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The Use of Facebook For Information Seeking in Social and Personal Relationships

One can learn a great deal about a person on Facebook. Once someone has friended another person on Facebook, he or she has access to that person's profile (including basic information, interests, “favorites,” etc.), notes, photographs, and blog. In some cases, people can access this information even if they are not friends with someone on Facebook, depending on the target's privacy settings. Walther's (1992) Social Information Processing theory Social (SIP) related to information seeking online. He argued that when there is an absence of social and context cues online, people adapt by seeking out a variety of types of information online in order make sense of the communication with, and to form impressions of, their partner. Because Facebook is so widely used and Facebook users have access to a great deal of personal information of their Facebook friends, there is little doubt this process occurs on Facebook. This paper will explore information seeking strategies used on Facebook and seek to expand on Westerman, Van Der Heide, Klein, and Walther's (2008) work on the use of social networking sites to gather information. In addition, this research will examine whether reducing uncertainty via Facebook affects relationship satisfaction or communication satisfaction among Facebook friends.

Uncertainty Reduction

Uncertainty Reduction Theory (URT) provides a communication-based theoretical explanation of relationship development and social interaction. Berger and Calabrese (1975) postulated that level of uncertainty relates to reciprocity, information-seeking, liking (attraction), nonverbal affiliative expressiveness, amount of verbal communication, intimacy level of communication content, and similarity. They also posited that reducing uncertainty about the predicted behavior of both self and other would result in positive relational outcomes.

Berger (1979) argued that although uncertainty is always present to some extent, people vary in
their need to reduce that uncertainty. According to Berger, three antecedents exist which affect the
desire to reduce uncertainty: (1) expectation of future interaction (will the relationship continue?), (2)
deviance (what is the reason for the other’s deviation from normative behavioral expectations?), and
(3) incentive value (can the other provide me with some type of reward?). Berger stated that the
presence of any one of these antecedents, or a combination thereof, should induce one to employ
information-seeking strategies in an effort to seek out information via increased monitoring of the self
and the other.

Additionally, Berger (1979) presented a typology of information-seeking strategies people use
when attempting to reduce uncertainty. He classified these strategies as passive, active, or interactive.
The passive strategy refers to unobtrusive behaviors, such as monitoring nonverbal behaviors of the
partner and watching the partner interact with another person. The active strategy refers to behaviors
involving engagement with persons other than the partner in an effort to gain information or the
manipulation of the context in order to gain information. Specifically, a person may seek out
information about a partner from that partner's friends or family members, or employ “secret tests”
such as creating a situation in which the partner can be observed to see how she or he responds. Finally,
the interactive strategy refers to target-directed behaviors enacted to obtain information, such as
directly questioning the partner or strategic self-disclosure in an effort to induce reciprocation of
information exchange.

*Uncertainty Reduction in Relationships*

Uncertainty reduction has been identified as a primary factor in the initiation and development
of relationships (e.g., Berger & Bradac, 1982; Berger & Calabrese, 1975); however, applications of
uncertainty reduction theory have included the explication of URT to later, as opposed to strictly initial,
stages of relationships (Berger, 1979; Berger & Bradac, 1982; Emmers & Canary, 1996; Parks &
Parks and Adelman (1983) examined the use of extended communication networks (e.g., family, friendship circles) in relation to the use of active uncertainty reduction strategies and the development of intimate relationships. Again, active strategies involve the seeking out of information from someone other than the relational partner. Based on participants’ responses, the authors reported that levels of uncertainty reduction and liking are significant indicators of relationship stability. This is in line with original axioms of URT. Additionally, they suggested that the influence of communication networks is a prevalent factor in the reduction of uncertainty and subsequent relationship stability; therefore, it is unclear as to what degree uncertainty is lessened by amount of contact with the relational partner versus partner’s network of family and friends.

In an investigation of events that increase uncertainty Planalp, Rutherford, and Honeycutt (1988) reported that unexpected sexual behavior, deception, personality changes, and infidelity increased uncertainty in relationships. The authors concluded that negative events, more so than positive events, increase uncertainty and decrease degree of liking.

