

Behavioral Experiments of Small Societies in Social Media: Facebook Expressions of Anchored Relationships

Nuran Öze

Abstract—Communities and societies have been changing towards computer mediated communication. This paper explores online and offline identities and how relationships are formed and negotiated within internet environments which offer opportunities for people who know each other offline and move into relationships online. The expectations and norms of behavior within everyday life cause people to be embodied self. According to the age categories of Turkish Cypriots, their measurements of attitudes in Facebook will be investigated. Face-to-face field research and semi-structured interview methods are used in the study. Face-to-face interview has been done with Turkish Cypriots who are using Facebook already. According to the study, in constructing a linkage between real and virtual identities mostly affected from societal relations serves as a societal grooming tool for Turkish Cypriots.

Keywords—Facebook, identity, social media, virtual reality.

I. INTRODUCTION

SOCIAL media has become a part of social life after social interaction in computer mediated communication spread around the world. Social media provides the user an open environment which can accommodate to their needs. Social media platforms are self-controlled areas. You can decide what to share/not to share, to comment/not to comment, to like or not, adjustments can be done on who can see what you share, how disclosure is going to be, how its privatized, in what frequency you can use it, and how much time you spent on it. Nowadays, the usage of social media effects everyday life motivations, because positive or negative comments, number of likes, and shares, etc. affect your daily life rhythms. Anticipation of bad returns on social media can lead to avoidance of sharing, comments or even likes in the online environment. People feel the pressure of real-life relationships in their virtual relationships within the social media field. Especially in small societies, the pressure of offline relationships compared to online relationships is much more distinctly noticeable. It is the power of anchored relationships in small societies.

So far, many studies have been made on the use of Internet and social media [2]-[5], [8]-[13], [26]-[38]. However, there are not many studies upon the use of social media usage and its impact on small societies. It was observed that, researches and studies usually focus on people who live in modern countries with a high population and high income levels [4],

[11], [13], [26], [28]-[31], [33]-[38]. This situation makes it worth studying societies which are living in different formations with similar experiences. The world is home to diversity which combines millions living together in harmony. Studying different societies and cultures will enhance the chance to see different colors of the world from a different angle. The only way to see the whole picture is to be open to looking different perspectives. As Bromberg [1] says, the health of living things depends on the coordinated functioning of the differences. Being aware of differences and making sure they work properly makes us healthy. Health is being one, while being many. Metaphorically, the result can be called healthy if it is possible to see the whole system.

In this study, the aim is to investigate the effects of offline anchored relationships versus the online relationships of the Turkish Cypriot community on the basis of Facebook. In this research, people in different age categories of Facebook usage habits have been analyzed by using field research and semi-structured interview methods.

Öze's explanation about Cyprus is beneficial for this study. According to Öze [2], many civilizations have passed over the Cyprus Island for many centuries, and its strategic position is the reason for that. Cypriots' multicultural society features are the effects of past centuries. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was declared in 1983; although, it is not recognized by any country except Turkey. This will result in the isolation of the Northern Cyprus economically and politically around the world. Each Turkish Cypriot tries to break these isolations individually in the socio-cultural arena; however, this is not enough. Keeping up with technological improvement is one of the usable keys to break societal isolations [2]. Because of the unique and different condition North Cyprus, it is worth to investigate in a comparison to other recognized countries.

This study, attempts to examine how offline relationships are affecting the online behaviors of Turkish Cypriots. Of particular importance is the use of social media in offline environments and how they affect the relations of people who know each other.

II. SOCIAL MEDIA AS A PART OF SOCIAL LIFE

Strong connection between communication and psychology was the infrastructure in this study. In order to discuss communication, there should be an atmosphere where the frame of minds has something in common. Common in the frame of minds can only occur if there is a communicative atmosphere. As Olaniran et al. [3] mentioned messages can be

N. Ö. is with the Near East University, Faculty of Communication, Nicosia Northern Cyprus (phone: +90392-223-7677; fax: +90392-680-2040; e-mail: nuran_oze@yahoo.com).

transmitted among people, but not meanings; this is related with psychology and communication. In recent years, social media has become a big part of social life; this is related with sociology and social psychology. Social media has necessitated a new way of thinking about relationships in the world. All communication technologies are foreign to the user. As such, it is necessary to take into consideration a person's motivation for communication [4]. In the beginning of 2000s, Kim [5] said: In the field of sociology, cyberspace is increasingly viewed as a focus in which social life and interaction achieve new meanings and patterns. Researcher's across diverse fields, such as psycholinguistics, cognitive, and social psychology suggesting that people mental representations of an original experience can be shaped by communicating about that experience [6].

Many people spend most of their day alone, staring at the screen of their smart phone or android phone, iPad or computer. According to Castells [7], a network society is a society whose social structure is made around networks activated by microelectronics-based, digitally processed information and communication technologies. He understands social structures to be the organizational arrangements of humans in relationships of production, consumption, reproduction, experience, and power expressed in meaningful communication coded by culture. So, Colombo [8] argued that globalization and networks are closely intertwined, even though they cannot be reduced into one another. In particular, it should be clear that the network does not create any new space, but it is included within any space we cross in our daily lives. Virtual space would imitate reality, and therefore, would create a parallel experience. The web is not a space, but a set of relational contexts. Social media does not have a place, even if they are everywhere, as their users are. But it is human ubiquity which generates web globalization, and not vice versa. Furthermore, Silverstone [9] says that technology can shape the social life. Technology can do social shaping process on the sly. Rapid integration of a technology in social life is the proof of this. On the other hand, Turkle [10] thinks images of machines have come ever closer to images of people, as images of people have come ever closer to images of machines. With computer mediated communication, our rootedness to place has attenuated. These shifts raise many questions, one being: What will computer mediated communication do to our commitment to other people?

