7. My family consistently provided me with enrichment opportunities like travel out of state or out of the country, exposure to cultural activities like museums, theatrical productions, and foreign language immersion.
   ____ 1. Strongly Disagree
   ____ 2. Disagree
   ____ 3. Undecided
   ____ 4. Agree
   ____ 5. Strongly Agree
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Abstract

Several studies using the Five Factor Model have assessed personality traits associated with Facebook use (Ross et al. 2009; Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky 2010). However, literature regarding interpersonal communication motivations associated with Facebook use is lacking. Recent research has examined differences between users and non-users of social networking sites. This study evaluates Facebook users and non-users via the Basic Factors Inventory (BFI) and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation – Behavior (FIRO-B) assessments. Hypothesis: users of Facebook will not have scores on the FIRO-B and BFI assessments that are opposite from non-users of Facebook. Using a t-test, data from 73 undergraduates were analyzed. Data support the hypothesis. Results indicate other factors may exist, which override personality and interpersonal communication motivations as reasons individuals do not use Facebook.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a relationship between fundamental interpersonal relations orientations and personality factors between users and non-users of the Social Networking Site (SNS) Facebook in an undergraduate sample population. Literature abounds on topics such as presentation of self (Hogan 2010; Mehdizadeh 2010); identity construction (Zhao et al. 2008); privacy (Boyd 2008); the 2008 presidential election (Robertson et al. 2010); and even job candidate selection (Bohnert and Ross 2010) and how these varied topics relate to Facebook and its users. Personality traits associated with Facebook use are a rapidly emerging area of study, and are becoming more prevalent in the current body of literature (Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky 2010; Ross et al. 2009), while interpersonal communication motivations remain virtually unexamined. This article fills a gap in the literature by taking a comparative look at the interpersonal communication motivations, as well as the personality differences of users and non-users.

Facebook has reached a never before seen level of ubiquity in our society. Created in 2004 by Mark Zuckerburg, a then sophomore at Harvard, the site was first exclusive to Harvard students as a means of keeping in touch with academic and professional contacts. As it increased in popularity, other colleges
were added, until it was finally opened up for public use in September of 2006. Since its inception, the Web site has snowballed into a virtually unrivaled social phenomenon. According to recently released figures, Facebook has over 600 million users worldwide (Carlson 2011) and approximately 42% of the United States population has a Facebook account (socialmediatoday.com 2011). What truly differentiates Facebook from other social networking websites is its unique offline-to-online characteristic, meaning that most people’s Facebook friends are met offline (in person) and then added online at a later time (Ross et al. 2009). In 2006, when Facebook became a public domain, scholars immediately became interested in the emerging trend.

**Literature Review**

**The Facebook Personality**

In recent years, scholars have been conducting an increasing number of studies that explore personality traits associated with Facebook use (Amichai-Hamburger and Vititkosy 2010; Ross et al. 2009; Wilson et al. 2010). In 2000, Hamburger and Ben-Artzi concluded that Internet use is linked to personality. Amichai-Hamburger (2005) asserted that we cannot evaluate Internet usage without also trying to understand the personalities of its users because the Internet itself is powered by human interaction. When boyd (2007) states that a Facebook profile “can be seen as a form of digital body where individuals must write themselves into being” (131), it would only seem to follow that this cyber entity would become an extension of the creator’s personality. Or, it would seem in some cases, an extension of the persona or character of whom they wish to be viewed.

**The Dramaturgical Approach**

Hogan (2010) examined presentation of self in online social media environments using Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical approach, which uses the metaphor of a theatrical production to explain how individuals present an often idealized version of themselves to others. This approach has been used extensively by researchers to examine self-presentation in online social media environments (boyd 2006; 2007; Lewis et al. 2008; Mendelson and Papacharissi 2010; Tufekci 2008). While Goffman’s (1959) work posits a situational model in which performances take place on the stage of life in front of an audience, Hogan (2010) argues an exhibitional approach. Hogan (2010) states that self-presentation can be broken down into two distinct categories: performances and exhibitions. This model contends that within the parameters of presentation of self on social networking sites, there are exhibitions in conjunction with situational activities. The key difference between the two is that performances happen in synchronous environments, and exhibitions take place in asynchronous environments, leaving behind what Hogan (2010) refers to as “artifacts.” Examples of artifacts in the context of asynchronous online social media environments would be lists of status updates and albums of photos. A couple examples of synchronous online behavior via social networking sites are instant messaging and chatting.