Uncertainty Reduction Online

In recent years, scholars have investigated how uncertainty is reduced in computer-mediated communication. Walther (1992, 1993) posited a theory of information processing whereby relational development occurs over a longer period of time than in face-to-face interactions; partners must first adapt to the lack of cues and reduced bandwidth in order to reduce uncertainty and form impressions of one another. According to Walther's (1992) Social Information Processing theory Social (SIP), in the absence of face-to-face social and context cues, people make an effort to seek out a variety of types of information online in order make sense of the communication with, and to form impressions of, their partner. One example of this is the reading of wall posts on Facebook. Walther et al. (2008) found that
when people read their friends' wall posts on Facebook, impressions are formed about those Facebook friends' levels of credibility and social attractiveness. Furthermore, information on Facebook friends' walls left by their (non-mutual) friends also affected the observer's impressions of that friend.

More recently, Westerman et al. (2008) examined what specific information seeking strategies people use (including Internet-based strategies) and found that people reported frequent use of social networking sites to gather information about both people they know well and those they do not know well. According to Westerman et al., the popularity of social networking sites to seek information, especially when the target is not well known, is due in part to the information seeker's ability to be either identifiable or unidentifiable on these sites, depending on the situation and their specific needs.

**Passive Uncertainty Reduction.** It has been argued that passive information seeking strategies online are unlikely due to the constraints of communicating online (e.g., Ramirez, Walther, Burgoon, & Sunnafrank, 2002; Tidwell & Walther, 2002). In other words, it is difficult to simply “observe” someone, or listen in on her or his communication, online. However, this argument was posited with primarily email, listserves, and discussion boards in mind. In other online contexts, such as virtual worlds and social networking sites, passive strategies are not only possible but may be quite common. Facebook users regularly check the pages of their Facebook friends, reading status updates, checking out groups and “fan clubs” that have joined, and keeping up with wall posts and comments. In fact, this is what Facebook is about; keeping up with friends.

**Active Uncertainty Reduction.** Research thus far has found that people use active information seeking strategies minimally in CMC (e.g., Ramirez et al., 2002; Tidwell & Walther, 2002). These researchers suggest that people communicating online may have less opportunity to use active strategies due to the size of their online social networks. For example, if someone has a friend online, she may not have a wide circle of mutual friends from whom to seek information or may not have an
opportunity by which to contact these mutual friends. Facebook users, however, often have many mutual friends; in fact, the service facilitates this by providing friend suggestions based on mutual network ties, interests, and acquaintances. Therefore, it is quite possible the Facebook users are engaging in active information seeking strategies while on Facebook.

**Interactive Uncertainty Reduction.** Tidwell and Walther (2002) reported that, when examining FTF versus CMC uncertainty reduction strategies, people communicating in a computer-mediated environment are more likely than those communicating face-to-face to engage interactive (direct) strategies for seeking information and reducing uncertainty. It is possible that the use of these direct strategies, such as frequent questioning and self-disclosure, may lead conversational partners to form the impression that their relationships are quite intimate (or hyperpersonal). This fits with prior research that has shown people disclose more and built intimacy more quickly online. Thus, people may find it easier to obtain personal information about a target online than in person. Because Facebook users spend so much time on Facebook, it stands to reason that people would use Facebook to try and obtain that information. Ramirez et al. (2002) also argued that the very lack of verbal and nonverbal cues in CMC may actually increase the use of interactive strategies online; people communicating online adapt their information seeking strategies to fit the medium. This is consistent with Walther's (1992) SIP perspective.

**Extractive Uncertainty Reduction.** Ramirez et al. (2002) argued that online communication technologies may elicit different “technology-specific” uncertainty reduction tactics, which they called extractive strategies, than those have been found in previous studies of face-to-face interaction. The extractive information seeking strategy refers to searching the Internet for information. Thus, instead of observing a person (passive), asking that person's friends (active), or questioning that person directly (interactive), someone may choose to simply go online and search for information about that individual.
Communicating On Facebook

Facebook, the most popular social networking site (e.g., Kazeniac, 2009), reports having over 175 million active users as of January 2009. There are millions of college students who check their facebook accounts multiple times a day, using the service to update themselves on friends' lives and to send and receive messages. The ability to make new friends and maintain current friendships is what makes Facebook so popular. When network friends or casual off-line acquaintances are added as friends on Facebook, these Facebook friendships do not rival those of close off-line friends who are friends on Facebook in which friends have shared interests and high levels of trust (Acquisti & Gross, 2006). In light of the number of people who use Facebook and the research by Westerman et al. (2008), people are undoubtedly seeking out information to reduce uncertainty about their acquaintances, friends, and romantic partners on Facebook; however, scholars do not know which specific information seeking strategies they are using or how it is affecting Facebook users' relationships.