III. RECASTING SOCIAL IDENTITY IN SOCIAL MEDIA

Social media can be used for many reasons. One of the reasons to use social media is to get in touch with other people. The aim can be to maintain a pre-existing social connection and/or can be to find others with similar interests to get in contact with via social media. Getting in contact with someone face-to-face and/or with Social Network Sites (SNSs) is the subject of social capital. Stutzman et al. [11] explain social capital as the total actual or potential resources individuals have access to through their social network [11]. They suppose social capital includes physical, emotional and informational resources among others. People can physically

drive a friend to the airport, emotionally give a friend a hug and informational resource can be giving a friend advice about an important decision. Stutzman et al. [11] thinks that social capital should be understood as an investment in one's personal network with expectation on returns at some future point; which means, reciprocity is a key component of social capital for them [11]. On the other hand, Stutzman et al. [11] focuses on evidence of the relationship between privacy and social capital in the SNS context. They claim that there is a positive relationship between the usage of segmented privacy settings on Facebook and the perception of social capital. Such as limitations on access to specific updates or to one's profile more generally—is positively correlated with perceptions of social capital [11]. Suler explains how people manage their identity in cyberspace with the username chosen by users, the details they do or do not indicate about themselves, the information presented on users' personal web page, the persona or avatar they assume in an online community. Identity is a very complex aspect of human nature [12]. According to Turkle's [13] opinion, people are developing ideas about identity as multiplicity through new social practices of identity as multiplicity while they are living on the screen. Social media can be defined as an area where people are recasting their identity in their online life.

Turkle focuses on one key element of online life and its impact on identity: The creation and protection of constructed personae into virtual space in her article. Turkle defines people who make the most of their lives on the screen are those who are able to approach it in a spirit of self-reflection. According to Turkle, what does a user's behaviour in cyberspace tell us about what the user wants, who the user is, what the user may not be getting in the rest of his/her life? And, he continues with the reality complexity. Turkle implies to rethink the user's relationships with the computer culture and psychoanalytic culture, as a proudly held joint citizenship [13].

IV. SOCIAL MEDIA IDENTITY RECONSTRUCTION AREA

In the social media fields, people can create a fiction about themselves as they wish. Profile picture, profile name, interest areas, sharing's, likes, emogies, comments can give much information about the individual. This information can be evaluated as identification of the person. However, most people always share good things about themselves. Bad characteristic issues of people probably have never been a subject about themselves in the social media. Societal pressures usually prevent people to share unacceptable things which can cause them to get out of society, especially in social media. Social media users know everything can easily be spread by social media. Perception and action are intertwined and related through a mind that has socially developed to respond, not just to the environment, but also to the relationship between the person and environment, adjusting each to meet the needs, goals and desires of the person. This connection between perception and action or behaviour is central to identity theory, as is the understanding that

behaviour is always in the pursuit of the goals of the person [14]

Social media is being used as a social mirror for individual identity. Rummens [15] evaluated identity concept on the basis of psychology, sociology, anthropology and philosophy. According to Rummens, identity is the conception, qualities, beliefs, and expressions that make a person (self-identity) or group (particular social category or social group). Identity may be distinguished from identification; identity is a label, whereas identification refers to a classifying act itself. Identity is thus best construed as being both relational and contextual, while the act of identification is best viewed as inherently procession. Social media certainly should be considered as new relationship area.

Tajfel and Turner [16] proposed that the groups (e.g. social class, family, football team etc.) which people belonged to were an important source of pride and self-esteem. Groups give us a sense of social identity: A sense of belonging to the social world. According to McLeod [17], people enhance the status of the group to which they belong in order to increase their self-image. Therefore, people divided the world into "them" and "us" based on the process of social categorization. This is known as in-group (us) and out-group (them). Social identity theory states that the in-group will discriminate against the out-group to enhance their self-image.

Burke and Steets compare both differences and similarities of identity theory and social identity. They implied, these theories are not too different from each other and their togetherness has to be taken into account when identity issue is in subject. Membership meanings primarily have implications for who you are; role meanings primarily have implications for what you [18].

For social identity theory, self-categorizations are cognitive groupings of persons who are similar to the self with respect to these stimuli are grouped with the self (the in-group); persons who differ from the self are classified as the out-group [18]. A person that people accept into their social media fields can be evaluated as in-group (this means people accept these people to get into contact) and the rest can be evaluated as out-group. Many people mostly accept the people who they already know in their offline life (relatives, friends, neighbors) to their social media accounts. For identity theory, the self-categorizations depend upon a named and classified world. Among the class terms learned within a culture are symbols that are used to designate "positions," the relatively stable, morphological components of social structure that are termed as roles. Persons acting in the context of social structure name one another and themselves in the sense of recognizing one another as occupants of positions [18]. To feel a belonging to a group; group norms and rules restricts behaviors' of group members; gives some roles to group members; and expected to fulfill these roles, have to be accepted by group members. Burke and Steets explain this as in social identity theory, an identity is a self-categorization in terms of a group or social category and in identity theory, an identity is a self-categorization in terms of a role. So, the self-concept is the set of all of a person's identities [18].

Many outcomes in social identity theory are cognitive and are a consequence of the depersonalization process (also, a cognitive process) that occurs when an identity is activated. This occurs because each is seen similar to the self in sharing prototypical characteristics, and people like those who are similar to them, an intragroup rather than interpersonal phenomenon. This mutual attraction and liking is termed group cohesion [18]. It is possible to say that, identity and social identity manipulate selfhood to show itself both in real and virtual life if the level of adherence to categorical standards is high. It is called deindividuation and social identity model of deindividuation (SIDE) theory has to be taken into consideration.