The social media platform assumes a role that Hogan (2010) calls the curator. Similar to a traditional museum curator who carefully chooses and places historically significant works of art (artifacts) to display, often with the intention of telling a narrative, the social media platform accesses relevant artifacts and presents them to the user. Good curation, according to Hogan (2010), will present the user with artifacts that are interesting or germane to what they are already looking at. However, bad curation is usually topically inappropriate or overwhelming to the user. Hogan (2010) delineates three basic functions of the curator which are not a characteristic part of performances and situations: filtering, ordering, and searching.

Hogan (2010) states that filtering happens when the artifacts on display are limited in some way. This can be as a result of the relationship between the user and the artifact, or even just the quality of the artifact. Filtering cannot be accomplished in a situation, due to the emergent nature of the performance. Although one can ignore a performance and the performer can censor a story, situational selectivity is not equivalent to filtering. Performers have the ability to censor themselves, while curators filter artifacts for the user by retrieving only relevant artifacts from a storehouse and displaying them.

Artifacts are also often ordered in a meaningful way. Items for sale are commonly ordered according to price, which can be filtered to show lowest to highest price, or highest to lowest price. Flights are displayed in chronological order according to departure time. A more refined version of this can be seen when Facebook shows prospective friends for the user derived from the secondary connections of those already on the user’s friend list. Names are frequently compiled alphabetically, as is the case with Facebook friends lists. Ordering is another function of curation which cannot be realized in a synchronous setting (Hogan 2010). Situations do, in fact, have a definite sequence; however, performances that take place in “real time” situations cannot be suitably re-ordered. Hogan (2010) states that the ordering of online artifacts is based in the fact that each artifact is one piece of a set of similar artifacts that are known ahead of time. Lastly, artifacts online can be searched, which means that they are filtered (as well as ordered) based on user input. Hogan (2010) says that curators usually work passively; an example of this would be when people view their Facebook news feeds. By merely viewing online content the user is subject to both filtering and ordering. Searching entails the user submitting supplementary information in order to get the curator to display the desired content.
Users Versus Non-Users

Also relevant to the current study is the emerging body of work regarding differences between users and non-users of the Internet. Robinson and Martin (2009) compared Internet users and non-users with particular attention to whether Internet use is connected to individuals having more or less “liberal” political opinions, and how these connections have changed since the year 2000. Generally, they found that when any differences existed, Internet users tended to be more supportive of diverse and tolerant points of view. This is in line with the idea that Internet use is a way of expressing openness to differing perspectives and new experiences. However, Robinson and Martin (2009) also found that higher levels of Internet use did not lend to proportionately more progressive ideals. Furthermore, there were differences for some select attitudes that could not be structured into standard political affiliations. The researchers concluded that, with the exception of a very limited number of political issues, there were no significant attitudinal differences between Internet users and non-users with regard to social issues.

Even more directly related to the hypothesis herein is the study conducted by Hargittai (2007), who asked if there are systematic differences between users and non-users of social networking sites. Using a sample that consisted of primarily 18 and 19 year olds, the study focused on predictors of use for six social networking sites: Xanga, Bebo, MySpace, Orkut, Facebook, and Friendster. The results indicated that usage is not random, but that the individual’s gender, parental educational background, and race and ethnicity were all linked with use. Interestingly, this was primarily the case when the aggregate concept of social networking was broken down by individual service. That is, trends were not always consistent across users of social networking sites, but they showed strong affinities when the sites were examined separately. According to Hargittai (2007), when social networking usage is examined in the aggregate sense, the results show a correlation only between gender and use, in addition to the importance of context of use and the user’s experience with a given medium. Moreover, it was found that individuals with more experience with specific sites were more likely to be users of the medium at large. Hargittai (2007) also theorizes that existing inequality of participation is due to the effect that user background has on usage of social networking sites.