On Facebook, users can access information about their friends in multiple ways. The most common way to gain information about others is by reading their “wall,” a public area where the account user and her/his friends can have public conversations, highlight web pages of interest, post photographs, and share other information. Although the account owner can control what he or she writes on his or her own page, what that person's friends contribute to the page is not controlled. Mazer et al. (2007) argues that this is one of the dangers of posting and allowing others to post information in a public sphere.

People who use Facebook do so primarily to maintain current face-to-face relationships. Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe (2007) found that of the average Facebook user's 150 to 200 Facebook friends, the majority of these friends were people the Facebook user had off-line. Other Facebook friends are commonly “friended” because of shared network acquaintances and/or a one-time face-to-
face meeting (Strater & Richter, 2007). Furthermore, users report rarely removing Facebook friends once they have been added (Strater & Richter, 2007). Therefore, the average Facebook user has a large network of friends who may post information that about or in reference to that user that may be seen by any other member of the users' friends. If the user has not enabled any privacy settings, any person in their university or city network can gain access to information to their walls. Facebook users are also savvy and aware that they find information about other Facebook users by reading their walls.

*Satisfaction*

Satisfaction, or contentment, is central to the examination of interpersonal relationships. Because individuals strive toward contentment, fulfillment, and happiness in their romantic relationships, an abundance of social psychological and communication literature has focused on both relational satisfaction and interpersonal communication satisfaction as predictor and criterion variables. The following section examines interpersonal communication satisfaction and relationship satisfaction.

*Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction.* Duck & Pittman (1994) state that communication is the building block of relationships, thus, it stands to reason that the more satisfying that communication is, the more it can affect relationship satisfaction. Also, if one feels understood in her or his communication with another person, then it is likely to positively influence communication satisfaction. For example, Emmers-Sommer (2004) reported that communication satisfaction positively affected relationship satisfaction. In addition, Anderson and Emmers-Sommer (2006) reported that communication satisfaction was a significant predictor or relationship satisfaction in computer-mediated relationships. Therefore, the role of communication satisfaction in Facebook friendships may show similar patterns.

*Relationship Satisfaction.* Because communication and interpersonally relating are so closely linked, another dimension of satisfaction that is important to the understanding of interpersonal
interactions is relationship satisfaction. Relational satisfaction is the degree to which an individual is content and satisfied with his or her relationship. Previous research has shown relationship satisfaction to be a strong predictor of FTF relationships success and length; also, research has shown that relationship satisfaction is influenced by one's perceptions of their relational partner's communication (Guerrero, 1994).

In CMC, researchers have found relationship satisfaction to be high, in general (e.g., Anderson & Emmers-Sommer, 2006; Parks & Roberts, 1998), and a willingness to develop and maintain online relationships (e.g., McKenna, Green, & Gleason, 2002; Parks & Floyd, 1996).

Research Questions

It can be argued that active uncertainty reduction strategies are impractical on Facebook. For example, people may not want to use Facebook as the medium to seek out information from third-parties because that request could be made public or shared with others. Also, it may not be as easy to manipulate the Facebook environment in an effort to gain information from a target's reaction to that manipulation. On the other hand, because so many people use Facebook so regularly and check the pages of their Facebook friends, it may be that it is easier to manipulate the environment on Facebook by simply changing one's personal profile information, adding a new friend, or posting something to one's wall and expecting the target to see that information and respond in some way. Similarly, according to Westerman et al. (2008), in certain circumstances people actually prefer seeking information in online settings such as social networking services. Therefore, because (1) people are increasingly spending time on social networking sites in general and Facebook in particular; (2) we can assume uncertainty reduction is taking place on Facebook but are unsure in what ways, and (3) uncertainty reduction is important to relationship development, maintenance, and relational outcomes, the following research questions are posed:
RQ 1: To what degree do people use passive, active, and interactive information seeking strategies on Facebook to seek information about their Facebook friends?

RQ 2: What are the relationships among information seeking on Facebook, attributional confidence towards one's Facebook friend, relationship satisfaction with one's Facebook friend, and communication satisfaction with one's Facebook friend?

