

Measuring the Interaction among Jordanians via Facebook Network "A Proposed Model for Bridging the E-Interaction Gaps "IN Model" "

Prof. Iyad A. Al-Nsour

Advertising and Marketing Communication Department

College of Media and Communication

Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University IMSIU

Riyadh – Saudi Arabia

Abstract. The study consisted of two theoretical and operational objectives. The theoretical goal aimed to design a model for measuring online interaction via Facebook. The practical objective is aimed at using the proposed model to measure the interaction of Jordanian users with community issues. The proposed model has two dimensions: technical and behavioral interactions. It is named IN Model. The technical interaction consists of four sub-components: privacy, language, username, and way of access. The second dimension consists of five sub-components are the participation, the purpose of the interaction, the expression of participation, the emotions of interaction, and the source of interaction. Applying the proposed model on a sample of Jordanian users. The study is made up of all 5.5 million users of Facebook in Jordan who are active. The application of the model has concluded important results about how the online interaction among Facebook users. The level of interaction via Facebook is strong, while the interaction with community issues is moderate. A statistical impact of sex and age on technical interaction was proved, and the impact of education and age on behavioral interaction was proved as well. Finally, the study suggests a set of implications for better use to the proposed model in communication and marketing fields.

Key Words: Electronic Interaction, Digital Dialogue, Social Media, Internet, Electronic Communication, Community Issues, Jordan.

1. Introduction:

The Internet as a modern and rapidly growing communication tool has seen increasing demand from all sectors (Neff, 2014). The Internet has facilitated individuals' life, upgraded the collection and storage of information with minimal time, effort, and money (Pratama, Nirwanto & Firdiansjah, 2019). The internet has made communication among people worldwide fast and easy (Ngai, Tao & Moon, 2015). As a result, the Internet has changed communication and connect ways (Laksamana, 2018). It provided a number of online alternatives that helped research, disseminate information, increase the level of interaction, and reproduce information upon request (Godey, 2017).

Thus, social media has emerged as one of the most important Internet-based communication tools. Peer communication has risen and is seen as a form of personal socialization. These means have much effect possibilities on the decisions of others who have similar views, interests, and feelings (Siddiqui & Singh, 2016). Social media consists of different

sources of information about any subject or issue of interest to society (Traphagen,2015). It is classified as part of electronic communication tools to share views, ideas, experiences, expectations, and opinions among people (Das&Mandal,2016). Because of social media, the interaction becomes a continued phenomenon in all life aspects such as education, sports, friendship, medicine, engineering, economics, sociology, music, welfare... etc. (Arshad, 2019).

The literature of Communication confirms that interaction via social media has reduced communication barriers and obstacles among people (Hudson, Huang, Roth, & Madden, 2016), and formulated the personal characteristics of people (Abrar et al., 2017). With the spread of social media, however, the ways of interaction, exchange, and Acquaintance have expanded (Hajli, 2014). Messaging and sharing of users' data became easy (Chappuis et al., 2011). The data access mechanism has improved (Lupton, 2014). So interaction via social media has become an effective option against traditional communication methods. In the social media age, all participants can share experiences and results, experiences using messages, Videos, and images... etc. (Das & Mandal, 2016).

As a result, the interaction via social media enhances the level of familiarity (Stresewski, 2016), and increases the chances of building real relationships among users (Dennis, Papagiannidis, Alamanos, & Borlakis, 2016). It also allows publishing the content for reading, viewing purposes, and using in daily life decisions (Skoog & Söderström, 2015). We add that interaction via social media creates significant opportunities for mind development, and an increased level of enthusiasm due to the dissemination of many experiences, emotions, and opinions (Ismail, 2017). Studies show that interaction via social media is a complex process and can avoid theoretical implications (Gale, 2013).

Little practical research in the interaction field is vague, confusing, and cannot be used to generalize results, knowing their impact on the behavioral process of people. Ease of use, low cost, and expansion of Internet connectivity and mobile applications are a matter of caution and forethought. The credibility of the communicative content created by a user or audience may be at stake, and social media platforms have become fertile grounds for gossip, electronic spelling and extreme reproduction of certain contents and posts (Ito,Baumer, Bittanti, Boyd, Cody, Herr-Stephenson, Horst, et al.,2010). Studies add that social media are classified as new places of slavery (Boyd, 2008), bullying, and social isolation (Carrasco, Hogan, Willman & Miller, 2008), and social fear (Tillery, Cohen, Parra, Kitzmann, & Howard Shine).Recent studies confirm that electronic interactions are a complement to traditional social relationships, and they looking to developing the existing relationships via social media (Boyd, 2010).Finally, it can be said that interaction via social media hasgiven people wide opportunities to engage in broad social interactions using a large number of inaccessible social communication tools in the past (Berinato, 2010).

In the light of the above, it is imperative to frame and conceptualize the interaction of Jordanians via Facebook. The interaction discusses and evaluates critical social issues in politics, corruption, and economic, etc. The Facebook network is the most widely used by Jordanians and has 5.5 million active users with 87.3% of all social media active users in 2021 (6.3 million

social media users). Facebook has a set of interactive instruments include text and language, images and videos ... etc. These instruments are supposed to convey emotions, feelings, and expressions of opinion about any social issue. In the end, it's to be hoped that we will offer and simplify the interaction process via Facebook, and explain the practical interactive practices with completely ignored of the traditional theoretical justifications in this place.

2. Research Statement:

Social media has enhanced interactive dialogue among users, and has allowed data exchange using a set of tools such as text messages, recordings and images. Social media allows users to interact and express their feelings freely and easily (Baym, 2010). Social media offers a rich diversity of tools that express electronic interaction and reduce the level of ambiguity in the opinions in electronic discussions (Boyd, 2008). Such tool takes into consideration the differences and variations in culture, education and the customs and traditions among users in the local society.

In the developed societies, the impact of social media has reached the behavioural and cultural changes in societies. It facilitated the integration and intervention of cultural structures in a set of developed countries such as China and USA (Öztürk, 2019). Social media is a reliable source of information, and a favorite place to political events, opinions, promote government policies and action programs, participate in elections and facilitate journalists to the news, and increase the level of accountability and transparency in the governmental institutions and for the politicians (Green, 2012).

On the other hand, social media has a negative use and ambiguous phenomena. Social media caused a negative impact on the awareness level in the host societies, and has increased the aggressiveness among the society components. A number of Arab countries are examples of bad feelings for social media. These countries have lacking of social capital able to effectively participate in country policies. Therefore, these countries are suffering from the absence of genuine relations with their peoples. The countries and people are unable to keep their national identity, and there is a weakness in affecting the behavior of people national issues. In the midst of cultural and ideological conflicts in developing countries, there is an urgent need to increase the level of democracy and to promote the participation of citizens in their societies (Cheng & Evans, 2009).

Therefore, we are trying to focus on the process of online dialogue among Jordanians via social media, specifically Facebook. It is important to fragmenting the interaction mechanisms used by Jordanians. What are national issues are highlighted in the online discussions. What are tools are available on Facebook to express their national views and issues? What are the differences in online discussions according to age, gender and education? A range of ideas are borne by this study, which will be discussed in various parts of the research.

3. Research Objectives :

- Propose a model for measuring interaction via social media. Facebook is most commonly used in Jordan. The proposed model is fit for Interaction via Facebook.

- Application of the proposed model to a sample of Jordanian Facebook users. The application will be to measure the interaction of Jordanians with the most important societal issues in the economic, corruption and politics.

4. Research Significance :

- Interaction via Social media is one of the most interested sensitive issues to researchers of communication and marketing. Interaction largely reflects the level of awareness and perception of host audience during dialogue and social discussions. Understanding the interaction means that feedback can be linked to the intellectual differences and feedback in society and its role in formulating the thinking styles of Jordanians.
- Provide a simplified application framework to explain the interaction between Jordanians on Facebook. The components of the interaction will be analysed. This significant contribution is important for researchers and policymakers in the marketing and communication field. It is remark about use the social media in Jordan.
- Presenting a set of conclusions and recommendations. It is very necessary to understand the social media interaction and predict future behavior of society.

