

The Influences of Facebook on Romantic Relationship Development: Facebook Activities and Perception of the Person of interest

Nuchada Dumrongsiri

Abstract

Social networking sites (SNSs) have become a significant medium for communicating with others interpersonally and socially. Facebook usage has grown rapidly worldwide with estimated 1,679 million users (Internet World Stats, 2016). An extensive use of Facebook plays a crucial role in daily interactions between people globally and, definitely, in relationship enactment and development. Previous studies indicated a significant impact of Facebook on romantic relationships, both in positive and negative ways. Facebook usage fosters jealousy and suspicion (Fox, Osborn, & Warber, 2014; Ruedar, Lindsay, & Williams, 2015) and is a threat to romantic relationships (Cohen, Bowman, & Borchert, 2014). However, some reported that Facebook increases partners' self-expansion (Carpenter & Spottswood, 2013) and level of commitment through Facebook Official (FBO) (Fox, Warber, & Makstaller, 2013). The main purposes of this study were to investigate (1) how people used Facebook to access information of and learned about the person of interest, and (2) how this information affected perception of the person they were dating during relationship enactment. Participants were 154 undergraduate students who completed a self-administered questionnaire. The results showed that people were more likely to use passive activities to learn more about the person of interest. Passive activities were the strongest predictors of relationship development. However, Facebook use did not predict trust in the person. Thematic analysis also revealed Facebook activities of the person of interest that made the other feel good and worst. Feeling-good activities were responsiveness and positive self-expression; feeling-worst activities were unresponsiveness and negative self-expression.

Keywords: Social networking sites, dating, romantic relationship development, Facebook

บทคัดย่อ

เครือข่ายสังคมออนไลน์ได้กลายเป็นสื่อสำคัญยิ่งในการสื่อสารกับบุคคลอื่นทั้งในเชิงระหว่างบุคคล และเชิงสังคม การใช้เฟซบุ๊กได้แพร่หลายอย่างรวดเร็วไปทั่วโลก โดยมีจำนวนผู้ใช้อันประมาณ 1,679 ล้าน

คน (Internet World Stats, 2016) การใช้เฟซบุ๊กอย่างกว้างขวางนี้จึงมีบทบาทสำคัญในการปฏิสัมพันธ์ระหว่างคนในแต่ละวันทั่วโลก รวมถึงการริเริ่มและพัฒนาความสัมพันธ์ งานวิจัยที่ผ่านมาได้ระบุถึงผลกระทบที่สำคัญของเฟซบุ๊กต่อความสัมพันธ์ฉันทน์รักทั้งในเชิงบวกและเชิงลบ การใช้เฟซบุ๊กทำให้เกิดความหึงหวงและความหวาดระแวง (Fox, Osborn, & Warber, 2014; Ruedar, Lindsay, & Williams, 2015) และเป็นผลร้ายต่อความสัมพันธ์ฉันทน์รัก (Cohen, Bowman, & Borchert, 2014) อย่างไรก็ตาม งานวิจัยยังได้รายงานว่ามีเฟซบุ๊กช่วยเพิ่มการเปิดตัวเองของคนรัก (Carpenter & Spottswood, 2013) และเพิ่มระดับความยึดมั่นต่อกัน โดยการระบุสถานะความสัมพันธ์บนเฟซบุ๊ก (*Facebook Official (FBO)*) (Fox, Warber, & Makstaller, 2013) งานวิจัยนี้มีจุดประสงค์หลัก คือ (1) เพื่อศึกษาการใช้เฟซบุ๊กเพื่อเข้าถึงข้อมูล และเรียนรู้เกี่ยวกับบุคคลที่ชื่นชอบ และ (2) เพื่อศึกษาผลกระทบของการรับรู้ข้อมูลต่อทัศนคติที่มีกับบุคคลที่ชื่นชอบในช่วงที่ริเริ่มความสัมพันธ์ ผู้เข้าร่วมวิจัยคือ นักศึกษาระดับชั้นปริญญาตรี จำนวน 154 คน โดยการตอบแบบสอบถามด้วยตนเอง ผลการวิจัยได้แสดงว่าคนนิยมใช้เฟซบุ๊กในรูปแบบกิจกรรมที่ไม่แสดงตน (passive activities) ในการเรียนรู้เกี่ยวกับบุคคลที่ตนชื่นชอบ ทั้งนี้ กิจกรรมที่ไม่แสดงตนยังเป็นตัวทำนายการพัฒนาความสัมพันธ์ที่เด่นชัดกว่ากิจกรรมอื่นๆ อย่างไรก็ตาม การใช้เฟซบุ๊กไม่สามารถทำนายความไว้วางใจในบุคคลที่ชื่นชอบได้นอกจากนี้ ผลการวิเคราะห์เนื้อหาเชิงคุณภาพยังสามารถจำแนกประเภทกิจกรรมการใช้เฟซบุ๊กได้ โดยกิจกรรมที่บุคคลที่ชื่นชอบทำแล้วทำให้อีกฝ่ายรู้สึกดี คือ การแสดงความสนใจและตอบสนองกลับ (responsiveness) และการแสดงตัวตนเชิงบวก (positive self-expression) ส่วนกิจกรรมที่บุคคลที่ชื่นชอบทำแล้วทำให้อีกฝ่ายเสียความรู้สึก คือ การไม่ตอบสนองกลับ (unresponsiveness) และการแสดงตัวตนเชิงลบ (negative self-expression)