The Five Factor Model

The Five-Factor Model (FFM) breaks down the human personality into five distinct personality dimensions (Costa and McCrae 1992). The first of these traits is Extraversion, which reflects the predisposition to be sociable, experience positive emotions, and the tendency to seek stimulation in the company of others. Neuroticism, the second trait, is an inclination to experience unpleasant emotions easily, such as anger, anxiety, depression, or vulnerability, and is associated with a vulnerability to threat. Openness to Experience represents an individual’s willingness to consider new approaches, as well as their appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, and intellectual curiosity. Conscientiousness, the fourth dimension and another aspect of interpersonal behavior, can be defined as a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement. This trait is marked by planned rather than spontaneous behavior, organization, and scrupulousness. Finally, Agreeableness reflects a tendency to be trusting, compassionate, and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others. This model has been employed in the majority of recent studies that explore motivations and personality factors surrounding Internet usage (Ross et al. 2009; Wilson et al. 2010).

Using a FFM questionnaire, Ross et al. (2009) sought to discern the ways in which dimensions of personality and competency are related to how individuals in a sample of university students use Facebook for social purposes. Their findings partially supported the association between an individual’s personality and the FFM personality traits displayed through their use of Facebook. Contrary to the researchers’ speculation, the traits of Agreeableness and Openness to Experience were found to be unconnected to features of Facebook use. Neuroticism was found to be related to where and what an individual preferred to post on their Facebook. Consistent with the expectations of Ross et al. (2009), participants who scored high in Extraversion were members of more Facebook groups than individuals who scored lower. However, higher Extraversion scores were not found to be related to number of Facebook friends, or time spent online, as researchers had hypothesized. Higher competency using computer-mediated communication platforms was also found to increase the amount of time the individual reported spending on Facebook daily.

Important to note (along with the strengths of any particular study) are the shortcomings. Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky (2010) proposed what they thought, and what this researcher agrees, would be a more effective methodology. Instead of relying on the self-reporting of participants, these researchers advocated that the Ross et al. (2009) scrutinize the way that subjects build their Facebook profiles. Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky (2010) cited objectivity as the primary advantage to their proposed alternative method since self-reports are often influenced by social desirability. Additionally, they recommended replicating Ross et al.’s (2009) study utilizing analytical tools that would be less prone to bias.

Also referred to as the Big Five Model, Costa and McCrae’s (1992) FFM was adapted by John and Srivastava (1999) to become the Big Five Inventory (BFI), an abbreviated 44-item measure of the five traits - Neuroticism (a tendency to experience unpleasant emotions easily, such as anger, anxiety, depression, or vulnerability); Extraversion (energy, positive emotions, and the tendency to seek stimulation in the company of others); Openness to
Experience (appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, curiosity, and variety of experience); Agreeableness (a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others); and Conscientiousness (a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement; planned rather than spontaneous behavior). This model has been used extensively by researchers, obtaining support and validation in a number of studies (Mahoney and Stasson 2005; Ross et al. 2009).

**FIRO-B**

Schutz (1958) developed an interpersonal orientation theory that is grounded in the base assumption that “people need people,” and that all people strive to establish harmonious relationships in their social interactions. Schutz posits three key interpersonal needs that must be satisfied. The first of these is need for affection, or the measure of positive or negative emotional aspects in a relationship. This need is not restricted to romantic relationships, but includes a person’s need for warmth, intimacy, and love. The second interpersonal need delineated in Schutz’s model is the need for inclusion. This can be described as a need to maintain relationships with other people, as well as to be included in their activities, or to include them in one’s own activities. The final need forwarded by the FIRO-B model relates to control, which is a need to maintain an agreeable equilibrium of influence in relationships. Schutz theorizes that every individual needs to exercise control over other people, while simultaneously remaining independent from them. Schutz also forwards the notion that people innately need to be controlled, directed, or structured by others, while maintaining independence (Furnham 1996).

Each of these three interpersonal needs is measured in two ways: an expressed value, and a wanted value; therefore, the FIRO-B scale returns six scores: Affection Wanted (AW), Affection Expressed (AE), Control Wanted (CW), Control Expressed (CE), Inclusion Wanted (IW), and Inclusion Expressed (IE).

