication Research Reports, 32*(3), 281–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2015.1052899

Lincoln, S., & Robards, B. (2014). 10 years of Facebook. *New Media & Society, 16*(7), 1047–1050. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543994

Linne, J. (2014). Common uses of Facebook among adolescents from different social sectors in Buenos Aires City [Usos Comunes de Facebook En Adolescentes de Distintos Sectores Sociales en la Ciudad de Buenos Aires]. *Comunicar, 22*(43), 189–197. https://doi.org/10.3916/C43–2014–19

Linné, T. (2016). Cows on Facebook and Instagram. *Television & New Media, 17*(8), 719–733. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476416653811

Liu, J., Li, C., Carcioppolo, N., & North, M. (2016). Do our Facebook friends make us feel worse? A study of social comparison and emotion. *Human Communication Research, 42*(4), 619–640. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12090

Livingstone, S. (2008). Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: Teenagers' use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and self-expression. *New Media & Society, 10*(3), 393–411.

Lo, K. D., & Waters, R. D. (2012). New technologies, new cultural traditions: The impact of Facebook on Chinese nongovernmental organizations. *China Media Research, 8*(4), 99–110.

Lorenzana, J. A. (2016). Mediated recognition: The role of Facebook in identity and social formations of Filipino transnationals in Indian cities. *New Media & Society,*

18(10), 2189–2206. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816655613

Loureiro, S. M. C., & Gomes, D. G. (2016). Relationship between companies and the public on Facebook: The Portuguese and the Brazilian context. *Journal of Promotion Management, 22*(5), 705–718. https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2016.1185493

Lovari, A., & Parisi, L. (2015). Listening to digital publics. Investigating citizens' voices and engagement within Italian municipalities' Facebook pages. *Public Relations Review, 41*(2), 205–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.11.013

Lukacs, V., & Quan-Haase, A. (2015). Romantic breakups on Facebook: New scales for studying post-breakup behaviors, digital distress, and surveillance. *Information, Communication & Society, 18*(5), 492–508. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1008540

Maben, S., Edwards, J., & Malone, D. (2012). Online engagement through Facebook groups. *Southwestern Mass Communication Journal, 27*(3), 1–27.

MacAulay, M., & Moldes, M. D. (2016). Queen don't compute: Reading and casting shade on Facebook's real names policy. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 33*(1), 6–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2015.1129430

Maíz-Arévalo, C. (2015). Jocular mockery in computer-mediated communication: A contrastive study of a Spanish and English Facebook community. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture, 11*(2), 289–327. https://doi.org/10.1515/pr–2015–0012

Malik, A., Dhir, A., & Nieminen, M. (2016). Uses and gratifications of digital photo sharing on Facebook. *Telematics & Informatics, 33*(1), 129–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.06.009

Mambadja, S. M. T., Conradie, D. P., & Van der Waldt, D. (2015). Online stakeholder relationship strategies on Facebook used by South African universities. *Communicare, 34*(2), 58–74.

Mao, Y., & Qian, Y. (2015). Facebook use and acculturation: The case of overseas Chinese professionals in Western countries. *International Journal of Communication, 9*, 2467–2486.

Marchi, R. (2012). With Facebook, blogs, and fake news, teens reject journalistic "objectivity." *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 36*(3), 246–262. https://doi.org/10.1177/0196859912458700

Marichal, J. (2012). *Facebook democracy: The architecture of disclosure and the threat to public life*. Farnham, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate: Farnham.

Markham, T. (2016). Review essay: Social media, politics and protest. *Media, Culture & Society, 38*(6), 946–957. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716665101

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d. (2014). Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social media. *New Media & Society, 16*(7), 1051–1067. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543995

Marwick, A., & Ellison, N. B. (2012). "There isn't wifi in heaven!" Negotiating visibility on Facebook memorial pages. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56*(3), 378–400. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.705197

Matamoros–Fernández, A. (2017). Platformed racism: The mediation and circulation of an Australian race-based controversy on Twitter, Facebook and YouTube. *Information, Communication & Society, 20*(6), 930–946. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1293130

McEachern, R. W. (2011). Experiencing a social network in an organizational context: The Facebook internship. *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(4), 486–493. https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569911423963

