



# A systems approach to understanding the effect of Facebook use on the quality of interpersonal communication



Megan Davies<sup>a</sup>, Josephine K. Musango<sup>b,\*</sup>, Alan C. Brent<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Master's in Sustainable Development, School of Public Leadership, Stellenbosch University, South Africa

<sup>b</sup> School of Public Leadership, Centre for Renewable and Sustainable Energy Studies, Stellenbosch University, Private Bag X1, Matieland, 7602, South Africa

<sup>c</sup> Department of Industrial Engineering, Centre for Renewable and Sustainable Energy Studies, Stellenbosch University, Private Bag X1, Matieland, 7602, South Africa

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 14 August 2015

Received in revised form

12 October 2015

Accepted 23 October 2015

Available online 12 January 2016

### Keywords:

Technology

Facebook

Interpersonal communication

Systems approach

System dynamics

## ABSTRACT

Social networking platforms such as Facebook have become integrated into the milieu of modern-day social interactions. Facebook, one of the most prominent social networking platforms globally, is widely used as a primary medium for communicating and networking for personal, professional and recreational purposes. To date, studies have focussed on developing an understanding of why people make use of Facebook. Limited studies have explored the effect of Facebook use on interpersonal communication. This paper then investigated the tension between the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication. From the literature, the need to belong, and the need for self-presentation, were identified as the two main set of complex relations that justifies why people use Facebook. Qualitative system dynamics modelling, specifically causal loop diagrams, was used to gain more insights on the tension between Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication from the perspective of a potential Facebook user. This tension was represented by the trade-off arising when considering the amount of time spent on Facebook and interpersonal communication. It is argued in this paper that Facebook is not a sufficient substitute to interpersonal communication, as it tends to degrade the quality of interpersonal relationships. Future investigation will require developing a simulation model for a specific case to provide more insights on the extent of this trade-offs and potential intervention measures.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Social networking platforms have become integrated into the milieu of modern-day social interaction. Facebook is one such platform, and is the most prolific online social networks of the contemporary era and the first of its kind in history. Created in 2004 in the United States of America by Mark Zuckerberg and a group of fellow Harvard University students, it reached 50 million users by October 2007 and an astonishing one billion monthly active users on 14th September 2012 from across the globe [1]. By the time Facebook reached one billion users, the median age of the active users was 22 years and the top five countries where people were connected were Brazil, India, Indonesia, Mexico and the United

States [1].

Facebook enables users to create visible profiles with basic personal information; users are able to make available a wide range of personal details thereafter. The platform boasts a host of features facilitating virtual interaction that have the potential to be extended to offline environments. Some of these features include the friends list, the wall, status, events, messages, video, photos, pokes, chat, groups and like functionality, as describe by Nadkarni and Hofman [2]:

“The *friends* list is a crucial component of Facebook because it allows the end user to create a public display of links to connections which viewers can in turn click through, to traverse the network. The *wall* is a term given to the Facebook feature that functions as a bulletin board and allows other users to post personal messages directed toward the end user. The *pokes* function allows users to offer initial greetings to other users. *Status* allows users to inform their friends of their whereabouts

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [megdavies84@gmail.com](mailto:megdavies84@gmail.com) (M. Davies), [josephine.musango@spl.sun.ac.za](mailto:josephine.musango@spl.sun.ac.za) (J.K. Musango), [acb@sun.ac.za](mailto:acb@sun.ac.za) (A.C. Brent).

and thoughts. The *events* feature enables users to plan meetings or events that they can extend invitations for. *Photos* and *videos* allow users to upload albums, photos and videos which other users can comment on. Communication with friends is accomplished through *messages*, which are public or private, but also through a chat feature. The *groups* feature allows users to create and join interest groups. The *like* functionality allows users to give positive feedback about preferred content.”

Facebook's mission is to give people the power to share and make the world more open and connected [1]. The above-mentioned technical features shed light on the myriad of opportunities for engagement and sharing that Facebook makes possible in the virtual social networking space. In social network theory, a network is understood as a set of relationships [3]. The Facebook platform succeeds in incorporating a vast array of features that culminate in a rich set of network interactions and relationships. However, the networks established on Facebook are anchored in offline, real-life networks, relationships and connections, although the possibility of connecting with people outside of established networks is a distinguishing feature of the platform. Essentially, offline social networks are extending onto a virtual platform in a way that codifies, externalises and collates an individual's family, friends, acquaintances and wider connections. “Facebook represents a means for individuals to continue (and extend) their offline relationships and conversations in an online medium” [4].

Arnaboldi et al. [5] similarly affirms that the properties of offline social networks are true for Facebook as well. Facebook users primarily communicate with people who are already part of their extended social network [7]. As in offline contexts, Facebook users are closely connected to a smaller group of people and loosely connected to a larger group of people; however, it is acknowledged that Facebook makes it possible to connect or be ‘friends’ with considerably more people, as reflected in the friends list feature. Nonetheless, the number of relationships that an individual can actively sustain, even on Facebook, is approximately the same as in real-life; Dunbar's number sets this at 150 individuals [5].

