UNDERSTANDING THE FACE IN FACEBOOK: IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT AND SELF-MONITORING BEHAVIORS ON FACEBOOK.COM

Alexandra Hutchinson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements of the degree for
Master of Arts

Department of Communication and Dramatic Arts

Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, Michigan
December 2012

Accepted by the Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies,

Central Michigan University, in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the master's degree

Thesis Committee:

Lesley Withers, Ph.D.	Committee Chair
Edward Hinck, Ph.D.	Faculty Member
Shelly Hinck, Ph.D.	Faculty Member
December 19, 2012	Date of Defense
Roger Coles, Ed.D.	Dean College of Graduate Studies
April 11, 2013	Approved by the College of Graduate Studies

This is dedicated to my amazing grandparents,

both far and near,

who have forever been my biggest cheerleaders.

Without them, I would never have had the strength to make it this far.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been a learning experience. It has been one of the most trying experiences in my life, but it has also been one of the most rewarding. This task certainly would have not been possible without some key players. First of all, Dr. Lesley Withers, my committee chair, thank you so much for endless emails back and forth with edits and many, many questions. This certainly would not have been at all possible without you and your constant confidence in me. Secondly, it is necessary for me to thank my committee members who have been continual academic guideposts for me. Thank you, Dr. Edward Hinck for constantly helping to convince me that I could do this. And, thank you, Dr. Shelly Hinck for helping me organize and navigate my ideas along the way.

I would also like to thank my incredible parents, Tom and Loree Hutchinson, for putting up with many complaints along the way and for always making me feel like I am able to do anything I put my mind to. There is no way I could accomplish nearly as much without your unending love and support. Of course, Dustin Briggs deserves a special mention for his unwavering support and sense of humor throughout my work on this project. Finally, I would like to thank my friends and colleagues for their encouragement along the way.

ABSTRACT

UNDERSTANDING THE FACE IN FACEBOOK:
IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT AND SELF-MONITORING BEHAVIORS ON FACEBOOK.COM

by Alexandra Hutchinson

Social networking sites like Facebook.com have become prevalent in people's lives. However, there is still little known about how individuals manage their identities on Facebook, particularly when they are creating a profile that is being viewed by many different audiences. The purpose of this study is to examine the ways in which individuals monitor their own behavior and manage impressions of themselves in online SNS environments, particularly in their use of Facebook. This study was guided by the following hypotheses and research question: (a) there is a positive relationship between CMC self-monitoring and impression management strategy use on Facebook (b) does an individual's number of Facebook friends affect his/her use of impression management strategies? and (c) whether a greater variety of types of Facebook friends (audiences) has an effect on individuals' use of Facebook impression management strategies.

Using quantitative methods, online surveys were completed by participants recruited through classes at a large Midwestern university and through group invitations on Facebook. There were 186 participants who completed the study; participants had a mean age of 28 years. Online self-monitoring and impression management were not found to have a significant relationship (r (186) = -.01, p = .428). Use of impression management strategies was positively related to number of Facebook friends (r (185) = .143, p = .026) and Facebook audiences (r (185) = .231, p = .001).

This study provides insight into self-monitoring in a computer-mediated environment and suggests that the concept needs further study to understand whether it is consistent in both face-to-face and computer-mediated environments. Additionally, this study provides insight into how and when Facebook users use impression management strategies. There is also an indication of which strategies are used most frequently to manage impressions in Facebook use.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Online communication has permeated the lives of nearly everyone in America. Posts from sites like Facebook have become an everyday part of television news reporting; CNN.com and other news websites are filled with stories about and from social networking sites. There are stories about what celebrities posted on Twitter, incidents of people being fired from their jobs over their Facebook posts ("Chili's server fired," 2012; Gross, 2012; Wilson, 2012), and stories about whether Facebook use makes people sad or anxious (Donnelly, 2012). “The Social Network,” the film telling the story of the creation of Facebook and creator Mark Zuckerberg, topped box offices across the country (“The social network,” 2010) and social media and user-generated online content are as popular in many people’s lives as their cellular phones.