According to Reicher et al., deindividuation is almost treated as an individual difference variable rather than arising as a general consequence of immersion in a group [19]. In deindividuation phenomena, the deindividuated individual is one who is acting in the absence of self-regulation. What is more, insofar as the self is the sole source of values, norms and standards, the implication is that deindividuated behaviour is out of the individual's control [19]. Social media is assumed to be the virtual area of self-presentation; control over the movements is assumed to be in the people's hands, which seems there is no deindividuation. Optimistically: Social media gives a chance for people to create and distribute digital content. Is it reality? Or are people automatically bounding themselves in these imitations of reality. Social interactions have got invisible social boundaries in social media. Socio-economic situation, sociological structure and social-psychological structure are some examples which areas boundaries in social media.

V.REALITY VERSUS VIRTUALITY

Social media is a kind of computer mediated communication in some way. Because, smart phones and android phones are a sort of computerized mini vehicles which can be used to communicate with other people and can be used for many other purposes also. Social information processing theory (SIP) is developed in 1992 by Joseph Walther. SIP is an interpersonal communication theory and media studies theory. Social information processing theory explains how people interact with other people online without nonverbal cues and develop and manage relationships in a computer mediated environment [20], [21]. Anthony Giddens' structuration theory affected adaptive structuration theory. According to Giddens, structuration theory is a social system that includes social groups are produced and reproduced by sources. Structures are both the medium and the outcome of social action. Adaptive structuration theory asserts that CMC is contained of a technological dimension, a contextual dimension and structuration interaction [21]. Nowadays, interaction with other people has changed in social media fields. People can use non-verbal cues or can use verbal cues to develop and manage relationships in a CMC and in a social media. Videos can be used to share feelings, video calls, voice calls and group video chat can be used to reach each other.

Communication professor Joseph Walther is credited with the development of hyperpersonal model theory in 1996, after extensive research on CMC. The hyperpersonal model is a model of interpersonal communication that suggests CMC can become hyperpersonal because it 'exceeds face-to-face interaction', thus, affording message senders a host of communicative advantages over traditional face-to-face (FtF) interaction [22]. According to Pena, Walther and Hancock [23], in FtF communication, physical features such as appearance, facial expressions, gesture and postures is exposed to others, which can help to convey nonverbal information to help with the communication. FtF communication is formed naturally in emotional, cognitive and physical aspects. Those nonverbal languages are the cues that lack in CMC communication. The point that should not be overlooked in SIPs model and Hyperpersonal Model: Nowadays people are using CMC and social media rather than 'face-to-face' communication to get in connect and to develop a relationship with each other. The critical point is that devices supplant face-to-face interactions in relationship establishing.

VI. SOCIAL MEDIA AS DOUBLE EDGED SWORD

The intersection between the new media and mobile technologies (smartphones, android phones and tablets) allow users to be almost always connected with others in more or less stable and rooted communities. As it happens in the offline life, the disclosure level of individuals can be bounded by the cultural rituals and norms of belonged group membership in their online lives. To guarantee social support, people can stay voiceless in social media. It is a way of preventing social pressure and to stay in the accepted group. Social media seems as supportive to individualism as well as to self-disclosure. On the other hand, offline relationships come up as a social grooming tool for people in the social media. This situation is making social media a double-edged sword.

According to Tajfel and Turner [16], the major characteristic of social behaviour related to this belief system is that, in the relevant intergroup situations, individuals will not interact as individuals, on the basis of their individual characteristics or interpersonal relationships, but as members of their groups standing in certain defined relationships to members of the other group. Tajfel and Turner thinks, one of the main features of this belief system is the perception by the individuals concerned that it is impossible or extremely difficult to move individually from their own group to another.

Greene et al. examine individuals' decision making about what, when, whom, and how much to disclose personal feelings and thoughts in self-disclosure in their personal relationship article. They suppose all forms of verbal and nonverbal communication reveal something about the self, and, hence any communicative act should be defined as self-disclosure. They explain self-disclosure in terms of verbal messages that contain statements such as "I feel" and "I think," and non-verbal messages such as the clothes people wear as well as discourse of people. Greene, Derlega and Mathews explain personal disclosures in two levels. One is

gives relationship partners "up-to-date" information about what each person is thinking and feeling (e.g. how was his/her day). The second one is about relational disclosures which informs partners about the state of their relationship and how they are getting (e.g. I wish to have a happy life with you) [24].

Greene et al. then focused on nondisclosure reasons of individual. The self-focused reasons for nondisclosure delay with the psychological and physical cost based on divulging personal information and include fear of rejection and possible loss of privacy [24]. Greene et al. defined self-disclosure as communicating personal information to other people [25]. Derlega and Chaikin said 'disclosure is bound by the norm of reciprocity: self-disclosure begets disclosure from a target person, thus its utility as an information-seeking behaviour' [26]. Social media usage patterns penetrate to social relationships among society. Benefit-cost ratio based on a forecast for future decides how to behave in social media.

VII. REPRESENTATION OF DIGITAL IDENTITY IN FACEBOOK

The digital world has changed the way that people express themselves. As Castell [27] mentioned in his study, networks are very old forms of social organization. However, the information age has changed the forms of networks. Networks have become a new life style now and they are powered by new information technologies. Castell proposed that information networks play a substantial role in the set of transformations. He claims, the essential role that technology plays in framing the relationships of experience. Castell thinks human reproductive technology frames family relationships and sexuality. Therefore, Castell thinks integration of technology must be on its own ground, as a specific player of the social structure, following an old tradition in human ecology. Castells prefers to use conceptualizing technology as a layer of the social structure, and sees technology as a material tool, and meaning as symbolic construction, through relationships of production/consumption, experience, and power. Castells thinks that these are the fundamental ingredients of human action and only an action produces and modifies social structure. According to Castells, information processing is at the source of life, and of social action, which is why the eco-social system is thereby transformed [27].