To date, studies have focussed on developing an understanding of why people make use of Facebook based on differing case studies and potential factors influencing its growth. Most of these studies do not consider the dynamics of the Facebook use. The need for utilising system dynamics in analysing the dynamics of social networks platforms such as Facebook was echoed by Pay et al. [6]. They developed a system dynamics model to understand why students in Iran use Facebook. Similarly, students at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) were given an assignment to develop causal loop diagrams of the main factors influencing exponential growth in Facebook use.<sup>1</sup> Limited studies have, however, explored the tension between the growing use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication. This paper thus employed system dynamics modelling in an attempt to develop a dynamic hypothesis of the relationship between the use of Facebook and its impact on the quality of interpersonal communication. Given the highly subjective and qualitative nature of this investigation, qualitative system dynamics was deemed most appropriate to provide a richer understanding of the identified problem.

## 2. The dynamics of Facebook

This section unpacks the motivations for people's use of

Facebook, as well as the reasons for the social networking platform's commendable success and continuous proliferation. With technology increasingly shaping and being shaped by our lifestyles, it is imperative to shed light on the fundamental psychological and social drivers for the use of Facebook. Coupled to this is an explanation of the underlying logic of how Facebook works, and how it propagates networks of relationships and connections in a way that bolsters the platform's mission to make the world a more open and connected place.

### 2.1. Why do people use Facebook?

According to Facebook, people use the site to stay connected with friends and family, to discover what is going on in the world and to share and express what matters to them [1]. Numerous studies have investigated the psychological factors contributing to Facebook use ([7–11]).

Nadkarni and Hofmann [2] reviewed an array of studies and proposed a dual-factor model of Facebook use. In line with this model, Facebook use is primarily motivated by two basic social needs, namely: the need to belong, and the need for self-presentation. Even though humans are highly dependent on the social support of others [2] and Facebook provides a very concrete, accessible and traceable platform through which to foster this, the relationship between Facebook and social connection is complex. Nonetheless, the need to belong - connected to self-worth, self-esteem and so on - is acknowledged as a fundamental driver for the use of Facebook.

The need for self-presentation is a closely connected motivation. Users are invited to create a personal profile through which they establish a presence on Facebook. Comprehensive research has been conducted on the role that social networking sites play in identity construction (e.g. Refs. [12–14]). Like other social networking sites, Facebook “leaves itself open to the possibility its users display their idealised, rather than accurate, selves through their profiles” [2]. Moreover, Facebook “has a number of characteristics (e.g. its ubiquitous nature, high visibility, direct connection to a sizeable and heterogeneous network of known individuals) that provide unique and interesting conditions for investigating the interaction of multiple selves ... in self-expression” [4].

Crucial findings by Back et al. [14] and Zhao et al. [15] reveal that, unlike other anonymous online environments, Facebook users express and communicate their real personality rather than promoting idealised versions of themselves. This is because information about a user's reputation or personality is difficult to control (e.g. wall posts posted by other users) and the fact that friends provide accountability and subtle feedback on the self as presented through the Facebook profile [14].

Thus, it can be seen how the reasons underpinning the use of Facebook are intricately connected with complex psychological processes and patterns. Nonetheless, for the purpose of this paper, a simplistic understanding of the two overriding motivations is sufficient.

### 2.2. Facebook: the strength of weak ties

As has been illustrated, Facebook replicates and extends the vast, varied and interlinking social networks that exist in real life; those constituting the rich social fabric of diverse societies. Similarly, many of the principles underpinning offline social networks are true also for online social networks. One of these principles is the strength of weak ties and the nature of information dissemination ([5,16–18]). Granovetter (1973) seminal text, *The Strength of Weak Ties*, depicts the strategic functionality of weak ties in large scale social networks as small groups aggregate to form large-scale

<sup>1</sup> [http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/sloan-school-of-management/15-871-introduction-to-system-dynamics-fall-2013/assignments/MIT15\\_871F13\\_ass2.pdf](http://ocw.mit.edu/courses/sloan-school-of-management/15-871-introduction-to-system-dynamics-fall-2013/assignments/MIT15_871F13_ass2.pdf).

network patterns. Weak ties are indispensable to an individual's opportunities and their integration into communities, as well as for the dissemination of ideas, influence and information among diverse individuals and communities [19]. The article also outlines the nature of strong ties that constitute dense networks.

According to Granovetter [19], “the strength of a tie is a probably linear combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding) and the reciprocal services which characterise the tie”. Additionally, “the more frequently persons interact with one another, the stronger the sentiments of friendship for one another are apt to be” (Homan in Ref. [19]). In a network, “whatever is diffused can reach a larger number of people and traverse greater social distance when passed through weak ties rather than strong” [19]. Additionally, in terms of organisation of communities and societies, “weak ties play a role in effecting social cohesion” [19]. It becomes apparent that strong ties are not conducive to the widespread sharing of information. Facebook understands the power of weak ties as those responsible for the majority of information spread on its platform [18]. Facebook's success as an online social network can thus be understood on the basis of and attributed to its ability to target fundamental social needs (belonging and self-presentation) using a platform, which leverages the strength of weak ties.

Reflecting on Facebook's purpose to provide people with the power to share information through a host of functionalities, and making the world more open and connected, it becomes apparent that fostering loose, weak ties is the most fruitful way of spreading information whilst ensuring that people feel connected to their virtual communities. Since more people can be connected through weak ties, it makes logical sense for Facebook to cultivate online social network structures that are less dense and that constitute a richness of loose ties, over and above the strong ties in networks that people identify with in both real and virtual life.