RQ 3: To what extent do people use Facebook to seek out information in an effort to reduce uncertainty about someone who is not a Facebook friend?

Method

Sample and Procedure

Two hundred and thirty two participants (59% female; 41% male) completed a survey that asked them to reflect on their communication on Facebook. Participants were solicited from undergraduate courses at a New England university and were comprised of a convenience and snowball sample. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 51 with an average age of 23.78 (mode = 21). Participants reported having been a member of Facebook for 3 months to 50 months (with an average of about 31 months).

To assess the types of uncertainty reduction strategies used by people on Facebook, participants were asked to think of one specific friend on Facebook and to then think of a time they wanted to know something about a Facebook friend and to detail how the sought out that information using Facebook. Then, participants were asked the same question again but prompted to think about a person they had met in-person but whom was not currently their Facebook friend. In other words, participants were asked to report information seeking strategies used to gain information about someone with whom they already had an established relationships and about someone with whom they did not already have an
established relationship. Last, while keeping the Facebook friend in mind that they identified previously, participants completed a questionnaire containing measures of attributional confidence (certainty), communication satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and degree of information seeking.

Instrumentation

Uncertainty Reduction Strategies. Based on Strauss and Corbin's (1990) constant comparative method, the responses to the open-ended questions about using Facebook to seek out information were analyzed and coded into the 4 uncertainty reduction categories (passive, active, interactive, and extractive) by the researcher and an assistant. Twenty percent of the responses were checked for intercoder reliability; the Cohen's kappa was .89.

Passive strategies refer to and were coded as viewing a Facebook friend's profile, blog posts, posted photographs, wall posts and exchanges with others, and notes (extended messages Facebook users can write about themselves) without influencing the target or any other Facebook user. Active strategies refer to and were coded as seeking out information on Facebook from a Facebook friend's other Facebook friends and network members by (1) asking questions or inquiring about relationships, work, school, or other personal topics and (2) manipulating the Facebook environment in an effort to elicit a reaction from the target (e.g., making an antagonistic comment on the target's wall, posting information to one's own page with the intent of the target seeing it, etc.). Interactive strategies refer to and were coded as asking a Facebook friend a direct question about her or his relationships, work, school, or other personal topics via a Facebook message (email) or post to that person's wall, and strategically self disclosing information about oneself via a Facebook message or wall post in an effort to elicit a reciprocal exchange of information. Finally, extractive strategies refer to and were coded as seeking out information on Facebook by searching for information on Facebook that is not posted on a person's profile page or wall (e.g., reading through a discussion thread on the wall of a group for which
the target is a member in an effort to find any comments the target has made).

**Attributional Confidence.** The short version of the Attributional Confidence Scale (CL7) (Clatterbuck, 1979) was used to assess participants’ perceived level of certainty about their previously identified Facebook friend. Certainty is measured on a 0% to 100% scale. Cronbach’s alpha = .88 in the current study. The mean score for attributional confidence was 78.87 ($SD = 11.82$), therefore, participants reported relatively high attributional confidence with their friends on Facebook.

**Communication satisfaction.** Interpersonal communication satisfaction was conceptualized as "the emotional reaction to communication which is both successful and expectation fulfilling" (Hecht, 1984, p. 201). This variable was assessed using a shortened eight-item version of Hecht's (1978) seven-point Likert-type measure of communication satisfaction. This measure had an alpha of .92 in the current study. The mean score for communication satisfaction with one's Facebook friend was 5.83 ($SD = 1.67$), therefore, participants reported high communication satisfaction with their friends on Facebook.

**Relationship satisfaction.** Relationship satisfaction is the degree to which an individual is content with his or her current relationship. To assess relationship satisfaction the researchers used a version of Norton’s (1983) Quality Marriage Index adapted for persons in (non-marital) online romantic relationships. The QMI is a six-item Likert-type scale. Previous research has found Norton’s measure to be reliable when used with non-marital relationships (e.g., VanLear, 1991). Additionally, the measure has remained reliable in previous studies when adapted for non-married persons (VanLear, 1991). Cronbach’s alpha = .92 in the current study. The mean score for relationship satisfaction with one's Facebook friend was 6.01 ($SD = .92$), therefore, participants reported high relationship satisfaction with their friends on Facebook.