McKenna et al. think that a social structure has a transformable side. Systemic transformation happens in relationships of production/consumption, power, and experience, ultimately leading to a transformation of culture. The especially designed structure of the Internet allows individuals to easily find others who share specialized interests [28]. Social networking sites are designed to foster social interaction in virtual environment [29]. Respondents may use the sites to interact with people they already know offline or to meet new people [30].

Small societies 'community' is partially defined by social interactions among a set of persons who know each other, and Wellman et al. [31] use the definition of a "neighborhood community" in a bounded geographical area in which many of the residents know each other [31]. Zhao is influenced by

Bakardjieva's 'anchored relationships' concept. This concept is related with close relationships which are continuing in offline life. Family members, neighbors, colleagues, and other offline acquaintances also communicate with each other on the Internet. This type of offline-based online relationships is called here 'anchored relationships' [32]. An anchored relationship is thus a 'nonymous'. It is the opposite of 'anonymous' relationship. Nonymity needs to be distinguished from acquaintanceship [33]. Acquaintanceship can be maintained anonymously, as in social media where people may become friends (with people they may know, with people they may interested in, etc.), but only know each other virtually. Identity construction in a nonymous online environment has not been well studied in North Cyprus. In the nonymous online environment, people do not feel free to establish their identity as they want. In fact, most small communities in the world almost all know all, and have frequent face-to-face contact. Most kith and kin are living closer to each other (short drive) in Northern Cyprus. It is a small island; the longest distance on the island is two and a half hours by car; and so, just a phone call or face-to-face contact can bring people together in a short time. Wellman et al. [31] claims that, the Internet is another means of communication, which is being integrated into the regular patterns of social life. They suppose that widespread usage of mobile phones and wireless computers makes communication more mobile [31].

Hardey asserts Internet sites provide users with a more or less open environment which they can tailor to meet their needs [34]. Boyd mentioned online and offline impression management and sees both online and offline impressions not just an individual act, and evaluates them as a social process [35]. According to Bargh et al. [36], Internet communication is seductive. Psychological self-processes are likely to play a central role in the social life of the Internet, and thus, it is becoming an instrumental tool of management of new forms of life, including the building of online communities of support and collective learning [37]. Bakardjieva [37] claims that virtual togetherness is not the same as a real or genuine community, as the current theoretical debate suggests. However, she also mentioned that the consumption of digitized goods and services within the realm of particularistic existence cannot be denied. Bakardjieva used the concept of Wellman et al. [31] of 'warmly persuasive' to explain the form of togetherness online [37]. The challenge to analysts is to understand and appreciate the significance of these various forms of transcending the narrowly private existence and navigating the social world for individual respondents, for society at large and for the shaping of the Internet [37]. Wellman et al. [31] proposed that, the Internet makes it necessary to redefine our understanding of what social capital is and hence, to introduce new ways to measure it. The person becomes the target of communication. We call a person and not a place. The person is the node to which communication is directed. Person-to-person communication is supplanting door-to-door and place-to-place communication [31].

According to Öze's research, high Internet and social networking use frequency have been observed in the daily life practices of Turkish Cypriots. Turkish Cypriots have easy access to technological tools and the Internet. Facebook is a computer-mediated Social Networking System that has become one of the most popular means of communication in North Cyprus, as in the world. The wide appeal of Facebook is that it allows to combine all other social networks specialties in one place [2]. Facebook allows its users to construct an image or identity to communicate to the greater online community. If one of the benefits of Facebook is to bring individuals in a community together, then it also make sense that Facebook provides a means for self-expression in order to form these social, geographical, and political connections [38]. Pempek et al. focus on users allowance to designation of 'friends' via Facebook. They suppose an individual who is invited to be a member's Facebook friend may either accept or reject the offer, thus providing individual control over one's list of friends. Also, control over the account is in the hands of users. The user can control how much information to post and who can view this information by editing their privacy settings. They think user profiles can be limited according to users' preferences. [30].

VIII. PURPOSE AND HYPOTHESES

The present research was designed to explore how anchored relationships in small societies influenced the ways in which people utilized Facebook for identity construction. In part, this research was intended to examine the Facebook usage for a contemporary Turkish Cypriot sample. Attitudes toward Facebook, disclosure levels in postings were examined. This research has been conducted to find out the effects of anchored relationships in offline life upon online life. Based on research discussed above and the nature of the group membership examined, the following hypotheses have been developed.

- H1: Instead of sharing their views, people frequently use Facebook to observe others because people are aware of the reactions they will face after sharing.
- H2: Attitudes towards Facebook sharing would be affected by social identity and social norms.
- H3: Facebook sharing would be expected to be in a more relaxed attitude of young people under the age of 25. The life experiences and business life with certain social pressures would greatly be expected to be affected by people attitudes.
- H4: Sensitive issues are considered as advocacy, political, issues like terrorism, would be expected to have a negative effect on the level of sharing on Facebook.

IX. METHODOLOGY

A. Sample

The face-to-face field research and the semi-structured interview methods have been applied upon respondents. Miles and Gilbert, focuses on finding out 'Why' rather than 'How many' or 'How much' in semi-structured interviews. They

think people get to talk to other people in order to find out about what they have experienced and what they think and feel about something that you are interested in [39]. The target respondents were all Turkish Cypriot North Cyprus local residents over the age of 15 years. The research population consists of 99 respondents, and of the sample, all are Facebook users. Every five years has been considered as a separate age category. The intergenerational differences and the technology usage habits were attempted to be explained in this way. The sample was compromised of 44 women and 55 men. The sample size represents 0.043 % of the total Turkish Cypriot population in Northern Cyprus. Research was carried out in a two month period; it covers the period July – August 2016. All potential respondents were Turkish Cypriots selected at random by the researcher. The research has been conducted without the names of respondents. In this way, respondents can freely express themselves in answering the of the questionnaire form. Data was processed into the SPSS analysis program; quantitative results are obtained as percentages and totals according to categories. They have been used to reveal the qualitative results.