คำสำคัญ: เครือข่ายสังคมออนไลน์, การคบหาใจ, การสร้างความสัมพันธ์ฉันทน์รัก, เฟซบุ๊ก

The Influences of Facebook on Romantic Relationship Development: Facebook Activities and Perception of the Person of interest

Social networking sites (SNSs) have become a significant medium for communicating with others interpersonally and socially. As one of the most popular SNSs, Facebook has grown rapidly worldwide with estimated 1,679 million users, representing 22.9% of the world population (Internet World Stats, 2016). In Thailand, Facebook subscribers are 41.0 million, which is 60.1% of the population (Internet World Stats, 2016), and Facebook active users are approximately 30 million per month, with 66% logging in daily and 63% at age between 18-34 years old (Vichienwanitchkul, 2015). An extensive use of Facebook plays a crucial role in daily interactions between people globally and, definitely, in relationship enactment and development.

Previous studies have reported a significant impact of Facebook on romantic relationships, both in positive and negative ways. Facebook usage fostered jealousy and suspicion (Fox, Osborn, & Warber, 2014; Ruedar, Lindsay, & Williams, 2015) and is a

threat to romantic relationships (Cohen, Bowman, & Borchert, 2014). However, some indicated that Facebook increased partners' self-expansion (Carpenter & Spottswood, 2013) and level of commitment through Facebook Official (FBO) (Fox, Warber, & Makstaller, 2013).

Thus far, past research have shown inconsistent findings about the effects of Facebook use on romantic relationships in various contexts. Differently, this study was aimed to further examine the influences of Facebook use on romantic relationship, particularly during a stage of relationship development. The main purposes were to investigate (1) how people used Facebook to access information of and learned about the person of interest, and (2) how this information affected perception of the person they are dating during relationship enactment. Next, the following sections present a review of Knapp's (1978) staircase model as a theoretical framework and previous research related to Facebook and trust in romantic relationships.

Facebook and Romantic Relationship Development

As technology changes the way people connect, communicate, and interact with one another, Facebook has become a prominent channel to form, maintain, and determinate romantic relationships (Cohen et al., 2014; Fox et al., 2014; Fox et al., 2013). Facebook use, particularly through private messages and photography tags, predicted relationship escalation with a change in relational categories (Sosik & Bazarova, 2014). Knapp's (1978) model of interaction stages in relationships provides a theoretical framework for this study to investigate how people engaged in romantic relationship enactment and searched for information about the person of interest via online communication.

Knapp's (1978) staircase model suggests five stages of how relationships form, develop, and terminate as characterized by communication interactions. The five interaction stages are initiating, experimenting, intensifying, integrating, and bonding (Knapp & Vangelisti, 2005). *Initiating* is to attract attention of the other and to show a pleasant impression. At this stage, people try to open a channel for communication and observe the other for uncertainty reduction that they might have about the person. Initiative communication varies by time and situational constraints. *Experimenting* is to explore the unknown with a willingness to find common interest and to express a desirable self. The relationships at this stage is relaxed and limited in commitment. Then, *intensifying* is to unfold personal uniqueness and secrets and to validate intensification with physical and psychological favors. *Integrating* is to become united with the other but does not lose a distinct self. Couples seem to share identity and present the two persons as the oneness. Lastly, *bonding* is to announce the increased relationship commitment through various forms of public rituals such as engagement and religious ceremony. FBO, showing a relationship status as "in relationship," "engaged," or "married," was also the ritual to declare the formal commitment publicly (Fox et al., 2013; Orosz, Szekeres, Kiss, Farkas, & Roland-Levy 2015).