McEwan, B., Fletcher, J., Eden, J., & (Bryant) Sumner, E. (2014). Development and validation of a Facebook relational maintenance measure. *Communication Methods & Measures, 8*(4), 244–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2014.967844

McGirt, E. (2007). Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg: Hacker. dropout. CED. *FastCompany*. Retrieved Feburary 2, 2018 from https://www.fastcompany.com/59441/facebooks-mark-zuckerberg-hacker-dropout-ceo

McKinney, B. C., Kelly, L., & Duran, R. L. (2012). Narcissism or openness?: College students' use of Facebook and Twitter. *Communication Research Reports, 29*(2), 108–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2012.666919

Mihailidis, P., Fincham, K., & Cohen, J. N. (2014). Toward a media literate model for civic engagement in digital culture: Exploring the civic habits and dispositions of college students on Facebook. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 22*(5), 293–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870.2014.961400

Miller, D. (2011). *Tales from Facebook*. Maiden, MA: Polity Press.

Miller, J. H., Danielson, C., Parcell, E. S., Nicolini, K., & Boucher, T. (2016a). Blurred lines: Privacy management, family relationships, and Facebook. *Iowa Journal of Communication, 48*(1/2), 4–22.

Miller, J. H., Danielson, C., Parcell, E. S., Nicolini, K., & Boucher, T. (2016b). Blurred lines: Privacy management, family relationships, and Facebook. *Iowa Journal of Communication, 48*(1/2), 4–22.

Milošević, I., Živković, D., Arsić, S., & Manasijević, D. (2015). Facebook as virtual classroom—Social networking in learning and teaching among Serbian students. *Telematics & Informatics, 32*(4), 576–585. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.02.003

Mkandawire, H. (2016). The use of Facebook and mobile phones to report presidential election results in Zambia. *African Journalism Studies, 37*(4), 81–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/23743670.2016.1256050

Mochon, D., Johnson, K., Schwartz, J., & Ariely, D. (2017). What are likes worth? A Facebook page field experiment. *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR), 54*(2), 306–317.

Moe, H. (2013). Public service broadcasting and social networking sites: The Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation on Facebook. *Media International Australia, 146*, 114–122.

Montgomery, K. C. (2015). Youth and surveillance in the Facebook era: Policy interventions and social implications. *Telecommunications Policy, 39*(9), 771–786. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2014.12.006

Mor, Y., Ron, Y., & Maoz, I. (2016). "Likes" for peace: Can Facebook promote dialogue in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict? *Media & Communication, 4*(1), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v4i1.298

Morin, D. T., & Flynn, M. A. (2014). We are the Tea Party!: The use of Facebook as an online political forum for the construction and maintenance of in-group identification during the "GOTV" weekend. *Communication Quarterly, 62*(1), 115–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2013.861500

Morris, J. D., Choi, Y., & Ju, I. (2016). Are social marketing and advertising communications (SMACs) meaningful?: A survey of Facebook user emotional responses, source credibility, personal relevance, and perceived intrusiveness. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising, 37*(2), 165–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/10641734.2016.1171182

Nam Mak, B. C., & Hin Leung Chui. (2014). Impoliteness in Facebook status updates: Strategic talk among colleagues "outside" the workplace. *Text & Talk, 34*(2), 165–188. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2013-0042

Nartey, M. (2013). A speech act analysis of status updates on Facebook: The case of Ghanaian university students. *Language in India, 13*(12), 114–141.

Ndlovu, M., & Mbenga, C. (2013). Facebook, the public sphere and political youth leagues in South Africa. *Journal of African Media Studies, 5*(2), 169–186. https://doi.org/10.1386/jams.5.2.169_1

Netchitailova, E. (2012). Facebook as a surveillance tool: From the perspective of the user. *TripleC (Cognition, Communication, Co-Operation): Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society, 10*(2), 683–691.