B. Measure

Rather than establish the functions of the Facebook use a priori, 11 age categories were devised among different age categories from 37 different occupations of Facebook user: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65-over. The interview guide contained questions related to demographic profiles (age, gender) and the Facebook activities of respondents. The Likert-type scale was used to measure the respondents Facebook activities.

Five questions addressed Facebook activities, disclosure levels and effects of posts on respondents. These questions were measured with a 5-point scale. The first question addressed the frequency of Facebook use: How often do you use Facebook? Respondents answered using a 5-point scale (Frequently during the day '1', several times during the day '2', every few days '3', once a week '4', I use rarely '5'). To measure Facebook usage patterns, the second question: 'How do you define your Facebook usage pattern?' asked with a 5-point scale (Very passive audience '1', passive audience '2', participant and audience '3', active participant '4' and other '5'). The third question tried to discover the effects of Facebook friends on the respondents' feelings and thoughts with the question: How do the posts, comments, shares and likes of your Facebook friends affect your feelings and thoughts? a 5-point scale (Very affective '1', sometimes affects '2', it depends to the situation '3', it doesn't affects too much '4', it doesn't affects '5'). The fourth question is related with the disclosure level of sharing thoughts and feelings about special issues on Facebook: How often do you share your thoughts and feelings about matches/elections/terrorist attacks/natural disasters on Facebook? To measure it, answers were scaled as frequently '1', often '2', it depends '3', rarely '4' and never '5'. The last question was: 'What is the level of disclosure of your shares views/feelings about matches/elections/terrorist attacks/natural disasters on Facebook?' With a 5-point scale (Willful disclosure '1', Sometimes I share my

views '2', I am sharing my opinions if wouldn't bet any social pressure or danger and to eliminate getting into polemic with someone '3'; To eliminate get in polemic with someone; I'm not sharing my opinions '4'; I never reflect my opinions '5').

C. Findings and Discussion

According to this research, 99 Facebook user respondents answered the questionnaire form.

RQ1: How often do you use Facebook?

Over half of the respondents (55.6% of respondents - 56.8% of women and 54.5% of men) use Facebook frequently during the day; 34.3% (29.5% of women and 38.2% of men) of the respondents use Facebook several times during the day; 8.1% of the participant use Facebook every few days (9.1% of women and 7.3% of men); 1% of the respondents use Facebook once a week; and only 1% of the respondents use Facebook rarely. Women are using Facebook more frequently than men during the day. Most of the respondents use Facebook frequently during the day.

Most (81%) respondents in the 15-19 age range use Facebook frequently during the day. As age ranges increase, the frequency of Facebook usage decreases until the 50-54 age range. In North Cyprus, most of the people who work in the public sector are retiring in this age range. It means that they have more free time than the 15-19 age range to spend on Facebook.

RQ2: How do you define your Facebook usage Pattern?

Nearly half of the respondents (49.5% of respondents - 50% of women and 49.1% of men) define their Facebook usage pattern as participant and audience. This means, respondents sometimes share their feelings, thoughts and images on Facebook. However, usually 'likes'/'comments' on sharing of the people that they follow via Facebook. Only 18.2% of the respondents (same percentage in both genders) define themselves as active respondents on Facebook. Active respondents are those who do not mind the social pressure and whose disclosure levels are high on Facebook. Those respondents freely share their views in every subject; they will not hesitate to enter into a discussion with others on Facebook. Also, 17.2% (22.7% of women and 12.7% of men) of respondents have been identified as a passive audience on Facebook. Passive audiences are those who sometimes 'like'/'comment' on the safe sharing of the people they follow via Facebook; however, never share anything on Facebook. In this category, respondents are highly dreading the social pressure, and mostly they prefer to observe the people they follow. According to the results, women are more passive then men in North Cyprus on Facebook, with 8.1% (2.3 of women and 12.7 of men) saying that they are very passive audience on Facebook. These respondents neither share anything nor like or comment on something, they are just observing others on Facebook. In this category, respondents are using Facebook as a tool for a spying on other people. Lastly, 7.1% of respondents put themselves into the other category.

A total of 50% of 60-64 age, 20% of 45-49 age and %15 of 15-19 age categories respondents defined their Facebook usage pattern as very passive. Older people mostly prefer face-to-face conversation in their daily lives. The 45-49 age

category is the busiest age range in their life span; however, some of the respondents said they are using Facebook as a tool for observing others in this category. The 15-19 age categories are teenagers who are trying to find themselves and they are observing, especially their peers around them and the famous people around the world. Most (85.7%) of the 50-54 age category is seen as a passive audience. Most people in this category use Facebook to find out the relatives and acquaintances that they meet during their life. They are quite afraid of social pressure also. They have a status in society and it is quite important for them what others think and say about them. A total of 83.3% of the respondents in the 55-59 year, 72.7% of 35-39 year and 70% of 30-34 year age categories are respondents and audiences on Facebook, while the 30-34 year and 35-39 year age categories are still trying to broaden their social environment. On the other hand, they are not active respondents because they eliminate the risk of social pressure and the threat of exclusion from society. It is important to be accepted by society for this age category. People excluded by society can have difficulty in finding work. Generally, it is not possible to pass through these ages without having a job; they mostly have families and children. Therefore, acceptance by society for the individual in this age category is an important criterion. Of the respondents, 100% of the over-65 years and 40% of 45-49 year age categories are active respondents on Facebook. In Cyprus everybody knows who you are, what your political view is and how you think about the life in the age of 65-over. It is a small island. These age categories do not have any worry about being excluded from society; they have retired, they also have their own social life. Active respondents in ages 45-49 years are the brave ones; these respondents are generally the opinion leaders and marginal. Opinion leaders are those who can influence other segments of society with their views and voices on Facebook. Marginal individuals are those who do not mind about society or the social pressure it has on them. These respondents are risk takers and are also more likely to enter into discussions.