Against the above understanding of the functionality, purpose and nature of Facebook, as an online social networking site, a specific problem was identified in the relationship between the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication. Interpersonal communication in this paper was framed as the two-way communication or sharing that takes place between individuals whereby specifically tailored messages find relevance in the unique interpersonal relationship that exists between them. Although it is not limited to reciprocal communication between two people, it was assumed that the intended audience is known and constituting a small number of individuals only.

The specific problem to this study was thus built upon the central notion that Facebook tends towards the cultivation of weak ties and loose connections, as opposed to the facilitation and support of strong ties. It is understood that strong ties, or strong interpersonal relationships, require considerable time and emotional investments as well as elements of mutual confiding and reciprocal services [19].

According to Marche [20] “our omniscient new technologies lure us towards increasingly superficial connections at exactly the same moment they make avoiding the mess of human interaction easy”. Herein lies the fundamental tension between the use of Facebook relative to the use of interpersonal communication. On one hand, Facebook appeals to fundamental human social needs and both facilitates and encourages loose connections for the purpose of creating a more connected world where people share more with the people in their networks. On the other hand, Facebook is criticised for its deleterious impact on the quality of interpersonal communication [20]; these kinds of negative sentiments are widely held [21].

From the above discussion, the assertion that the use of Facebook impacts the quality of interpersonal communication finds

justification. This paper thus asserts that the impact of Facebook use on the quality of interpersonal communication entails complex psychological processes patterns, and utilised qualitative system dynamics modelling to explore the problem.

### 3. Qualitative system dynamics analysis

#### 3.1. System dynamics: a brief overview

System dynamics is a useful tool in creating feedback theories. It is based on feedback control theory and was developed by Forrester in the 1960's in order to understand the behaviour of problems within a system ([22,23]). System dynamics not only guide in understanding the structures of systems and their dynamics; it also provides vigorous approaches to building simulation models.

Several studies have developed guidelines for system dynamics modelling process ([23–28]). While the guidelines provide a range from three to eight steps, all include similar iterative activities that involve both qualitative modelling and quantitative modelling.

Qualitative modelling entails problem identification and conceptualisation, whereby, the issue being investigated is mapped out using qualitative tools such as causal loop diagrams and influence diagrams. Qualitative modelling is a crucial component of the system dynamics modelling process given that qualitative data is usually the main source of information [29] that constitutes the starting point for the modelling process. Mainstream authors in the system dynamics field ([23–27]) also share the view that qualitative modelling is a necessary aspect of system dynamics modelling.

Though many system dynamics practitioners place emphasis on the importance of qualitative modelling, others stress the importance of quantitative modelling in pursuit of robust knowledge (e.g. Refs. [23,30]). Proponents of quantitative modelling advocate this approach to problem conceptualisation since it: (i) utilises mental models and structural elements of problems; (ii) specifies and integrates both soft and hard variables; (iii) simulates dynamic behaviour of the problem under investigation; and (iv) result in greater problem understanding, as well as the enhanced ability to explain and manage dynamic real world issues. Nonetheless, quantitative modelling faces a considerable challenge in the formulation and quantification of soft variables. Some experts argue that simulation from such analysis could be misleading given the uncertainty associated with quantifying soft variables [31]. For this reason, others conclude that an emphasis should rather be placed on qualitative system dynamics practice [27]. Although the authors of this paper do not fully agree with Wolstenholme [27] and Coyle [31] in only advocating qualitative system dynamics practice, it is considered sensible to use qualitative system dynamics in some situations where the quantification of soft variables is challenging and often unattainable.

Social networks like Facebook represent complex systems characterised by continuous changes, non-linear relationships, self-organising, adaptability and trade-offs, as discussed by Sterman [23]. This makes system dynamics an appropriate approach to gain more insights on the dynamics and impact of Facebook use on the quality interpersonal communication. Given the considerable amount of soft variables involved, qualitative system dynamics modelling was found appropriate to the issue under investigation in this paper.

#### 3.2. An application of qualitative system dynamics

Qualitative system dynamics is essentially the first attempt in structuring the essential elements or components of the problem within the system being studied. This can be done using various qualitative system dynamics diagrams such as causal loop

diagrams, stock and flow diagrams, sector diagrams, bull's eye diagrams, influence diagrams, and archetype diagrams [30]. Clearly, the objective of developing system dynamics diagrams is to map the overall relationships among factors or elements of a system. As earlier indicated, this may be a sufficient level of analysis given the inherent complexity of the issue being investigated, particularly where data is mostly qualitative in nature. However, in some situations where there is more information, knowledge or experience regarding the different factors or elements, it may be possible to move beyond qualitative analysis to quantitative modelling.

Causal loop diagramming is the most commonly utilised tool for qualitative system dynamics analysis. Causal loop diagrams reveal the causal interrelationships among sets of variables pertinent to the problem. This is done for the purpose of generating greater understanding of the nature of a problem with a view to enabling greater insight into potential interventions or problem solutions. The following are the building blocks of causal loop diagrams [32]:

- (i) *Variables* – this is a condition, situation, action or decision that *can influence* and *can be influenced* by other variables. A variable can be quantitative or qualitative, since causal loop diagrams have the ability to incorporate both of these variables.
- (ii) *Links/arrows* – these show the relationship and the direction of influence or causation between variables.
- (iii) *Direction of influence* – this is represented by S's (+), meaning 'same direction' or O's (–), meaning 'opposite direction'. These arrows indicate the way in which one variable moves or changes in relation to another.
- (iv) *Type of feedback loop* – there are two types of feedback loops: balancing feedback loops that seeks equilibrium and are represented by 'B' and reinforcing feedback loops that amplify changes and are represented by 'R'.