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Interaction Index</th>
<th>Wanted</th>
<th>Expressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>IW</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amalgam of these six values is referred to as the social interaction index (Furnham 1996). The individual’s score on the social interaction index indicates her/his overall need for interpersonal interaction. Those who score high in Expressed needs, and low in Wanted needs are more inclined to be involved with others and gregarious, while people with high Wanted scores and low Expressed scores are more apt to be shy, reserved individuals.

In one of only a few studies of its kind, researchers Mahoney and Stasson (2005) correlated data from the FIRO-B and BFI measures. The study provided limited support for a commonality between the FIRO-B interpersonal motivations and the BFI personality measures. Their findings revealed a consistently strong correlation for the BFI trait of Extraversion across all six FIRO-B scales. They attribute this rather pronounced correlation to the fact that most individuals who score high on the trait of Extraversion would simply have larger social circles. Highly Extraverted participants have a propensity to both express and to want Inclusion and Affection from others, as well as to express Control. Conversely, the only FIRO-B trait negatively correlated with Extraversion was Control Wanted. The BFI trait of Agreeableness correlated positively with Affection Wanted and Affection Expressed, as well as Inclusion Expressed. Mahoney and Stasson (2005) suggest that this could indicate an elevated social proficiency amongst individuals who enjoy social activity. In contrast, there was a negative correlation between Conscientiousness and Control Wanted. These researchers propose that this negative correlation may represent a complexity in choosing relationships that facilitate the avoidance of control by others. Additionally, Neuroticism is strongly and positively correlated with Control Wanted. Mahoney and Stasson (2005) speculate that people who have trouble expressing their emotions may be just fine with being controlled by others. Lastly, these researchers discuss the correlation between Openness and Inclusion Wanted, Affection Wanted, and Affection Expressed. Nevertheless, despite these correlations, the researchers point out that the two measures “are neither isomorphic nor strongly equivalent” (Mahoney and Stasson 2005, 212). The objective of the present study, however, is not to analyze the ways in which these measures correlate, but to explore whether or not opposing scores within traits can determine an individual’s use or non-use of Facebook.

The studies cited herein indicate personality traits associated with use of Facebook; thus, one could reasonably assume that opposite personality traits would be present in those who choose not to use the site. This study intends to clarify such an assumption. Accordingly, the hypothesis guiding this study is that users of Facebook will not have scores on the FIRO-B and BFI assessments that are opposite from non-users of Facebook. For clarity, this researcher is defining “opposite” as the mean scores for users and non-users having a difference of greater than 2.5 on the five point Likert-style scales used for both measures.
Method

Participants
A convenience/snowball sample of 43 undergraduate students from a diverse northern California state university participated in the study. Of the individuals in the sample, 17 were male, and 26 were female. The mean age of participants was 24.

Instrument
The Big Five Inventory is comprised of 44 items that comprehensively measure five personality dimensions. Openness, one of the traits, has ten items, two of which are reverse-scored. Conscientiousness and Agreeableness are each represented by nine items, four of which are reverse-scored. Extraversion and Neuroticism have eight items each, including three which are reverse-scored.

The FIRO-B assessment (Schutz 1958) is a 54-item questionnaire, with nine questions for each of the six scales, that measures three dimensions of interpersonal needs: Inclusion, Control, and Affection. These variables are stated in terms of an expressed behavior (E) and a desired or wanted behavior (W). The “E” score represents the person's overt, observable behavior toward others, and the “W” score refers to what the person wants from other people. The six scales are Wanted Inclusion (WI), Expressed Inclusion (EI), Wanted Affection (WA), Expressed Affection (EA), Wanted Control (WC), and Expressed Control (EC). Each question is answered using a five point Likert-type scale.

Additional survey questions about the individual's age, sex, availability of Internet, and use of Facebook were asked on a separate survey page, following the BFI and FIRO-B questionnaires.

Procedure
Forty-three surveys were completed by the sample group. After gaining the permission of the professors, the researcher emailed students in four undergraduate level Communication Studies courses a hyperlink to an online survey. The participants were given the opportunity to go to the site and take the assessment. They were also encouraged to refer friends who were also undergraduate students to take the survey. Participants were able to access the website and take the survey at their leisure. The website used to administer the survey for this study was: www.surveygizmo.com.