RQ3: How do 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of your Facebook friends affect your feelings and thoughts?

To this question, 41.4% of respondents (38.6% of women and 43.6% of men; 100% of 65-over years, 60% of 45-49 years, 54.5% of 15-19 years, 50% of 55-59 years and 30-34 years) said 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends may affect their feelings and thoughts; it depends on the situation. Good and bad stories about life, natural disasters, terrorism attacks, matches, political issues effects people lives in some way. If the shares, likes, comments of the respondents' friends are creating a sense of belonging in a negative or positive way; respondents have specified that they are influenced by the reactions given to their shares, likes, and comments. Meanwhile, 26.3% of respondents (34.1% of women and 20% of men; 42.9% of 50-54 year age category) said 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends do not affect their feelings and/or thoughts too much. Women participating in the study are more cautious than men in regard to 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends. Also, the 50-54 age category

is more cautious than other age categories in regard to the 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends. A total of 19.2% (15.9% of women and 21.8% of men; 50% of 60-64 year age category) said that the 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends sometimes has an effect on them. Again, men are being more affected by 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends than women.

Only 7.1% of respondents (6.8% of women and 7.3% of men; 27.3% of 15-19, 20% of 45-49 age categories) said that the 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends do not affect them. The 15-19 year age categories are especially important here. In this age category, many applications are using Facebook to reproduce photos, also meaningful sentences are used without citations and all of them know their peers mind-sets.

Just 6.1% of respondents find 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends very affective (4.5% of women and 7.3% of men; 28.6% of the 50-56 year age category). Men believe 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends affect their feelings and thoughts on Facebook than women. Also, the 50-56 age category believes 'posts, comments, shares and likes' of their Facebook friends affect their feelings and thoughts on the site, more so than for other age groups.

RQ4: How often do you share your thoughts and feelings about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook?

A total of 28.3% of respondents (34.1% of women and 23.6% of men; 100% of 60-64 year, 57.1% of 50-54 year age categories) never share their thoughts and feelings about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook. Women are more conservative than men in sharing on Facebook, and the older age categories are just as conservative too. Of the respondents, 26.3% (31.8% of women and 21.8% of men; 50% of 40-44 year, 45.5% of 35-39 year age categories) share depends on the situation Women respondents are more likely to share their thoughts in social media in times when they feel more secure. It has been observed that male respondents have more sharing their thoughts in social media than women in sensitive/dangerous/fanatic situations. 25.3% of respondents (20.5% of women and 29.1% of men; 100% of 65-over year, 40% of 45-49 year age categories) rarely share their thoughts and feelings about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook. Until this point, all the responses have tended to be negative. Only 16.2% of respondents (13.6% of women and 18.2% of men; 35% of 20-24 year, 33.3% of 55-59 year age categories) often share their thoughts and feelings about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook. And just 4% of respondents (0% of women and 7.3% of men; 20% of 30-24 year and 45-49 year age categories) frequently share their thoughts and feelings about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook.

RQ5: What is the level of disclosure of your sharing of your views on matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook?

Just over a third of the respondents (39.4% of respondents - 52.3% women and 29.1% men; 100% of 60-64 year, 71.4% of 50-54 year, 54.5% of 15-19 year age categories) never reflect their opinions about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook. While, 25.3% of respondents (18.2% of women and 30.9% of men; 100% of 65-over year, 54.5% of 35-39 year, 50% of 55-59 year age categories) do not prefer to share their opinions about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook in order to avoid getting into a polemic with someone. Also, 14.1% of respondents (9.1% of women and 18.2% of men; 27.8% of 25-29 year age category) sometimes share their opinions about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook. Only 15.2% of respondents (13.6% of women and 16.4% of men; 45% of 20-24 year, 20% of 45-49 year age categories) say they are willful in the disclosure of their opinions about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook. And 6.1% of respondents (6.8% of women and 5.5% of men; 20% of 30-34 year, 12.5% of 40-44 year age categories) share their opinions on Facebook if they believe there is not any social pressure or danger.

X.CONCLUSION

Communicating via Facebook is affected by the psychological and social-psychological pressures of society. Social media, especially Facebook, is increasingly viewed as a focus in which social life and interaction achieve new meanings and patterns among Turkish Cypriots. Facebook affects Turkish Cypriots communication patterns in the way of commitment of other people.

Emphasizing identification or associating with being a Turkish Cypriot is related with social identity theory. If roles and behaviors of the person are shaped by being a Turkish Cypriot, this issue should be explained by the identity theory. In social identity theory, the prototype is a cognitive representation of a social category containing the meanings and norms the person associates with the social category. In identity theory, the identity standard is a cognitive representation of a role containing the meanings and norms the person associates with the role [18]. Activation of a social identity is sufficient to result in depersonalization. Depersonalization is the basic process underlying group phenomena such as social stereotyping, group cohesiveness, ethnocentrism, cooperation and altruism, emotional contagion, and collective action [18].

Social boundaries affect people's shares on social media in Northern Cyprus. Turkish Cypriots accept invisible offline group norms, identities and bound themselves in social media. It causes stereotyping and it can be contributed with the SIDE model. Nowadays, interactions with other people have changed in North Cyprus among Turkish Cypriots. Most Turkish Cypriots are using Facebook to develop and manage relationships in the social media. Devices mostly supplant face-to-face relationships or traditional interactions in relationship establishing.