Nitschke, P., Donges, P., & Schade, H. (2016). Political organizations' use of websites and Facebook. *New Media & Society, 18*(5), 744–764. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814546451

Oberst, U., Chamarro, A., & Renau, V. (2016). Gender stereotypes 2.0: Self-representations of adolescents on Facebook [Estereotipos de Género 2.0: Auto-Representaciones de Adolescentes en Facebook]. *Comunicar, 24*(48), 81–89. https://doi.org/10.3916/C48-2016-08

Öngün, E. (2015). Thoughts on interpellation and intertextuality among Facebook cover photos of four major political parties as visual narratives during the Turkish general election of 2015 campaign [Türkiye 2015 genel seçimleri sürecinde dört temel siyasi partinin görsel anlati olarak Facebook kapak fotoğraflari arasindaki metinlerarasilik ve çağri üzerine düşünceler]. *Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art & Communication, 5*(2), 9–17. https://doi.org/10.7456/10502100/002

Öngün, E., & Demiirağ, A. (2014). An evaluation of Facebook users' blocking tendencies regarding their privacy and secrecy settings [Facebook Kullanicilarinin Güvenlik ve Gizlilik Ayarlari Kapsaminda Engelleme Eğilimlerinin Ölçümü]. *Global Media Journal: Turkish Edition, 5*(9), 264–279.

Orchard, L. J., Fullwood, C., Morris, N., & Galbraith, N. (2015). Investigating the Facebook experience through Q methodology: Collective investment and a 'Borg' mentality. *New Media & Society, 17*(9), 1547–1565. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814530099

Palmieri, C., Prestano, K., Gandley, R., Overton, E., & Qin Zhang. (2012). The Facebook phenomenon: Online self-disclosure and uncertainty reduction. *China Media Report Overseas, 8*(3), 108–113.

Panger, G. (2016). Reassessing the Facebook experiment: Critical thinking about the validity of big data research. *Information, Communication & Society, 19*(8), 1108–1126. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1093525

Park, J. H., Lee, C., Yoo, C., & Nam, Y. (2016). An analysis of the utilization of Facebook by local Korean governments for tourism development and the network of smart tourism ecosystem. *International Journal of Information Management, 36*, 1320–1327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.05.027

Park, N., & Lee, S. (2014). College students' motivations for Facebook use and psychological outcomes. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 58*(4), 601–620. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2014.966355

Parra, P., Gordo, A. J., & D'Antonio, S. A. (2014). Social research applied to social networks. A methodological innovation for the analysis of Facebook likes. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social, 69*, 195–212. https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2014-1008en

Peeters, W. (2015). Metacognitive awareness in foreign language learning through Facebook. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 174–192. https://doi.org/10.1075/dujal.4.2.03pee

Peeters, W. (2016). Developing first-year students' self–efficacy beliefs about academic writing through online peer collaboration: The case of Facebook. *Journal for Language Teaching, 50*(2), 79–101. https://doi.org/10.4314/jlt.v50i2.4

Penney, J. (2015). Social media and symbolic action: Exploring participation in the Facebook red equal sign profile picture campaign. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 20*(1), 52–66. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12092

Penney, R. (2014). Social media as surveillance: Rethinking visibility in a converging world. *Canadian Journal of Communication, 39*(1), 162–164.

Pennington, N. (2013a). Facebook democracy: The architecture of disclosure and the threat to public life. *European Journal of Communication, 28*(2), 208–210. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323113476943d

Pennington, N. (2013b). Taking back the White House: An analysis of GOP candidate-constituent communication through Facebook in the 2012 U.S. presidential primaries. *Iowa Journal of Communication, 45*(1/2), 19–38.

Pennington, N. (2017). Tie strength and time: Mourning on social networking sites. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 61*(1), 11–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2016.1273928

Phua, J., & Ahn, S. J. (2016). Explicating the 'like' on Facebook brand pages: The effect of intensity of Facebook use, number of overall 'likes', and number of friends' 'likes' on consumers' brand outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 22*(5), 544–559. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2014.941000

Phua, J., Jin, S. V., & Kim, J. (Jay). (2017). Gratifications of using Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, or Snapchat to follow brands: The moderating effect of social comparison, trust, tie strength, and network homophily on brand identification, brand engagement, brand commitment, and membership intention. *Telematics & Informatics, 34*(1), 412–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2016.06.004

Phyak, P. (2015). (En)countering language ideologies: Language policing in the ideospace of Facebook. *Language Policy, 14*(4), 377–395. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9350-y

