

WHY ARE WE “FRIENDS” ONLINE
WITH OUR FACE-TO-FACE
ANTIPATHIES?

by

TIFFANY GREEN

DEBORAH M. CASPER, COMMITTEE CHAIR
MARY ELIZABETH CURTNER-SMITH
JOSHUA PEDERSON

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science
in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2018

Copyright Tiffany Green 2018
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

This study explored the reasons why emerging adults remain friends online with their face-to-face antipathy. Even further, this study explored to what degree these individuals were interacting with and lurking on their antipathy on the four various social media platforms: Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and Snapchat. It also analyzed the associations among attachment, jealousy and fear of missing with individual lurking online.

In this study, the reasons for remaining friends online with their former friend were categorized into eight distinct themes. The themes include hope of reconciliation, attention seeking, aggression, comparison, reconciled, past or present social connection, indifference, and lurking. It was found that the individuals in this study were lurking on their former friend across all social media platforms. Further analysis indicated that some of these individuals were also interacting with their former friend on these platforms. Fear of missing out was positively associated with lurking on their former friend on Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter. However, Jealousy was only positively associated with lurking on their former friend on Facebook and Instagram but not Twitter.

Generally, individuals remain friends with their antipathy on social media because they have some form of connection with them. Although, the term friend is often used to describe online connection in this study, the term is in fact ambiguous as these individuals who are “friends” on social media are not mutual liking relationships.

Further research should continue to look into the various consequences and associations for remaining friends on social media with an antipathy. It should also seek to replicate the themes found within this study for remaining friends with their antipathy on social media.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to everyone who has supported me along this difficult but rewarding journey in completing this manuscript. Especially, my close friends and family who have unconditionally supported me through the extensive amount of time it has taken me to create this masterpiece.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

α	Cronbach's index of internal consistency
F	Fisher's F ratio: A ration of two variances
FOMO	Fear of Missing Out
M	Mean: the sum of set measurements divided by the number of measurements in the set
Mdn	Median: the middle number of a sample
n	number: total number participants in a subset of the data
ns	Not significant
p	Probability associated with the occurrence under the null hypothesis of a value as extreme as or more extreme than the observed value
r	Pearson product-moment correlation
SD	Standard Deviation: a measure that is used to quantify the amount of variation of a set of data values
t	computed value of a t test
<	Less than
=	Equal to

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am pleased to have this opportunity to thank my colleagues, friends, and faculty members who have helped me with this research project. I am most indebted to Deborah Casper, the chairman of this thesis, for sharing her extensive knowledge and research expertise in the areas of adolescent and emerging adult development and for her prior research leading me to my main research question. I would also like to thank all of my committee members, Mary Elizabeth Curtner-Smith and Joshua Pederson, for sharing their indispensable knowledge, insightful questions, and for their full support along the way in creating my thesis from my initial thesis proposal to the completion of my thesis project. I would like to thank Samantha Anderson for her invaluable guidance, knowledge, and help in uploading my full questionnaire onto the Qualtrics system. I would again like to thank Deborah Casper and Samantha Anderson for their insight and guidance in helping me create my qualitative codes for this project. The data collection of this project would not have been possible without the help of the research assistants in the CAPRI lab. I am externally thankful for Tori Hinton, Brianna Santobello, and Leah Rubinoff for taking the time to be my inter-raters for all of my qualitative coding.

This research would not have been possible without the support of my friends, multiple faculty members in the department of Human Development at the University of Alabama, and my family who never stopped encouraging me to persist through every challenge that I faced throughout my thesis project. Finally, I would like to thank all of the students of The University of Alabama who volunteered to participant in my study without whom, I could not have completed my thesis project.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. FRIENDSHIPS AND ANTIPATHETIC RELATIONSHIPS	3
Friendships on Social Media	3
Antipathetic Relationships	4
3. ATTACHMENT.....	6
Attachment Relationships in Early Childhood.....	6
Adult Attachment	7
Attachment on Social Media	9
4. SOCIAL MEDIA ATTACHMENT	10
Lurking	11
Associations between Social Media Use and Psychological Adjustment	12
Fear of missing out and social media	12
Jealousy on social media	13

5. PRESENT STUDY.....	15
6. HYPOTHESIS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	16
7. METHOD	17
Sample Size	17
Sample	17
Procedures	18
Measures.....	19
Demographics.....	19
Experiences in Close Relationships Scale.....	19
Facebook Jealousy General Scale	20
Facebook Jealousy Former Friend Scale.....	20
Fear of Missing Out Scale	21
Fear of Missing Out Former Friend Scale.....	21
Social Media Behaviors Questionnaire	21
Plan of Analysis.....	22
Method for Coding Narrative Responses for Research Question 1	24
Method for Coding Narrative Responses for Research Question 2	24
8. RESULTS	25
Friends on Social Media	25
Unfriended on Social Media	28

Interactions on Social Media	28
Former friend’s mean comments	29
Participant’s mean comments	29
Perception	29
Interactions on Specific Social Media Platforms	30
Instagram	30
Posted comments	30
Received comments	31
Direct messages	31
Facebook	31
Posted comments	32
Received comments	32
Messenger	32
Twitter	33
Replies	33
Messages	34
Subtweets	34
Snapchat	34
Watching stories	34
Sending and receiving personal snaps	35

Screenshots	36
Lurking	37
Instagram	37
Twitter	38
Facebook	38
Snapchat	39
Attachment	39
Fear of Missing Out.....	40
Jealousy	40
Hypotheses 1 and 2.....	40
Hypothesis 3	40
Hypothesis 4	41
Hypothesis 5	41
Hypotheses 6	41
9. DISCUSSION	42
10. STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	47
11. CONCLUSION.....	49
REFERENCES	50
APPENDICES	54
Appendix A. Demographics	54

Appendix B. Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory.....	55
Appendix C. Facebook Jealousy General Scale	57
Appendix D. Facebook Jealousy Former Friends Scale.....	58
Appendix E. Fear of Missing Out General Scale	59
Appendix F. Fear of Missing Out Former Friend Scale.....	60
Appendix G. Social Media Behaviors Questionnaire	61
Appendix H. IRB Certificate and Informed Consent	73

1. INTRODUCTION

Friendships can be unpredictable, and in some situations a friendship can transform into an antipathetic relationship. Card (2007) found that 43% of antipathetic relationships emerged from broken friendships. Some of the reasons these friendships transformed include jealousy, incapability, intimacy rule violation, and aggression (Casper & Card, 2010). When a friendship transforms into an antipathetic relationship, one might expect the former friends to unfriend or unfollow one another on social media. Surprisingly, Lenhart, Smith, Anderson, Duggan, and Perrin (2015) found that approximately 40% of former friends remain friends on social media platforms despite no longer being friends in real life. Even further, Casper, Green and Hinton (under review) reported that 37% of former friends remained friends on social media with someone they strongly disliked or even hated. Although, some friendships come to an end, some choose to remain friends on social media despite not liking each other in person.

Underwood and Faris (2015) suggest that online platforms are merely an extension of an adolescent's social life, which means their friends online should be reflective of the people whom they interact with every day. In some circumstances, a person may still interact with their former friend or antipathy in a social setting, despite not liking them at all. For example, they may still have mutual friends and interact with each other at social events. Even further, Boyd (2007) suggests the reason behind someone adding another person online, whom the person might not like, is it would be awkward not to add a higher status peer who has sent a friend

request. Plus, it presents the opportunity for the requestee and requester to read each other's posts and updates (Boyd, 2007). The question that still remains unanswered is: Why do people remain "friends" on social media with someone whom they do not like in person? Even further, what do their interactions look like, if they interact at all?

2. FRIENDSHIPS AND ANTIPATHETIC RELATIONSHIPS

Friendship on Social Media

What is a friend? In the scientific community, a friendship is often defined as a mutually liking relationship between two people. However, this definition applies to only in-person friendships. With the creation of social media and social networking platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter or Snapchat, a friend can take on a different meaning than a mutually liking relationship. It's been hypothesized that the term friend is ambiguous construct when it comes to online friends; it can refer to someone who is an intimate friend or, on the other hand, a complete stranger (Debatin, Lovejoy, Horn, & Hughes, 2009). A person can also be friends with or follow someone on social media, who in real life they may not like at all. Casper and colleagues (under review) found that 80% of the early emerging adults in the study were still "friends" on social media with their antipathy, and 37% of those still consider their antipathy to be someone whom they strongly disliked or even hated. Lenhart and colleagues (2015) found approximately 40% of their participants remained "friends" with their former friend on social media. Being virtual friends with someone you dislike in person suggests the term "friends" on social networking platforms is an ambiguous construct.

As previously stated, some researchers hypothesize online friendships are merely an extension of our social lives (Underwood & Faris, 2015). People interact and socialize with different types of people on a day-to-day basis. Some of those people may be close intimate friends or acquaintances, but they may also interact with someone they do not necessarily like too. Boyd (2007) suggests that a person may add someone whom they may not consider to be a

friend because “it may be socially awkward” to not add them. For example, the person who is friending the other, may be someone whom the person being friended interacts with on a regular basis. If the person refuses to add the requester, it may create an awkward situation within their personal friend network. At the same time, the requester may hold a higher social status in comparison to the requestee, which could be potentially beneficial for the requestee to add the requester. By adding someone who has a different social status gives the two people (requestee and requester) have the ability to read each other’s current posts and updates on a regular basis too (Boyd, 2007).

Antipathetic Relationships

An antipathetic relationship is a mutually disliking relationship, and they form for a variety of reasons. Card (2007) found that approximately 43% of antipathetic relationships resulted from broken friendships. The reasons those friendships transformed into antipathetic relationships involved jealousy, incapability, intimacy rule violation, and aggression (Casper & Card, 2010). When close friendships transformed into antipathetic relationships, it was found that jealousy involving a third party was the most common theme to arise in these transformations (Casper & Card, 2010). The third party, or interloper, within the relationship, who invoked the feelings of jealousy, could be a new friend, a significant other, or someone who is perceived to be taking attention away from the one friend in the relationship. Lenhart et al. (2015) found that conflict within the relationship, a friendship growing apart, or some other factor led to the dissolution of their participants’ friendships too.

As friendships transform into antipathetic relationships, Lenhart et al. (2015) found that around 60% of former friends will unfriend or unfollow their former friend on social media. Casper et al. (under review) found that 80% of participants were still “friends” on social media

with their antipathy. Within the 80% of the participants, who chose to remain friends online with their antipathy, 37% of participants still considered their former friend to be someone whom they disliked, strongly disliked or even hated (Casper et al., under review).

3. ATTACHMENT

Relationships that transform from a friendship to antipathetic relationship likely vary in quality, and one factor that might affect quality of a relationship is one's attachment style. Attachment is an emotional bond, most often between a primary caregiver and a child (Ainsworth, 1970; 1979; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). The attachment bond develops in infancy as a result of the quality of care the infant receives. The quality of care further influences whether or not the child develops a sense of trust (Ainsworth, 1979). Even further, as children grow older, these primary attachment bonds will serve as a template for future relationships (Ainsworth, 1982, 1989; Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bowlby 1977, 1980, 1982).

Attachment Relationships in Early Childhood

Ainsworth's strange situation experiment was the first to classify a child's attachment style based on the infant's reaction to the caregiver as the infant was reunited with him or her following a brief absence (Ainsworth, 1970; 1979; Ainsworth et al., 1978). An infant with a secure attachment bond learns to trust the environment because the primary caregiver is dependable and consistent in responding to the infant's needs (Ainsworth et al., 1978). As a result, a child with a secure attachment will use the caregiver as a secure base from which to explore the environment. Most importantly, a child in a secure attachment relationship will expect others to be consistently warm and affectionate.