Results
Data were analyzed using an independent sample t test to look for statistically significant differences between the scores of the two discrete participant groups: users and non-users. Table 2 presents the participants’ mean scores, separated by the distinction of being either users or non-users, for each component of the BFI and FIRO-B scales. Means are listed, as well as the differences obtained when the means of non-users are subtracted from the means of users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BFI/FIRO-B trait</th>
<th>Non-users (N=14)</th>
<th>Users (N=29)</th>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>3.8438</td>
<td>3.6750</td>
<td>-.16875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.7361</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>.37500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4.3472</td>
<td>3.6444</td>
<td>-.70278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.6094</td>
<td>2.7917</td>
<td>.18229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>3.9000</td>
<td>3.9000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Inclusion</td>
<td>3.2375</td>
<td>2.1400</td>
<td>-1.09750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Inclusion</td>
<td>3.2917</td>
<td>3.1037</td>
<td>-.18796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Control</td>
<td>4.2778</td>
<td>4.3704</td>
<td>.09259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Control</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>3.4889</td>
<td>-.28889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Affection</td>
<td>3.5139</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>-.29167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Affection</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.5333</td>
<td>-.46667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the study supported the hypothesis; the BFI and FIRO-B scores of users of Facebook were not opposite (difference of means > 2.5) from those of non-users of Facebook. The only trait that had no variance in the means between users and non-users was the BFI trait of Openness to Experience. This trait does not seem to have any impact whatsoever on whether an individual uses Facebook. The mean scores for users and non-users were identical (3.9). Openness to Experience relates to an individual's appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, curiosity, and variety of experience. Appreciation for a variety of experience seems like it could play an integral role in a person's adoption of new communication media. However, if the actual communication experience is not unique (messaging on Facebook functions much like email), perhaps the medium is not the point of contention for non-users. Rather, it is also possible that the quality of communication, unwillingness to have yet another point of contact to have to keep track of, or even another BFI trait could override this aspect of personality to the point of it having no influence at all.

Both the BFI and the FIRO-B measures score the assessment using a five point Likert-style scale. The most significant variance found in the dataset of the present study is scarcely more than one point out of the five possible; therefore, the
word “opposite” as defined by this researcher (difference of means > 2.5) cannot accurately describe that difference. Differences of means ranged from zero for the BFI trait of Openness to Experience, to 1.0975 for the FIRO-B dimension of Wanted Inclusion.

Table 3 presents the t scores, degrees of freedom, and significance levels from the t test for each component of the BFI and FIRO-B scales as found through this study. Degrees of freedom relate to sample size and allow the researcher to identify the correct t values. The significance level (p) indicates the probability that the data are a random occurrence. A p value of less than .05 is considered to be statistically significant. For example, if the p value is .02, it means that there is only a two percent probability that the data are a random occurrence. Significance levels for each component of the BFI and FIRO-B scales as found through this study are also listed in the table below.

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BFI/FIRO-B trait</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.380</td>
<td>10.079</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>1.580</td>
<td>10.660</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-3.679</td>
<td>17.025</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>10.418</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>9.458</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Inclusion</td>
<td>-2.255</td>
<td>9.725</td>
<td>.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Inclusion</td>
<td>-4.68</td>
<td>11.366</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Control</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>12.172</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Control</td>
<td>-.620</td>
<td>15.367</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Affection</td>
<td>-9.29</td>
<td>9.472</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Affection</td>
<td>-1.453</td>
<td>9.440</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

The only two scores that achieved statistical significance (p < .05) were Conscientiousness from the BFI (p = .002) and Wanted Inclusion from the FIRO-B (p = .049). Although these two scores achieved statistical significance, the mean scores between users and non-users can hardly be called opposite – a difference of only -.70278 exists between users and non-users with regard to the BFI trait of Conscientiousness, and a difference of -1.09750 for the FIRO-B Wanted Inclusion score.