Based on the above understanding of the strengths and applications of this form of qualitative system dynamics, the investigation of the relationship between the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication employed causal loop diagramming to map the pertinent qualitative causal relations. This form of qualitative systems modelling is further supported by the fact that causal loop diagrams demand confronting mental models. In this case, surfacing assumptions and beliefs about the manner in which people interact, connect and communicate with other people in person, on communication platforms and virtually was necessary in order to depict the causal relation between the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication. This also demanded addressing personal opinions and perceptions of Facebook and the importance placed on interpersonal communication. Thus, the causal loop diagrams is reflective of subjective, personally held beliefs and values with regard to what it means to be close to another person, to be connected to networks of people and the nature of contemporary communication methods.

The process employed in this investigation emulated the phases described in qualitative system dynamics analysis [23], which includes problem formulation, variable identification and causal loop construction and analysis. After the tension between the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication had been introduced, the system boundaries and scope of investigation was demarcated. Given the myriad of opportunities for investigation around issues of modern communication and the impact of social networking platforms, stringently outlining the scope of investigation was crucial. In this way, the causal loop exploration was guided by an established and clear boundary in line with the identified problem. The basis for this problem statement was primarily an assertion from personal experience subsequently

grounded in supportive supplementary literature. In order to construct the causal loop diagrams, pertinent variables linked to the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal relationships were identified. Using these preliminary variables, a series of causal loop diagrams were constructed, surfacing other significant variables in an attempt to illustrate the causal relationship within the specified problem. This iterative process culminated in the causal loop diagrams featured in this investigation.

### 3.2.1. Problem formulation and conceptualisation

The causal loop diagrams explored the interconnection between the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication. More significantly, this problem was personally experienced and intuitively known by one of the co-authors of this paper. The causal loop diagrams explored the issue by delineating the causal relations leading to a decrease in the quality of interpersonal communication. However, in order to investigate the problem properly, a clear understanding of the fundamental principles and key assumptions of the study was necessary.

The use of Facebook was presented as active engagement with the multiplicity of public-oriented Facebook functionalities, thus excluding the private messaging function, which would be categorised as interpersonal communication. It was assumed in this study that the use of Facebook equated to engagement with public communication platforms on the online social network.

In an era in which a vast array of technological devices and platforms enable this kind of communication, the concept of interpersonal communication is not limited to face-to-face interaction. The quality of interpersonal communication is grounded in the understanding of a strong interpersonal tie, as outlined by Granovetter [19]. Here a "combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding) and the reciprocal services which characterise the tie" is what constitutes a valuable interpersonal relationship, made possible by the array of communication tools as well as conventional face-to-face interaction [19].

The first assumption in this study concerned the definition of interpersonal communication. Since it groups an array of direct communication mediums together with face-to-face interaction, it became evident that this variable equated the value of real-life interaction with that of interpersonal communication on a technological platform. This assumption was problematic in light of the attention given to the negative impact of social media, in general, on real-life human interaction [21]. Nonetheless, this assumption was important to understand the manner in which the use of the public-oriented functionalities of Facebook detracts from the input into direct interpersonal communication, whether in person or by using one of the conventional interpersonal communication methods, and thus also the quality thereof. Related to this is the fact that the study employed generalities concerning the use of conventional interpersonal communication methods for the purpose of illustrating the aforementioned point. Specifically, it is acknowledged that the use of a conventional interpersonal communication method does not necessarily result in a higher quality of communication, rather, the potential for more time and emotional investment along with mutual confiding and reciprocal services would be greater.

A second assumption to confront was that the nature and value of connection via Facebook or conventional interpersonal methods was not equated. This investigation recognised that people desire and to varying extents, requires both public (virtual) and interpersonal interaction (virtual and real-life). Given the fact that people have a limited propensity to communicate and connect, it becomes evident that the tension would then be where these capabilities and energies are directed and the consequences of these

choices made. The causal loop diagrams endeavoured to unpack this dynamic interplay between the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication.

In terms of the use of Facebook, a distinction was made between the relationships and connections that can be established. Facebook replicates and extends existing real-life social networks whilst also enabling and propagating abundant online connections. As in real-life, a relatively stable number of individuals can maintain *relationships* with on Facebook remain [5], as opposed to the countless *connections* which that user can establish.

### 3.3. Identifying variables for causal loop diagrams

After the grounding principles and assumptions had been made clear, variables that would be endogenous, exogenous, and excluded ones were identified as shown in Table 1. Endogenous variables are those influenced by the causal linkages constituting the core problem addressed in causal loop diagrams. The causal loop diagrams featured in this investigation attempted to capture the tension in focus by introducing a central variable depicting the time and effort investment in the use of Facebook relative to interpersonal communication. The remainder of the endogenous variables found relevance in how they related to the ratio of time and effort invested into the use of Facebook relative to interpersonal communication. It is acknowledged that this variable does not equate the nature or value of communicating interpersonally or via Facebook but rather illustrates the tension that individuals experience given the allure of Facebook and the messiness of interpersonal communication [20].