In contrast, an infant with an insecure-ambivalent attachment style learns that the caregiver may not always be dependable (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Sometimes the caregiver

responds promptly to the child's needs and other times the caregiver has a delay in response or does not respond at all. As a result, the child does not trust that the caregiver will be responsive and therefore clings to his or her caregiver (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

An infant with an insecure-avoidant attachment style learns that the caregiver is consistently unresponsive (Ainsworth et al., 1978). As a result, the child becomes emotionally detached from its caregiver and actively avoids contact.

Adult Attachment

In the early attachment research, individuals were categorized into one of the three attachment styles described above (Ainsworth, 1970, 1979; Ainsworth et al., 1978). More recent attachment research has investigated adult attachment styles. Adult attachment is often measured on two dimensions: fear of abandonment (anxiety) and fear of intimacy (avoidance; Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Holowitz, 1991). The current method suggests four different styles of adult attachment. Individuals who are low in both attachment avoidance (fear of intimacy) and anxiety (fear of abandonment) are categorized as having a secure attachment style (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Holowitz, 1991). Adults with low avoidance but high anxiety are categorized as preoccupied (deriving from the insecure-ambivalent category; Bartholomew & Holowitz, 1991). Adults high in attachment avoidance and anxiety are categorized as fearful (avoidant; Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Holowitz, 1991). Fearful adults desire to have close relationships but fear rejection; as a result, they avoid relationships (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Holowitz, 1991). Adults high in avoidance but low in anxiety are categorized as dismissing (avoidant; Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Holowitz, 1991). These adults have no desire to form relationships with other people.

As adults grow older, their original attachment bond will serve as template for future relationships with others (Ainsworth, 1982, 1989; Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Bowlby 1977, 1980, 1982). Bartholomew (1990) suggests that adults will seek out environments or relationships that will favor one's attachment style formed early in life. Adults with a history of a secure attachment usually trust their social environment, are more willing to trust others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; You & Malley-Morrison, 2000), and are more likely to be socially competent (Scharf, 2014; Ladd, 2005). They are also more likely to form more intimate relationships with others compared to others who do not have a secure attachment style (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; You & Malley-Morrison, 2000).

Adults with higher levels of anxiety (fear of abandonment) and lower levels of avoidance (fear of intimacy) are less trusting, are more likely to be socially incompetent (Scharf, 2014; Ladd, 2005), and have less intimate or close friendships as compared to those with a history of secure attachment (Bartholomew, 1990; You & Malley-Morrison, 2000). In addition, those who have higher levels of attachment anxiety but lower levels of attachment avoidance perceive other people to be unpredictable or unreadable (You & Malley-Morrison, 2000). These adults are also more likely to apply hostile intentions to other people's actions (Zimmerman, 2004), and they are also more likely to switch from positive to negative evaluations of their friendships as well (Zimmerman, 2004). These adults may have the desire to connect with others; however, their inability to trust others can make forming more intimate relationships difficult (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Adults with lower levels of anxiety (fear of abandonment) but higher levels of avoidance (fear of intimacy) are less trusting of others and are more likely to be socially incompetent (You & Malley-Morrison, 2000; Scharf, 2014; Ladd, 2005). These adults will avoid connecting with

others because they perceive others to be rejecting (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Holowitz, 1991; You & Malley-Morrison, 2000). Consequently, those with lower levels of anxiety but higher levels of avoidance tend to have less intimate friendships (You & Malley-Morrison, 2000). However, these adults are also likely to state they do not need other people (Zimmerman, 2004), which is why they tend to avoid relationships and have less intimate friendships.

Adults who are high in attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance are more likely to avoid relationships despite having a desire to form them. These adults will avoid connecting with others because they too are afraid of being rejected (Bartholomew, 1990; Bartholomew & Holowitz, 1991; You & Malley-Morrison, 2000). They are more likely to be social incompetent (Scharf, 2014; Ladd, 2005), less trusting of others, and more likely to have negative expectations of their friends (You & Malley-Morrison, 2000).

Attachment on Social Media

The way in which a person interacts with others in person carries over into how they interact with others in the virtual environment (Underwood & Faris, 2015). A person with a secure attachment style will use social media to enhance existing relationships from the offline world (Oldmeadow, Quinn & Kowert, 2013). On the other hand, if a person has high attachment anxiety, they may use social media more frequently compared to the others, who are not high in attachment anxiety (Oldmeadow et al., 2013; Hart, Nailling, Bizer, & Collins, 2014). Oldmeadow and colleagues (2013) found that those with high attachment anxiety had a tendency to seek more comfort from social media when they experienced a depressed or negative mood. Those with high attachment avoidance had a tendency to avoid using social media altogether compared to those who are not high in attachment avoidance (Oldmeadow et al., 2013)

4. SOCIAL MEDIA

Social media allows people to connect on an online platform with others whom they may know currently, they knew in the past, or they may be getting to know (Subrahmanyam, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008; Barker, 2009). Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and Snapchat are a few of the social media platforms that allow a user to connect with other users on an online platform (Greenwood, Perrin, & Duggan, 2016). The aforementioned platforms grant the user with the ability to make posts or updates about their life, which can be seen by their followers or friends on the social media platform in which they make the post. Ideally, this creates a way for people to keep in touch with old friends, distant family or close friends, which otherwise could be difficult through other means.

It comes as no surprise that young adults are frequent users of the Internet and social networking platforms. The development of smartphones affords the user the ability to connect with their friends or followers online 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and 365 days a year, which means young adults can be in constant contact with their friends anytime they like. In a national survey by the Pew Research Center, approximately 93% of young adults were using the Internet regularly (Lenhart, Purcell, Smith & Zickuhr, 2010), and this statistic has remained consistent throughout the years (Perrin, 2015). In another national survey, Perrin (2015) found that around 90% of all young adults were using social media as a method to connect with others. The most recent national survey estimated 88% of 18-29 year olds are using Facebook, followed by 59% who are using Instagram, and lastly, approximately 36% are using Twitter to connect with others

online (Greenwood, Perrin, & Duggan, 2016). Even further, Greenwood and colleagues (2016) found that approximately 76% of young adults are using Facebook on a daily basis, 51% of young adults are using Instagram on a daily basis, and followed by 42% of young adults are using Twitter on a daily basis.

Lurking

Although, the main purpose of social media is to connect with others online (Subrahmanyam, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008; Barker, 2009; Lenhart et al., 2010), lurking online may be a behavior that is becoming more normative. Lurking, also called passive social media use, is characterized by reading content online without actively posting a status or interacting with other users (Underwood & Ehrenreich, 2017; Frison & Eggermont, 2016; Antheunis, Valkenburg, & Peter, 2010). Lurking might involve reading through various content posted on one's own newsfeed or even reading various people's profiles. In a recent study, it was found that adolescents spend more time lurking on social media than actively posting on social media (Underwood & Faris, 2015). There are multiple reasons for a person to lurk on social media. Some of these reasons are as simple as keeping up with celebrities and existing friendships or because a person is generally bored (Underwood & Faris, 2015). Other reasons for lurking on social media include worrying about missing when a friend posts, checking to see how many likes and comments their own posts receive, making sure they are not being excluded by friends, or even making sure no one is saying mean things about them online (Underwood & Faris, 2015).

Lurking occurs in dating relationships as well (Reed, Tolman, & Sayfer, 2015). A person may lurk on their significant other's social media profiles to see what they are doing. Some take their lurking behavior to the extreme through electronic intrusion. Electronic intrusion can occur

through the constant checking of their significant others' social media pages, checking in on whom they are speaking to or even checking significant other's phone to see with whom they are speaking (Reed et al., 2015). Those who lurk on their significant other in this manner tend to have an insecure-ambivalent (preoccupied) attachment style (Reed et al., 2015). It is possible that a person with high attachment anxiety may lurk on their friends as well. If individuals are remaining friends online despite not liking each other in person, are these individuals just lurking on the former friend without actually interacting?

Associations between Social Media Use and Psychosocial Adjustment

The frequent use of social media may come at a cost to users. For many young adults or adolescents, the frequent use of social media may be a source of pain because they may witness their friends doing things without them, which could lead to feelings of rejection (Underwood & Faris, 2015). Although perception of being rejected may not mean the individual is actually being rejected, however, the fear of rejection may result in the pain associated with perceived exclusion, which is just as painful as if they had been excluded or rejected by their friend (Underwood & Faris, 2015).

Fear of missing out and social media. Social media platforms and the development of smartphones allow for people to remain in contact with each other 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. If a person wants to know what someone is doing, it can be as simple as visiting a social networking site/app and checking the other person's profile for the most recent update. This ability to be in constant contact can bring up fears of being rejected or forgotten for some people who struggle with having feelings with a fear of missing out (FOMO). FOMO is often defined as a fear where a person is afraid they might be missing out on a rewarding experience with other

people including friends (Oberst, Wegmann, Stodt, Brand & Chamarro, 2017; Underwood & Faris, 2015; Underwood & Enrenreich, 2017).

A person with FOMO may use social media platforms to confirm or alleviate their fear, which can lead to a feedback loop. The person with FOMO may check social media to see what their friends are doing, and if they are doing anything without them. By checking social media, it can either confirm their fear of being left out or deny their fear, which can cause more anxiety or on the other hand, ease their fear. If their FOMO is confirmed, it can cause more anxiety, which will lead to them checking social media again to see what their friends are doing. If it denies their fear, it eases their anxiety around being left out. However, when the fear returns, they will return to social media to ease their anxiety again.

Adolescents are living their social lives out online just as much as in person. Adolescents, who attended a social event, may feel obligated to post about it because it can bring them more likes or comments, which can be positive for the receiver (Lenhart et al., 2015; Underwood & Ehrenreich, 2017). However, those aforementioned posts can bring negative consequences for the teen who may be lurking on social media or the one who may be afraid of being left out by their friends. In a study by Underwood and Faris (2015), 30% of adolescents felt left out by others after seeing posts or pictures online. In a national survey by Lenhart et al. (2015), 53% of adolescents in their study reported finding out about an event they had not been invited to attend by posts online their friends had made either prior to the event or after the event had occurred. Even further, 21% of those adolescents reported feeling worse after seeing posts online about an event they were not invited to attend (Lenhart et al., 2015).

Jealousy on social media. The act of lurking through a newsfeed may be simple or mind numbing, but constantly looking at other people's post can have negative effects on a person.

The act of seeking out or targeting a specific person such as a former friend or an antipathy to see what they may be posting can also lead to feelings of jealous.

Jealousy is a complex emotion characterized by fear or resentment of a third person (an interloper) that is perceived to be taking away a valued friendship (Casper & Card, 2010; Muise, Christofides, & Desmarais, 2009; Smith & Kim, 2007). A person may become jealous of another person if they are constantly witnessing their friend doing things with others on social media. Casper and Card (2010) found jealousy to be one of the most common reasons a friendship can transform into an antipathetic relationship. Muise and colleagues (2009) found that in dating relationships, various things on Facebook could incite jealous feelings between partners, where they are continuously checking their partner's social media accounts to see who they are interacting with or who is interacting with them. This pattern may also be seen in online friendships where a person may perceive or witness interactions between their friend and another person, whom they see as an interloper. These interactions can be as simple as a comment on their friend's post by the interloper, to a more complex interaction, such as the two people (their friend and the interloper) hanging out in person and one or both posting about it on social media. This could make the person who witnesses the interaction feel jealous and can lead to the termination of the friendship.

5. PRESENT STUDY

The purpose of the present study is to explore *why* emerging adults are friends with someone on social media whom they do not like in person, and specifically, a *former friend*. An additional aim is to examine if and how former friends interact on social media. The present study will also examine the various associations between their online lurking and feelings of jealousy and FOMO. Finally, this study will examine if a person's attachment style moderates the associations between online lurking and feelings of jealousy and FOMO.