Unlike face-to-face communication, Facebook possesses the characteristics that make it unique as a tool for relationship development – an access to needed information beyond the time and situational constraints and to information about the person of interest and his/her society altogether. The relational stage model underlines interaction between two ends, but with the effects of social network of each party on the relationship (Knapp & Vangelisti, 2005). Facebook offers a forum where people have access to information of their friends and friends' social circle. Certain Facebook activities such as tagging one another and appearing together in pictures expanded the self to the other's network (Carpenter & Spottswood, 2013). In face-to-face interactions, the partners spend time to learn about each other and then about the other's social connections when the relationship is escalated to higher stages. Facebook serves as a shortcut to access this information.

This study focused on how Facebook was used to learn about the person of interest in a non-defined relationship status (Research Question 1). Thus, it was not expected at the relational stages to reach the status of having physical contact and being oneness in the intensifying and integrating levels, respectively. Precisely, the purposes were to explore a theoretical understanding of two relational stages of initiating and experimenting through communication activities on Facebook. Moreover, this study investigated if Facebook use affected relationship development overall (Research Question 3).

Facebook and Trust

Trust is developed based on interactions and is escalated when the romantic relationship progresses. Trust is a major component in a successful intimate relationship. Past research has defined trust differently as general trust, interpersonal trust, and dyadic trust (Gabbay, Lafontaine, & Bourque, 2012). This study explored how people perceived the person of interest through online information and activities during the beginning state of the relationship and how this perception was related to trust. Then, in this study, trust was defined as an individual trust in a particular person (Wheless & Grotz, 1977). Specifically, trust is favorable perceptions toward the person of interest.

Loss of trust leads to negative inferences about people's behavior. During a relationship initiation, people pay special attention to the person of interest to learn more about him/her. With Facebook, they access information to observe the person's behavior and explore the unknown. However, information presentation on Facebook can be ambiguous and results in doubts about the person (Cohen et al., 2014; Muise, Christofides, & Desmarais, 2009). Also, an excessive use and surveillance on Facebook yield negative outcomes in intimate relationships such as jealousy (Rahaman, 2015) and conflict (Rueda et al., 2015). People with lower trust tended to have higher Facebook jealousy (Muise et al., 2009).

Using Facebook allows people to obtain more information about the person of interest and build trust in the person. On the other hand, the information on Facebook

can be doubtful and trigger negative feelings. Possibly, people may learn more about the person and lose trust in him/her simultaneously. Therefore, this study was to investigate whether gaining more information about and interacting with the person of interest through Facebook influenced the perceived trust in him/her (Research Question 2).

In summary, to examine the relationships among Facebook use, trust, and relationship development, this study proposed three research questions:

RQ1: What were activities that people do to seek information on Facebook about the person of interest?

RQ2: Did Facebook use predict perceived trust in the person of interest?

RQ3: Did Facebook use predict relationship development?

Research Method

This study employed a cross-sectional design. Data collection was completed during a two-month period. The sampling and data collection procedure as well as measurement were explained in this section.

Sample and Procedure

Participants were Facebook users who had used Facebook for a certain purpose to develop a romantic relationship with the person of interest. The purposive sampling was used to recruit participants who were college students at a large state university in Pathumthani province, Thailand. A research assistant personally approached participants outside class and asked if they were willing to participate in this study.

Participants ($N = 225$) volunteered to participate in this study. They were provided with an informed consent and then answered a screening question asking if they had used Facebook during the past three months to learn more about the person of interest. In the screening question, the person of interest was defined as “someone whom participants liked or who they were learning about each other without a defined status in their relationship.” The self-administered questionnaire was divided into five parts: a screening question, personal information, Facebook use, perceived trust, and relationship development.

A total of 154 participants ($n = 154$) were included in data analysis. They had known the person of interest for 1 month to 132 months ($M = 24.55$ months, $SD = 25.83$). Seventy-one participants ($n = 71$) did not use Facebook to know about the person of interest and then were excluded from this study. Their reasons for not using Facebook

were that they were not interested in anyone (47.9%); they were currently in a relationship (21.1%); they or their person of interest did not use Facebook (15.5%); they used other channels to develop the relationship (12.7%); and they already ended the relationship (2.8%).