The types of impressions individuals create online have become increasingly important in recent years. On social networking sites, such as Facebook and Twitter, individuals create multi-dimensional impressions of themselves without being constrained by time. They use various intrapersonal and self-presentation strategies – such as self-monitoring and impression management – to influence others’ perceptions. Impression management is the process used by individuals to convince others that they are a particular type of person or have a particular set of characteristics (Leary, 1996). Self-monitoring is the process in which individuals regulate their behavior to feature traits that are desirable and perceived favorably by others or hide traits that are seen as less desirable (Snyder, 1974). In order to understand the interpersonal implications of social networking, it is necessary to understand how impression management and self-monitoring function in online social networking environments.

Impression management and self-monitoring are well-studied and understood in face-to-face interpersonal contexts (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Schlenker, 1980; 2003; Snyder, 1974); however, self-monitoring and impression management have not been studied as thoroughly in the context of computer-mediated communication (CMC). CMC presents a unique environment. Without the physical presence of another person and the pressure of synchronous (real-time) communication, individuals can take time to more carefully plan their asynchronous online communication (Walther, 1996). Additionally, the absence of many traditional nonverbal communication cues prompts individuals to develop ways to overcome that absence, communicating differently online than they would face-to-face (Walther, 1992).

To better understand the potential influence of the CMC context, online impression management and self-monitoring should be studied, and communication is a discipline well-suited to research social networking. Social networking sites (SNS) are an understudied area in the communication discipline. Communication scholars study messages and behaviors in interpersonal exchanges; these are elements that are also present in social networking. In general, individuals adapt their behavior to different people and groups of people (Goffman, 1959); it is essential to understand if and how that adaptation differs in a computer-mediated environment.

In addition, computer-mediated communication is an integral part of interpersonal relationships; studying CMC is imperative for any researcher who is interested in the dynamics of modern interpersonal relations. Facebook is a key venue for interpersonal communication to occur. According to Craig and Wright (2012), individuals spend a great amount of time both developing and maintaining relationships on Facebook and other social networking sites. Facebook users typically have more social ties than non-Facebook users (Hampton, Goulet,

Rainie, & Purcell, 2011), so the ways in which people behave and manage their relationships on Facebook should be studied.

According to Facebook.com, Facebook has more than 900 million active users, and more than 50 percent of those users log in on any particular day. That means that every day more than 450 million people access their Facebook profiles to keep in contact with their friends, classmates, family members, co-workers, and acquaintances. Users have an average of 130 friends ("Facebook key facts," 2012). "More than 1 in 4 people who browse the internet not only have a Facebook account but have returned to the site within the past 30 days" (Fletcher, 2010, p. 22).

Facebook began in early 2004 as a Harvard-only SNS (Cassidy, 2006). To join, a user had to have a harvard.edu email address. This exclusivity was one of the primary features that attracted college students to the site. "As Facebook began supporting other schools, those users were also required to have email addresses associated with those institutions, a requirement that kept the site relatively closed and contributed to users' perceptions of the site as an intimate, private community" (Boyd & Ellison, 2007, p. 8). In 2005, Facebook opened access to high school students and in 2006, opened the site to the general public and introduced communities for commercial organizations (Cassidy, 2006). By 2007, Facebook was reported to have more than 21 million registered members generating 1.6 billion page views a day (Ellison, Steinfeld, & Lampe, 2007).

Facebook is not just a website anymore; it has become an institution: the social network. A survey of 250 college students found that, for many, Facebook and Twitter are more addictive than tobacco or alcohol ("Facebook and Twitter," 2012). Facebook is where many people go to share online. Individuals can post their interests, photographs, videos, and comments in order to

create a desired image of themselves. Individuals can, to a certain extent, control the image that they portray to their Facebook audience. There are many users now on Facebook, and users often share with their audiences multiple times a day. Users' audiences can range from close friends to colleagues to family to strangers, and with each post, users choose how and whether to portray themselves to each or all of their Facebook audiences. Do individuals adapt their self-presentations to their different Facebook audiences?