Pilgun, M., & Gradoselskaya, G. (2015). Political communication on Facebook: Russian case. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social, 70,* 726–749. https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2015-1068en

Pires de Sá, F., & Roig, A. (2016). Challenging prime time television. *Convergence: The Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 22*(4), 392–407. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856516641623

Portwood-Stacer, L. (2013). Media refusal and conspicuous non-consumption: The performative and political dimensions of Facebook abstention. *New Media & Society, 15*(7), 1041–1057. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812465139

Priya, P. P. (2014). From tribe to Facebook: The transformational role of social networks. *Media International Australia, 153*, 159–160.

Rachoene, M., & Oyedemi, T. (2015). From self-expression to social aggression: Cyberbullying culture among South African youth on Facebook. *Communicatio: South African Journal for Communication Theory & Research, 41*(3), 302–319. https://doi.org/10.1080/02500167.2015.1093325

Radovanović, D., Hogan, B., & Lalić, D. (2015). Overcoming digital divides in higher education: Digital literacy beyond Facebook. *New Media & Society, 17*(10), 1733–1749. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815588323

Raimondo Anselmino, N., Reviglio, M. C., & Diviani, R. (2016). Esfera pública y redes sociales en Internet: ¿Qué es lo nuevo en Facebook? [Public sphere and social networks resources on Internet: What's new in Facebook?]. *Mediterranean Journal of Communication / Revista Mediterránea de Comunicación, 7*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.14198/MEDCOM2016.7.1.12

Rains, S. A., & Brunner, S. R. (2015). What can we learn about social network sites by studying Facebook? A call and recommendations for research on social network sites. *New Media & Society, 17*(1), 114–131. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814546481

Rashid, A. T. (2015). Online befriending on Facebook and social capital: A socio-psychological study on university students of Assam. *Global Media Journal: Indian Edition, 6*(1&2), 1–25.

Rashid, R. A. (2016). Topic continuation strategies employed by teachers in managing supportive conversations on Facebook timeline. *Discourse Studies, 18*(2), 188–203. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445615623906

Reddick, C. G., Chatfield, A. T., & Ojo, A. (2017). A social media text analytics framework for double-loop learning for citizen-centric public services: A case study of a local government Facebook use. *Government Information Quarterly, 34*(1), 110–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.11.001

Reershemius, G. (2017). Autochthonous heritage languages and social media: Writing and bilingual practices in Low German on Facebook. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 38*(1), 35–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1151434

Reid, I. (2015). An education in Facebook. *Information, Communication & Society, 18*(12), 1478–1480. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.984744

Reilly, P., & Trevisan, F. (2016). Researching protest on Facebook: Developing an ethical stance for the study of Northern Irish flag protest pages. *Information, Communication & Society, 19*(3), 419–435. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1104373

Reinecke, L., Vorderer, P., & Knop, K. (2014). Entertainment 2.0? The role of intrinsic and extrinsic need satisfaction for the enjoyment of Facebook use.

Journal of Communication, 64(3), 417–438. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12099

Rivero Ortiz, G. A., Gutiérrez, Y. A., & Baquero Rodríguez, M. J. (2014). The construction of Facebook as an affective prosthesis [La construcción de Facebook como una prótesis afectiva]. *Íkala: Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 19*(2), 149–166. https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v19n2a03

Robards, B. (2012). Leaving MySpace, joining Facebook: 'Growing up' on social network sites. *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies, 25*(3), 385–398.

Robards, B. (2014). Digital traces of the persona through ten years of Facebook. *M/C Journal, 17*(3). Available at: http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/818

Robertson, A. (2014). Mining the social web: Data mining Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Google+, GitHub, and more. *Technical Communication, 61*(3), 209–209.

Ross, K., Fountaine, S., & Comrie, M. (2015). Facing up to Facebook: Politicians, publics and the social media(ted) turn in New Zealand. *Media, Culture & Society, 37*(2), 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443714557983

Rossetto, K. R., Lannutti, P. J., & Strauman, E. C. (2015). Death on Facebook. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships, 32*(7), 974–994. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407514555272

Rowe, I. (2015). Civility 2.0: a comparative analysis of incivility in online political discussion. *Information, Communication & Society, 18*(2), 121–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.940365

Rubenking, B., & Rister, A. (2016). A look at user motivations with restaurant brands on Facebook and Twitter. *Florida Communication Journal, 44*(2), 11–23.