Participants were 26 males (16.9%) and 128 females (83.1%) with age ranged from 18-30 years old ($M = 20.46$ years old, $SD = 1.60$). As expected, females outnumbered males. Consistent with prior study, females tended to use SNSs than did males to maintain relationships (Pornsakulvanich & Dumrongisiri, 2013). Most of them had used Facebook between 3 to 6 years (64.9%), followed by more than 6 years (29.9%), between 1 year to less than 3 years (4.5%), and less than 1 year (0.6%). Also, they reported their daily hours spent on Facebook with less than 2 hours (37.0%), between 2 hours to less than 4 hours (29.2%), between 4 hours to less than 6 hours (22.1%), between 6 hours to less than 8 hours (9.7%), between 8 hours to less than 10 hours (1.3%), and 10 hours and above (0.6%).

Measurement

Facebook use. Facebook use was operationalized as activities that people did on Facebook to seek information and learn more about the person of interest. The scale was adapted from Fox and Anderegg (2014) by listing activities that people normally did when they used Facebook to keep in touch with others and to know more about someone. The measure consisted of 13 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *Strongly disagree* (1) to *Strongly agree* (5) and was divided into three dimensions: passive activities (6 items, Cronbach's $\alpha = .80$), active activities (four items, Cronbach's $\alpha = .71$), and personal activities (three items, Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$). For example, the items for passive activities were “*search for Facebook of the person of interest,*” “*follow his/her Facebook activities,*” and “*look through his/her information and pictures.*” Some of the items for active activities were “*click like his/her pictures and posts regularly,*” “*click like his/her comments regularly,*” and “*comment on his/her posts regularly.*” The three items for personal activities were “*write messages or send pictures via his/her wall directly,*” “*tag messages or pictures to him/her directly,*” and “*chat with him/her through inbox messenger.*”

Individualized trust scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$; $M = 3.57$; $SD = .74$). Wheelless and Grotz (1977) defined individualized trust as favorable perception of a person which leads to dependent behavior on the person. Rubin, Palmgreen, and Sypher (1994) suggested the scale to measure trust in a particular person rather than in others in general. In this study, a particular person is operationalized as the person of interest. The scale has 15 items rated on a 5-point semantic differential scale.

Relationship development (Cronbach's $\alpha = .79$; $M = 3.32$; $SD = .94$). Relationship development was operationalized as a person's feelings to continue the romantic relationship with the person of interest. The scale was developed for this study. Two items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale from *Strongly disagree* (1) to *Strongly*

agree (5). The items were “following Facebook of my person of interest makes me feel good about him/her,” and “following Facebook of my person of interest makes me want to further continue the relationship with him/her.” Two open-ended questions also asked participants to list “what are activities on Facebook that the person of interest makes you feel very good?” and “what are activities on Facebook that the person of interest makes you feel worst?”

Results

Data analysis included both statistical and thematic analyses. Descriptive analysis was conducted to analyze Facebook use to access the information about the person of interest. Regression analyses were computed to examine the predictive relationships among Facebook activities, trust, and relationship development. Thematic analysis was used to explore the pattern of Facebook behavior leading to positive and negative feelings of the other.

Statistical Analyses

Research Question 1 asked what activities that people did on Facebook to learn more about their person of interest. Descriptive analysis was conducted to examine the activities on Facebook. The activities that participants tended to agree most were those in passive category ($M = 3.62$; $SD = 0.74$), whereas those in personal activities were rated the lowest overall ($M = 2.25$; $SD = 1.06$) (see Table 1).

Table 1 Descriptive Analysis of Facebook Activities for Romantic Relationship Development with the Person of Interest

	Mean	SD
<i>Passive activities</i>		
	3.62	0.74
Search for Facebook of the person of interest	4.01	0.89
Follow his/her Facebook activities	3.99	0.88
Look through his/her information and pictures	3.86	0.98
Read comments on his/her posts	3.64	1.11
Update his/her log-in status	3.38	1.09
Look at Facebook of his/her friends	2.85	1.24
<i>Active activities</i>	2.78	0.92
Click like his/her pictures and posts regularly	3.27	1.31

Add him/her as friend on Facebook	3.16	1.32
Click like his/her comments regularly	2.54	1.32
Comment on his/her posts regularly	2.13	1.10
<i>Personal activities</i>	2.25	1.06
Chat with him/her through inbox messenger	2.80	1.40
Write messages or send pictures via his/her wall directly	2.00	1.14
Tag messages or pictures to him/her directly	1.97	1.17

Note. $N = 154$.