Conversely, exogenous variables fall outside of the boundary of the causal loop diagrams and are determined by factors outside of the system. In Section 1, two motives for the use of Facebook were explained: the need to belong, and the need for self-presentation. These, along with the three types of information dissemination and the interpersonal communication, information intake and network communication thresholds, were considered exogenous variables since they operate as constant variables. The perception of Facebook and the expected derived value/utility from Facebook were identified as exogenous variables that influence conditions for the use of Facebook and the investment in Facebook identity. Endogenous and exogenous variables are referenced and elaborated on further in Section 4, where the dynamic analyses of the causal loop diagrams are explained.

The excluded variables were those that were seen pertinent to the qualitative investigation, but were omitted from the causal loop

diagrams as they were outside the scope analysis, as well as the need to ensure brevity and simplicity. Face-to-face interaction was considered an important component of interpersonal communication. However, given the focus of the investigation was on modern communication technologies enabling interpersonal and network communication, this variable was excluded. The relationship between the Facebook identity and real identity was also excluded. Even though the dynamics and tensions are of integral importance to the presentation of the self on Facebook and thus also the investment in Facebook identity, research has indicated that there is significant congruence between the real and virtual identities of Facebook users ([14,15]). It is for this reason that these variables were excluded. Amount of time, emotional intensity, mutual confiding and reciprocal services are related to the strength of interpersonal relationship ties and thus relevant to the quality of interpersonal communication. However, these variables were excluded so as to focus on the aggregate nature of the quality of interpersonal communication. The quantity of Facebook connections was excluded given that this aspect of the use of Facebook was beyond the scope of the study.

## 4. Results from causal loop analysis

The causal loop diagram consists of seven feedback loops, and each is discussed in the sub-sections that follow.

### 4.1. The use of Facebook and the need to belong: R1, R2, R3

There are three reinforcing loops that were associated with the use of Facebook and need to belong, R1, R2 and R3 (see Fig. 1). The use of Facebook is motivated by a fundamental human social need, the need to belong. As an online social network, Facebook provides people with the opportunity to engage with an array of networks, organisations, movements and interest groups. The use of Facebook can also be attributed to the perceptions that users have about the platform and their related positive, negative or ambivalent opinions thereof. Fundamental drivers and perceptions are closely connected to the expectations of users. Facebook users engage with Facebook with certain expectations about the value and utility that can be derived for their personal and professional lives from using the online social network.

Considering R1, the more an individual uses Facebook, the more time and effort he/she invests into communication via this social network as opposed to interpersonal communication. Thus it is asserted that the more an individual uses Facebook, the less time

**Table 1**  
Identified variables for causal loop diagrams\*.

Endogenous variables	Exogenous variables	Excluded variables
Use of Facebook relative to interpersonal communication	Organisational communication	Face-to-face interaction
Use of Facebook	Cultural sharing	Facebook identity
Information dissemination	Personal expression	Real identity
Network communication	Need to belong	Amount of time
Global awareness	Need for self-presentation	Emotional intensity
Perception of network connection	Perception of Facebook	Mutual confiding
Derived value/utility from Facebook	Expected utility/derived value from Facebook	Reciprocal services
Desire to connect through Facebook	Interpersonal communication threshold	Quantity of Facebook connections
Investment in Facebook identity	Information intake threshold	
Conventional interpersonal communication methods	Network communication threshold	
Quality of interpersonal communication		
Derived value/utility from interpersonal communication		
Desire to connect interpersonally		
Quantity of interpersonal communication		
Information intake		
Quantity of Facebook relationships		

Note: \*The identified variables are elaborated on in Section 4.




Fig. 1. The use of Facebook and the need to belong causal loop diagram.

and effort she/he puts into interpersonal communication given the person's limited propensity to communicate. Given Facebook's primary function of making the world a more open and connected place, dissemination of information is the overarching outcome of the use of Facebook. The more a person uses Facebook, the more information can be and is shared. Primarily, this information can take the form of organisational communication, cultural sharing or personal expression.

Organisational communication refers to the information shared to organise virtual and real-life gatherings, such as events, rallies or celebrations. Cultural sharing refers to the interesting content that people share, including current affairs, politics, art, humour and the like. Personal expression refers to the information pertinent to the thoughts, beliefs and happenings relevant to an individual. These three types of information dissemination make use of the wide array of both active and passive, and direct and indirect, Facebook functionalities. It has increasingly become easier to share these kinds of information on Facebook, making it an attractive and hassle-free platform to share personal preferences, plans or sentiments with a wide group of people. Sharing these same pieces of information using conventional interpersonal communication methods is made to look relatively cumbersome and effortful; Facebook takes the hassle out of connecting people with their networks.

The more information dissemination that takes place on the Facebook platform, the greater a user's awareness of global events, trends and affairs is, since the more information the user is able to take in, as depicted in R1. However, there is only so much that an individual can come to know about what is taking place around the world, given the extent of the information shared on Facebook. Encapsulating this tension, this information intake threshold is a relative variable however unpacking it was beyond the scope of this investigation.

Similarly, as seen in R2, the more information is shared, the more network communication takes place, that is, more conversing and interaction takes place in the various networks accessible on

Facebook. Public sharing enriches the communication within networks. The more network communication (refer R2) and global awareness (refer R1), the greater the perception of network connection. Users feel more aware of what is happening in the world, and thus they perceive a greater connection to a global society. The more information is shared, the more network communication takes place and the greater the sense of global awareness, which in turn, induces an enhanced perception of connection and belonging to these virtual networks. A greater desire to connect through Facebook result from the enhanced perception of connection and belonging since people derive greater value from engagement with the social network.