The purpose of this study is to examine the ways in which individuals monitor their own behavior and manage impressions of themselves in online SNS environments, particularly in their use of Facebook. In an effort to understand major aspects of self-monitoring, impression management, and computer-mediated communication, this literature review (a) looks at Face Theory as it relates to impression management and self-monitoring, (b) examines theories about computer-mediated communication and social networking, (c) reviews studies about social networking sites and Facebook, and (d) explores the relationship between self-monitoring, impression management, and Facebook. To better understand self-monitoring and impression management on Facebook.com, this review of literature is guided by the following hypotheses and research question: (a) there is a positive relationship between CMC self-monitoring and impression management strategy use on Facebook (b) does an individual's number of Facebook friends affect his/her use of impression management strategies? and (c) whether a greater variety of types of Facebook friends (audiences) has an effect on individuals' use of Facebook impression management strategies.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Face Theory

Goffman (1959) studied human interaction as the primary way in which individuals present themselves to others. His research suggests that people use strategic action to maintain a desired image of themselves; individuals often want to maintain previously established positive impressions of themselves. Goffman (1967) also suggested that individuals constantly work to preserve their face, or their desirable personal image, in social interactions with others. Similarly, when an individual is around other people, those other people seek information about the individual. They often want to learn about his or her likes or dislikes, income, character, and more. He or she may wish to be liked or to be perceived as honest by others; whatever the desired impression, individuals attempt to control their own behavior to affect other people's perceptions.

Goffman suggested that people, on both sides of an interaction, act in ways to maintain their own and others' public images. If face is not maintained, there are often negative consequences, such as embarrassment or loss of credibility (Goffman, 1967). Goffman developed a dramaturgic metaphor in order to help understand individuals' presentation of their public self. He compared face-to-face interaction to actors performing on stage in front of an audience. Each "performance" consists of a front stage, backstage, setting, and appearance. The front stage is the part of life an individual intends for others to see. This stage consists of the social interactions planned by an individual. The backstage is the part of someone's self that he or she does not intend to share with others. In this space, he or she prepares for social interaction. The setting consists of the interaction's location, recent events, and the props. The appearance

involves the way the person dresses, his or her mannerisms, and the type of people or things that surround the person (Goffman, 1959).

From the dramaturgical perspective, a person attempts to maintain a "line" of verbal and nonverbal acts appropriate for a particular situation. The actor is fulfilling a certain role. In order for any actor to be successful, there must be a consensus between the actor and the audience of what the line of appropriateness is. If either party does not act in a way appropriate for the interaction, it becomes more difficult for the interactants to maintain their desired face. Successful impression management also requires face-saving skills, an awareness of the possible interpretations of certain acts, a desire to maintain social approval, and a willingness to engage in face-saving tactics (Goffman, 1959).

Building upon the dramaturgical perspective, Face Theory was developed. Face is the positive social value that an individual claims for him/herself; face changes depending on the type of social interaction and audience. The management of face is dependent on audience factors. Factors can include things like the relationship with the audience members, the sex of the audience members, and the age of the audience members. The intersection of multiple audiences can cause difficulties because action is no longer clearly situated. The lack of a clear audience situation complicates audience management (Goffman, 1959). Individuals attempt to adapt to maintain their face in all social interactions for all audiences (Goffman, 1967).

Brown and Levinson (1987) suggested two dimensions of face: positive face and negative face. Positive face is the want of an individual to be seen as desirable by others. An individual may want to be seen as good or honest by others. Negative face is the want of any individual to be able to take action without being impeded by others. Positive face goals require individuals to engage with others to make social connections; negative face concerns cause individuals to

exercise restraint in expressing feelings to maintain boundaries and display independence. All interactions have both negative and positive face concerns at play (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It is important to understand how individuals manage these face concerns in interactions.