In addition, the open-ended question was also provided for participants to write three additional activities that they did for the purpose of knowing more about the person of interest. Twelve participants (7.79%) reported that they looked what was shared by the person of interest on Facebook (e.g., pages, songs, VDO clips, news, information); looked at his/her profile picture; looked at his/her friends or mutual friends; looked at check-in places; called him/her via chat box; and added his/her family members as friends.

Research Question 2 asked whether Facebook use predicted perceived trust in the person of interest. A linear regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how each Facebook activity predicted the perceived trust. Only passive activities were significant predictors of trust ($R^2 = .03$, $F(1, 152) = 4.76$, $p < .05$), whereas active and personal activities were not significantly related to trust. However, a multiple regression analysis was computed to examine the relationships between passive, active, and personal activities on Facebook and perceived trust. The results indicated that Facebook activities did not predict trust ($R^2 = .04$, $F(3, 150) = 2.14$, $p = .09$).

Research Question 3 asked if Facebook use predicted relationship development. The predictors were three Facebook activities (i.e., passive, active, and personal use) while the dependent variable was relationship development. A multiple regression analysis revealed a significant relationship ($R^2 = .28$, adjusted $R^2 = .26$, $F(3, 148) = 18.74$, $p < .01$), indicating that approximately 28% of the variance of the relationship development was accounted for by a combination of the Facebook activities.

Table 2 presents the relative strength of the individual predictors. All bivariate relationships were positive, showing that high Facebook use increased possibility for relationship development. Passive activities were the strongest predictors of relationship development.

Table 2 Multiple Regression Analysis of Facebook Use Predicting Relationship Development

Dependent	Predictors	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
	$R^2 = .28^*$			
	Passive activities	.50	.10	.40*
	Active activities	.06	.11	.06
	Personal activities	.17	.90	.19

Notes. $N = 154$, $*p < .01$

Thematic Analysis

Thematic analysis is a process that encodes qualitative information into quantitative data to interpret the observations about people, events, situations, and organizations (Boyatzis, 1998). This study used a thematic analysis to interpret Facebook activities that made the other feel good or bad. The unit of analysis was the dyad communicating through Facebook. The unit of coding was a response to the two open-ended questions asking “*what are activities on Facebook that the person of interest makes you feel very good?*” (feeling good) and “*what are activities on Facebook that the person of interest makes you feel worst?*” (feeling worst).

Among 154 participants, 90 of them (58.44%) provided answers for the two open-ended questions. Two coders separately analyzed the provided answers to categorize the theme or pattern of Facebook behavior of the person of interest. When analyzing the content of communication phenomenon, Berelson (1952) suggested two types of categories: “how is said” categories and “what is said” categories. To develop categories in this study, the coders discussed the indicators and description of the categories until they reached consensus of a final coding scheme. Representing the how-is-said category, the first indicator of coding categories was a degree to which each Facebook activity reflected an exchange of interactions between the dyad (i.e., responsiveness and unresponsiveness). Reflecting the-what-is-said category, another indicator was an expression of self (i.e., positive and negative).

Intercoder reliability assessed by Scott’s (1955) *pi* was adequate with .81 for the feeling-good responses and .80 for the feeling-worst responses. The raw percentage of agreement was 93% and 90%, respectively.

Feeling-good activities. Activities on Facebook that the person of interest made the participants feel very good were classified into two categories: responsiveness and positive self-expression. About 98% of the responses were coded using the two classifications. Responsiveness (76%) referred to activities that the person of interest directly interacted with the participant such as initiating chat, greeting, clicking like, and making comment. Positive self-expression (22%) referred to information that

generated a favorable impression such as updating daily activities (e.g., checking in at places, posting pictures), doing non-profit activities, and posting amusing clips/news (see Table 3).

Feeling-worst activities. Another two categories of the activities that the person of interest made the participants feel worst: unresponsiveness and negative self-expression. Approximately 98% of the responses were coded using the two categories. Unresponsiveness (58%) referred to activities that showed ignorance of the other such as not reading/answering chat, doing unfriend/blocking, not clicking like, not commenting, and not accepting a friend request. Negative self-expression (40%) referred to activities that generated undesirable feelings such as posting nonsense words, expressing political dilemmas, using impolite language, and over liking/commenting someone (see Table 3).