The perception of network connection is positively related to the value and utility derived from Facebook. That is, the more people feel connected to other people, the more (they think) they know about what is going on in their lives. In this way, Facebook is both useful and valuable, providing useful (practical reminders about birthdays for example) and edifying (notifications about engagements, births and so forth) information. The more value is derived, the more users desire to connect through Facebook which in turns boosts the use of Facebook. The ease of information sharing and thus the greater desire to connect through Facebook might also cause a desire to connect with a greater number of people in the network of relationships that a user has established on Facebook (refer R3). However, as it has been earlier indicated, there is a limit to the number of networked relationships that a Facebook user can sustain [5]. Thus, the network communication threshold keeps a check on the quantity of Facebook relations.

The reinforcing loops R1, R2 and R3 illustrate how Facebook successfully facilitates and encourages ease of communication and connection within networks of people through the public dissemination of information, tapping into a fundamental human need to belong. Conversely, though, these reinforcing loops, when framed and explained differently also illustrate the alienation that a poor perception of network connection fosters under conditions of less information dissemination and reduced derived value/utility. The

popular discourse around Facebook corroborates this finding; much is written about how Facebook makes people sad or lonely [21].

4.2. The use of Facebook and the need for self-presentation: R4, R5

Building on the explanation of R1, R2 and R3 above, the reinforcing loops R4 and R5 (Fig. 2) illustrate how the use of Facebook relates to the other fundamental driver: the need for self-presentation. The more an individual uses Facebook, relative to interpersonal communication, the more information is shared and absorbed and in turn, the greater the person's perception of connection because of enhanced global awareness (refer R4) and network communication (refer R5). Therefore, the more one uses Facebook, the more value one can derive from Facebook, which motivates an investment in the Facebook identity. Interactions on Facebook are anchored by the personal profile. So, in order to derive greater value from the platform, users invest more time and effort in crafting a rich and engaging Facebook profile grounded in their actual identity. The more a user invests in his/her Facebook identity, the more the person then uses Facebook.

This section concludes that the use of Facebook, motivated by fundamental human needs, can on one hand, foster a greater sense of connection and belonging to the groups and networks that extend from users' real lives into the virtual world. On the other hand, it can reduce an individual's perception about his/her connection to these same networks and the world at large.

4.3. The use of conventional interpersonal communication methods and the quality of interpersonal communication: R6, B1

Distinctive to the reinforcing loops connected to the use of Facebook, R6 and B1 depict how the quality of interpersonal

communication is related to the use of conventional interpersonal communication methods (see Fig. 3). These communication tools are understood to be those that make possible direct communication either between two people or amongst a small group of individuals. They include instant messaging tools such as Whatsapp, WeChat, BBM, Skype, private Facebook messages, traditional mail, email, phone calls, text and face-to-face interaction. These kinds of communication platform allow for clearly directed, specific (in some cases, both verbal and non-verbal) messages from one individual to another. The excluded variables relating to the strength of an interpersonal relationship are relevant here since conventional interpersonal communication methods require a degree of effort and investment more than the public declarations that constitute public information dissemination on Facebook. Therefore, it is asserted that the more conventional interpersonal communication methods are used, the greater the potential quality of these interpersonal interactions is, though this is not necessarily the case. Quality of interpersonal communication exhibits a level of time investment, emotional intensity, mutual confiding and reciprocal services that allows for strong interpersonal connections.

The more an individual employs conventional interpersonal communication methods, the greater the quality and the derived value and utility from interpersonal communication are. This, in turn, prompts a greater desire to connect interpersonally as opposed to over Facebook as seen in B1. The more an individual finds interpersonal communication valuable and useful, the less he/she will use Facebook. R6 shows that an individual who desires to connect interpersonally will make an effort to do so, and thus the quantity of interpersonal connections will be greater. This is monitored or checked by the interpersonal relationship threshold, a range around Dunbar's number of 150 people [5]. The quantity of interpersonal communication is positively related to the use of conventional interpersonal communication methods.




Fig. 2. The use of Facebook and the need for self-presentation causal loop diagram.




Fig. 3. The use of conventional interpersonal communication methods and the quality of interpersonal communication methods causal loop diagram.

#### 4.4. The use of Facebook relative to interpersonal communication

Fig. 4 illustrates the dynamic interaction revolving around the central tension between the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication. It has been explained in Section 4.2 and 4.3 how the use of Facebook results in a greater perception of network connection. The more a user feels connected to a network through the use and engagement with Facebook, the less he/she makes use of conventional interpersonal communication methods. The abundance of loose connections fostered by Facebook that enable the increased sharing of information, opinion and influence, negatively impacts the quality of strong interpersonal communication made possible through conventional communication methods.

Essentially, Facebook's attraction and the sense of belonging that it brings reduce the effort that people put into interpersonal relationships given their perception of connection informed by the abundance of information shared on Facebook. The users already feel connected to people, so they make less effort to engage in interpersonal communication, which can often be unpredictable and messy as much as it might be rewarding and fruitful. The less people use conventional interpersonal communication methods, the lower the quality of their (limited) interactions and the value derived from them are. In turn, people feel less of a desire to connect interpersonally if they gain little from these interactions, which then prompts more use of Facebook as a means of fulfilling the essential human desire to belong and connect with one another.