5. Literature Review:

1.5 The Electronic Interaction:

The twentieth century is the beginning of the Internet, and the emergence of the era of digital exchange. There is therefore a clear influence on the ways in which individuals communicate (Edosomwan, Prakasan, Kooame, Watson, & Seymour, 2011). The quantity and quality of material shared from images, files and throughout the day has increased, and e-mail has spread with it as an effective and rapid means of communication (Mitchell, Petrovici, Schlegelmilch & Szöcs, 2015). Studies therefore confirm that the beginning of the advent of the computer in 1969 is the true beginning of social interaction and participation sites. The first century saw a strong technological boom that helped to grow and integrate society further. Communication methods have shifted to interactive, and the social media of using websites and mobile devices in particular has emerged (Sharma & Verma, 2018). Prior to this, social communication was found to have its roots in ancient times when indicative signals were used to express fires and smoke and communicate in ancient China, Egypt, and Greece (King, Pan, & Roberts, 2017). In other regions of the world, drums have been used to expand the reach of the human voice as a communication tool. Studies confirm that social media seeds grew since 550 BC, with the establishment of the postal system in Iran using horses (Baruah, 2012). In the 8th and 19th centuries, the telegraph (1872), telephone (1890) and radio (1891) appeared, all of which allowed long-distance messages to be sent and received, and the connection was moved from one level to another, more sophisticated and modern (Baker and Moore, 2008).

Interaction is a symbolic process that involves creating dealings, and creating a number of values and meanings that can be shared with other individuals (Aljufri, 2017). Interaction refers to the quality of data shared between individuals using various means such as text

messages, recordings, images (Das & Mandal, 2016), or oral speech (Dholakia & Acciardo, 2014; Dichter, 1966). Interaction is a logical behavioural process with other people aimed at making gains, obtaining feedback, participating in the creation of new opportunities, and formulating new objectives in the interactive relationship (Sarasvathy & Dew, 2005).

Social media over the Internet helps to improve interaction, significantly change human communication methods, and allows access to anywhere around the world (Öztürk, 2018). The fact is that social media is content-creating (Nchabeleng, Boath, & Bisschoff, 2018), and there is no specific classification of such media (Kaplan & Heinlin, 2010), including, for example, social networks (Facebook), social books (Digg), video sharing (e.g. YouTube), photo sharing (Flickr).

Online social media is an alternative to traditional methods of interaction, attracting participants from around the world (Hajli, 2014). These participants have a number of experiences and capacities to share and exchange their life experiences. It is seen as one of the shortest ways to deliver visual and long-distance audio messages (Çolaklar & Aras, 2015). It enabled users to create their own personal traits, ease and flexibility to engage and participate in any dialogue (Chawinga, 2017). Electronic interaction constitutes communication related to interpersonal themes (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2013), and because human beings are a social organism, they seek to participate in others, and to obtain new life experiences from people with high experience and skills (Huw. in addition to sharing personal data, assessing other people's life experiences, shopping, and entertainment (Chappuis et al., 2011). Here, the information confirms that 5% of the influencers have 75% of the traffic on social media, have more than 100,000 followers, and thus the opportunities for interaction have an impact on the level of awareness and awareness of users (Cheng and Evans, 2009).

Generally speaking, the literature conflates the concepts of online interaction with the features (use) of social media. Positive interaction refers to improved awareness, mind-building, and spreading enthusiasm (Ismail, 2017). Viral spread over the Internet helps spread experiences, emotions and opinions quickly (Lieberman & Schroeder, 2020). Social media is seen as an important digital communication channel used to educate individuals, share data with others, assess it and interact with it (Chappuis, Gaffey, & Parvizi, 2011). Often, digital interaction allows the transmission of feelings of friendship between individuals, the building of relationships, and the expression of intimate feelings (Baym, 2010). In contrast, studies confirm that the reasons for social media interaction are due to friendship, leisure, learning, religious groups, sports clubs... Et cetera. These reasons are enough to achieve belonging, friendship, and attract romantic partners (Kojath, 2011). Nevertheless, social media is a fertile place for gossip, spelling, bullying, reproduction and reshaping of practices by new users (Boyd, 2010). These means may give rise to social isolation (Tillery, Cohen, Parra, Kitzmann, & Howard Sharp, 2015).

2.5 Electronic Interaction in Host Communities:

After the end of age era of photographs on the Internet for dating and marriage relationships purposes, social media appeared during 1998-2005 as a tool allowed interactive dialogue among users (Hajli, 2014). This dialogue was designed for reading, viewing, and

decision-making process (Hudson et al., 2016). This interaction depends on the quality of the data circulating through text messages, recordings, images... etc. (Das & Mandal, 2016). Users can express feelings and relationships (Baym, 2010). The interactive channels provided by social media - text, audio, and video - are able to enrich electronic dialogue and reduce ambiguity in expression of emotions and ideas (Boyd, 2008).

Images are often shared via social media to express details of routine life. and Expression of Friendship, Belonging and Love (Kojath, 2011). These images are related to religious issues, sports, education, celebrities... Social media is used as a complementary step to face - to - face interaction between individuals, as studies see most users' relationships across Facebook as an extension of their prior interaction. While there is a class of users who have full tendencies to build familiarity relationships across Facebook (Kujath, 2011). Other times, online interaction is done using text, e-mails and personal blogs. The effectiveness of this method requires taking into account cultural differences between users and societal customs and traditions (Kelly, Zilanawala, Book & Sacker, 2018).

Elsewhere, face-to-face interaction was found to contain non-verbal communication such as smiles and handshakes, and speech devoted to conveying emotions such as humor and irony (Wang, Jackson, Gaskin & Wang, 2015). However, textual interactions on social media (Facebook, Twitter and WhatsApp) lack the ability to express physical emotions such as handshake, audio. These non-verbal references mean reading the caller's opinion by text (Gjoka, Kurant, Butts, & Markopoulou, 2011). Studies compare text used via e-mail and audio message hearing. The voice message reduces the listener's ability to self-guess the inaccurate content, during which thoughts and emotions are easily communicated (Ribeiro, 2010). The text message reduces the number of people unable to express their thoughts and feelings for others (Nduhura & Prieler, 2017). We add that the read message reduces interaction and makes it less effective in terms of planning and emotion (Liao, F., Yang, Wang, Brown, & Shi, 2012). Text-based interaction is often inhumane, restricting a person's mental abilities when expressing what is on their mind (Chen, Zhang & Wilson, 2013).

Social media allows social capital to be created through networking, used to transfer knowledge, reach others, and influence them in their usual environment (Aljufri, 2017). These tools have become a key component and lifestyle in modern human life, and are responsible for many of the changes that have taken place in societies by the interaction and its shaping methods (Fetscherin & Heinrich, 2015). One can share articles and publications via social media, mark people involved, and create more discussion among them (Nagi, 2013). Studies confirm that social media interaction has a significant impact on how host communities communicate, and this has brought about many behavioural and cultural changes in them (Wang, Bindle, Mai & Cutte, 2015). Its impact went beyond the societal structure that made societies more integrated and overlapping, became responsible for shaping many of the details of human life, and interfered with the formation of cultural concepts and dimensions in society (Öztürk, 2018).

The online community has become a source of information, a venue for organizing events, expressing opinions, sharing photos, identifying new people, promoting work, and

participating in campaigns (Chapuis et al., 2011). It facilitated the access of journalists and the media to information, and increased the level of accountability and accountability of organizations and public figures (Green, 2012). Many local governments around the world therefore engage in social interactions with their parks to ensure broad popularity (Fischer & Reuber, 2011). Social interaction has become a key component of Governments' work programmes. Through it, it seeks to influence actual levels of perception, and the different behaviors of societies towards many of the societal or important issues of national sovereignty (Cheng & Evans, 2009).