6. HYPOTHESIS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based upon my literature review, I pose the following research questions and hypothesis:

Research Question 1: Why do people remain friends on social media with their former friend whom they no longer like in person?

Research Question 2: How are emerging adults who are antipathies in real life but friends on social media platforms interacting online?

Hypothesis 1: Individuals with higher attachment avoidance will spend less time online lurking.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals with higher attachment anxiety will spend more time online lurking.

Hypothesis 3: FOMO will be positively associated with lurking.

Hypothesis 3A: FOMO toward the former friend will be positively associated with lurking on former friend.

Hypothesis 4: Jealousy will be positively associated with lurking.

Hypothesis 4A: Jealousy toward their former friend will be positively associated with lurking on former friend.

Hypothesis 5: Attachment anxiety will moderate the association between FOMO and lurking for those who are social media friends a former fact-to-face friend.

Hypothesis 6: Attachment anxiety will moderate the association between jealousy and lurking for those who are social media friends a former fact-to-face friend.

7. METHOD

Sample Size

To determine the needed sample size for this study, an a priori power analysis using the G-power software was conducted. In order to detect effects as small as .25 while maintaining a power of .80 within the 95% confidence interval of analysis of variance, this study will need at least 158 participants. The participants recruited for this study will be emerging adults from various classes at The University of Alabama.

Sample

There are a total of 380 participants in this study (88.9% female). The average age was 20.57 ($SD = 3.78$). Approximately 72.1% of participants are Caucasian, 18.8% of participants are African American, 3.8% identified as Other, 2.9% of participants identified as Hispanic, 1.6% of participants identified as Asian, and .8% of participants identified as either Native American or Alaskan Native.

Of the 380 total participants, there are 210 participants (94.3% female) in this study who are friends with their former friend. Approximately 80% of the participants are Caucasian, 10% of the participants are African American, 4.3% of the participants are Hispanic, 2.9% of the participants identify as Other, 1.9% of the participants are Asian, and 1.0% of the sample is currently Native American or an Alaskan Native. Majority of the participants who identify as Other are bi-racial or mixed race. This includes the following: Hispanic, White and Asian, Asian and White, Black and White, and Cuban and White.

Procedures

Participants were recruited from various undergraduate classes at the University of Alabama. For their participation, some professors offered the students extra credit. If the participant agreed to participate in the study, they were provided with a link to the Qualtrics survey. Prior to filling out the survey, each participant was provided the informed consent form. If the participant agreed to participate in the study, they indicated by selecting the option, “I consent to participating in this study” following the informed consent. If they did not agree to participate in the study, they were to select the option, “I do not consent to participating in the study.” If they consented to participate in the study, they were able to complete the rest of the survey.

At the beginning of the survey, each participant filled out their demographic information and completed a questionnaire on friendship attachment then they were asked about their general social media use. After this section, there was a filter questions. The first filter question the participant did answer is “During high school or in college, did you have a friend or a best friend who later became someone you dislike?” If the participant responded with “No” then the participant was finished with the survey. If they responded with a “Yes,” the participant answered the final filter question, “Are you currently friends with this person on social networking sites (i.e. Facebook, Instagram, or Twitter)?” Once again, if the participant answers “No” they were asked various questions about their former friendship, social media use, why did they or the former friend remove the other off social media, how it felt when they removed or was removed off social media, and finally if they were ever friends with their former friend’s parents on social media. The participant will then be finished with the survey. If the participant answers “Yes,” the participant continued on to finish the rest of the survey.

After the filter questions, the participant who indicated they were friends with their former friend on social media continued on to answer questions about their nature and transformation of their friendship. Then the participants were asked to indicate which of the four social media platforms (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat) they are using with their former friend. After they indicated which platforms they use, the participant answered various questions about their specific interactions with their former friend on the various platforms chosen. For example, if the participant indicated they follow their former friend on Instagram and Twitter, then the participant answered one set of questions about their interaction with them on Twitter and one set of questions about their interaction with them on Instagram.

After the aforementioned portions of the survey, the participants were asked to rate various statements about their general jealousy and FOMO. The participants were then asked to rate various statements about their specific jealousy and FOMO towards their specific former friend. Items from each of the scales were randomized as well.

Measures

Demographics. Each participant was asked a series of questions about their basic demographics such as their race, age, gender, their date of graduation from college and the day they started college (Appendix A).

Experiences in Close Relationships Scale. In order to measure attachment style, this study used the *Experiences in Close Relationships Scale* (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Appendix B). This questionnaire contains 18-statements for anxiety and 18-statements for avoidance. The participants was asked to rate on a 7- point Likert scale about how much they agree with each statement. The 7-point Likert scale ranges from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Example statements include the following: “I am nervous when my friends get too

close to me,” “I try to avoid getting too close to my friends,” and “I tell my friends just about everything.” (Brennan et al., 1998). In one study, Cronbach alpha for the scale were .90 (Brennan et al., 1998). In this study, the internal consistency for the anxiety subscale was high ($\alpha = .88$), and the internal consistency for avoidance subscale ($\alpha = .93$) was high as well.

Facebook Jealousy General Scale. This study used a revised version of the *Facebook Jealousy Scale* (Muisse et al., 2009; Appendix C). The original scale rated jealousy toward a partner on Facebook. However, in this study, the scale was in order to rate jealousy toward their general friends on Facebook. Participants rate each statement on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1-Strongly disagree to 5-Strongly agree. Some of the statements include: “Be jealous if my friend posts pictures of him or herself with another friend,” “Experience Jealousy related to Facebook,” and “Become jealous after seeing one of my friends has added another person on Facebook. In a previous study involving older adolescents and emerging adults, the original scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.96 (Muisse et al., 2009). The internal consistency for the Facebook Jealousy General scale was high ($\alpha = .91$).

Facebook Jealousy Former Friend Scale. Each participant also rated on the same 5-point Likert scale his or her Facebook jealousy in relation to his or her former friend (Appendix D). This scale is an adapted version of the *Facebook Jealousy Scale* (Muisse et al., 2009). Some of the statements included in this version of the questionnaire are “Become jealous after seeing that my former friends has added another person on Facebook,” “Become jealous after seeing that my former friend has posted a message on the wall of a mutual friend,” and “Attempt to use Facebook to evoke jealousy in my former friend.” The internal consistency for the Facebook Jealousy Former Friend Scale was high ($\alpha = .93$).

Fear of Missing Out Scale. In order to measure FOMO, this study will use the *Fear of Missing Out Scale* (Przbylski, Murayama, Dehaan & Gladwell, 2013; Appendix E). Each participant rated statements on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree.” Some of the statements included in this questionnaire are “ I get anxious when I don’t know what my friends are up to,” “It bothers me when I miss an opportunity to meet up with friends,” and “Sometimes I wonder if I spend too much time keeping up with what is going on.” In a prior study, this 10-item scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .87 (Przbylski et al., 2013). The internal consistency for the Fear of Missing Out Scale was high ($\alpha = .82$).

Fear of Missing Out Former Friend Scale. Each participant also rated on the same 5-point Likert scale their FOMO in relation to their former friend (Appendix F). This scale was adapted from the *Fear of Missing Out Scale* (Przbylski et al., 2013). Some of the statements included in this version of the questionnaire are “My former friend has more rewarding experiences than me,” “I get anxious when I don’t know what my former is up to,” and “Sometimes I wonder if I spend too much time keeping up with what is going on with my former friend.” The internal consistency for the Fear of Missing Out Former Friend Scale was high ($\alpha = .79$).

Social Media Behaviors Questionnaire. This questionnaire consisted of various questions related to use of social media as well as their behaviors enacted on social media toward their former friend on four different social media platforms which are Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, and Twitter (Appendix G). Some of the questions include “How often have you looked at your former friend’s profile?” “In what ways do you interact with your former friend online?” and “What is the nature of the interaction, positive or negative?” This questionnaire will be used

to measure their specific behavior and their perception of behaviors enacted by their former friend.

Plan of Analysis

The information gathered from these questionnaires was analyzed using SPSS. In order to answer research questions 1, “Why do people remain friends on social media with their former friend whom they no longer like in person?” The responses from question 12 on the social media behavior survey, “Tell me about the reasons you are still friends with them on social media,” was coded and analyzed for patterns and themes. The responses from the various questions about the interactions on the four different social media platforms on the *Social Media Behavior Questionnaire* was used to answer research question 2, “How are emerging adults who are antipathies in real life but friends on social media platforms interacting online?”

In order to test hypothesis 1, “Individuals with higher attachment avoidance will spend less time online lurking,” and hypothesis 2, “Individuals with higher attachment anxiety spend more time online lurking,” each participant was classified into a category of attachment based upon Bartholomew’s four categories of attachment. If a person’s attachment anxiety and avoidance score was below the median score for each measure ($Median_{anxiety}=2.94$; $Median_{avoidance}=2.44$) then the person was categorized as having a secure attachment style (Brennan et al., 1999). If the person’s attachment anxiety was below the median but the person’s attachment avoidance score was above or equal to the median score then the person was categorized as having a dismissing attachment style (Brennan et al., 1999). If the person’s attachment anxiety and avoidance was above or equal to the median of scores then the person was categorized as having as a fearful attachment style (Brennan et al., 1999). If the person’s attachment anxiety was above or equal to the median score but their attachment avoidance was

below the median score then the person was categorized as having a preoccupied attachment style. For time spent online, question 1 and 2 on the *Social Media and Behaviors Questionnaire* was used to calculate total time spent online. In order to calculate the time, the answer from question 1 “How often are you on social media?” was used to find the total of times a person goes on social media during the course of a week then the number was multiplied by the answer to question 2 “How much time do you spend each time you are on social media?” to find the total amount of time on social media during a week. After each participant was assigned an attachment style and amount spent online was calculated, a one-way ANOVA was used to test if there is a difference in time spent online between the various attachment styles.

In order to test hypothesis 3, “FOMO will be positively associated with lurking” and hypothesis 3A “FOMO toward the former friend will be positively associated with lurking on former friend,” a Pearson correlation was used to see if there is an association between general FOMO and general lurking. A Pearson correlation was also used to examine the association between lurking on the former friend and FOMO related to the former friend.

In order to test hypothesis 4 “Jealousy will be positively associated with lurking” and hypothesis 4A “Jealousy toward their former friend will be positively associated with lurking on former friend,” a Pearson correlation was used to see if there is an association between general lurking and general jealousy. As well as, if there was an association between lurking on his or her former friend and jealousy related toward his or her former friend.

To analyze the potential moderating effect of attachment style, a series of two-way ANOVAs will be used. In order to test hypothesis 5 “Attachment anxiety will moderate the association between FOMO and lurking,” a two-way ANOVA was used to see if there was an interaction between FOMO and the moderator attachment style in predicting lurking.

In order to test hypothesis 6 “Attachment anxiety will moderate the association between jealousy and lurking”, a two-way ANOVA was ran to see if there was an interaction between jealousy and the moderator attachment style in predicting lurking.

Method for Coding Narrative Responses for Research Question 1

The narrative responses provided for the question “Tell me about the reason you are still friends with or following [name] on social media.” were initially analyzed by the author with the assistance of her major advisor and one undergraduate research assistant. Using the constant comparative method (Glaser, 1965), the first narrative response was read and a major theme was identified. Each subsequent response was read and compared to the previous responses. If the overall theme did not match previous responses, a new theme was added to the coding scheme. This process continued until all narrative responses were read and coded. Following the first initial coding, the author then reviewed all themes and combined those that were closely related resulting in eight major themes, for the reasons that participants remain friends online with their former friend. Two of the major themes contained subthemes. Following completion of the author’s coding, a graduate research assistant independently coded the responses using the author’s coding scheme. The inter-rater agreement between the author and the other graduate student was 84% for both the eight major themes and subthemes.