Research results show that, Turkish Cypriots do not interact as individuals, and instead, they act as a member of their

social groups standings. Their offline relationships (anchored relationships) affect their disclosure level on Facebook. Divulging personal information in social media means to a loss of privacy; behaving according to social group norms causes stereotyped and superficial behaviors.

Disclosure levels of Turkish Cypriots on Facebook are low; women are much more passive and conservative than men; this is a factor that can be contributed to gender issues originating from societal rules and norms. Most of respondents (79.9%) do not prefer to share their thoughts and feelings about matches/political elections/terrorist attacks on Facebook. While, 78.3% of respondents' said they are rarely sharing their ideas about sensitive issues on Facebook. It means disclosure levels of respondents on Facebook about sensitive issues are low. Instead of sharing their views, people frequently use Facebook to observe others as they are aware of the reactions that they will face after sharing.

Attitudes towards Facebook sharing are affected by social identity and social norms. Facebook sharing on sensitive issues is more relaxed in the attitude of young people under the age of 25 years. Life experiences and business life, accompanied by certain social pressures is affecting people's attitudes very much, with the exception of retired individuals. Sensitive issues are considered as advocacy, political, issues like terrorism are affecting negatively the level of sharing on Facebook. Social norms are influencing the appropriateness of self-disclosure. The self-disclosure level of individuals on Facebook depending on the lasting affect they want to leave on their audience; individuals are deciding to construct what kind of relationship to have. Nevertheless, there may be negative social consequences of self-disclosure for personal relationships. An analysis of the impact of social media needs to consider how the Internet may be contributing to new forms of interaction and community that cannot be measured using standard indicators of social capital.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. M. Broomberg, "Speak that I may see you": Some reflections on dissociation, reality and psychoanalytic listening." *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, vol. 4 (4), pp. 517-547. 1994. Retrieved from <http://icpla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Broomberg-P.-Speak-That-I-may-see-you-Some-Reflections-on-Dissociation-Reality-and-Psychoanalytic-Listening-517-547.pdf> (accessed 17 June 2016).
- [2] N. Öze, "Cultural reflections of Internet, social media and new media usage in everyday life: The case of Northern Cyprus" in *Digital Media & Electronic Communication*, Ed. F. Lienard and S. Zlitni, 1-3 Jun. 2016, pp. 957-967 (*4th International Conference: Digital Media and Electronic Communication*, Le Havre, France) https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304539077_Cultural_Reflections_of_Social_Media_Usage_in_Everyday_Life_The_case_of_Northern_Cyprus (accessed 1 July 2016).
- [3] B. A. Olaniran, N. Rodriguez, & I.M. Williams, "Social information processing theory (SIPT): A cultural perspective for international online communication environments", in *Computer-Mediated Communication Across Cultures: International Interactions on Online Environment*, S. Kelsey, and K. St. Amant, Ed. IGI Global, 2011: pp. 45-65.
- [4] C. Ross, E. S. Orr, M. Sisic, J. M. Arseneault, M. G. Simmering and R. R. Orr, "Personality and motivations associated with Facebook use," *Computer in Human Behaviour* 25, pp. 578-586, 2009. doi: 10.16/j.chb.2008.12.024.
- [5] J. Y. Kim, "Social interaction in computer-mediated communication," *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science* 26 (3), pp. 15-17, 2000. Retrieved from