Communication in modern societies seeks to influence the process of shaping national identity and promoting socialization (Buckingham, 2012). In this spirit, government institutions invest a large part of their efforts and resources in modern communication tools with the aim of easily reaching the target audience over the Internet.(Mergel, 2013), which seeks to increase democratic space, citizen participation and cooperation, and to create positive practices towards current and future public issues and government policies (Stresewski, 2016), interpreting laws and regulations, and improving investment output in human capital (Bertot, Jaeger, & Grimes, 2010). These practices improve popular satisfaction with government, and help make more effective and efficient government policies (Mergel, 2013).

Promoting electronic interaction among citizens; ensure that the government respects the views and wishes of the public, and has a deeper feedback and understanding of the needs of its people (Snead, 2013). These practices delay societal clashes with their governments, and reduce behavioral problems and the negative effects of conflict between them (Margel, 2013). Studies indicate that electronic interaction (dialogue) in developed countries such as China and the United States; One of the most prominent social media tools for direct communication with people. While in Jordan, we have 6.3 million active social media users, 87.3% of whom are via Facebook only (www.deportal.com). Employment of these figures ensures the creation of a vital and continuous social interaction between the state and society, which means the future development of economic, political and social output (Labricque, 2014). Sharing views, sharing positive views, obtaining the views of the public in the shortest and least costly way, taking human rights into account a broad societal perspective, and viewing citizens' complaints as a general phenomenon rather than as specific requirements for a particular group or entity; They are all important elements for the development of electronic interaction (Medaglia & Zheng, 2017).

In general, the use of social media to address societal problems; It is seen as an effective way to achieve community euphoria, build inclusive national identity, and improve social integration in a diverse and autonomous environment (Brakus, Schmitt, & Zarantonello, 2009). In this environment, everyone can exercise their social role effectively, with a higher level of communication (Mesch, 2006,124), increase cohesion and interaction and improve relationships between individuals (Go & You, 2016).

6. Field Study:

1.6 Research Population: It consists of all Facebook users in Jordan. According to formal information from deportal Site, it is found that there were 5.5 million effective users of the network in Jordan for 2021.

2.6 Sampling Technique: The study used the purposive method. It is the most appropriate for current research. It allows access to the required sample on Facebook. The researcher get pack 367 questionnaires from different Jordan cities and the age and cultural segments. The researcher designed an online questionnaire via Google Drive. The questionnaire was distributed to Facebook users randomly. According to gender analysis, the males has two thirds of females' reaches 67% and 33% of the total sample respectively. The age distribution shows that there are eight age groups. The + 50 age group has a high rate reaches 23.6%, compared with 7% of age under 18. The other age groups are closed to each other: 25- less than 30 (9.4%), 30- less than 35 (11.2%), 35-less than 40 (13.9%), 40-less than 45 (13.1%). Finally, the education level indicates that more than half of the sample are undergraduate degree holders (52.4%), then the graduate students with 39.7%, while 14% of the participants are secondary holders.

Table (1): Responses and Percentage of Demographics

Demographics		The Categories								
1	Gender	Male %		Female %						
		67		33						
2	Age	Less than 18 %	18 – less than 25 %	25 – Less than 30 %	30 – Less than 35 %	35 – Less than 40 %	40 – Less than 45 %	45 – Less than 50 %	+ 50 %	Age 35 – Less than 40 ± 1.983
		7	7.9	9.4	11.2	13.9	13.1	20.2	23.6	
3	Education level	Less than Secondary School %	High School %	Bachelor degree %	Graduate degree %	Other % (Diploma)	Educational Level 3.3483 ± 0.66775			
		1.5	14	52.4	39.7	1.5				

3.6 Measurement and Data Analysis : he Research Instrument has a set of closed-ended questions to explain the items. Table 1 shows the results of the demographical analysis of the sample. The questionnaire was used as a tool for primary data collection from the participants. The proposed model has two main dimensions. The first dimension is called a technical interaction and measured by three points scale. The value 3 was given to the "strong" response level, value (2) to the "medium" response level, and (3) to the "weak" response level. The second dimension is called a behavioral interaction and measured by five points scale. The response levels were ranged between 1-5. The value 5 was given to the response level "very strong" , value (4) for response level "strong," value (3) for response level "medium," value (2) for response level "weak," and value (1) for response level "very weak" .Studies looking for more accuracy, so the relative scale was used. The three-points relative scale consists of (1) 3 for strong response (+2.33) , (2) 2.33 –more

than 1.67 is medium , (3) less than 1.67 is weak. The five points relative scale consists of (1) + 4.2 is very strong . (2) 4.2 – more than 3.6 is strong, (3) 3.6 –more than 2.4 is medium, (4) 2.4 –more than 1.6 is weak, and (5) less than 1.6 is very weak.

To analyze the research responses, the descriptive analysis was used. The arithmetic mean, standard deviation and frequencies were used .Table 1 shows the results of the internal consistency test of study variables using the Cronbach's Alpha test. This rate is statistically accepted since it is more than the statically permitted rate 60%. The results showed that all the variables are statistically accepted since it is more than the permitted rate.

Table 2 : Cronbach's Alpha Results

The Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
Electronic Interaction	0.688
A. Technical Interaction	0.75
B.Behavioral Ineraction	0.618
The Awarness Toward Social Issues	0.81
Total Variables	0.79

7. The Responses Profile:

1.7 The Proposed Electronic Interaction Model:

Table 3: The Responses of the Tow Dimensions of the IN model

The Domain	Response Level	Response Value	Percent %	Mean	S.D
IN Model Domains					
1.Technical Interaction Instruments:					
Account Privacy					
Public	Strong Interaction	3	41.2	2.16	0.8
Specific and Selected Friends	Middle Interaction	2	33.7		
Facebook Friends Only	Low Interaction	1	25.1		
Language					
Arabic (Mother Tongue)	Strong Interaction	3	77.2	2.7744	0.4187
English (Second Language In Country)	Middle Interaction	2	22.2		
Other Languages	Low Interaction	1	0.4		
Account User Name					
Official Name	Strong Interaction	3	95.9	2.9438	0.28861
Nickname	Middle Interaction	2	2.6		
Fake Name	Low Interaction	1	1.5		
Access Way					
Mobiles (Quick Access)	Strong Interaction	3	76.8	2.711	0.56635
Computer + Mobiles (Middle Access)	Middle Interaction	2	17.5		
Tablets + Mobiles + Mobiles (Weak Access)	Low Interaction	1	5.7		
Technical Interaction Degree				2.6473	0.5184
2.Behavioral Interaction Instruments:					
Participation on Facebook					
Creating New Content	Very Strong Interaction	5	46.4	4.0247	1.076
Sharing Posts to the Others With Amendment	Strong Interaction	3	18		

Sharing Posts to the Others Without Amendment	Middle Interaction	4	31.4		
Watching the Posts Only	Weak Interaction	2	0		
No Action Taken	Very Weak Interaction	1	4.2		
Purpose of Interaction					
Media and News	Very Strong Interaction	5	33.9	3.4736	1.40729
Social Occasions and Varieties	Strong Interaction	4	19.8		
Entertainment	Middle Interaction	3	18.1		
Building Friendships	Weak Interaction	2	16		
Developing Skills	Very Weak Interaction	1	12.2		
Expression of Interaction					
Share	Very Strong Interaction	5	14.7	3.5714	0.91108
Comment	Strong Interaction	4	37.4		
Like	Middle Interaction	3	43.1		
Watching Only	Weak Interaction	2	0		
Non Active User	Very Weak Interaction	1	4.8		
Emoji Used (Feelings)					
Love (Very Optimistic)	Very Strong Interaction	5	60.7	4.4195	0.8065
Care (Optimistic)	Strong Interaction	4	22.1		
Haha (Medium Felling)	Middle Interaction	3	15.7		
Sad (Pessimistic)	Weak Interaction	2	1.5		
Angry (Very Pessimistic)	Very Weak Interaction	1	0		
Source of Interaction					
The Posts By Self-User	Very Strong Interaction	5	34.5	3.7293	1.20186
The Social Issues (The Society)	Strong Interaction	4	26.1		
Posts by Relatives and Friends	Middle Interaction	3	22.7		
PostsBy VIP (Celebrities)	Weak Interaction	2	11.2		
The Posts By Facebook Groups’ Members	Very Weak Interaction	1	5.5		
Level of Behavioral Interaction				3.8437	0.8805