Method for Coding Narrative Responses for Research Question 2

The same constant comparative method was used to code the responses provided for the 23 different questions about interactions on social media. Two undergraduate research assistants coded the various open-ended questions about how participants interacted with their former friend on social media (i.e., comments, messages, replies, snaps and screenshots). The averaged inter-rater agreement for these questions was 74%.

8. RESULTS

Friends on Social Media.

The main research question was “Why do people remain friends on social media with their former friend whom they no longer like in person?” I explored this question by asking the participant to “Tell me the reason why they are still friends or following their former friend on social media.” These responses were qualitatively coded for themes. In this process, eight distinct themes emerged. The themes included hope of reconciliation, attention seeking, aggression, comparison, reconciled, past or present social connection, indifference, and lurking.

The first theme that arose was *hope of reconciliation* ($n=3$). This theme includes response where the participant stated that the reason they didn’t unfriend or unfollowed their former friend on social media was because they hoped they would eventually work it out. This includes the following response: “In hopes that maybe she will talk to me again.” Within in this study, 1.42% of the reasons participants gave for remaining friends with their former friend on social media fell within the theme of hope of reconciliation.

The second theme that emerged was the theme of *attention seeking* ($n=5$). Responses that were categorized in this theme indicated that the reason they kept their former friend on social media was for their benefit. This included responses like the following: “Gotta rack up those followers,” “I allow my former friend to follow me,” and “She added me, so I just accepted it.” Some (2.38%) of the responses given for the reason for remaining friends with their former friend on social was categorized as attention seeking.

The third theme was the theme of *aggression* ($n=10$). This theme includes response where the participant admits to engaging in aggressive behavior such as “I like to hate on her pictures,” where the participants is afraid of becoming the victim if they unfriend their former friend “Fear of retribution, or where the participant is afraid to unfriend their former friend because their former friend may some mean about them online such as “To make sure they don’t say anything mean about me.” A few (4.76%) of the participant responses for the reason why participants remained friends with their former friend on social media were categorized in the theme of aggression.

The fourth theme to emerge was *comparison* ($n=10$). This theme encompasses any response where either comparison seemed to be mentioned or comparison seemed to have already occurred whether it was negative self-comparison or positive self-comparison. This includes the following responses: “Every time I see her ugly face, it appeases the petty side of me that knows that we stopped being friends because I was competition in more ways than just looks,” “To see how much better, I’m doing than her,” or simply “I compare myself to her.” A small number (4.76%) of responses for the reasons that a participant remains friends with their former friend on social media fell within this theme.

The fifth theme to emerge was *reconciled* ($n=11$). This theme was used to designate the responses in which the participant stated the reason they were still friend with their former friend was because they had reconciled the friendship. These friendships were either acquaintances or friendships. This theme includes the following responses, “She’s my best friend,” “We are still friendly,” or “I still care about this person, they are still my friend, but I choose not to be close to them like I used to be because of personality differences.” Of the responses for the reasons why a

person remains friends with their former friend on social media, 5.24% of responses fell within this category of reconciled the relationship

The sixth major theme to arise was *past or present social connection* ($n=48$). This theme included responses that indicated that the reason they were still friends on social media with their former friend had to do with things that were socially related. In this major theme there was also subthemes: history (a shared former history), mutual friends or friend group, antipathy unknown (if they unfriended their former friend then the other person would know that they didn't like them), awkward social situation (a situation that would result if the participant unfriended the former friend whether awkward or cause drama), and impression management (where the participant felt that it was immature or rude to unfriend their former friend. An example of history is "We graduate together" or "We share great memories together." An example of mutual group or friend group is "Because we are on the same soccer team it would be awkward to unfollow her." An example of a response in the antipathy unknown would be "She doesn't know I don't like her." An example of an awkward social situation would be "She is still in my life, so I feel as though removing her from my social media would cause needless drama." An example of impression management is "I believe it's immature to unfriend or unfollow people." A little less than one-fourth (22.86%) of the responses fell within the theme of past or present social connection.

The seventh major theme was *indifference* ($n=51$). The responses that fell within this category were typically because the person didn't care to unfollow/unfriend or just never took the time to unfollow/unfriend. The responses in this theme include the follow statements: "I simply haven't unfriended them" or "I didn't feel the need to unfriend them. A quarter (24.29%) of responses were categorized as the theme of indifference.

The eighth major theme was *lurking* ($n=56$). The responses in this theme were all around the topic of lurking. Some were lurking because they cared. For example, “I want to make sure she’s doing okay.” Other responses just liked to see what their former friend posted online. For example, “I like to see her posts.” Many (26.67%) of the responses given for the reasons why a person remains friends with a former friend on social media were categorized as lurking.

Unfriended on Social Media

Although, the main research question was why the participants remained friends with their former friend on social media, some participants ($n=48$) were no longer friends on social media. Two participants stated that their former friend removed them from their social media platform. Although, they couldn’t provide a reason why their former friend removed them, they did state that they felt sad and confused because their former friend had removed them. One person even believed the incident that led to the falling out of their friendship was not serious enough to warrant being removed from social media. On the other hand, many participants ($n=23$) were the ones who removed their former friend from social media. Majority ($n=18$) of the participants stated the main reason they removed their former friend was because they did not want to see their posts anymore. Some blatantly stated “I didn’t care about them anymore...” which is why they removed them from social media. When inquired about how they felt after removing their former friend, the most common answers were relieved, liberated, or even freed because they didn’t have to see their posts anymore.

Interactions on Social Media

Research question 2 was about how former friends interact on social media, the frequencies were calculated using the various questions about interactions on social media such as do they like, comment or private message their former friend. Even further, the responses

were evaluated to determine if the interactions were positive, negative or both. These interactions were analyzed for each of the four social media platforms in this study: Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, and Snapchat.

Former friend's mean comments. When asked if any of the participant's former friends said anything mean about them online, 9.4% of the participants ($n=11$) said that their former friend stated mean things about them online. Eleven of the mean messages were provided in this study. Some of mean things said online included "You need to get a life and stop worrying about mine," "You're lying," and "You're a bad friend." Of the former friends who said mean things about the participant, 27.27% of the mean things said online were either derogatory names directed toward the participants or statements made in a manner intended emotionally harm the participant. One of the mean things left online about a participant stated that the "Some people [participant] need to learn when their life isn't worth living."

Participant's mean comments. When asked if any of the participants stated anything mean about their former friend online, 3.7% of the participants ($n=5$) stated that they did say something about their former friend online. Five of the participants provided examples of some of the mean things they said about their former friend online. One of the mean statements said about their former friend used derogatory comments such as calling them stupid and used racial slurs meant to tear apart their former friend. Another mean statement about their former friend was "He's ugly." Another participant admitted to saying petty things about their former friend online. Finally another admitted to ranting on social media about the person and their posts.

Perception. Each participant was asked if they ever thought about how their posts were perceived online by their former friend. Exactly, 24.2% of individuals ($n=39$) have thought about how their former friend perceives their posts online. Twenty-three participants provided

information regarding how they thought their former friend perceives their posts online. These responses were coded for common themes. The themes are aggression ($n=1$), comparison ($n=15$), envy ($n=1$), indifference ($n=1$), jealousy ($n=3$), and lurking ($n=2$). The most common theme was comparison. Majority of participants wanted their former friend to either make a comparison that they (participants) were better off than them (former friend).

Interactions on Specific Social Media Platforms

Instagram. On Instagram, 166 participants either follow their former friend or are still followed by their former friend. Of the participants who have their former friend on Instagram, 95.1% of these individuals ($n=156$) are still following their former friend. On the other hand 96.1% of the participants ($n=158$) have their former friend following them.

These individuals are not just following each other, but they are also interacting with each other on Instagram. When asked if they are watching the stories of their former friends on Instagram, 60.4% of the participants ($n=99$) consistently watch their former friend's stories they post on Instagram. On the other hand, 65.9% of former friends ($n=108$) consistently watch the participant's stories they post on Instagram. Finally, 46.3% of individuals ($n=76$) still like their former friend's posts on Instagram, and 63.4% of their former friends ($n=104$) also like the participant's posts on Instagram.

Posted comments. When asked if they comment, 6.1% of the participants ($n=10$) stated that they comment on their former friend's Instagram post as well. Seven participants provided comments they left on their former friend's posts. These comments were rated on a scale ranging from negative to neutral to positive. All comments provided were rated as positive comments. Examples of these comments are "Love this, so cute, pretty" and "Pretty."

Received comments. When asked if they had received any comments from their former friend on Instagram, 5.42% of the participants ($n=9$), who had a former friend on Instagram, stated that their former friend comments on their posts on Instagram. Five of the participants provided an example comment that was left on their post by their former friend. These posts were also rated as negative, neutral or positive. All of the five comments were rated as positive. A couple of examples of the comments left on the post include “Pretty, cute, positive vibes” and “I like this pic.”

Direct messages. Eleven percent of the participants ($n=18$) have messaged their former friend through the Instagram platform. Fourteen participants provided examples of messages they sent to their former friend through Instagram. These responses were rated to be negative, neutral or positive. There were a total of four positive messages sent to their former friend. An example of a positive message is “Sending a holiday wish” or “The fire emoji.” Eight messages were rated to be neutral. An example of a neutral message was “Asking for someone’s number.” Two messages were rated to be negative. An example of a negative message is sending a message stating “I’m your biggest fan.”

Facebook. On the social media platform Facebook, 166 of the participants stated that they were still online friends with their former friend. Eighty-two percent of the participants ($n=132$) had mutual in person friends with their former friend. Of the participants, who were still friends with their former friend on Facebook, 43.5% of these individuals ($n=70$) had a mutual group or peer network such as a sports team, sorority, clique or friend network. Even further, 31.1% of participants interacted with their former friend in person. Finally, 95.7% of the participants ($n=154$), who had their former friend on Facebook, also had mutual online friends with their former friend.

Posted comments. These individuals do not only have mutual friendships and peer groups, but they also interact online. For example, 40.4% of the participants ($n=65$) who are friends with their former friend on Facebook also like their former friend's posts on Facebook. Further, 6.8% of the individuals ($n=11$) who are friends with their former friend on Facebook are also commenting on their former friend's posts. For those who comment on their former friend's posts, 91% make positive comments, and 9.1% of those individuals make both positive and negative comments. Four participants provided examples of comments they might leave on their former friend's post. These comments were rated on as negative, neutral, or positive. All four comments were rated to be positive. Examples of these comments include "Pretty," "So cute," and wishing their former friend "Happy Birthday."

Received comments. Among the participants who are friends with their former friend on Facebook 22.3% state that their former friend likes their posts. Even further, 7.83% of individuals ($n=13$) stated that their former friend comments on their posts, and 87.5% of the individuals who state that their former friend comments on their post, state that the comments are positive. Another 2.5% of individuals state their former friend makes negative comments on their positive, and 10.0% of the individuals state that their former friend makes both negative and positive comments on the participant's posts. Twenty-four of the participants provided an example of the comments their former friend makes on their post. These comments were coded as negative, neutral, or positive. Twenty-four of the comments provided were rated to be positive. Examples of positive message left by their former friend on their posts are "Cute" and "Pretty."

Messenger. Only 5.6% of the participants ($n=5$) who have their former friend on Facebook use Facebook Messenger to communicate with their former friend. Of those

individuals ($n=9$), who message their former friend through Facebook Messenger, 88.9% of those individuals state that these messages are positive, while 11.1% state that these messages sent to their former friend are both negative and positive. Six participants provided an example of private messages they sent their former friend. These messages were rated negative, neutral, or positive. Two of the example messages were rated to be positive, two were rated to be neutral and two of the messages was rated to be negative. An example of the positive message is “That she looks good.” An example of the neutral message is “How are you?” An example of the negative message is “I figure that’s something you would try.”