Russomanno, J. (2016). Facebook threats: The missed opportunities of Elonis V. United States. *Communication Law & Policy, 21*(1), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/10811680.2016.1119023

Sabra, J. B. (2017). "I hate when they do that!" Netiquette in mourning and memorialization among Danish Facebook users. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 61*(1), 24–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2016.1273931

Samp, J., & Palevitz, C. (2014). Managing relational transgressions as revealed on Facebook: The influence of dependence power on verbal versus nonverbal responses. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 38*(4), 477–493. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-014-0197-x

Santos, P., & Ndlovu, K. (2015). "Democratic unfreedom" on Facebook in Zimbabwe. *African Journalism Studies, 36*(4), 145–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/23743670.2015.1119496

Sarapin, S., & Morris, P. (2014). When "like"-minded people click: Facebook interaction conventions, the mean-

ing of "speech" online, and Bland v. Roberts. *First Amendment Studies, 48*(2), 131–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/21689725.2014.962557

Saxton, G. D., & Waters, R. D. (2014). What do stakeholders like on Facebook? Examining public reactions to non-profit organizations' informational, promotional, and community-building messages. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 26*(3), 280–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2014.908721

Schweisberger, V., Billinson, J., & Chock, T. M. (2014). Facebook, the third-person effect, and the differential impact hypothesis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*(3), 403–413. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12061

Scott, G. G. (2014). More than friends: Popularity on Facebook and its role in impression formation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*(3), 358–372. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12067

Seo, M., Kim, J., & Yang, H. (2016). Frequent interaction and fast feedback predict perceived social support: using crawled and self-reported data of Facebook users. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 21*(4), 282–297. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12160

Sheldon, P. (2016). Facebook friend request: Applying the theory of reasoned action to student-teacher relationships on Facebook. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 60*(2), 269–285. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2016.1164167

Shen, B., & Bissell, K. (2013). Social media, social me: A content analysis of beauty companies' use of Facebook in marketing and branding. *Journal of Promotion Management, 19*(5), 629–651. https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2013.829160

Sherman, T., & Švelch, J. (2015). "Grammar Nazis never sleep": Facebook humor and the management of standard written language. *Language Policy, 14*(4), 315–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9344-9

Sherwood, M., & Nicholson, M. (2013). Web 2.0 platforms and the work of newspaper sport journalists. *Journalism, 14*(7), 942–959. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884912458662

Shpigelman, C.-N., & Gill, C. J. (2014). Facebook use by persons with disabilities. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*(3), 610–624. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12059

Sidury Christiansen, M. (2015). 'A ondi queras': Ranchero identity construction by U.S. born Mexicans on Facebook. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 19*(5), 688–702. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12155

Simons, J. (2016). Fields and Facebook: Ta'ayush's grass-roots activism and archiving the peace that will have come in Israel/Palestine. *Media & Communication, 4*(1), 27–38. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v4i1.390

Slaughter, M. (2015). The barriers of Facebook's terms of service agreement: Hardships placed on fiduciaries

access to digital assets. *Information & Communications Technology Law, 24*(2), 183–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2015.1042569

Slimovich, A. (2016). La digitalización de la política y la vuelta de lo televisivo. El caso de los candidatos argentinos en Facebook [The digitalization of politics and return to television. The case of the Argentinian candidates on Facebook]. *Revista de Comunicación, 15*, 111–127.

Sommer, J., & Rum, T. (2013). Discovering the Libyan youth movement's identity through Facebook. *Conflict & Communication, 12*(1), 1–15.