In the current study, the researcher designed a model to measure the process of online Facebook interaction. A number of previous studies have been reviewed to analyze how the reaction is measured. Previous studies have been found that there is a confused concepts related to use, advantages of use, and purposes of use. In fact, these are different concepts from the core idea of interaction that the researcher looking for designing this model. The researcher called the model IN Model for electronic interaction. The model proposes two main dimensions. The first dimension is the technical dimension of interaction, which explains the technical components contained in Facebook and is an important part of the interaction process. The user selects these components simultaneously with the account, which is a user's identification card, through which they can better interact with events and people. These components are a necessary for activating the account and cannot be operated without them. Facebook management leaves complete and restricted freedom for the user to choose between a set of technical alternatives, but it's actually a mandatory practice of interaction. The researcher collected these components and identified them in four groups, including account privacy, account language, account user name, and account access way. The second dimension of the proposed model is called the behavioural dimension. It expresses the user's practices or behavior after accessing Facebook. These practices are optional, and the user may continue on the web without such actions later. However, using of these

practices determines the level of voluntary interaction. The researcher collected and classified these practices into five groups: form of participation; Purpose of interaction; expression of participation; Emogi used (Feelings); and source of interaction. Therefore, the relative weight of the technical interaction is lower than the relative weight of the behavioral interaction in the model. Table 3 explains all interaction components and dimensions of the proposed model. Human action is always subject to deficiency or oblivion. Therefore, the application of the model by academics and specialists and improving its uses in additional studies are important and sufficient factor of the model success. The model is based on a number of simple assumptions that facilitate the evaluation of the electronic interaction process in the next section.

1.1.7 The Technical Dimension in the Proposed Interaction Model:

In the first part of the model of reaction measurement comes the technical dimension. The three points scale was used to measure technical interaction. Response options varied between high and medium levels depending on the arithmetic mean value. The mean value of the four components in this dimension is 2.65. The confidence interval is 2.65 ± 0.52 . This result means that the technical interaction among Facebook users in Jordan has a strong degree and 72.7% of the participants are approved this result. The first sub-component is the account privacy which means the authorized persons to see and view the user's profile and his posts. As the profile (account) is open to others, this means that posts can be viewed by more users, so the level of impact and sharing with others becomes greater. Results indicate that 41.2% of participants have public accounts. The confidence interval ranged from 2.16 to 0.8. As a result, the level of interaction by this component is moderate. The second sub-component is the language of account. Arabic is the mother tongue of Jordanian society. The use of Arabic facilitates and strengthens the handling and impact of other users. 77.2% of the participants are Arabic users in their interactions. The confidence interval is 2.77 ± 0.42 . The arithmetic mean value indicates that the level of interaction by language was high level. The third subcomponent is the account user name. It's how the user defines himself for others. The definition is by choosing an explicit name with its surname and surname. The name might be fake. The most obvious name is more acceptable to others for interacting, building relationships and exchanging posts. As a result, the probability of influence increases when the official and nick names of users are known to other users. There are a lot of ethical and legal constraints in daily life that impose users to use their real names on Facebook. The cyber-crime law in Jordan, and Facebook policy aimed at deleting fake accounts, are all examples of such constraints. Overall, 95.9% of users have real names on Facebook, and a confidence interval is 2.94 ± 0.29 . The arithmetic mean value means that level of interaction by this component is strongly done. The fourth sub-component is the access way. The study in the proposed model shows that there are three options used to access the Facebook accounts. The most frequently used way is mobile, which is the fastest and most common among participants at 76.8%. This way is considered to be available to all users at all times and places - outside and inside homes. It doesn't require special equipment or connections, and it needs very little physical effort. Using of this way ensures that high

confidentiality and privacy are maintained in the use of account. The user can activate, arrange and manage all apps associated with his or her personal Facebook account, and follow updates and posts on a regular basis. The interaction using this way is at the highest level. But the researcher afraid that multiple ways of access reduce privacy, the ability to follow the posts and updates easily and continuously. Often, computers or tablets are vulnerable to use by the most of family members. Access to the account using these devices means that the bad use by all family members may occurred, thereby reducing the level of privacy, and increasing the crowding on using the Facebook accounts continuously. The current study confirms that low purchasing power of Jordanians reduce the probability to win personal tablets and computers. Overall, there is no enough time on Facebook for everyone. The confidence interval is 2.71 ± 0.57 . The arithmetic mean value of this component means that the level of interaction is strong.

2.1.7 The Behavioural Dimension in the Proposed Interaction Model:

The second part of the proposed electronic interaction measurement model IN is the behavioral dimension. It Expresses the own practices and behavior of users. These behaviors are defined by the user himself. It's part of the level of awareness, the perception of users. The five point scale was used to measure behavioral interaction and was given a higher relative weight than the first dimension. According to the result, the answers are varied between very strong, and strong according to arithmetic mean value. The mean value of the five subcomponents was 3.84 and the confidence interval was 3.84 ± 0.88 . This means that the behavioral interaction among Facebook users in Jordan is strongly measured according to 62.7% of participants. The first sub-component is how to participate on Facebook. This component contained five answer options according to literature reviewed. The ordering in the proposed model is not permanent. Different results can be obtained depending on the different participants in the sample. User creation of new content representing the highest level of interaction by 64.4%. Sometimes the user shares the leaflets with or without any modification. It indicates lower levels of interaction by 31.4% and 18% of participants, respectively. The failure of the user to perform any practices has been found to mean a significantly lower level of interaction. The average response of participants recorded a confidence interval of 4.025 ± 1.08 . The value of the arithmetic medium means that the reaction level is done at an average degree.

The second subcomponent is the purpose of the reaction. This component has five answer keys as well. These options have been identified from the literature. It's ordered in the model according to the response level by the participants. The order of those options may vary according to the participants in the different samples. In Jordanian society, news and media have the strongest degree of interaction at 33.9%, then the participation in social events at 19.8%. Entertainment, building friendship relationships and developing personal skills have lower degrees of interaction according to the participants in the sample. The arithmetic mean value refers to the high level of interaction according to purpose of participation.

The third subcomponent is the expression of interaction. This component contains five answer keys. The options are available on Facebook to help the user express their interaction with others. The order in the model according to expression. Suppose Share means a higher level

of interaction compared to comment or like options. In Jordanian society, a few percentage of the sample reaches 14.7% who share posts with others, while like and comment were widely used to express interaction with 43.1% and 37.4% respectively. On the other hand, a percentage of participants who have no action via Facebook reaches 4.8%. Those are the silent users. The moderate response of participants recorded and a confidence interval is 3.47 ± 1.4 . The arithmetic mean value means that the interaction by this component is strong. The fourth sub component expresses the feelings and emotions. Emogi is used as part of the physiological reaction process. This component has five answer keys. These keys are available on Facebook to express the emotional level in posts of other people. They are ordered in the model according to supposed expression of participants. Options range from very optimistic (Love) to very pessimistic (Angry). It was found that 82.8% of the participants were optimists, who showed strong interaction with posts of others. There are low percentage of Jordanians who had a sense of irony and humor (Haha) reaches 15.7%. There's a very small percentage that shows the passive passion for posts of others at 1.5%. There's a confidence interval for this component is 4.42 ± 0.82 . The arithmetic mean value indicates that the level of interaction by emotion is very strong.