Table 3 Content Analysis of Feeling-Good and Feeling-Worst Facebook Activities

	<i>Percentage Coded</i>
<i>Feeling-good activities</i>	98
Responsiveness	76
Initiating personal chat	18
Clicking like on status post/picture	17
Answering chat without delay	15
Making comments on status post/picture	10
Posting on the other's wall	9
Tagging photo	5
Accepting a friend request	1
Positive self-expression	22
Updating daily activities	11
Doing good activities	6
Posting entertaining clips/information	5
<i>Feeling-worst activities</i>	98
Unresponsiveness	58
Not reading/answering chat	30
Doing unfriend/blocking	16
Lost in contact (e.g., not clicking like, no comments, and not accepting a friend request)	12
Negative self-expression	40
Posting related to the third person (e.g., tagging someone, over clicking like/ commenting someone)	21
Posting non-sense/ impolite contents	19

Note. $n = 90$.

Discussion and Future Directions

The results of this study provide theoretical and practical knowledge in interdisciplinary areas of media technology and interpersonal communication. The findings served the two purposes of this study to examine (1) how people used Facebook to learn more about the person of interest, and (2) how the Facebook information influenced perception of the person of interest and overall relationship development. Overall, participants rated passive activities on Facebook higher than active and personal behaviors. Also, passive Facebook activities were strongest predictor of relationship development. Learning more about the person of interest passively leads the participants to pursue the relationship with him/her.

Theoretically, the findings generate a further question whether information seeking truly reduces uncertainty when people develop relationships. Uncertainty reduction theory posits that people use passive, active, and interactive strategies to seek information when they have uncertainty during relationship development (Berger & Calabrese, 1975). In this study, in an online context where a relational status was not defined, passive strategies were common to observe and learn more about the person of interest's behavior on Facebook. However, unobtrusive observing behavior can be more questionable and uncertain about him/her. Facebook provides a platform to access information about the person, but this information can be ambiguous and lead to suspicion, misunderstanding, and jealousy. Liking and commenting on pictures or status updates of someone causes the other to wonder who this person is (Ouytsel, Gool, Walrave, Ponnet, & Peeters, 2016). Media technology offers convenient information, but the convenience may come with more questions about and doubts in people as well.

Passive observation is a common strategy while the relationship is not developed to the stage that allows the dyad to learn about each other personally, in both online and offline contexts. Meanwhile, people use passive activities to overcome time and situational constraints in order to discover the unknown about the person of interest as well as to avoid being noticed. Past research reported that people used Facebook active and personal activities – liking/commenting pictures and status updates of the person of interest and sending private messages – to be noticed by the other person (Ouytsel et al., 2016). Thus, this study suggests that people prefer to observe rather than to be noticed by the other. They tended to be more passive to learn about the person of interest during the two relational stages of *initiating* and *experimenting* – using active and personal means could be viewed as intimidating. Consistent with past research, passive strategies were used more on Facebook before and after face-to-face interactions with the potential partners, and tended to be declined during exclusive dating (Fox & Anderegg, 2014).

Nevertheless, participants in this study were outnumbered by females. Using a passive strategy could be influenced by gender role differences as females may prefer not to look too approachable. Future studies may include an in-depth analysis of cultural and gender differences in Facebook use for romantic relationship development.

According to prior studies, communication via personal means comes when relationship is escalated. Messages were considered to be more intimate if they were more exclusive and posted privately through Facebook's messaging system, as opposed to being posted as a status update or a public wall post (Cohen et al., 2014). Similarly, Facebook use through private messages and photography tags predicted relationship escalation with a change in relational categories (Sosik & Bazarova, 2014). Thus, when the relationship is beyond the *initiating* and *experimenting* stages, active and personal Facebook activities are more likely to happen. Future research may explore further how people use Facebook differently when relational stage changes.

Although people preferred to be passive on Facebook during relationship enactment, the thematic analysis results implies that they also expect the person of interest to be active and interactive with them. Approximately half of the participants felt good when their crushes were responsive and noticed them, especially when the person initiated a private chat, liked/commented their posts and pictures, and hastened chat responses. Thus, the next question arises for further investigation – to what extent to be passive, active, and interactive when people use Facebook to develop romantic relationships.