The attempt to unpack the causal relationship between the use of Facebook and the quality of interpersonal communication in this paper has illuminated the dynamic process whereby the more an individual uses Facebook relative to interpersonal communication methods and feels more connected to people across an array of groups and networks, the less he/she connects directly with people on an interpersonal basis, forfeiting valuable reciprocal intimacy from (potentially) strong interpersonal relationships. Thus, the person turns once again to Facebook as a means of gaining access to groups of people with whom he/she has loose associations and where he/she can attain a sense of belonging and connection.

The problem of Facebook use competing with interpersonal communication for time (effort) resources presented in Fig. 4, can generally be represented by the success to the successful systems archetype (see Fig. 5). The archetype 'relates to situations in which two parties or activities compete for the same limited resources and an even a small advantage results in more resources being allocated to the most successful party or activity, which reinforces the competition' [30]. This implies that growth in one activity results in decline in another activity because the limited resources are shared, and resource allocation decision is governed by the most successful activity.

In this case, it is observed that the two activities, namely, Facebook use and interpersonal communication, compete for the same limited resource of time (effort) that an individual can allocate to these. As observed in the causal loop analysis, derived value (utility) from one of these activity results in more time resource being allocated to the activity that is perceived to yield more value (utility), in the case of our analysis, Facebook use. In this way, the reinforcing loops related to the use of Facebook are dominant. The resulting dynamic behaviour of the two activities and the resources allocated to each are sketched in the behaviour over time graph presented in Fig. 6.

The trap that the success to the successful systems archetype presents is the possibility to displace the weaker activity or individual by possibly allocating all the resources to the successful activity/individual [33]. This raises the question of whether interpersonal communication will no longer be in existence at one point in time, and, if so, what interventions can be made now to address this.

Based on the success to the successful system archetype, the success or failure of one of the two activities may be due to initial conditions rather than to the intrinsic benefits. Some suggested ways of overcoming the success to the successful system archetype trap include identifying potential success traps that can be kept under control and identifying goals and objectives that define success. One of the identified success traps was the network communication threshold and information intake threshold. Hence, even if a Facebook user decides to allocate all his/her time to






Fig. 4. The use of Facebook relative to interpersonal communication causal loop diagram.




Fig. 5. The success to the successful systems archetype.




Fig. 6. The use of Facebook relative to interpersonal communication.

Facebook use, there is only so much information that one can absorb, as well as limited network communication. Facebook users should thus make an effort not to allocate so much time to Facebook that it would compromise conventional interpersonal communication.

Identifying the goals and objectives of the two activities in relation to time resource allocated is more subjective and possibly not within the scope of this paper and warrants further investigation. It is, however, argued that individuals' propensity to communicate should be shared between engagement on Facebook and using conventional interpersonal communication methods.

## 5. Conclusions

This paper used qualitative system dynamics to provide an understanding of the dynamics of Facebook use and quality of interpersonal communication. Facebook is a complex system and its use entails a multiplicity of complex psychological patterns and trends, which are mainly qualitative. By using causal loop diagrams, seven feedback loops were identified as inherent to the problem, of which six were reinforcing loops and one was a balancing loop. As a tool for making sense of this particular problem, the causal loop diagrams have given important insights into how Facebook emerged as a substitute for the connection that people lack in their interpersonal relationships. In order to deal with this problem, Facebook users are encouraged to see interactions not as tradeoffs, but rather as complementary, and the value of the respective communication platforms/mediums should be recognised.

The causal loop diagrams have illustrated the value of Facebook in developing networks of strategic and useful loose connections and also the importance of strong interpersonal relationships for personal development and fulfilment. The analysed problem can generally be represented by the success to the successful systems archetype. This archetype is represented by the trade-off when considering the amount of time spent on Facebook and interpersonal communication. In this investigation, Facebook users, motivated by the need to belong and need for self-presentation, are

found to allocate more time resource to Facebook use hence, compromising the time available for interpersonal communication. This implies that measures to deal with the potentially degrading quality of interpersonal communication need to be identified. Facebook users should make more of an effort to communicate with people by using conventional communication methods so as to nurture the emotional intimacy valued in these strong interpersonal relationships. Broadcasting and sharing on Facebook is not a sufficient substitute and has been shown to degrade the quality of interpersonal relationships.

Future investigations will require applying the causal loop diagrams to specific case study(ies) in order to quantitatively provide more insights on the extent to which Facebook use has been impacting interpersonal communication. This in turn would enable exploration of potential intervention measures to deal with the tension between Facebook use and quality of interpersonal communication.