The fifth sub component is the source of the interaction. This component has five key answers. It's designed according to Facebook interaction literature. The ordering of such answer keys according to the response level by the participants. The first source of interaction is the user's own posts and has the highest level of interaction at 34.5%. Social posts are important and significant to 26.1% of participants. The last one and two options mean a higher level of interaction by the user. Posts of friends and relatives have 22.7% of interaction among participants. It also found that VIP (political, artistic and sports) is a low source of interaction at 11.2%. The answers of participants recorded a confidence interval of 3.73 ± 1.2 , and the arithmetic mean value indicates that the level of interaction by this component is strong.

After determining the level of interaction, based on the dimensions in the proposed model. The technical interaction is based on three answers key. The upper limit of the arithmetic mean is 3. The behavioral interaction is based on five answers key. The upper limit of the arithmetic mean is 5. The level of interaction among Facebook users can be measured by:

- Addition of response values on the two proposed dimensions $(6 + 15) = 21$.
- The relative weight of technical interaction via Facebook is 0.2858 $(6/21)$.
- The relative weight of behavioral interaction via Facebook is 0.7142 $(15/21)$.
- Multiply the arithmetic mean of the two proposed dimensions by the relative weight of each one.
 - The Technical Interaction Value (TIV) = $0.2858 * 2.6473 = 0.75659$.
 - The Behavioral Interaction Value (BIV) = $0.7142 * 3.8437 = 2.7451$.
- Addition the last interaction values for the two proposed dimensions. The five points scale is used to measure the overall level of interaction among Facebook users as follows:

- If the interaction value between 5 – more than 4.2, the interaction is very strong.
 - If the interaction value between 4.2 –more than 3.4, the interaction is strong.
 - If the interaction value between 3.4 –more than 2.6, the interaction is moderate (average).
 - If the interaction value between 2.6 – more than 1.8, the interaction is weak.
 - If the interaction value less than 1.8, the interaction is very weak.
- The total values of the two proposed interaction dimensions is 3.5. The value is located in the second level. This means that the level of interaction among Facebook users in Jordan is strong.

2.7 The Social Issues:

Table 4: The Interaction among Participants with Social Issues

The Variable	Percent %	Mean	S.D
Scope of News			
Local News (Jordan News)	32.9	2.0603	0.8462
Regional News (Arab News)	28.2		
International News	38.9		
News Type			
Sport News	6.4	5.4215	2.4966
Corruption News	10.7		
Politicians News	11.2		
Celebrities News	6.8		
Government News	13.6		
COVID – 19 News	10.8		
Societal News	18.3		
Economic News	8		
Marketing and Sales News	13.5		
Other	0.7		
Level of Interaction With Societal News			
Very Strong	7.5	3.03	0.96511
Strong	18.4		
Medium	50.9		
Weak	16.1		
Very Weak	7.1		

This variable is not an essential part of the proposed model. It can be replaced by any other variable such as satisfaction, loyalty, awareness, perception...etc. The researcher aims at measure the interaction of Jordanian with important societal issues. The first question concerns the spatial scope of the subjects with which Jordanians interact. The frequent distribution shows that world news have the highest percentage of attention reaches 38.9%, then local news with 32.8% and Arab news with 28.2%. The confidence interval for answers was 2.06 ± 0.85 , and the arithmetic mean value indicates that the level of follow-up to local news is moderate in our study. The type of local news favored by Jordanians concentrate on social news with 18.3% of

total participants. The news of government (policies and strategies) has the second rank at 13.6%, and news of shopping and sales at 13.5%. The economic problems in Jordan were not a priority for Jordanians and has low interest at 8% of participants. The news of VIP such as celebrities and athletics has 6.8% and 6.4% respectively. The other news, which is supposed to be at the top of Jordanians priority has a moderate degree of attention. Results show that interest in COVID-19news at 10.8%, news of corruption and politicians have 10.7% and 11.2% of participants' responses respectively. In general, the important social news has 30.7% of the participants' interest. This means that there is a clear shortage in the level of interaction among Jordanians towards the sensitive and important societal issues. That finding was confirmed in the third question, and the results indicate that 25.9% of participants have a high interaction. The confidence interval for participants was 3.03 ± 0.97 , and the arithmetic mean value indicates that interaction level among Jordanians with their important social issues via Facebook is moderate.

3.7 The Statistical Differences:

To testing the hypothesis of statistical differences, ANOVA was used for the variables with more than two answering categories such as education and age levels, while t test was used for variables with binary response categories such as sex. Table 5 indicates the results of this test. The statistical rule says that if the p-value of the demographic variable is less than 5% , so we can accept the effect of a demographic on the dimensions of an electronic interaction.

Table 5 : The Statistical Differences According to Demographics

The Domain	P-value For Sex Differences	P-value For Age Differences	P-value For Education Differences	Statistical Decision
IN Model Domains				
1.Technical Interaction Instruments:				
Account Privacy				
Public	0.96	0.00	0.118	No Statistical Differences According to Sex and Education. But There is a Differences tend to Age Group 18-25 Years.
Specific and Selected Friends				
Facebook Friends Only				
Language				
Arabic (Mother Tongue)	0.65	0.24	0.581	No Statistical Differences According to All Demographics
English (Second Language In Country)				
Other Languages				
Account User Name				
Official Name	0.00	0.00	0.158	No Statistical Differences According to Education. But There Is A Statistical Differences tend to Males and Age Group 18-25 Years.
Nickname				
Fake Name				
Access Way				
Mobiles (Quick Access)	0.013	0.343	0.119	No Statistical Differences According to All Demographics
Computer + Mobiles (Middle Access)				
Tablets + Mobiles + Mobiles (Weak Access)				
2.Behavioral Interaction Instruments:				

Participation Type on Facebook				
Creating New Content	0.614	0.135	0.00	No Statistical Differences According to Sex and Age. But There Is a Statistical Differences tend to Less than Secondary School.
Sharing Posts to the Others With Amendment				
Sharing Posts to the Others Without Amendment				
Watching the Posts Only				
No Action Taken				
Interaction Interest				
Media and News	0.002	0.008	0.838	No Statistical Differences According to Education. But There Is a Statistical Differences tend to Males and Age Group 18-25 Years.
Social Occasions and Varieties				
Entertainment				
Building Friendships				
Developing Skills				
Interaction Expression				
Share	0.924	0.037	0.502	No Statistical Differences According to Sex and Education. But There Is a Statistical Differences tend to Age Group 35 – less than 40 Years.
Comment				
Like				
Watching Only				
Non Active User				
Emoji Used				
Love (Very Optimistic)	0.397	0.224	0.482	No Statistical Differences According to All Demographics
Care (Optimistic)				
Haha (Medium Felling)				
Sad (Pessimistic)				
Angry (Very Pessimistic)				
Corporation of Interaction				
The Posts By Self-User	0.325	0.623	0.159	No Statistical Differences According to All Demographics
The Social Issues (The Society)				
Posts by Relatives and Friends				
PostsBy VIP (Celebrities)				
The Posts By Facebook Groups’ Members				

8. The Results Discussion of The Proposed Model:

This study was based on a proposed model for measuring interaction via Facebook. The proposed model is called IN Model for Electronic Interaction. The proposed model has two main dimensions. The technical dimension of the interaction describes the importance of the tech parts in Facebook. It consists of four interactive segments: privacy, language, username, and mode (way) of access. The researcher applied the model on a sample of 367 Jordanian Facebook users. Facebook is the most widely used website in Jordan reaches 87% of all social media users. Results show that 41.2% of users have public Facebook accounts for friends and non-friends to view those accounts. As for the language of use, Arabic is the language of interaction for 77.2% of participants, and 95.9% of participants have accounts with their real names. In addition to 76.8% of participants were mobile users of accessing their Facebook accounts. The overall components of the technical interaction indicate a strong degree of interaction among Jordanian participants via Facebook. Studies confirm that technical interaction virtually emerged as the relationship between computer use and technology, and this relationship is explained by ease and

access of use. These features are embedded with the features of social networks, making them a means of perception, learning, and simplicity (Das & Mandal, 2016; Hudson et al., 2015). Other studies have shown the benefits of a social networks that improve the interaction process such as access to data and allocation of using time (Lupton, 2014). Some researchers focus on determining the level of interaction by effort and ease of information exchange. Time and space are motivations for use and not to measure the level of interaction (Décieuxa, Heinenb & Willems, 2018). It must be recognized that there are moral differences between employment, the determinants of use, and the measurement of social media interaction. Over time, there is a continuing need to develop social media metrics (Hudson, Roth, Madden & Hudson, 2015; Lee, Chang, & Stokes Berry, 2011). In previous studies there is no quantitative methodology for measuring the interaction process. The researcher therefore considers that previous studies refer to the uses of the social network, rather than indicators for measuring the level of interaction, and thus highlights the importance of the proposed interaction model IN in bridging the gaps ignored by previous studies. Overall, the level of technical interaction among Facebook Jordanian users was found to be strong in this study.