- <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bult.153/full> (accessed 16 July 2016) doi: 10.1002/bult.153.
- [6] T. E. Higgins, G. Echterhoff, R. Crespiello and R. Kopietz, "Effects of communication on social knowledge: Sharing reality with individual versus group audiences", *Japanese Psychological Research*, 49 (2), pp. 89-99, 2007. Retrieved from https://www.uni-muenster.de/imperia/md/content/psyifp/aeechterhoff/wintersemester2011-12/vorlesungskommperskonflikt/higginsechterhoffcrespiello_kopietz_jpr_2007.pdf (accessed 8 July 2016) doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5884.2007.00336.x.
 - [7] M. Castells *Communication Power*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
 - [8] F. Colombo, "What we talk about when we talk about social media" 2015 (in International Workshop, Barcelona, Spain), doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.4598.576.
 - [9] R. Silverstone, "Domesticating Domestication. Reflections on the Life of a Concept" in *Domestication of Media and Technology*, T. Berker, et al., Ed. Berkshire: Open University Press, 2006: pp. 229-248.
 - [10] S. Turkle, *Life on the screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997.
 - [11] F. Stutzman, J. E. Vitak, B. Nicole, R. Gray, and C. Lampe, "Privacy in interaction: Exploring disclosure and social capital in Facebook", 4-7 June 2012, pp. 330-337. California: AAAI Press (Sixth international AAAI conference on weblogs and social media, Dublin, Ireland, Spain). Retrieved from http://www-personal.umich.edu/~enicole/StutzmanVitakEllisonGrayLampe2012_ICWSM.pdf (accessed on 2 August 2016).
 - [12] J. R. Suler, "Identity management in cyberspace," *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* 4 (4), pp. 455-459, 2002. Retrieved from <http://users.rider.edu/~suler/psycyber/identitymanage.html> (accessed on 22 September 2016).
 - [13] S. Turkle Cyberspace and identity. *Contemporary Sociology*, American Sociological Association, 28 (6), pp.643-648, 1999, Retrieved from <http://people.exeter.ac.uk/jp501/Turkle-CyberspaceIdentity.pdf> (accessed on 2 August 2016).
 - [14] P. J. Burke and J. E. Steets, *Identity Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
 - [15] J. Rummens, Personal identity and social structure in Sint Maartin/Saint Martin: a plural identities approach. Unpublished Thesis/Dissertation: York University, 1993.
 - [16] H. Tajfel And J. C. Turner, "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict", in *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, W. G. Austin and S. Worchel Ed., Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole, pp. 33-47, 1979.
 - [17] S. A. McLeod, Social Identity Theory, 2008. Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html (accessed on 22 September 2016).
 - [18] P. J. Burke and J. E. Steets "Identity theory and social identity theory", (in Social psychology section session on theoretical frameworks at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, USA, 1998). Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1.1.8754&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed on 22 September 2016).
 - [19] S. D. Reicher, R. Spears and T. Postmes, "A social identity model of deindividuation phenomena", *European Review of Social Psychology*, 6, 1995: pp. 161- 198. doi: 10.1080/14792779443000049.
 - [20] J. B. Walther, "Interpersonal effects in computer-mediated interaction: A relational perspective," *Communication Research*, 19 (1), 1992: pp. 52-90. doi:10.1177/009365092019001003.
 - [21] B. A. Olaniran, "Social information processing theory (SIPT): A cultural perspective for international online communication environments," *IGI Global*. Epub ahead of print 25 November 2011: pp. 45-46. Retrieved from <http://www.igi-global.com/viewtitlesample.aspx?id=55560> (accessed on 22 September 2016) DOI: 10.4018/978-1-60960-833-0.ch004.
 - [22] J. B., Walther, "Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction," *Communication Research* 23, 1996: pp 3-43.
 - [23] J. Pena, J. B. Walther and J. T. Hancock, "Effects of geographic distribution on dominance perceptions in computer-mediated group," *Communication Research*, 34, 2007: pp. 313-331. doi: 10.1177/0093650207300431.
 - [24] K., Greene, V. J. Derlega and A. Mathews, "Self-disclosure in personal relationships", *The Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships*, in A. L. Vangelisti and D. Perlman Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006: pp. 409-42.. Epub ahead of print June 2012. Chapter doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511606632.023> (accessed on 30 June 2016).
 - [25] V. L. Derlega and A. L. Chaikin, "Privacy and self-disclosure in social relationships". *Journal of Social Issues* 33, 1977, pp. 102-115.
 - [26] L. C. Tidwell and J. B. Walther, "Computer-mediated communication effects on disclosure, impressions, and interpersonal evaluations: Getting to know one another at a time," *Human Communication Research* 28 (3), 2002: pp. 317-348.
 - [27] M. Castells, "Materials for an exploratory theory of the network society". *British Journal of Sociology* 51 (1), January/March 2000: pp. 5-24. Retrieved from: <http://faculty.georgetown.edu/irvinem/theory/Castells-NetworkSociety.pdf> (accessed on 17 July 2016).
 - [28] K. Y. A. McKenna, A. S., Green and M. E. J. Gleason, "Relationship formation on the Internet: What's the big attraction?," *Journal of Social Issues* 58 (1), 2002: pp. 9-31. Retrieved from: <http://richardstevens.com/articles/McKenna-onlinelrelation.pdf> (accessed on 30 September 2016).
 - [29] T. A. Pempek, Y. A. Yermoleyeveva and S. L. Calvert, "College students' social networking experiences on Facebook," *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 30, 2009: pp. 227-238. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2008.12.010.
 - [30] N. B. Ellison, C. Steinfield and C. Lampe, "The benefits of Facebook "Friends": Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12, 2007, pp. 1143-1168. Retrieved from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00367.x/epdf> (accessed on 12 July 2016).
 - [31] B. Wellman, A. Quan-Haase, J. Boase and W. Chen, "Examining the Internet in everyday life," (The euricom conference on e-democracy, Nijmegen, Netherlands. 9-12 October 2002). Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1.1.8754&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed on 22 August 2016).
 - [32] S. Zhao, "Cyber-gathering places and online-embedded relationships," (Annual meetings of the eastern sociological society, Boston, USA, February 2006).
 - [33] S. Zhao, S. Grasmuck and J. Martin, "Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships," *Computers in Human Behaviour* 24, 2008: pp. 1816-1836. Retrieved from <http://anthrocyber.blogspot.com.cy/2009/05/identity-construction-and-self.html> (accessed on 22 September 2016).
 - [34] M. Hardey, "Life beyond the screen: Embodiment and identity through the internet," (The Editorial Board of The Sociological Review, 2002). Retrieved from http://www.jimelwood.net/students/grips/man_group_comm/hardey_2000.pdf (accessed on 12 July 2016).
 - [35] D. Boyd, *It's complicated*. USA: Yale University, 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.danah.org/books/ItsComplicated.pdf> (accessed on 22 June 2016).
 - [36] J. Bargh, K. Y. A. McKenna and G. M. Fitzmons, "Can you see the real me? Activation and expression of the "true self" on the Internet," *Journal of Social Issues* 58 (1), 2002: pp. 33-48. Retrieved from <http://smg.media.mit.edu/personals/chi2004/private/papers/bargh.pdf> (accessed on 19 July 2016).
 - [37] M. Bakardjieva, "Virtual togetherness: an everyday-life perspective," *Media, Culture & Society* 25, 2003: pp. 291-313. Retrieved from <http://people.ucalgary.ca/~bakardji/files/pubs/journals/VirtualTogetherness.pdf> (accessed on 22 September 2016).
 - [38] N. J. Hum, P. E. Chamberlin, B. L. Hambright, A. C. Portvood, A. C. Schat and J. L. Bevan, "A picture is worth a thousand words: A content analysis of Facebook profile photographs," *Computers in Human Behaviour* 27, 2011: pp. 1828-1833. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2011.04.003 Retrieved from <https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/elsevier/a-picture-is-worth-a-thousand-words-a-content-analysis-of-facebook-aqX0cH4zNm> (accessed on 12 September 2016).
 - [39] J. Miles and P. Gilbert *A Handbook of research methods for clinical and health psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.