Moreover, another qualitative finding provided an observation of the “don'ts” activities when having a particular interest in someone on Facebook. People felt worst when the other person disappeared in any means, did activities showing attention to other males and females, rejected relationship, and posted unreasonable and impolite contents.

Also, the findings indicated that Facebook use did not affect perceived trust in the person of interest. Trust is generally developed based on interactions in the relationship and experiences of having the other being responsive to one's needs (Gabbay et al., 2012; Rampel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). In this study, participants preferred passive activities when learning about the person of interest. Then, being interactive and responsive between the dyad is limited. Perhaps, during the initiating and experimenting relational stages, trust may not be developed yet as the romantic relationship is not firmly established.

References

- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research, 1*, 99-112.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Carpenter, C. J., & Spottswood, E. L. (2013). Exploring romantic relationships on social networking sites using the self-expansion model. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*, 1531-1537.
- Cohen, E. L., Bowman, N. D., & Borchert, K. (2014). Private flirts, public friends: Understanding romantic jealousy responses to an ambiguous social network site message as a function of message access exclusivity. *Computers in Human Behavior, 35*, 535-541.
- Fox, J., & Anderegg, C. (2014). Romantic relationship stages and social networking sites: Uncertainty reduction strategies and perceived relational norms on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 17*(11), 685-691.
- Fox J., Osborn J. L., & Warber, K. M. (2014). Relational dialectics and social networking sites: The role of Facebook in romantic relationship escalation, maintenance, conflict, and dissolution. *Computers in Human Behavior, 35*, 527-534.
- Fox, J., Warber, K. M., & Makstaller, D. C. (2013). The role of Facebook in romantic Relationship development: An exploration of Knapp's relational stage model. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30*(6), 771-794.
- Gabbay, N., Lafontaine, M. F., & Bourque, L. (2012). Factor Structure and Reliability Assessment of the Dyadic Trust Scale with Individuals in Same-Sex Romantic Relationships. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 8*, 258-269.
- Internet World Stats (2016). *Facebook users in the world*. Retrieved from <http://www.internetworldstats.com/facebook.htm>
- Knapp, M. L. (1978). *Social intercourse: From greeting to goodbye*. Needham Heights, MA, USA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Knapp, M. L., & Vangelisti, A. L. (2005). *Interpersonal communication and human relationships* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Muise, A., Christofides, E., & Desmarais, S. (2009). More Information than You Ever Wanted: Does Facebook Bring Out the Green-Eyed Monster of Jealousy? *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, *12*(4), 441-444.
- Orosz, G., Szekeres, A., Kiss, Z. G., Farkas, P., & Roland-Levy, C. (2015). Elevated romantic love and jealousy if relationship status is declared on Facebook. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, 1-16.
- Ouytsel, J. V., Gool, E., V., Walrave, M., Ponnet, K., & Peeters, E. (2016). Exploring the role of social networking sites within adolescent romantic relationships and dating experiences. *Computers in Human Behaviors*, *55*, 76-86.
- Pornsakulvanich, V., & Dumrongsri, N. (2013). Internal and external influences on social networking site usage in Thailand. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*, 2788-2795.
- Rahaman, H. M. S. (2015). Romantic relationship length and its perceived quality: Mediating role of Facebook-related conflict. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, *11*(3), 3395-405.
- Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*, 95-112.
- Rubin, R. B., Palmgreen, P., & Sypher, H. E. (1994). *Communication research measures: A sourcebook*. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Rueda, H. A., Lindsay, M., & Williams, L. R. (2015). "She Posted It on Facebook": Mexican American Adolescents' Experiences With Technology and Romantic Relationship Conflict. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *30*(4), 419-445.
- Scott, W. A. (1955). Reliability of content analysis: The case of nominal scale coding. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *19*, 321-325.
- Sosik, V. S., & Bazarova, N. N. (2014). Relational maintenance on social network sites: How Facebook communication predicts relational escalation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *35*, 124-131.
- Vichienwanitchkul, M. (2015). *[Infographic] Online Marketing Thailand: The State of Social Media*. Retrieved from <http://syndacast.com/infographic-online-marketing-thailand-the-state-of-social-media>
- Wheeless, L. R., & Grotz, J. (1977). The measurement of trust and its relationship to self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research*, *3*, 250-257.