Sørensen, M. P. (2016). Political conversations on Facebook—The participation of politicians and citizens. *Media, Culture & Society, 38*(5), 664–685. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443715620924

Sormanen, N., Lauk, E., & Uskali, T. (2017). Facebook's ad hoc groups: A potential source of communicative power of networked citizens. *Communication & Society, 30*(2), 77–95. https://doi.org/10.15581/003.30.2.77–95

Souleles, N. (2012). An action research project on the use of Facebook in an undergraduate visual communication study unit. *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education, 11*(2), 127–141. https://doi.org/10.1386/adch.11.2.127_1

Steenkamp, M., & Hyde-Clarke, N. (2014). The use of Facebook for political commentary in South Africa. *Telematics & Informatics, 31*(1), 91–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2012.10.002

Stewart, M. C., Dainton, M., & Goodboy, A. K. (2014). Maintaining relationships on Facebook: Associations with uncertainty, jealousy, and satisfaction. *Communication Reports, 27*(1), 13–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/08934215.2013.845675

Stirling, E. (2016). Technology, time and transition in higher education—Two different realities of everyday Facebook use in the first year of university in the *UK. Learning, Media & Technology, 41*(1), 100–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2015.1102744

Stroud, N. J., Scacco, J. M., Muddiman, A., & Curry, A. L. (2015). Changing deliberative norms on news organizations' Facebook Sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 20*(2), 188–203. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12104

Sung Woo Yoo, & Gil de Zúñiga, H. (2014). Connecting blog, Twitter and Facebook use with gaps in knowledge and participation. *Communication & Society, 27*(4) 33–48. https://doi.org/10.15581/003.27.4.33–48

Syn, S. Y., & Kim, S. U. (2016). College students' health information activities on Facebook: Investigating the impacts of health topic sensitivity, information sources, and demographics. *Journal of Health Communication, 21*(7), 743–754. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2016.1157652

Tahiri, N. (2016). Zur Verschriftung mündlich tradierter Sprachen in sozialen Netzwerken: Der Gebrauch des Tarifit auf Facebook. *Glottotheory, 7*(2), 175–194. https://doi.org/10.1515/glot-2016-0014

Tang, J.-H., Chen, M.-C., Yang, C.-Y., Chung, T.-Y., & Lee, Y.-A. (2016). Personality traits, interpersonal relationships, online social support, and Facebook addiction. *Telematics & Informatics, 33*(1), 102–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.06.003

Tello, L. (2013). Intimacy and "extimacy" in social networks. Ethical boundaries of Facebook [Intimidad y "extimidad" en las Redes Sociales. Las Demarcaciones Éticas de Facebook]. *Comunicar, 21*(41), 205–213. https://doi.org/10.3916/C41-2013-20

Theocharis, Y., & Lowe, W. (2016). Does Facebook increase political participation? Evidence from a field experiment. *Information, Communication & Society, 19*(10), 1465–1486. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1119871

Theocharis, Y., & Quintelier, E. (2016). Stimulating citizenship or expanding entertainment? The effect of Facebook on adolescent participation. *New Media & Society, 18*(5), 817–836. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814549006

Theodoropoulou, I. (2016). Translating the style of Aganaktismenoi (Indignants) on Facebook. *Multilingua, 35*(5), 561–582. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-1019

Toma, C. L. (2017). Developing online deception literacy while looking for love. *Media, Culture & Society, 39*(3), 423–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716681660

Toma, C. L., & Carlson, C. L. (2015). How do Facebook users believe they come across in their profiles?: A meta-perception approach to investigating Facebook self-presentation. *Communication Research Reports, 32*(1), 93–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2014.990557

Treré, E., & Cargnelutti, D. (2014). Movimientos sociales, redes sociales y Web 2.0: el caso del Movimiento por la Paz con Justicia y Dignidad [Social movements, social media and Web 2.0: The case of the Movement for Peace with Justice and Dignity]. *Comunicación y Sociedad, 27*(1), 183–203.

Trottier, D. (2012). *Social media as surveillance: Rethinking visibility in a converging world*. Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing.

Trottier, D., & Fuchs, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Social media, politics and the state: Protests, revolutions, riots, crime and policing in the age of Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Tsay-Vogel, M. (2016). Me versus them: Third-person effects among Facebook users. *New Media & Society, 18*(9), 1956–1972. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815573476

Tufekci, Z. (2008). Can you see me now? Audience and disclosure regulation in online social network sites. *Bulletin of Science, Technology, & Society, 28*(1), 20–36.