Impression Management

Impression management is the process individuals use to attempt to influence the perceptions others have of them (Rosenfeld, Giacalone, & Riordan, 1995). Goffman (1959) suggested that people use communication to intentionally impress certain images of themselves upon others. In other words, through communication, people employ impression management strategies to establish and maintain face. The communication used to form an impression can occur verbally or nonverbally. Impressions can be formed verbally by what a person says or nonverbally by how person looks or behaves. An audience can look to nonverbal cues, such as physical appearance or the types of people with whom he or she associates, to help verify the accuracy of the verbal message. An individual may only be aware of what he or she verbalizes, but an observer is often aware of many cues at once. The observer may choose to believe the impression that an individual tries to communicate or may be skeptical about it.

For the actor, influenced by the environment and target audience, an interaction is a performance. The objective of the performance is to provide the audience with an impression consistent with the actor's desired goals. In addition to these goals, individuals differ in their responses from the interactional environment; some may be unresponsive to audience's reactions, while others actively adapt to these audience reactions to elicit positive results (Schlenker, 1980).

There are generally two instrumental goals in impression management. First, individuals want to be able to influence others (Schlenker, 1980). Individuals engage in impression management strategies and behaviors to exert interpersonal influence and to obtain desired

outcomes, like forming friendships and obtaining jobs (Leary, 1996). Second, individuals want to express themselves and be unique individuals (Schlenker, 1980). Individuals often care greatly about the opinions others have of them. Impression management successes and failures impact an individual's self-esteem. Individuals tend to feel good when they successfully manage their impression (Leary, 1996).

Individuals also engage in particular impression management strategies in order to create and maintain their desired impressions as unique individuals. One strategy is self-description. Self-description occurs when an individual attempts to convince his or her audience to form a certain impression of him or her by behaving a certain way and telling others certain information about him or herself (Leary, 1996). When engaging in self-descriptive behaviors, individuals tend to stress certain information and leave other information out entirely (Goffman, 1959). Typically, people attempt to omit unflattering information and present selectively the factual information about themselves (Leary, 1996). Individuals try to enhance themselves in the public eye in order to achieve social or material outcomes (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). To that end, individuals sometimes present information that contradicts their self-perception as long as the information does not contradict the information available to a particular audience (Schlenker, 1975). For example, an individual may say that he or she likes a movie that he or she actually dislikes to fit in with a group of people as long as that group does not have any way of disproving that information.

Another reason why individuals engage in impression management strategies is because those strategies are ingrained into natural behavior. Individuals learn from a young age that others' impressions of them have an effect on their happiness and well-being (Leary, 1996). As a result, the likelihood of others to be aware of one's actions creates increased motivation to

monitor impressions (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). The publicity of a behavior is an important factor in impression management. For example, men express more feminist views when they expect them to be shared publicly than when they do not expect them to be shared (Rosell & Hartman, 2001).

Although the intended outcome of impression management is to be viewed a certain way in others' minds, there are also risks to engaging in impression management. For each desired image that an individual attempts to create, there is also an undesired image risked (Turnley & Bolino, 2001). For example, if a person advertises his or her accomplishments, he or she could be perceived as competent; however, he or she could also appear to be bragging. Impression management research suggests that people or organizations must establish and maintain impressions that are congruent with the perceptions they want to convey to the public or they risk being perceived as insincere (Turnley & Bolino, 2001).

In addition to the interpersonal or relational context, impression management has been studied frequently in organizational contexts (Rosenfeld, Giacalone, & Riordan, 1995; Turnley & Bolino, 2001). In particular, researchers have explored impression management in relation to interviewing and leadership qualities. Jones and Pittman (1982) identified five impression management tactics which individuals are likely to employ in organizational settings: (1) ingratiation, which occurs when individuals use flattery or favors to be seen as likeable; (2) self-promotion, which is when individuals adapt their behavior to different people; (3) exemplification, when individuals go above and beyond the call of duty to appear dedicated; (4) supplication, when individuals advertise the areas in which they lack to be viewed as needy or in need of pity; and (5) intimidation, when individuals appear threatening to have others view them as dangerous.