When asked about interactions using messenger, 3.1% of the individuals who are friends with their former friend ($n=9$) on Facebook state that their former friend messaged them through Facebook Messenger. Two participants provided example messages from their former friend. These two messages, provided by the participants, were both rated as neutral. The two messages provided were “Hey” and “Hi, How are you?”

Twitter. Eighty-one of the participants stated that they had kept their former friend on Twitter. Of these 81 participants, 89.7% of these individuals ($n=70$) stated that they followed their former friend on Twitter, and 89.7% of these individuals ($n=70$) stated that their former friend was following them. Concerning their interactions, 11.5% of the participants ($n=9$) stated that they favorite their former friend’s tweets, and 21.8% of participants ($n=17$) state their former friend favorites their tweets. Finally, 5.1% of the participants ($n=4$) retweet their former friend’s tweet, and 14.1% of the participants ($n=11$) stated that their former friend retweet their tweets.

Replies. Nine percent of participants ($n=3$) state that their former friend replies to their tweets, and five participants provided an example of their former friend’s replies to their tweets. These tweets were coded as either positive, negative, or neutral. Five of the replies were coded as

positive. An example of a positive message is “So cute.” While 1.3% of participants state that they reply to their former friend’s tweets. Only one participant provided an example of a message they reply to their former. This message was coded as positive. This reply was “Best Mode.”

Messages. When asked if they use the private message feature on twitter to message their former friend, 3.8% of participants ($n=3$) stated that they use private messages to communicate with their former friend on Twitter. Three of the participants provide examples of these messages. These messages were coded as positive, negative or neutral. Of the two messages provide, one was coded as neutral and one as negative. An example of the neutral message is “Watch this video.” The negative message provided “Can I get your autograph?” On the other hand, 5.2% of the participants ($n=4$) stated that their former friend uses the message feature on Twitter to communicate with them. Four messages were provided as examples of messages sent by their former friend to them. One of the messages was negative and three were neutral. The negative message was “Sent me a mean tweet referring to me getting her in trouble for being drunk.” The neutral messages were “Trust the process” and “Watch this video.”

Subtweets. When asked if the participants ever subtweeted about their former friend, 34.6% of the participants ($n=27$) did subtweet their former friend.

Snapchat. One-hundred and twenty two participants kept their former friend on the social messaging app, Snapchat. Of the participants who have their former friend on Snapchat, 92.4% of the participants ($n=109$) state that their former friend still has them as a friend on Snapchat. In addition, 91.5% of the participants ($n=108$) state that they still have their former friend as a friend on Snapchat.

Watching stories. Of the participants who have their former friend on Snapchat, 49.2% of

the participants state that they watch their former friend's story *every time* a story is posted, while 24.6% of participants state that they watch their former friend's story every once in a while. Finally, 11.9% of participants state that they seldom watch their former friend's story, and 14.4% of participants never watch their former friend's story.

When asked if their former friend watches their story, 65.3% of participants stated that their former friend watches their story every time a story is posted, while 21.2% of participants stated that their former friend watches their story every once in a while. On the other hand, 3.4% of participants stated that their former friend seldomly watches their story. Finally, 10.2% of participants state their former friend never watches their story.

Sending and receiving personal snaps. When asked if they have sent any snaps to their former friend, 9.3% of participants ($n=11$) state that they send their former friend personal snaps. Nine participants provided the types of personal snaps that were sent to their former friend. These examples were coded as negative, positive or neutral. There were seven neutral snaps and two positive snaps. Some of the neutral snaps included chats (words, no picture), the ones they send to everyone, and generic snaps. The nice snaps included snaps sent within the group snap and replying to each other's stories. Another 17.8% of individuals ($n=21$) state that their former friend sends them personal snaps. Eighteen participants provided descriptions of snaps sent to them by the former friend. These snaps were coded as positive, neutral or negative. One snap sent to the participant from their former friend was negative, eleven snaps were considered neutral, and six snaps were considered positive. The neutral snaps include comments from a story posted, generic chain snaps, and random ones of mutual friends. An example of a positive snap was a guy stating he misses the participant. The negative snap was a drunken snap.

Screenshots. When asked whether they ever took a screenshot of their former friend's snap, 16.1% of individuals ($n=19$) stated that they took a screenshot of their former friend's snaps. Of the 19 people who took screenshots of their former friends, 68.42% of these individuals have never used their snaps against their former friend. Another 21.05% of these individuals ($n=11$) stated that they have used a screenshot of their former friend's snap against them whether it was the participant him or herself ($n=3$) or one of the participant's friends ($n=1$). Snaps that the participant screenshotted were coded as friendly ($n=4$), funny ($n=7$), keepsake ($n=1$), sharing ($n=2$) and violation ($n=2$). The friendly snaps include a snap of a really cute dog, ones with the participant in them, and a picture of her friend. A keepsake snap included pictures of them when they were friends. The funny snaps that were screenshotted were funny pictures. Two of the screenshots that were coded as "sharing" were of activities that the participant felt needed to be shared with one of their current friends. For example, a participant took a screenshot of an image of her former friend smoking and shared it with one of her current friends. The two violation snaps were images that the participant described as an incriminating situation and a screenshot of something the participant stated did not need to be on Snapchat. However, neither of the participants provided any more details of what either screenshot contained. .

When asked if their former friend has ever taken a screenshot of their snap, the participants stated that 9.3% of their former friends have taken a screen shot. Of the individuals ($n=11$), 63.63% of individuals stated that their former friend has never used a screenshot against them; however, 9.09% of participants stated that their former friend has used a screenshot against them. On the other hand, 9.09% of the participants stated that they never used a screenshot against the participant, but the former friend has said means things directed toward them. Eight

participants provided examples of screenshots their former friend took of them. These were coded as: friendly, funny, romantic relationship, and violation. There was a total of four friendly snaps screenshotted by their former friend. Examples of screenshotted snaps include cute pictures of the participants, a quote that they use, or ones with them in it. There was one snap coded as a violation, which was a snap of when the participant's kitchen burnt down. There was one snap that was screenshotted of the person's current romantic relationship that was coded as romantic relationship. Finally two of the screenshotted snaps were of something funny that the participant sent to them.

Lurking

Most individuals ($n=242$) go onto the various social media platforms more than 5 times a day. Even further, most individuals ($n=110$) spend at least ten minutes every time they are on social media, this was followed by 98 individuals who spend at least 5 minutes each time they go on social media. On average, participants ($n=354$) spend about 63.38 minutes a day on social media. Even further, the participants are not just casually lurking on social media.

They are actively lurking on their former friend as well. Eighty-six percent of participants who have their former friend on Instagram were also lurking on their former friend. Sixty-two percent of individuals who have their former friend on Twitter were also lurking on their former friend. Seventy-eight percent of individuals who had their former friend on Facebook were also lurking on their former friend. On Snapchat, 74.7% of individuals who have a former friend on the platform are looking at their former friend's story either every time a story is posted or every once in a while.

Instagram. Of the individuals who lurk on their former friend on Instagram ($n=143$), on average they reported lurking on their former friend's profile on Instagram for 21 minutes a

month. Ninety-two percent of individuals who lurk on their former friend on Instagram will lurk at their former friend's pictures that they have posted online. Twenty-seven percent of individuals would look at the pictures their former friend was tagged in on Instagram. Thirty-seven percent of individuals look at the comments that are being left on their former friend's pictures. Seven percent of these individuals who lurk on their former friend look at their former friend's followers. Six percent of individuals who lurk on their former friend look at who their former friend is following.

Twitter. Of the individuals who lurked on their former friend on Twitter (n=50), individuals on average spent a total time of 41 minutes per month lurking on their former friend's profile on Twitter. Ninety percent of participants who lurked on their former friend on Twitter were looking at their former friend's tweets. Forty-two percent looked at their former friend's pictures. Eighteen percent of participants who lurked on their former on Twitter looked at what their former friend was liking on Twitter. Four percent of individuals who lurked on their former friend on Twitter looked at who was following their former friend, and 2% looked at who their former friend was following on Twitter.

Facebook. Of the individuals who lurked on their former friend on Facebook (n=129), they spent on average 45 minutes a month lurking on their former friend's profile. Seventy-five percent of participants who lurked on their former friend on Facebook looked at their posts. Ninety-two percent looked at their pictures. Even further, 25.58% looked specifically at their profile pictures. Ten percent of individuals who lurked on their former friend on Facebook looked at what their former friend likes. Another 25.58% of individuals looked at the comments on their former friend's posts, and finally, 13% of participants reported that they looked at other people's posts on their former friend's wall.

Snapchat. Although, there is no quantitative time, on Snapchat, approximately 49.2% of the participants state that they watch their former friend's story *every time* a story is posted.

Twenty-five percent look at their former friend's story every once in a while.

Attachment

Attachment was split into two subscales. The first subscale was attachment anxiety ($M=3.27$, $SD=1.16$). The second subscale was attachment avoidance ($M=2.58$, $SD=.91$).

In this study, there were two major groups, those who had a former friend in general and those who did not have a former friend in general. A One-way ANOVA was used to examine whether there was a difference in the mean level of attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance between the two groups. Indeed, there was a significant difference in the average level of reported attachment anxiety among the individuals who had a friend who later became an antipathy and the individuals who did not have a friend who later became an antipathy in this study ($F(1, 356) = 11.93$, $p < .001$). The individuals ($n=257$) who had a friend who became an antipathy had higher attachment anxiety ($M=3.23$) than the individuals ($n=101$) who did not have a friend who late became an antipathy ($M=2.78$). On the other hand, there was no difference between attachment avoidance in the groups who had no former friend versus the group that has former friends ($F(1, 352) = .45$, $p = ns$).

There was no significant difference in attachment anxiety between participants who kept their former friend online and those who removed their former friend ($F(1, 254) = 1.69$, $p = ns$). Similarly, there was not a difference in reported attachment avoidance for those who kept their former friend online compared to those who remove their former friend ($F(1, 250) = .143$, $p = ns$). Attachment anxiety had a moderately strong association towards both FOMO toward their former friend ($r(198) = .477$, $p < .001$) and online jealousy ($r(194) = .462$, $p < .001$).

Fear of Missing Out

FOMO was measured both generally ($M=3.07$, $SD=.68$) and specifically towards the former friend ($M=1.96$, $SD=.69$). There was a mean difference between the scores of general FOMO and FOMO towards their former friend ($t(199) = 23.504$, $p < .001$), which means they are more likely to experience FOMO related to anyone they are friends with online than specifically to their former friend.

Jealousy

Facebook Jealousy was measured both generally ($M=2.24$, $SD=.73$) and specifically towards their former friend ($M=1.84$, $SD=.77$). There was a mean difference between general Facebook jealousy and Facebook jealousy toward their former friend ($t(195) = 10.75$, $p < .001$), which means they have more jealousy related to general friends on Facebook than they do toward their former friend on Facebook.

Hypotheses 1 and 2

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported. That is, there were no significant differences in time spent online when comparing the four different attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, fearful-avoidant, and dismissing; $F(3, 338) = .369$, $p = ns$).

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3: FOMO will be positively associated with lurking, and hypothesis 3A was FOMO toward the former friend will be positively associated with lurking on former friend.

There was no association for general FOMO and general lurking ($r(196) = .050$, $p = ns$).

However, there was an association for FOMO with the former friend and lurking on the former friend on Instagram ($r(94) = .34$, $p < .001$), lurking on the former friend on Twitter ($r(33) = .391$, $p < .05$), and lurking on the former friend on Facebook ($r(78) = .33$, $p < .005$).