The behavioral Dimension of the proposed interaction measurement model IN refers to the practices performed by the user after entering the network. It consists of five components: the form of participation, purpose, expression, emotion, and the source of interaction. Our study results suggest that 64% of participants have high interactive tendencies by creating new, continuous content, which means this segment is the most interactive. The purpose of interaction was focused on news and media (33.9%). Most of the time, this is spontaneous practice by users and does not indicate how much attention is paid to the post content. Expression of emotions shows that the largest segment with 82.8% of participants have a surplus of feelings for the posts using Love sign. 34.5% of participants focus on publications related to Jordanian society as an interaction source. These posts contain events, congratulations and stories about obituary, graduation, success, marriage, job promotion, religious holidays, birthdays, and exchange social stories, etc. In the light of the above, a number of studies have been reviewed to identify the concept of interaction. Remarkably, it did not speak of any similar components to the proposed model. This conclusion is useful on the one hand, but needs clarification on the other. As we've shown before, identifying a measurement process with a number of advantages for social media is extremely inaccurate. We need a theoretical framework illustrates the difference between use advantages, usability, and interaction measurement (Saboo et al., 2016; Hudson et al., 2015; Al-Badi et al., 2013). One study showed that text messages, audio recordings, photos and videos are tools of interaction, participation, and collaborating among online consumers (Das et al., 2016). Elsewhere, emotions and feelings have been focused on a way of building relationships via the Internet (Hudson et al., 2015). Leisure, Internet use, listening to music, games, and relaxation are measures of entertainment or recreational interaction via social media (Handyside & Ringrose, 2017). In fact, these elements represent motives and reasons for using social media, and cannot be considered as smart and genuine interactions reflect the level of awareness and knowledge and as a mean of dialogue and discussion of important issues. Social media has shortened the

personal relationships and make them virtual relationships via computers which complementing the face to face relationships. Therefore, important news can be passed immediately and there is no need to personal meetings. Social media options are available at any time and place, and can be written, chatted, shared photos and videos to increase the effectiveness of interaction, and Facebook provides Messenger service to the same end. Electronic interaction has become easy, automatic, and natural, and has contributed to increased symmetry and convergence with face to face interaction (Westlund & Bjur, 2014). In the current study, the level of behavioral interaction was strong among Facebook Jordanian users.

The results show that world news in the first rank with 38.9% Jordanian attention. Local news has 32.8%. In more detail, local news was distributed by 18.3% on community news, government policies by 13.6%, and shopping and sales by 13.5%. Jordan society suffers from deep problems in the economy, corruption and politics, but there is no remarkable attention by large segment of Facebook users on such issues with only 8% of participants. News of the COVID-19 has 10.8%, news of corruption reaches 10.7%, and news of politicians reaches 11.2%. The most significant news for Jordanians has 30.7% of the total attention via Facebook. So it can be said that the level of interaction of Jordanians via Facebook is strong, while interaction with their sensitive societal issues is moderate. Here, previous studies confirm that there are social drivers to motivate the users in social interaction via Facebook. The transparency explains citizens' desire to verify information disseminated by government agencies easily. The participation refers to practices towards content produced on Facebook and the extent of bilateral interaction between government institutions and publics. The collaboration allows the public to participate immediately and directly with governmental contents posted on Facebook. Finally, the results suggest that the education has no effect on technical interaction among Facebook Jordanian users. The age level has an influence on this interaction, and these differences tend to males and the 18-under-25 age group of Jordanians. It was found that this age group tended to use a public accounts, using a real usernames, while males are the most frequently used mobile and real usernames via Facebook. The behavioural interaction test show that males in the age group 18 - less than the 25 have higher tendency towards news and media than other groups, while the lower than secondary degree users are more different in creating their own content. This result is consistent with the free access and exchange of information; all of them are factors helped this group discover selves, try to enrich knowledge, and seek social value via Facebook.

The results add that there are fundamental differences in the expression of interaction tend to the age group 35 –less than 40 years. In general, the youth group below 40 years was more interested in interacting via Facebook, so we agree with studies confirmed that free time of young people is enough reason to get entertainment via Facebook such as meeting friends, listening to music, and using the Internet (Handyside & Ringrose, 2017). At certain times of the year, especially in holidays and national occasions, Facebook becomes an important mean to interact, share stories, greetings, and congratulations. This means that there is no urgent need to communicate with others later personally or virtually. So the personal meetings can be fully covered by interacting via Facebook. Other studies show that there are no differences between

males and females in using time of Facebook, whereas the differences focus on using ways. One of the most interesting findings is that males have more emotions via Facebook than females, and males are more likely to register on Facebook in times of isolation and depression (Kujath, 2011). The latest finding, consistent with our study, shows that 89.9% of males have a strong emotions via Facebook compared to 68.2% of females who have the same level of emotions.

9. Implications:

The world today is rapidly changed, and because of technological innovation, everything is easily achievable. All fields of knowledge have benefited from this development with a focus on marketing and communication majors. Social media is a miracle of the 21st century. Social media contains tools enhanced use, improved interaction with others. Most studies in this field have been concerned with the use of social media in marketing. However, the objectives and motives of the use have focused on developing the brand reputation and value, improving profit and sales indicators, and becoming more competitive. The desired interaction in this case is to facilitate communication with clients, respond to their queries, improve relationship management and build trust. On the other hand, we need to employ the multiple opportunities and areas that social media communication provides. It has become a tool for increasing the level of positive interaction, disseminating positive ideas in society, gaining different cultures and promoting constructive and fruitful dialogue.

A literary review showed that there are a number of concepts that relate to use, communication, and interaction via social media. Nowadays, such concepts closer and complementary each other, but the logic says can't use them as synonyms. Every concept has own philosophy and components that must be carefully considered. Therefore, the correct rule for theoretical conceptualization and the practical distinction among such concepts must be established. The interaction is the last stage comes after use, and it performs a different function than some theoretical literature. For a while, these literature has clearly confused and interpreted them as synonymous. This syncretism has led to many problems and unacceptable integration of goals, tools, and justification. So the current study focused on the concept of interaction via social media. The operational literature distinguishes between two types of interactions: direct and indirect interaction. Experience confirms that such interactions may be independent or complementary. Indirect interaction via social media includes the previous relationship among users, and at other times the relationship is based completely on social media. In both cases, we need a different way of understanding and simplifying the interaction process, identifying motivations, justifications, circumstances, tools of each pattern, and what community groups are used. Ultimately, the type and level of interaction that is most effective at influencing must be determined. The suggested model in this study focused on interaction via Facebook. It is an independent practice created only through the network. This network is a way to raise and build social identity, and create online friendship. The researcher therefore believes that merging physical life behaviors with virtual life behaviors may cause a difficulties in the measurement requiring more actual behavioral determinants in the proposed model.