**Information seeking.** To measure amount of information seeking with the identified Facebook
friend, the six item 7-point Likert-type information-seeking measure constructed by Kellerman and Reynolds (1990) was used. In this research the alpha coefficient for information seeking was .89 ($M = 4.63, SD = 2.14$).

### Results

Research question one asked, “To what degree do people use passive, active, and interactive information seeking strategies on Facebook to seek information about their Facebook friends?” Of the 232 participants open ended descriptions of seeking out information to reduce uncertainty on Facebook, 211 responses were usable. After the 211 responses were coded for type of uncertainty reduction strategy, the passive strategy emerged as the most frequently used method of reducing uncertainty among Facebook friends ($n = 91; 43.13\%$). Numerous participants described reading through friends' walls and subsequent comment discussions, checking for changes to basic profile information, investigating groups or fan pages that had been joined by the Facebook friend, and looking at photographs.

The second most frequent uncertainty reduction strategy used was the interactive strategy ($n = 84; 39.80\%$). Participants reported sending their friends private messages (emailing via Facebook), posting questions or comments on the friend's wall, and self-disclosing to prompt a reciprocal disclosure. Wall conversations—including discussions about someone's quiz results, posted web links, photographs, etc.—were very common. Active uncertainty reduction strategies were used the third most frequently, and not to a great extent ($n = 32; 15.17\%$). Examples included obtaining information from a mutual Facebook friend, strategically altering one's own Facebook page—for example, by placing a particular piece of “flair” or “bumper sticker” on one's wall or changing one's relationship status—in an effort to elicit a response. A few participants reported attempting to manipulate a mutual Facebook friends' page (e.g., by posting something to that friend's wall) hoping the target Facebook friend would respond.
Last, the extractive strategy proposed by Ramirez et al. (2002) was identified in only 1.9% (n = 4) of the participant's responses. Examples of extractive strategies that emerged when the data were coded include reading through messages on fan pages and group pages searching for a message from a specific Facebook member and signing up for a separate, “fake” Facebook account in an attempt to access otherwise blocked profile information.

Research question two asked, “For people who are Facebook friends, what are the relationships among information seeking on Facebook, attributional confidence towards one's Facebook friend, relationship satisfaction with one's Facebook friend, and communication satisfaction with one's Facebook friend?” To answer this question, a correlation matrix was conducted. Information seeking and attributional confidence about one's Facebook friend were positively correlated (r = .58, p < .05). In addition, information seeking and relationship satisfaction with one's Facebook friend were positively correlated (r = .32, p < .05), as was information seeking and communication satisfaction (r = .44, p < .05). Regarding attributional confidence, there was a positive relationship with relationship satisfaction (r = .49, p < .05) and with communication satisfaction (r = .39, p < .05). Finally, and not surprisingly, relationship satisfaction and communication satisfaction were positively correlated (r = .30, p < .05).

Research question three asked, “To what extent do people use Facebook to seek out information in an effort to reduce uncertainty about someone who is not a already a Facebook friend?” Of the 232 participants' responses, 204 were usable and, of those, 71 participants' responses were categorized as “Other” because the participants stated they had not sought out information about someone on Facebook who was not already a Facebook friend. Thus, the following analysis is based on the remaining 133 responses. When seeking information about a person who is not currently a Facebook friend (such as new acquaintance), 53.38% of participants (n = 71) reported using an active strategy, which most often referred to sending a friend request to the target in order to become their Facebook
friend and subsequently gain access to the target's profile information. A few participants disclosed that they had created an extra, fake Facebook account in order to try and gain access pseudo-anonymously from a target's profile. Passive uncertainty reduction was reported by 24.06% of participants \( (n = 32) \). These participants noted being able to access all or some of the target's Facebook profile because the target had not implemented the highest privacy setting. The extraction strategy (Ramirez et al., 2002) emerged as well, although not on Facebook but, rather, as a result of Facebook; 22.56% participants \( (n = 30) \) reported that because they could not gain access to a new acquaintances profile on Facebook they chose instead to search the Internet for sources of information about the target. No responses were found for the interactive uncertainty reduction strategy.