## References

- [1] Facebook. Key Facts, 2013. Available online: <http://newsroom.fb.com/Key-Facts> (accessed 12.10.13).
- [2] A. Nadkarni, S.G. Hofmann, Why do people use Facebook? *Personal. Individ. Differ.* 52 (2012) 243–249.
- [3] C. Kadushin, Introduction to Social Network Theory, 2004. Available online: <http://melander335.wdfiles.com/local-files/reading-history/kadushin.pdf> (accessed 05.02.14).
- [4] C.R. Hollenbeck, A.M. Kaikati, Consumers' use of brands to reflect their actual and ideal selves on Facebook, *Int. J. Res. Mark.* 29 (2012) 395–405.
- [5] V. Arnaboldi, A. Guazzini, A. Passarella, Egocentric online social networks: analysis of key features and prediction of tie strength in Facebook, *Comput. Commun.* 36 (2013) 1130–1144.
- [6] B.S. Pay, S.H. Hosseini, H.G. Shakouri, Why do students use virtual social networks in Iran: a system approach, *Interdiscip. Descr. complex Syst.* 11 (2013) 108–122.
- [7] D.M. Boyd, N.B. Ellison, Social network sites: definition, history, and scholarship, *J. Computer-Mediated Commun.* 13 (2007) 210–230.
- [8] N.B. Ellison, C. Steinfield, C. Lampe, The benefits of Facebook "friends": Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites, *J. Computer-Mediated Commun.* 12 (2007) 1143–1168.
- [9] J. Bonds-Raacke, J. Raacke, Myspace and Facebook: identifying dimensions of uses and gratifications for friend networking sites, *Individ. Differ. Res.* 8 (2010) 27–33.
- [10] D. Boyd, E. Hargittai, Facebook privacy settings: who cares? *First Monday* 15 (2010) 8.
- [11] K.M. Sheldon, N. Abad, C. Hinsch, A two-process view of Facebook use and relatedness need-satisfaction: disconnection drives use, and connection rewards it, *J. Personal. Soc. Psychol.* 100 (2011) 766–775.
- [12] S.T. Tong, B. Van Der Heide, L. Langwell, J.B. Walther, Too much of a good thing? The relationship between number of friends and interpersonal impressions on Facebook, *J. Computer-Mediated Commun.* 2008 (13) (2008) 531–549.
- [13] S.S. Wang, S.I. Moon, K.H. Kwon, C.A. Evans, M.A. Stefanone, Face off: implications of visual cues on initiating friendship on Facebook, *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 26 (2010) 226–234.
- [14] M.D. Back, J.M. Stopfer, S. Vazire, S. Gaddis, S.C. Schmukle, B. Egloff, et al., Facebook profiles reflect actual personality, not self-idealization, *Psychol. Sci.* 21 (2010) 372–374.
- [15] S. Zhao, S. Grasmuck, J. Martin, Identity construction on Facebook: digital empowerment in anchored relationships, *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 24 (2008) 1816–1836.
- [16] E. Gilbert, K. Karahalios, Predicting tie strength with social media, in: Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 2009, pp. 210–220. Available online: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1518736> (accessed 05.02.14).
- [17] R. Xiang, J. Neville, M. Rogati, Modelling relationship strength in online social networks, in: Proceedings of the 19th World Wide Web Conference, 2010, pp. 981–990. Available online: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1772790> (accessed 05.02.14).
- [18] E. Bakshy, I. Rosenn, The Role of Social Networks in Information Diffusion, 2012. Available online: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/78445521/Role-of-Social-Networks-in-Information-Diffusion> (accessed 12.10.13).
- [19] M.S. Granovetter, The strength of weak ties, *Am. J. Sociol.* 78 (1973) 1360–1380.
- [20] S. Marche, Is Facebook Making Us Lonely?, *The Atlantic*, 2 April 2012. Available online: <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2012/05/is-facebook-making-us-lonely/308930/> (accessed 12.10.13).
- [21] M. Warrell, Seduced by Social Media: Is Facebook Making You Lonely?, 2013. Available online: <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/margiewarrell/social->

- media-lonely\_b\_4034744.html (accessed 01.03.14).
- [22] J.W. Forrester, *Industrial Dynamics*, Productivity Press, Cambridge, MA, 1961.
- [23] J.D. Sterman, *Business Dynamics: Systems Thinking and Modelling for a Complex World*, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, 2000.
- [24] J. Randers, Guidelines for model conceptualization, in: J. Randers (Ed.), *Elements of the System Dynamics Method*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1980, pp. 117–139.
- [25] G.P. Richardson, A.L. Pugh, *Introduction to System Dynamics Modeling with DYNAMO*, Productivity Press, Cambridge, 1981.
- [26] N.H. Roberts, D.F. Anderson, R.M. Deal, M.S. Grant, W.A. Shaffer, *Introduction to Computer Simulation: the System Dynamics Modeling Approach*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1983.
- [27] E. Wolstenholme, *System Enquiry: a System Dynamics Approach*, Wiley, Chichester, 1990.
- [28] J.W. Forrester, P. Senge, Tests for building confidence in S-D models, *TIMS Stud. Manag. Sci.* 14 (1980) 208–228.
- [29] J.W. Forrester, *Industrial Dynamics - a Response to Ansoff and Slevin*, Wright-Allen Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1975, pp. 151–165.
- [30] E. Pruyt, *Small System Dynamics Models for Big Issues*, 2013. Available online: <http://simulation.tbm.tudelft.nl/smallSDmodels/News.html> (accessed 10.01.14).
- [31] R.G. Coyle, Qualitative and quantitative modelling in system dynamics: some research questions, *Syst. Dyn. Rev.* 16 (2000) 225–244.
- [32] E.F. Wolstenholme, Qualitative vs. quantitative modeling: the evolving balance, *J. Oper. Res. Soc.* 50 (1999) 422–428.
- [33] D.H. Meadows, *Thinking in Systems - a Primer*. USA, Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2008.