The current model focuses on measuring the interaction via Facebook by Jordanian users, and to bridge the shortage in existing studies that merge the use and interaction concepts. The mode was born from the Facebook womb, the researcher analyzed the interaction scientifically based on a number of previous studies. The researcher applied the proposed model on the most sensitive issues of Jordanians society. Electronic interaction is able to create an interactive environment based on fruitful dialogue, the exchange of valuable information, and the convergence of ideas between government and society. Studying the online interaction components is to predict behavioral patterns of users, to ensure human rights by giving them the ability to express their opinions, and the flexibility of electronic interaction as a means of social progress, in addition to building the personal identity and promoting a culture of meaningful and constructive dialogue among members of society. As a result, social cohesion can be strengthened, and trust in state institutions can be increased and community development can be achieved. From these implications, we looking for reducing the legal constraints on interactive dialogue, increasing the level of government transparency, and the planned openness to Facebook. It is a tools for social and political development in Jordan. Solving many national obstacles and problems require the real involved society. The corruption, poverty, unemployment, the absence of a national identity , and the weakness of citizenship are threats of political regime in Jordan.

References :

- Abrar , K. and Arif ,M., Sindhu M., and Hussain, A. (2017). Impact of Social Media Interaction and Social Media Usability on Brand Love and Brand Attachment with the moderating role of Gender. *Journal of Business and Tourism, Special Issue: ICCSS, Indonesia*.
- Ahmad, A. E. M. K. (2016). Social Media Usability and Its Impact on Buyer Purchasing Behavior Based on Buyer's Trust: Saudi Arabia Context. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 8(1), 87.
- Al-Badi, A. H., Okam, M. O., Al Roobaea, R., & Mayhew, P. J. (2013). Improving Usability of Social Networking Systems: a Case Study of LinkedIn. *Journal of Internet Social Networking & Virtual Communities*, 1.
- Aljufri, H. (2017, November 8). Digital Marketing Measurement.
- Baker, James R., and Moore, Susan M. (2008). Distress, Coping, and Blogging: Comparing New Myspace Users by Their Intention to Blog. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 11(1), 81-85.
- Baruah, T. (2012). Effectiveness of Social Media as a Tool of Communication and Its Potential for Technology Enabled Connections: A Micro-Level Study. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 2 (5).
- Berinato, S. (2010). Six Ways to Find Value in Twitter's Noise. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(6), 34-35.
- Bertot, J., Jaeger, P., and Grimes, J. (2010). Using ICTS to Create a Culture of Transparency: E-Government and Social Media as Openness and Anti-Corruption Tools for Societies. *Government Information Quarterly*, 27(3), 264-271 DOI:10.1016/j.giq.2010.03.001.

- Boyd, D. (2010) .Friendship In Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., Boyd, D., Cody, R., Herr-Stephenson, B., Horst, H.A. et al. (2010). Hanging Out, Messing Rround, and Geeking Out: Kids Living and Learning with New Media. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press.
- Brakus, J., Schmitt, B. and Zarantonello, L., (2009). Brand Experience: What is it? How is It Measured? Does it Affect Loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 52-68.
- Carrasco, J. A., Hogan, B., Wellman, B. & Miller, E. (2008). Agency in Social Activity Interactions: The Role of Social Networks in Time and Space. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*. 99, 562-583. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9663.2008.00492.x
- Chappuis, B., Gaffey, B., & Parvizi, P. (2011). Are Your Customers Becoming Digital Junkies. *McKinsey Quartely*.
- Chawinga, W. (2017). Taking Social Media to a University Classroom: Teaching and Learning Using Twitter, Blog. *International Journal of Education Technology in Higher Education*, 14(3), 1-19.
- Chen, L. Zhang, C., & Wilson, C. (2013). Tweeting Under Pressure: Analyzing Trending Topics and Evolving Word Choice on Sina Weibo. In Proceedings of the First ACM Conference on Online Social Networks, (pp.89–100), Boston, MA, October 7–8. New York, NY: ACM.
- Chen, Y.-S., Hung, S.-T., Wang, T.-Y., Huang, A.-F., and Liao, Y.-W. (2017).The Influence of Excessive Product Packaging on Green Brand Attachment: The Mediation Roles of Green Brand Attitude and Green Brand Image. *Sustainability*, 9(4), 654.
- Cheng, A., Evans, M., (2009). An In-Depth Look at the 5% of Most Active Users. Sysomos Research Library. August: <http://www.sysomos.com/insidetwitter/mostactiveusers>.
- Cheong, A. L. H. (2013). An Exploration of Antecedents and Consequences of Brand Attachment Among a Cross Section of Malaysian Consumers. *Asian Social Science*, 9(5), 263.
- Çolakarm H., and Aras, B. (2015). Role of Social Media.DOI: 10.15640/jlis.v3n2a5.
- Das, P., and Mandal, S. (2016). Evaluating the Influence of Social Media on Brand Sacralization: An Empirical Study among Young Online Consumers. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 5(3), 424-446.
- Décieux, J. P., Heinen, A. & Willems, H. (2016) .Youth in the municipality of Strassen. Developments, problems and perspectives[Die Jugend der Gemeinde Strassen. Entwicklungen, Probleme und Perspektiven]. Luxembourg: University of Luxembourg.
- Décieux , J., Heinenb, A., and Willems, H., (2018). Social media and its role in friendship-driven interactions among young people: A Mixed Methods Study. Heinen University of Luxembourg Maison des Sciences Humaines 11, Porte des Sciences. Luxembourg.
- Dennis, C., Papagiannidis, S., Alamanos, E., and Bourlakis, M. (2016). The Role of Brand Attachment Strength in Higher Education. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 3049-3057.
- Dholakia, R. R., and Acciardo, L. A. (2014). Branding a State University: Doing it Right. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 24(1), 144-163.
- Dichter, Ernest. (1966). How Word-of-Mouth Advertising Works. *Harvard Business Review* , 44(6), 147–166.
- Edosomwan, S., Prakasan, S., Kouame, D., Watson, J., and Seymour, T. (2011). The History of Social Media and Its Impact on Business. *The Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 16 (3).

- Fischer , E., and Reuber, R. (2011). Social Interaction Via New Social Media: (How) Can Interactions on Twitter Affect Effectual Thinking and Behavior? *Journal of Business Venturing* 26, 1–18.
- Fortezza, F. and Pencarelli, T. (2015). Potentialities of Web 2.0 and New Challenges for Destinations: Insights from Italy. *Anatolia*, 26(4), 563-573.
- Gale, S. (2013). Can Social Media Cross Borders for Global Brands? Find Out Here. *Retrieved on Apr, 3, 2015*
- Gary King, Jennifer Pan, and Margaret E. Roberts. (2017). [How the Chinese Government Fabricates Social Media Posts for Strategic Distraction, Not Engaged Argument](#). *American Political Science Review*, 111, 3, 484-501.
- Gjoka, M., Kurant, M., Butts, C., and Markopoulou, A. (2011). Practical Recommendations on Crawling Online Social Networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications* , 29(9), 1872 – 1892. DOI: 10.1109/JSAC.2011.111011.
- Go, E., You, K.H., (2016). But Not All Social Media are the Same: Analyzing Organizations’ Social Media Usage Patterns. *Telematics and Informatics*, 33, 176–186.
- Godey, B., Manthiou, A., Pederzoli, D., Rokka, J., Aiello, G., Donvito, R., and Singh, R. (2016). Social Media Marketing Efforts of Luxury Brands: Influence on Brand Equity and Consumer Behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5833–5841. Doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.181.
- Hajli, M. N. (2014). A Study of the Impact of Social Media on Consumers. *International Journal of Market Research*, 56(3), 387-404.
- Handyside, S. and Ringrose, J. (2017). Snapchat Memory and Youth Digital Sexual Cultures: Mediated Temporality, Duration and Affect. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 26(3), 347-360. Doi: 10.1080/09589236.2017.1280384.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., and Björn Bloching , C. (2013). Marketing the Pinball Way: Understanding How Social Media Change the Generation of Value for Consumers and Companies. *Journal of Interactive Marketing* ,27(4), 237–241. DOI: 10.1016/j.intmar.2013.09.005.
- Hudson, S., Huang, L., Roth, M. S., & Madden, T. J. (2016). The Influence of Social Media Interactions on Consumer–Brand Relationships: A Three-Country Study of Brand Perceptions and Marketing Behaviors. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 33(1), 27-41.
- Hudson, S., Roth, M. S., Madden, T. J., and Hudson, R. (2015). The Effects of Social Media on Emotions, Brand Relationship Quality, and Word of Mouth: An Empirical Study of Music Festival Attendees. *Tourism Management*, 47, (C), 68-76.
- Ismail, A. R. (2017). The Influence of Perceived Social Media Marketing Activities on Brand Loyalty. The Mediation Effect of Brand and Value Consciousness. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 29(1).
- Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., Boyd, D., Cody, R., Herr-Stephenson, B., Horst, H.A. et al., (2010). Hanging Out, Messing Around, and Geeking Out: Kids Living and Learning with New Media. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press. Available from: https://dmlcentral.net/wp-content/uploads/files/Hanging_Out.pdf.
- Kaplan, A.M., Haenlein, M., (2010). Users of the World, Unite! The Challenges and Opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons* , 53, 59–68.
- Labricque, L., (2014). Fostering Consumer–Brand Relationships in Social Media Environments: The Role of Parasocial Interaction. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28(2). DOI:10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.003.