Discussion

The focus of this study was to examine which uncertainty reduction (information seeking) strategies people use in Facebook when seeking information about people with whom they are already Facebook friends, when seeking information about people with whom they are not currently Facebook friends, and to examine the relationships among uncertainty, information seeking, and satisfaction among people who interact with their friends on Facebook. Although researchers have found previously that people communicating online use primarily interactive uncertainty reduction strategies, these studies had examined uncertainty reduction in leaner CMC mediums (such as email). Social networking sites such as Facebook are richer CMC mediums because they provide more cues than other forms of CMC. This may explain why this study found the passive uncertainty reduction strategy to be used more frequently.

After coding participants' responses, the most frequently used uncertainty reduction strategy for people who were seeking information about someone with whom they were already Facebook friends was the passive strategy, followed by the interactive strategy, the active strategy, and finally the extractive strategy. The common use of the passive strategy is not at all surprising given the very nature
of social networking; people are encouraged to both provide and share information with others. Also, based on existing research that has shown people (especially college-aged people) spend so much time on Facebook, it stands to reason that they are regularly going to and reading over the Facebook profiles of friends to gather information about those friends. When participants could not get the information they desired by looking at a profile page, or when they did not want to bother, they contacted the Facebook friend directly and interacted with her/him, usually through a wall post/comment or a private message. In FTF settings, interactive uncertainty reduction strategies have been found to be most effective at reducing one's level of uncertainty (Canary & Emmers, 1996). Again, social networking exists to facilitate these sorts of actions that are designed to help people stay connected. Active uncertainty reduction strategies were used, but not to a great extent. This may be because people feel they do not need to manipulate a situation on Facebook when there are easier, more direct way to get the information. Nonetheless, there were some examples of the active strategy such as changing one's relationship status or profile photo in an effort to get a reaction and creating a new, “fake” account and trying to get the target to accept an offer of friendship from this new account (in once case, as an obvious attempt at a secret test). Sometimes these interactions involved “poking,” or sending a Facebook gift, in the hopes that this would elicit a response back from the target. The extractive strategy was used only a handful of times, most likely because—for the most part—it is unnecessary on Facebook.

When looking at people who communicate with and seek out information about someone with whom they are currently Facebook friends, there are significant, positive linear relationships among attributional confidence (certainty), information seeking, interpersonal communication satisfaction, and relationship satisfaction. These findings coincide with previous research of both off- and online relationships that have found correlations and predictive relationships among these components.

An examination of uncertainty reduction strategies used by people seeking information about
someone with whom they were not friends on Facebook showed that the active strategy was used most frequently, followed by the passive and extractive strategies. No participants reported using the interactive uncertainty reduction strategy in this situation. Unlike when seeking information about current Facebook friends, active was the strategy of choice. This is not surprising given that sending the target a friend request is a means of manipulating the situation in an effort to get information, and it is quite common for people (especially college-age people) to invite someone to be friends on Facebook after only one meeting. For example, one participants detailed a situation in which she had been introduced to another young woman at a party on campus, was interested in learning more about and possibly pledging that woman's sorority, and so had sent her a friend request the next day hoping to learn more about the sorority and sorority life by reading that woman's profile once the request was accepted. Also of interest here is the increased use of the extractive strategy with non-Facebook friends. Although the strategy was not used on Facebook per se, a number of participants noted that it was precisely because they could not find information about a target on Facebook (which they checked first) that they then “Googled” the target hoping to find something out through a more general Internet search. The infrequent use of the interactive strategy seemed to be a result of participants not wanting to send a direct Facebook message to someone who was also on Facebook but not already their Facebook friend. One participant even noted this possibility and why she would not do it, having written, “it would be creepy to get a message from someone, especially if they didn't friend me first.”

Future Research and Limitations

Limitations of this research include the use of a non-random sample and survey methods to obtain data. It would be interesting to see an experimental design used to answer these questions. Although, the nature of the Facebook relationship should be examined in future research; that is, when participants were asked to think of someone on Facebook they wanted information about, they could have thinking of a romantic partner, romantic interest, friend, family member, or acquaintance. The
nature of the relationship can undoubtedly influence both the need for uncertainty reduction and the choice of strategy used.

More importantly, future research should examine how anticipated future interaction effects information seeking and uncertainty on Facebook. Prior research has indicated that whether or not someone desires to and/or anticipated interacting with a target in the future can influence her or his attributional confidence and need for uncertainty reduction. Also, although relationships were found among the satisfaction variables, attributional confidence, and information seeking (consistent with prior research of both FTF and online interactants), these relationships should be explored in more depth, specifically, predictive relationships should be examined.
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