Uldam, J., & Vestergaard, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Civic engagement and social media: Political participation beyond protest*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Der Heide, B., D'Angelo, J. D., & Schumaker, E. M. (2012). The effects of verbal versus photographic self-presentation on impression formation in Facebook. *Journal of Communication, 62*(1), 98–116. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01617.x

van Dijck, J. (2013). 'You have one identity': Performing the self on Facebook and LinkedIn. *Media, Culture & Society, 35*(2), 199–215. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443712468605

van Loon, J., & Unsöld, L. (2014). The work and the net: a critical reflection on Facebook-research methods and optical mediation. *Journal of Current Issues in Media & Telecommunications, 6*(1), 57–76.

Vendemia, M. A., High, A. C., & DeAndrea, D. C. (2017). "Friend" or foe? Why people friend disliked others on Facebook. *Communication Research Reports, 34*(1), 29–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2016.1227778

Venkat, A., Pichandy, C., Barclay, F. P., & Jayaseelan, R. (2014). Facebook privacy management: An empirical study of awareness, perception and fears. *Global Media Journal: Indian Edition, 5*(1), 1–20.

Vigil, T. R., & Wu, H. D. (2015). Facebook users' engagement and perceived life satisfaction. *Media & Communication, 3*(1), 5–16. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v3i1.199

Vishwanath, A. (2015). Habitual Facebook use and its impact on getting deceived on social media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 20*(1), 83–98. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12100

Vitak, J., & Ellison, N. B. (2013). 'There's a network out there you might as well tap': Exploring the benefits of and barriers to exchanging informational and support-based resources on Facebook. *New Media & Society, 15*(2), 243–259. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812451566

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science, 359*(6380), 1146-1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559

Walker, K. K. (2014). Cognitive and affective uses of a thoracic outlet syndrome Facebook support group. *Health Communication, 29*(8), 773–781. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2013.800830

Waters, R. D., & Lo, K. D. (2012). Exploring the impact of culture in the social media sphere: A content analysis of nonprofit organizations' use of Facebook. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 41*(3), 297–319. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2012.728772

Waters, S., & Ackerman, J. (2011). Exploring privacy management on Facebook: Motivations and perceived consequences of voluntary disclosure. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 17*(1), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2011.01559.x

Weijs, C., Majowicz, S., Coe, J. B., Desmarais, S., & Jones-Bitton, A. (2017). The personal use of Facebook by public health professionals in Canada: Implications for public health practice. *Journal of Communication in Healthcare, 10*(1), 8–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/17538068.2016.1274846

Wells, T., & Link, M. (2014). Facebook user research using a probability-based sample and behavioral data. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*(4), 1042–1052. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12058

Wen, W.-C. (2014). Facebook political communication in Taiwan: 1.0/2.0 messages and election/post-election messages. *Chinese Journal of Communication, 7*(1), 19–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750.2013.816754

Williams, C. B., & Gulati, G. J. 'Jeff.' (2013). Social networks in political campaigns: Facebook and the congressional elections of 2006 and 2008. *New Media & Society, 15*(1), 52–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812457332

Woolley, J. K., Limperos, A. M., & Oliver, M. B. (2010). The 2008 presidential election, 2.0: A content analysis of user-generated political Facebook groups. *Mass Communication & Society, 13*(5), 631–652. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2010.516864

Wright, K. B. (2012). Emotional support and perceived stress among college students using Facebook.com: An exploration of the relationship between source perceptions and emotional support. *Communication Research Reports, 29*(3), 175–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2012.695957

Wu, C.-H., & Chen, S.-C. (2015). Understanding the relationships of critical factors to Facebook educational usage intention. *Internet Research, 25*(2), 262–278. https://doi.org/10.1108/IntR–11–2013–0232

Yazan, B. (2015). Adhering to the language roots: Ottoman Turkish campaigns on Facebook. *Language Policy, 14*(4), 335–355. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9355-1

York, C., & Turcotte, J. (2015). Vacationing from Facebook: Adoption, temporary discontinuance, and readoption of an innovation. *Communication Research Reports, 32*(1), 54–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2014.989975

Zimmer, M. (2010). 'But the data is already public': On the ethics of research in Facebook. *Ethics and Information Technology, 12*(4), 313–325. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-010-9227-5