- Laksamana,P. (2018).Impact of Social Media Marketing on Purchase Intention and Brand Loyalty: Evidence from Indonesia’s Banking Industry. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 8 (1), 13-18.
- Laroche, M., Habibi, M. R., and Richard, M.-O. (2013). To be or Not to be in Social Media: How Brand Loyalty is Affected by Social Media? *International Journal of Information Management*, 33(1), 76-82.
- Lee, C. -P., Chang, C., & Stokes Berry, F. (2011). Testing the Development and Diffusion of e-Government and e-Democracy: A Global Perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 444–545.
- Lee, C., Chang, K., and Berry, F. (2011). Testing the Development and Diffusion of E-Government and E-Democracy: A Global Perspective.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02228.x.
- Liao, F., Yang, L., Wang, M., Drown, D., and Shi, J. (2012). Team–Member Exchange and Work Engagement: Does Personality Make a Difference? *Journal of Bus Psychol*, DOI 10.1007/s10869-012-9266-5.
- Lieberman , A., and Schroeder , J. (2020). Two Social Lives: How Differences Between Online and Offline Interaction Influence Social Outcomes. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 31, 16–21.
- Lupton, D. (2014). Feeling Better Connected: Academics’ Use of Social Media. Canberra: News and Media Research Centre, University of Canberra.
- Medaglia, R. aand Zheng, L. (2017). Extending Impact Analysis in Government Social Media Research: Five Illustrative Cases. 18th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research. Staten Island, NY, 7-9 June.
- Mergel , I. (2013). A Framework for Interpreting Social Media Interactions in the Public Sector, *Government Information Quarterly* , 30 (4). <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.015>
- Mesch, G. (2006). Family Relations and the Internet: Exploring a Family Boundaries Approach.*Journal of Family Communication*, 6(2), 119-138 . DOI:10.1207/s15327698jfc0602_2.
- Mitchell, V., Petrovici, D., Schlegelmilch, B. B., and Szöcs, I. (2015). The Influence of Parents Versus Peers on Generation Y Internet Ethical Attitudes. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 14(2), 95-103.
- Nchabeleng , N., Boath C., and Bisschoff, C. (2018). The Use of Social Media in Public Relations at Non-Governmental Organisations in South Africa.DOI: 10.22610/jeb.v10i6(J).2605.
- Nduhura, D., Prieler, M., (2017). When I Chat Online, I feel Relaxed and Work Better: Exploring the Use of Social Media in the Public Sector Workplace in Rwanda. *Telecommunications Policy* , 41, 708–716.
- Neff, J. (2014). Digital Is Selling More Soap That It Gets Credit For: Nielsen study. *Advertising Age, February 20, 1, 2*.
- Ngai, E. W., Tao, S. S., & Moon, K. K. (2015). Social Media Research: Theories, Constructs, and Conceptual Frameworks. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(1), 33-44.
- Ngai, E. W., Tao, S. S., and Moon, K. K. (November ,2015). Social Media Research: Theories, Constructs, and Conceptual Frameworks. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(1), 33-44.
- Öztürk, L. (2019). Functions and Role of Social Media Networks in Learning a Foreign Language: A Case Study.*International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 6 (6), 66-69. DOI: 10.21833/ijaas.2019.06.010

- Pratama,D., Nirwanto N, and Firdiansjah, A. (2019) The Influence of Social Media Marketing to Visit Intention through Brand Equity in Jatim Park 3. *International ResearchJournal of Advanced Engineering and Science*, 4 (3), 470-474.
- Ribeiro, B. (2010). Modeling and Predicting the Growth and Death of Membership-Based Websites.doi.org/10.1145/2566486.2567984.
- Roberts, D. F. and Foehr U.G. (2008) .Trends in Media Use. *The Future of Children*, 18(1), 11-38. Doi: 10.1353/foc.0.0000.
- Saboo, A. R., Kumar, V., and Ramani, G. (2016). Evaluating the Impact of Social Media Activities on Human Brand Sales. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 33(3), 524-541.
- Sarasvathy, S., Dew, N., (2005). New market Creation as Transformation. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* , 15 (5), 533–565.
- Schmitt, B., Zarantonello, L., and Brakus , J. (2009). Brand Experience: What Is It? How Is It Measured? Does It Affect Loyalty?Journal of Marketing 73(3).DOI: 10.1509/jmkg.73.3.52
- Sharma, S. and Verma, H. V. (2018). Social Media Marketing: Evolution and Change. S. G. Heggde G. İçinde, *Social Media Marketing* (s. 19-36). Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Siddiqui , S., and Singh, T. (2016). Social Media its Impact with Positive and Negative Aspects. *International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research*, 5(2), 71 – 75.
- Siddiqui, S., and Singh,T.(2016). Social Media its Impact with Positive and Negative Aspects.*International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research*, 5(2), 71 – 75.
- Skoog, M., & Söderström, M. (2015). Antecedents and Outcomes of Brand Love: A Qualitative Study Within the Swedish clothing industry.
- Snead, J. (2013). Social Media Use in the U.S. Executive Branch. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(1), 56–63.
- Stresewski, J. A. (2016). This is for the Lovers: Motivations and Self-Congruity as Antecedents of Anthropomorphism and Brand Love.University of Twente.
- Tillery, R., Cohen, R., Parra, G. R., Kitzmann, K. M. & Howard Sharp, K. M. (2015). Friendship and the Socialization of Sadness. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 61(4), 486-508.
- Tillery, R., Cohen, R., Parra, G., Kitzmann, K., and Howard Sharp, K. (2015). Friendship and the Socialization of Sadness. *Merrill –Palmer Quarterly*, 61 (4), 486- 508.
- Traphagen, M. (2015). Why Engagement DOES Matter As a Social Media Metric [online] Marketing Land.
- Wang , J., Jackson , L., Gaskin , J., and Wang , H. (2015). The Effects of Social Networking Site (SNS) Use on College Students' Friendship and Well-Being.*Computers in Human Behavior* , 37, 229–236 . DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2014.04.051.
- Wang, X. S., Bendle, N. T., Mai, F., and Cotte, J. (2015). The Journal of Consumer Research at 40: A Historical Analysis. *Journal of consumer research*, 42(1), 5-18.
- Westlund, O. and Bjur, J. (2014). Media Life of the Young. *Young*, 22(1), 21-41. doi:10.1177/1103308813512934.
- WWW.DataReporta.com. Annual Data , 2020.
- Y. Kelly, A. Zilanawala, C. Booker, et al., (2018). Social Media Use and Adolescent Mental Health: Findings from the UK Millennium Cohort Study, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm>.
- Zeng , B., and Gerritsen, R. (2014). What Do We Know about Social Media in Tourism? A *ReviewTourism Management Perspectives*,10, 27–36.DOI: 10.1016/j.tmp.2014.01.001.