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4: Jealousy will be positively associated with lurking, and hypothesis 4A is jealousy toward former friend will be positively associated with lurking on the former friend. There was no association for general jealousy and general lurking ($r(195) = .07, p = ns$). There was, however, an association for jealousy toward the former friend and lurking on the former friend on Instagram ($r(93) = .24, p < .05$) and lurking on former friend on Facebook ($r(78) = .25, p < .05$). There was no association between jealousy toward the former friend and lurking on Twitter ($r(32) = .20, p = ns$).

Hypothesis 5

Attachment anxiety will moderate the association between FOMO and lurking for those who are social media friends with a former fact-to-face friend. The association between general lurking and general FOMO was not significant; therefore, no moderator analyses was conducted.

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 is attachment anxiety will moderate the association between jealousy and lurking for those who are social media friends a former fact-to-face friend. The association between general lurking and general jealousy was not significant; therefore, the moderator analyses were not conducted.

9. DISCUSSION

Adolescents and young adults often lurk online looking at a variety of individuals from their best friends to random celebrities (Underwood & Faris, 2015). The primary aim of the present study was to explore why people remain friends on social media platforms with former face-to-face friends, and further, to explore how they interact with one another on social media platforms. Participants reported that when they remain friends on social media with someone they no longer consider a face-to-face friend, they do spend time lurking on their former friend's social media activity. Most individuals lurked on their former friend across *all platforms*. The most common lurking behavior reported by the participants was looking at the former friend's posts and pictures, which is not surprising especially given some of the reasons the participants chose to remain friends on social media with their former friend.

In response to my main research question: "Why are people friends or following their former friend on social media?" a major theme, that emerged was *lurking*. Lurking is a common phenomenon, where adolescents will passively read content on social media without actively interacting with other people online (Underwood & Ehrenreich, 2017; Frison & Eggermont, 2016; Antheunis, Valkenburg, & Peter, 2010). Underwood and Faris (2015) stated that adolescents spend more time lurking than actively posting. Although, a primary goal of the study was to find out if participant were lurking on their former friends, it was not expected to be a main reason the participants stayed friends with their former friend online. Many of the participants stated that they remained friends with their former friend because they wanted to keep up with their former friend's life. One person even stated that having them on social media

made it possible for her to know how her former friend was doing without actually having to ask them. Even further, multiple participants stated that the reason they lurked was because they still cared about their former friend despite not currently being friends with them.

Another expected finding is the *past or present social connection* theme that emerged within the qualitative data. Boyd (2007) suggested that a person might add someone whom they may not consider to be a friend because it would be socially awkward to not add them, which might also be the same reason why they would not remove someone. In addition, Underwood and Faris (2015) suggest that online platforms are merely an extension of an adolescent's social life, which means their friends online should be reflective of the people whom they interact with every day. Consequently, this theme related to social connections emerged because some participants stated that it would be awkward if they did remove them. The reason behind the awkwardness ranged from having in-person mutual friends, to being on the same sports team, or the antipathy is unknown, which if they unfriended the former friend would lead to awkwardness in face-to-face situations. These sets of findings suggest that online platforms and friendships on these platforms are reflective of the people whom they interact with every day, even if the people might be their antipathies.

Another interesting theme that emerged was *indifference*. Casper et al. (under review) found that 37% of the participants who remained friends with their antipathy online found that they dislike, strongly disliked or even hated their antipathy. The theme of indifference was unexpected because indifference is very different from hate and dislike, which would be the expected feelings of someone who does not like their former friend. Within the category of indifference, some participants stated that they simply had never unfriended their former. However, this indifference might not be because they have feelings of indifference towards their

former friend, but they might just be indifferent to their presence on social media, which feeling indifferent and being indifferent toward a person's presence are two different phenomena.

Although, the main research question asked was about why people remain friends on social media despite not liking each other in person, in this study the alternative was also explored. Participants who removed their former friend were asked why did they remove their former friend from social media platforms. One very distinct difference arose between the group of individuals who kept their former friend and the group of individuals who removed their former friend from social media. Those who were no longer friends on social media did not want to see their former friends posts anymore because they no longer cared about their former friend. One individual mentioned that every time she saw her former friend's post it made her feel worthless just like her former friend had in past. When asked how it felt to remove their former friend from social media, almost every participant stated that they felt relieved, freed, or even liberated because they no longer cared about their former friend. The major difference between the two groups is in the feelings about the former friend. Those who kept their former friend either felt indifferent to their former, lurked because they cared, wanted to see what their former friend was doing, or still interacted with their former friend. Those individuals who removed their former friend felt very differently because seeing their former friend's post made them feel annoyed, angry, frustrated and worthless.

Another specific aim of the present study was to explore how former friends interact online. Participants reported a range of online interactions. For example, they reported that they leave comments, reply to tweets, and that they like each other's posts and tweets. Some even opted to use the messaging feature on these various platforms to communicate with their former friend, and they were mutually sending each other snaps. When asked to provide an example of

the type of messages, comments, replies, and snaps, these interactions were expected to be mostly negative. The majority of these interactions, however, were either neutral or positive. Some interactions were not always positive; one person stated that their former friend would make comments about how her life just wasn't worth living, which is very hurtful and potentially harmful. In this study, these comments or messages were rare. One of the reasons, these interactions might occur is related to one of the reasons they remained friends on social media. Some participants remained friends on social media because they still cared to know how their former friend was doing even if they were not currently friends. If the participants lurked because they cared about their former friend then it wouldn't be a far reach to say they interact in a positive manner because these individuals still care about their former friend.

Casper and Card (2010) stated that one of the top reasons friendships transform was because of jealous feelings. As a result, it was expected that the jealousy might carry over to the online realm, and feelings of jealousy online was expected to be high among former friends as well. Online jealousy was high in general for participants. However, the level of online jealousy was significantly lower when comparing level of general jealousy to former friend jealousy online. This result was somewhat unexpected because it is possible that if jealousy was a reason some of these friendships transformed then feelings of jealousy toward this person might continue. On the other hand, jealousy is related to the fear of losing an important relationship because of a third person's interference. In the present study, general online jealousy was significantly higher than online jealousy toward former friends. These former friends may no longer experience feelings of jealousy because the relationship is no longer being threatened because it has already dissolved. Another reason that might explain why there is little jealousy toward the former friend is the theme of *indifference* as a reason why a person might keep their

former friend as a friend online. Essentially, about a quarter of participants were indifferent to their former friend's presence on social media. If they are truly indifferent to the person's presence online, then they likely have low levels of jealousy. .

As expected, former friend jealousy and former friend FOMO were related to lurking on former friends on most of the social media platforms. Lenhart et al. (2015) stated that 53% of adolescents in their study reported finding out about the event online. While Underwood and Faris (2015) stated 30% of adolescents felt left out by others. From this I hypothesized that lurking on former friend would be related to FOMO towards former friend. As expected, lurking on their former friend on the Instagram, Facebook and Twitter was positively associated with higher levels of FOMO toward their former friend, which means the more people lurk on their former friend the more likely they will experience higher levels of FOMO. Similarly, jealousy toward former friend was associated with lurking on Facebook and Instagram, which means the more a person lurks on these platforms the more likely they are to experience higher levels of jealousy. This phenomenon did not hold true of general lurking, general FOMO or general jealousy.

Attachment in this study was not related to general lurking; however, it was related to lurking on the former friend. Higher attachment anxiety was associated with higher feelings of jealous and FOMO related to their former friend. If an individual had a friend who later became an antipathy in this study, they had higher levels of reported attachment anxiety than the individuals who did not have an antipathy who use to be a friend. Future research should look into whether the transformation of the friendship occurred because of high attachment anxiety.

10. STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

One of the strengths of this study is that it was first to explore the reasons for remaining friends or following a former friend online, which is a novel area of research. This study also explored how these individuals are currently interacting with each other on social media, which is also the first time these interactions were explored in research.

A limitation for the study is sample size. Although, the sample size is large, it became too small to do some of the categorical analyses when broken down into social media categories. Furthermore, some of this data is retrospective. The individuals were asked to think about a relationship that took place in the past. Another limitation of this study is the lack of diversity. The sample was mainly Caucasian females; therefore, the study lacks generalizability. A final limitation is that the measure of lurking and social media used was extremely conservative. It is believe that adolescents and young adults spend more time on social media than 63 minutes a day. In a study by Alhabash and Ma (2017), they found that college students use Facebook, Instagram, and Snapchat for more than 100 minutes a day on each platform, and they use twitter for close to 90 minutes a day.

Future research should seek to gain a larger sample size and more diverse participants. Another area for future research would be for them to find a more accurate way to measure lurking on former friends or friends in general. The average time spent on social media in this study was extremely conservative. It is believed that college students and young adults are frequent users of social media. It is has been said that they use social media over 6.5 hours a day (Alhabash and Ma, 2017), which is higher than the average time spent online found in this study.

Future research should also look to replicate the themes for why a person remains friends online with their former friend.

11. CONCLUSION

Debatin et al. (2009) stated that the term friend online was an ambiguous construct. This study supports this finding. Over half of the sample had a former friend whom they were friends with or following on social media, which suggests that being friends with a person online does not necessarily mean a person is an actual face-to-face friend or friend at all. This was the first study to explore the question of why a person is an online friend with a person whom they do not like in person. Based upon their interactions and the reasons given for keeping their former friend, some may remain friends online with their face-to-face antipathy because they hold a special connection to their former friend. The former friend is likely to be someone with whom the participant has a history, they may still interact with regularly, or whom they care enough about to want to know how their former friend is doing in spite of the current antipathetic feelings.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D., & Bell, S. M. (1970). Attachment, Exploration, and Separation: Illustrated by the Behavior of One-Year-Olds in a Strange Situation. *Child Development, 41*(1), 49. doi:10.2307/1127388
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: Assessed in the strange situation and at home. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M. S. (1979). Infant–mother attachment. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 932-937. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.34.10.932
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1982). Attachment: Retrospect and prospect. In C. M. Parkes & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *The place of attachment in human behavior*, (pp. 3-30). New York: Basic Books.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist, 44*, 709-716
- Antheunis, M. L., Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2010). Getting acquainted through social network sites: Testing a model of online uncertainty reduction and social attraction. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(1), 100-109. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.07.005
- Appel, H., Gerlach, A. L., & Crusius, J. (2016). The interplay between Facebook use, social comparison, envy, and depression. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 9*, 44–49. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.10.006
- Barker, V. (2009). Older Adolescents Motivations for Social Network Site Use: The Influence of Gender, Group Identity, and Collective Self-Esteem. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*(2), 209-213. doi:10.1089/cpb.2008.0228
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of Intimacy: An Attachment Perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7*(2), 147-178. doi:10.1177/0265407590072001
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 226–244.
- Blease, C. R. (2015). Too many ‘friends,’ too few ‘likes’? Evolutionary psychology and ‘Facebook depression’. *Review of General Psychology, 19*(1), 1-13. doi:10.1037/gpr0000030
- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 130*, 201-210.

- Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and loss: Vol. 3. Loss, sadness and depression. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1969).
- Boyd, D. (2007). Why youth (heart) social network sites: The role of networked Publics in Teenage Social Life. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), Youth, identity, and digital media. *The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2008. 119–142. doi:10.1162/dmal.9780262524834.119
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. doi:10.1037/t23266-000
- Card, N. A. (2007). “I hated her gut!”: Emerging adults’ recollections of the formation, maintenance, and termination of antipathetic relationships during high school. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 22, 32-57.
- Casper, D. M., & Card, N. A. (2010). “We Were Best Friends, But . . .”: Two Studies of Antipathetic Relationships Emerging From Broken Friendships. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 25(4), 499-526. doi:10.1177/0743558410366596
- Casper, D. M., Green, T., & Hinton, T. (Under Review). “Friends to antipathies: The good, the bad, and the ugly.” *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.
- Debatin, B., Lovejoy, J. P., Horn, A., & Hughes, B. N. (2009). Facebook and Online Privacy: Attitudes, Behaviors, and Unintended Consequences. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 15(1), 83-108. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01494.x
- Frisson, E., & Eggermont, S. (2015). The impact of daily stress on adolescents’ depressed mood: The role of social support seeking through Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 44, 315-325. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.070
- Gibbons, F. X., & Buunk, B. P. (1999). Individual differences in social comparison: Development of a scale to measure social comparison orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 129–142.
- Greenwood, S., Perrin, A., & Duggan, M. (2016). Social media update 2016 report. Pew Research Center, Internet, Science and Tech. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/11/11/social-media-update-2016/>
- Haferkamp, N., & Krämer, N. C. (2011). Social Comparison 2.0: Examining the Effects of Online Profiles on Social-Networking Sites. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 14(5), 309-314. doi:10.1089/cyber.2010.0120

- Hart, J., Nailling, E., Bizer, G. Y., & Collins, C. K. (2015). Attachment theory as a framework for explaining engagement with Facebook. *Personality and Individual Differences, 77*, 33-40. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.12.016
- Ladd, G. W. (2005). The search for the origins of social competence revisited. In "Children's peer relations and social competence," 193-231.
- Lenhart, A., Purcell, K., Smith, A. & Zickuhr, K. (2010) Social media and mobile internet use among teens and young adults. Retrieved from: http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2010/PIP_Social_Media_and_Young_Adults_Report.pdf
- Lenhart, A., Smith, A., Anderson, M., Duggan, M., & Perrin, A. (2015). Teens, technology and friendships. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/08/06/teenstechnology-and-friendships/>
- Moreno, M. A., Jelenchick, L. A., Egan, K. G., Cox, E., Young, H., Gannon, K. E., et al. (2011). Feeling bad on facebook: Depression disclosures by college students on a social networking site. *Depress Anxiety, 28* (6), 447-455. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/da.20805>.
- Muise, A., Christofides, E., & Desmarais, S. (2009). More Information than You Ever Wanted: Does Facebook Bring Out the Green-Eyed Monster of Jealousy? *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*(4), 441-444. doi:10.1089/cpb.2008.0263
- Oberst, U., Wegmann, E., Stodt, B., Brand, M., & Chamarro, A. (2017). Negative consequences from heavy social networking in adolescents: The mediating role of fear of missing out. *Journal of Adolescence, 55*, 51-60. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.12.008
- Oldmeadow, J. A., Quinn, S., & Kowert, R. (2013). Attachment style, social skills, and Facebook use amongst adults. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*, 1142–1149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.10.006>.
- Perrin, A. (2015). Social media usage: 2005-2015. The Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/10/08/social-networking-usage-2005-2015/>
- Przybylski, A. K., Murayama, K., DeHaan, C. R. & Gladwell, V. (2013). Motivational, emotional, and behavioral correlates of fear of missing out. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*, 1841–1848.
- Radovic, A., Gmelin, T., Stein, B. D., & Miller, E. (2017). Depressed adolescents positive and negative use of social media. *Journal of Adolescence, 55*, 5-15. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.12.002
- Reed, L. A., Tolman, R. M., & Safyer, P. (2015). Too close for comfort: Attachment insecurity and electronic intrusion in college students' dating relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior, 50*, 431-438. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.03.050

- Scharf, M. (2014). Children's social competence within close friendship: The role of self-perception and attachment orientations. *School Psychology International*, 35(2), 206-220.
- Smith, R. H., & Kim, S. H. (2007). Comprehending envy. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(1), 46-64. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.46
- Subrahmanyam, K., Reich, S. M., Waechter, N., & Espinoza, G. (2008). Online and offline social networks: Use of social networking sites by emerging adults. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 29(6), 420-433. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2008.07.003
- Tandoc, E. C., Ferrucci, P., & Duffy, M. (2015). Facebook use, envy, and depression among college students: Is facebooking depressing? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 43, 139-146.
- Underwood, M. K., & Ehrenreich, S. E. (2017). The power and the pain of adolescents' digital communication: Cyber victimization and the perils of lurking. *American Psychologist*, 72(2), 144-158. doi:10.1037/a0040429
- Underwood, M., & Faris, R. (2015). #Being thirteen: Social media and the hidden world of young adolescents' peer culture. Cable News Network. Retrieved from <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/2448422-being-13-report.html>
- Vries, D. A., & Kühne, R. (2015). Facebook and self-perception: Individual susceptibility to negative social comparison on Facebook. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 86, 217-221. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.029
- You, H. S., & Malley-Morrison, K. (2000). Young Adult Attachment Styles and Intimate Relationships with Close Friends. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(4), 528-534. doi:10.1177/0022022100031004006
- Zimmermann, P. (2004). Attachment representations and characteristics of friendship relations during adolescence. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 88, 83-101. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2004.02.002

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Demographics

1. What is your date of birth?
Month:
Year:
2. When did you start college?
Semester:
Year:
3. What year did you graduate from high school?
Year:
4. What is your gender?
Male
Female
Other:
5. How would you describe yourself?
American Indian or Alaska Native
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
Asian
Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
Hispanic or Latino/Latina
White or Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
Other:

Appendix B
Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory-Adapted
Brennan, Clark, & Shaver (1998)

The following statements concern how you feel in friendships. We are interested in how you generally experience friendships, not just in what is happening in a current friendship. Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it. Write the number in the space provided, using the following rating scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Anxiety

1. I'm afraid that I will lose my friend's love.
2. I often worry that my friend will not want to hang out with me.
3. I often worry that my friend doesn't really like me.
4. I worry that friends won't care about me as much as I care about them.
5. I often wish that my friend's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.
6. I worry a lot about my friendships.
7. When my friend is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become closer to someone else.
8. When I show my feelings to my friend, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.
9. I rarely worry about my friend leaving me.
10. My friend makes me doubt myself.
11. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
12. I find that my friends don't want to get as close as I would like.
13. Sometimes friends change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.
14. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
15. I'm afraid that once my friend gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am.
16. It makes me mad that I don't get the support I need from my friends.
17. I worry that I won't measure up to other people.
18. My friend only seems to notice me when I'm angry.

Avoidance

19. I prefer not to show my friend how I feel deep down.
20. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my friend.
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on my friends.
22. I am very comfortable being close to my friends
23. I don't feel comfortable opening up to my friends.
24. I prefer not to be too close to my friends.
25. I get uncomfortable when a friend wants to be very close.
26. I find it relatively easy to get close to my friends.
27. It's not difficult for me to get close to my friends.
28. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my friends.
29. It helps to turn to my friends in times of need.
30. I tell my friends just about everything.

31. I talk things over with my friends.
32. I am nervous when friends get too close to me.
33. I feel comfortable depending on friends.
34. I find it easy to depend on my friends
35. it's easy for me to be affectionate with my friends.
36. My friends really understand me and my needs.

Appendix C

Facebook Jealousy General Scale

Using the scale provided please indicate how true each statement is of your general experiences. Please answer according to what really reflects your experiences rather than what you think your experiences should be. Please treat each item separately from every other item.

(Response Scale: 1 = "Not At All True Of Me", 2 = "Slightly True Of Me", 3 = "Moderately True Of Me", 4 = "Very True Of Me", and 5 = "Extremely True Of Me".)

1. Become jealous after seeing that one of my friends has added another person on Facebook.
2. Feel threatened if one of my friends added a previous close or best friend to his or her Facebook friends.
3. Monitor my friend's activities on Facebook.
4. Become jealous after seeing that one of my friends has posted a message on the wall of a mutual friend.
5. Experience jealousy if one of my friends posts pictures on Facebook of him or herself with another friend.
6. Be upset if one of my friends limited my access to his or her profile.
7. Be jealous if one of my friends posts pictures of him or herself with my close or best friend.
8. Worry that one of my friends will become close with another friend on Facebook.
9. Become jealous after seeing that one of my friends has received a wall message from another one of my friends.
10. Become jealous if one of my friends posts pictures of him or herself with unknown person.
11. Look at my friend's Facebook page if I'm are suspicious of their activities.
12. Attempt to use Facebook to evoke jealousy in one of my friends.
13. Have experienced jealousy related to Facebook.

Appendix D

Facebook Jealousy Former Friends Scale

Using the scale provided please indicate how true each statement is of your general experiences. Please answer according to what really reflects your experiences rather than what you think your experiences should be. Please treat each item separately from every other item.

(Response Scale: 1 = "Not At All True Of Me", 2 = "Slightly True Of Me", 3 = "Moderately True Of Me", 4 = "Very True Of Me", and 5 = "Extremely True Of Me".)

1. Become jealous after seeing that my former friend has added another person on Facebook.
2. Feel threatened if my former friend added a previous close or best friend to his or her Facebook friends.
3. Monitor my former friend's activities on Facebook.
4. Become jealous after seeing that my former friend has posted a message on the wall of a mutual friend.
5. Experience jealousy if my former friend posts pictures on Facebook of him or herself with another friend.
6. Be upset if my former friend limited my access to his or her profile.
7. Be jealous if my former friend posts pictures of him or herself with my close or best friend.
8. Worry that my former friend will become close with a friend on Facebook.
9. Become jealous after seeing that my former friend has received a wall message from another one of my friends.
10. Become jealous if my former friend posts pictures of him or herself with unknown person.
11. Look at my former friend's Facebook page if I'm are suspicious of their activities.
12. Attempt to use Facebook to evoke jealousy in my former friend.
13. Have experienced jealousy related to Facebook.

Scoring: Sum all response. Higher score indicates higher levels of Facebook jealousy.

Appendix E

Fear of Missing Out Scale

Below is a collection of statements about your everyday experience. Using the scale provided please indicate how true each statement is of your general experiences. Please answer according to what really reflects your experiences rather than what you think your experiences should be. Please treat each item separately from every other item.

- 1 Not at all true of me
- 2 Slightly true of me
- 3 Moderately true of me
- 4 Very true of me
- 5 Extremely true of me

1. I fear others have more rewarding experiences than me.
2. I fear my friends have more rewarding experiences than me.
3. I get worried when I find out my friends are having fun without me.
4. I get anxious when I don't know what my friends are up to.
5. It is important that I understand my friends "in jokes."
6. Sometimes, I wonder if I spend too much time keeping up with what is going on.
7. It bothers me when I miss an opportunity to meet up with friends.
8. When I have a good time it is important for me to share the details online (e.g., updating status).
9. When I miss out on a planned get-together it bothers me.
10. When I go on vacation, I continue to keep tabs on what my friends are doing.

Appendix F

Fear of Missing Out Former Friend Scale

Below is a collection of statements about your everyday experience. Using the scale provided please indicate how true each statement is of your general experiences. Please answer according to what really reflects your experiences rather than what you think your experiences should be. Please treat each item separately from every other item.

- 1 Not at all true of me
- 2 Slightly true of me
- 3 Moderately true of me
- 4 Very true of me
- 5 Extremely true of me

- 1. I fear my former friend has more rewarding experiences than me.
- 2. I get worried when I find out my former friend is having fun without me.
- 3. I get anxious when I don't know what my former friend is up to.
- 4. Sometimes, I wonder if I spend too much time keeping up with what is going on with my former friend.
- 5. When I have a good time it is important for me to share the details online (e.g., updating status).
- 6. When I go on vacation, I continue to keep tabs on what my former friend is doing.
- 7. When we were friends, If I felt they were excluding me, I would check social media.