**Discussion**

The aim of the present study is to examine the BFI and FIRO-B scores of participants and determine if an opposite relationship (difference of means > 2.5) of scores on these two scales exists between users and non-users of Facebook based solely on an individual’s use of the site. This study does not follow the pattern of studies before it, such as Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky (2010), which was meant to refine the work done by Ross et al. (2009) by using a more objective measuring process than the self-reports of users. The present study does not follow those patterns because it does not include an examination of how specific personality traits and interpersonal communication motivations are correlated with how and why individuals use Facebook. Instead, this study seeks to explore whether or not opposite FIRO-B and BFI scores will be found between users and non-users. Since the present study makes no attempts to predict habits of Facebook use, or personality traits of users and how they correlate to the FIRO-B and BFI scales, it is not necessarily feasible to draw correlations to previous research. However, there does seem to be a difference between users and non-users, which is consistent with the findings of previous studies.

While the findings of this study showed statistical significance in the two instances of Conscientiousness (found to be much lower in users) and Wanted Inclusion (found to be much higher in users), this study lacked the scope to attempt any meaningful determination of systematic differences between users and non-users. In the study conducted by Hargittai (2007) she also collected data about participant’s race and ethnicity, parental educational background (for determination of socioeconomic status), as well as time spent online. Such information allows researchers to extrapolate a more holistic profile of the participants, and better determine the types of individuals who do or do not fit into a certain category.

In Mahoney and Stasson’s (2005) study of how scores from the BFI and FIRO-B measures correlate, the researchers bring to light potential shortcomings of the FIRO-B scale. Through interaction analysis between and within the elements of the FIRO-B and BFI measures, the results reveal that Inclusion and Affection are so similar conceptually that the majority of their participants could not accurately distinguish between the two. This resulted in Mahoney and Stasson (2005) concluding that the difference was reduced to being “purely academic – a distinction without a difference” (213). When Schutz (1958) developed the FIRO-B measure, his data were collected entirely from white, male students at Harvard – a “highly homogeneous and socially exclusive population” (Mahoney and Stasson 2005, 213). Mahoney and Stasson make their case for why this distinction could have existed within the minds of Schutz’s original participants, positing that these privileged individuals would have had much more time to experience, note, and internalize the nuances of interpersonal interaction. This
researcher additionally suggests that the social pedigree of the average young man attending Harvard in the 1950s would lend to a greater level of awareness in everyday interpersonal interactions. Whatever the reason for the original delineation of the three components of the FIRO-B, Mahoney and Stasson (2005) speculate that in a more heterogeneous sample, the distinctions would be diminished to the point of near non-existence.

Also mentioned in the study conducted by Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky (2010), is the presence of outside factors. While personality seems to have some bearing on why and how individuals use Facebook, Amichai-Hamburger and Vinitzky also cite social norms as being potentially influential with regard to the individual's behavioral displays on the site. This researcher proposes that based on the answers from participants, socioeconomic status and availability of the Internet in an individual's home are two potential outside factors that would possibly contribute to non-use.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The present study is not without limitations. This study would be more comprehensive if a greater number of participants had taken the survey. Also, if a more externally valid measure of interpersonal motivations was available, the study could be easily replicated using a different measure, and perhaps would provide more insight into the possible interconnectedness of interpersonal motivations and Facebook use. Additionally, if users could be further broken down by frequency of use, such categories (e.g. daily user, weekly user, monthly user) might help to further our understanding of SNS users.

Another limitation the present study faced was the inherent flaw in using an online survey site to try to gather data about non-users. When a Web site is utilized for surveying purposes, it creates a bias against those who may not engage in the use of SNSs for competency reasons. A lack of computer skills could eliminate less competent individuals from the sample population (Ross et al. 2009). Another possible explanation for reluctance to participate is that some individuals simply may not be interested in spending their time on the Internet. These individuals might not become involved in the present study because doing so would increase their time spent online. As a result, those whom the present study is focused on may not be represented within the data set. Finally, since differences of means only ranged from zero to 1.0975 the lack of significant differentiation leads this researcher to believe that perhaps no two groups of people would have opposite traits as defined within the parameters of this study.

This researcher is also interested as to what a content analysis of users’ Facebook activities would yield when coded and analyzed in terms of interpersonal communication motivations. Moreover, a goal for future research could be to create a matrix of user types not defined by personality measures or any outside assessment, but by case studies of user profiles. The academic applications of such research could include furthering our knowledge and understanding of not only human personality and communication, but also how computers are affecting interpersonal and social aspects of our lives over time.
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