Appendix G

Social Media Behaviors Questionnaire

1. How often are you on social media?
 - a. Once a week
 - b. Once a day
 - c. 2-5 times a day
 - d. >5 times a day

2. How much time do you spend each time?
 - e. 5 minutes
 - f. 10 minutes
 - g. 15 minutes
 - h. 30 minutes
 - i. Other (Text Entry)

3. Approximately how many friends do you have on Facebook

4. What percentage of those friends on social media are...
 - _____ Best Friends
 - _____ Close Friends
 - _____ Acquaintances
 - _____ Former Friends
 - _____ People you don't like
 - _____ Former friends you do not like

5. When you go on social media who are the people whose profile you check first (or most often)? (you may select more than one)
 - j. Best Friend
 - k. Romantic Partner
 - l. Former Friend
 - m. Rivals
 - n. Former Romantic Partners
 - o. Co-workers
 - p. Friends
 - q. Enemies
 - r. Friends of Friends
 - s. Other _____

Filter Question 1

6. During high school or in college, did you have a friend or a best friend who you currently do not like?
- a. Yes
 - b. No * if no is selected the participant will be directed to the end of the survey

Filter Question 2

7. Are you currently friends with this person on social networking sites (i.e. Facebook, Instagram, or Twitter)?
- t. Yes- participant will be directed to question 8
 - u. No

If No- answer the following questions

Questions about the Friendship and Transformation

Please provide only the first name, nickname, or initials of the person who you are currently thinking about (do not include their last name)

When you were friends, you considered [name] to be?

- a. Best friend
- b. Close friend
- c. Casual friend
- d. Other _____

What is [name] gender?

- a. Male
- b. Female
- c. Other

When you were friends or best friends with [name], how do you think [name] felt about you?

- a. Thought of me as a best friend
- b. Thought of me as a close friend
- c. Thought of me as a causal friend
- d. Thought of me as an acquaintance
- e. Didn't really know me

What happened that led to you disliking [name]?

Questions about social media use?

Do you use social media?

Y/N

If yes

What social media platforms do you have an account on?

If no...the participant is finished
Does [name] use social media?

Y/N

If yes

Which platforms does [name] have?

If no...the participant is finished

Did you ever have [name] on social media?

Y/N

If yes...

What social media platforms did you have [name] on ?

If no... the participant is finished

Did you unfriend or unfollow [name]?

Yes

If no...move to question 2

Why did you unfriend or unfollow [name]?

How did it feel after you unfriended or unfollowed [name]
on social media?

Did [name] unfriend or unfollow you?

y/n

Why?

How did it feel when [name] unfollowed or unfriended you?

Were you friends with or following [name]'s parent(s) at one
point?

y/n

if yes

What platforms were you friends with or followed
[name]'s parent(s) on? (please select all that apply)

Instagram

Snapchat

Facebook

Twitter

Are you still friends with or following [name] parents?
y/n

if yes

Is there a reason you are still friends or following [name] parent(s)?

If no...

Did you unfriend or unfollow [name]'s parent(s)?

y/n

If yes...

How do you feel when you unfriended or unfollowed [name] parents?

if no...

Did [name] parent (s) unfriend or unfollow you?

How did it feel when [name] parent's unfriended or unfollowed you?

the participant will be finished after this point.

8. What is this person's first name, initial or nickname of the person (please do not provide the full name)? (The name provided will used in questions to remind the participant about whom they are answering the following questions)

Questions about the Friendship and Transformation

9. When you were friends you considered [first name or initials will be inserted here] to be?
- a. Best friend
 - b. Close friend
 - c. Casual friend
 - d. Other _____
10. What is [name]'s gender?
- d. Male
 - e. Female

f. Other

11. When you were friends or best friends (or if you still are), how do you think [name] felt about you?

- a. Thought of me as a best friend
- b. Thought of me as a close friend
- c. Thought of me as a causal friend
- d. Thought of me as an acquaintance
- e. Didn't really know me

12. What happened that led to you disliking [name]?

13. Tell me about the reason you are still friends with or following [name] on social media.

14. What social media platforms do you [name] on? (Please select all that apply)

- Facebook
- Twitter
- Instagram
- Snapchat

Questions about Facebook

1. Do you and [name] currently have mutual "online" friends?

- a. Yes
- b. No

2. Do you and [name] currently have mutual "in-person" friends?

- a. Yes
- b. No

3. Do you interact with [name] in person?

- a. Yes
 - i. How do you interact with [name] in person?
- b. No

4. Are you and [name] in a mutual group or peer network (sports team, sorority, clique, friend network, etc)?

- a. Yes
 - i. What type of group or peer network (i.e. sports team, sorority, friendship network, etc.)
- b. No

5. How do you interact with [name] online?
6. Do you like [name] posts?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
7. Do you comment on [name] posts?
 - a. Yes
 - i. What is the nature of the comments?
 - a. Positive
 - b. Negative
 - c. Both
 - ii. Provide an example of what you comment on your former friend's posts.
8. Do you send private messages to [name] through social media?
 - a. Yes
 - i. What is the nature of the messages you send to [name]?
 - a. Positive
 - b. Negative
 - c. Both
 - ii. Provide an example of the messages you send to [name] .
9. How often do you look at [name] profile?
 - a. Once a week
 - b. Twice a week
 - c. Once a day
 - d. Twice a day
 - e. Other [text entry]
10. When you view [name] approximately how much time does it take?
 - a. 5 minutes
 - b. 15 minutes
 - c. 30 minutes
 - d. 1 hour or more
 - e. Other [text entry]
11. What types of things do you look at on [name] profile?
 - a. Posts
 - b. Pictures
 - c. Profile picture
 - d. Likes
 - e. Comments on their posts
 - f. Other people's post on their wall

- g. Other
 - i. Explain
12. Do you think about how [name] will perceive your posts online?
- a. Yes
 - i. Please explain your thoughts regarding how [name] will perceive your posts online.
 - b. No
13. Does [name] interact with you online?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
14. How does [name] interact with you?
- a. Like
 - b. Comment
 - c. Private message
15. What is the nature of [name] comments on your post?
- a. Positive
 - b. Negative
 - c. Both
 - d. Please provide an example of the comments [name] leaves on your post?
16. Does [name] private message you?
- a. Yes
 - i. Please provide an example of the type of message [name] sends to you
 - b. No
17. Does [name] say anything mean about you online?
- a. Yes
 - i. Provide an example of a mean thing [name] says about you online.
 - b. No
18. Do you say anything mean about [name] online?
- a. Yes
 - i. Provide an example of something mean [name] says about you online
 - b. No.

If Twitter

Answer the following questions about how you interact with [name] on Twitter.

1. Do you follow [name]?
- a. Yes

- b. No
- 2. Does [name] follow you?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 3. Do you favorite [name]r tweets?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 4. Does [name] favorite your tweets?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 5. Do you retweet [name] tweets?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 6. Does [name] retweet your tweets?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 7. Does [name] reply to your tweets?
 - a. Yes
 - i. Provide an example of what [name]'s reply to your tweet may look like.
 - b. No.
- 8. Do you reply to [name] tweets?
 - a. Yes
 - i. Provide an example of what one of your replies may look like to [name]'s tweets
 - b. No
- 9. Do you private message [name]?
 - a. Yes
 - i. Provide an example of a private message you sent to [name] .
 - b. No
- 10. Does [name] private message you?
 - a. Yes
 - i. Provide an example of what a private message from [name] may look like.
 - b. No
- 11. Have you ever subtweeted [name] or about [name]?
 - a. Yes
 - i. If so what was the subtweet about?
 - b. No
- 12. Have you ever looked at [name]'s profile?
 - a. Yes
 - i. How often do you look at [name] profile?
 - a. Once a week
 - b. Twice a week
 - c. Once a day
 - d. 2 or more times a day

- e. Other
- ii. When you view [name] profile approximately how much time does it take?
 - a. 5 minutes
 - b. 15 minutes
 - c. 30 minutes
 - d. 1 hour or more
 - e. Other [text entry]
- iii. What do you look at on [name] profile? (Select all that apply)
 - a. Tweets
 - b. Pictures/Videos
 - c. Likes
 - d. Followers
 - e. Following
 - f. Other

b. No

If Instagram,

Answer the following questions about your former friend on Instagram

1. Do you follow [name]?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
2. Does [name] follow you?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
3. Do you like [name] posts?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
4. Does [name] like your posts?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
5. Have you messaged [name]?
 - a. Yes
 - i. Provide an example of the type of message you sent [name] on instagram.
 - b. No
6. Do you watch [name] stories?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
7. Does [name] watch your stories?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

8. Do you comment on [name] post?
 - a. Yes
 - i. What do you comment on [name]'s posts?
 - b. No
9. Does [name] comment on your posts?
 - a. Yes
 - i. What does [name] comment
 - b. No
10. Is your account private on Instagram?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
11. Is [name]'s account private on Instagram?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
12. Have you ever looked [name]'s profile?
 - a. Yes
 - i. How often do you look at [name] profile?
 - a. Once a week
 - b. Twice a week
 - c. Once a day
 - d. 2 or more times a day
 - e. Other
 - ii. When you view [name] profile approximately how much time does it take?
 - a. 5 minutes
 - b. 15 minutes
 - c. 30 minutes
 - d. 1 hour or more
 - e. other
 - iii. What do you look at on [name] profile? (Select all that apply)
 - a. Tagged photos
 - b. Pictures
 - c. Comments
 - d. Followers
 - e. Following
 - f. Other [text entry]

Snapchat questions

1. Do you follow [name] on snapchat? Y/N
2. Does [name] follow you on snapchat? Y/N
3. How often do you watch [name] stories?
 - i. Every time a story is posted
 - ii. Every once in a while

- iii. Rarely
 - iv. Never
- 4. How often, does [name] watch your stories?
 - i. Every time a story is posted
 - ii. Every once in a while
 - iii. Rarely
 - iv. Never
- 5. Do you send personal snaps to [name]?
 - a. Y/n
 - b. If yes,
 - i. What type of snaps do you send?
- 6. Does [name] send personal snaps to you?
 - a. y/N
 - i. if yes,
 - 1. What type of snaps does [name] send you?
- 7. Have you ever taken a screenshot of [name] snap?
 - a. Y/N
 - i. If yes,
 - 1. What type of snap did you screenshot?
- 8. Have you ever used those screenshotted snaps against [name]?
- 9. Has [name] ever taken a screen shot of your snap?
 - a. Y/N
 - i. If yes,
 - 1. What type of snap did [name] screenshot?
- 10. Has [name] ever used a screenshotted snap against you?
- 11. Is there any other ways in which you interact with [name] on snapchat?

Final Questions

- 1. Are there any other social media or messaging apps that you currently have [name] on?
 - a. Yes
 - i. Please list the other platforms?
 - ii. How do you interact with [name] on these platform?
 - b. No

- 2 Have you ever talked about what [name] posted on social media with other people in person?
 - a. Yes
 - i. If so, what did you talk about? Why?
 - b. No
- 3 Were you able to reconcile the relationship with [name]?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 4 What is the current status of your relationship with [name]?
 - a. Close friends
 - b. Casual Friends
 - c. Acquaintances
 - d. Someone I dislike
 - e. Someone I strongly dislike
 - f. Someone I hate

Appendix H
IRB Certificate



February 1, 2018

Tiffany Green
HDFS
CHES
Box 870311

Re: IRB#: 18-OR-037 "Why are we 'Friends' Online with Face-to-Face Antipathies?"

Dear Tiffany Green:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. You have also been granted the requested waiver of written documentation of informed consent. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies

Your application will expire on January 30, 2019. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of the IRB Request for Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent form to provide to your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,



Carpantato T. Myles, MSM, CIM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer

358 Rose Administration Building | Box 870127 | Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127
205-348-8461 | Fax 205-348-7189 | Toll Free 1-877-820-3066