A decisive factor in the use of impression management strategies is self-monitoring. Individuals who have learned that certain social behaviors are inappropriate in certain situations are likely to engage in self-monitoring to manage the impression they convey to others. That is, individuals attempt to control their expressive behavior to fit different social situations (Snyder, 1974).

Self-Monitoring

Self-monitoring is a concept that helps explain individuals' use of expressive controls. Expressive control refers to a person's ability to stay in character and send out the correct signals for a social interaction (Snyder, 1974). People who have the ability to and, in fact, do closely monitor themselves are categorized as high self-monitors and often behave in a manner that is highly responsive to social cues and their situational context.

According to Snyder (1974), high self-monitoring individuals are typically more concerned about behaving in a socially appropriate manner, more sensitive to the expression and self-presentation of others in social situations, and more skillful in using these and other situational cues than their low self-monitor counterparts. High self-monitors are often especially concerned with the social and situational appropriateness of their behaviors, and they engage in social comparison more frequently than low self-monitors (Snyder, 1987). High self-monitors also tend to change their behaviors from social context to social context in order to maximize their chance of success with each audience (Hutchinson & Skinner, 2007).

Conversely, low self-monitors typically do not participate in expressive control and do not share the same concern for situational appropriateness. They are often either unwilling or unable to adjust their impression for the sake of public appearance. Low self-monitors tend to express emotions or feelings closer to their internal states, beliefs, attitudes, and opinions,

without as much regard for social circumstances. Low self-monitors are often less observant of social context and consider expressing emotions or feelings that are different from their internal states as a falsehood and undesirable to their goals. Those individuals also have a greater consistency between their actual feelings and their behaviors across audiences (Gangstead & Snyder, 2000).

Larkin and Pines (1994) explored the characteristics of high and low self-monitors in a two-part study. In the first part of their study, Larkin and Pines showed participants slides of an individual who did or did not fit the stereotypes for a particular occupation. In this study, high self-monitors reacted more negatively when the slide's image did not seem to match the occupational stereotype they expected; the researchers suggested that participants may have felt confused, with unclear cues for expected behavior. In the second part of their study, Larkin and Pines had the participants give the "right" answers on an occupational personality test that either fit or did not fit their personalities. In this part of the study, low self-monitors reacted more negatively to jobs that did not fit their personalities; for example, if a creative person worked in a highly professional and conservative environment, low self-monitors tended to react negatively. However, high self-monitors reacted less negatively to jobs that did not fit the subjects' personalities. These results are consistent with the idea that low self-monitors want to accurately portray their identities; they reacted more negatively because of their desire to accurately portray themselves.

Snyder (1974) suggested the goals of self-monitoring are to (1) accurately communicate the way an individual feels with an intensified emotional expression, (2) communicate an arbitrary emotional state that might not coordinate with actual emotional experience, (3) conceal an inappropriate emotional state and appear emotionless, (4) conceal an inappropriate emotional

state and display an appropriate one, and (5) appear to experience an emotion if one actually experiences nothing and a nonresponse is socially inappropriate.

Self-monitoring has been studied in various ways; in 1977, Ickles and Barnes found that high self-monitors were more likely to initiate conversation than low self-monitors. Gudykunst and colleagues (1989) found that those from individualistic countries, like the United States, to be higher self-monitors than individuals from collectivistic countries, like Japan. Self-monitoring has also been studied in connection with impression management (Turnley & Bolino, 2001) and emotional expression (Friedman & Miller-Herringer, 1991).

Snyder (1974) developed a survey measure of self-monitoring that assessed five components of the concept: (1) concern for social appropriateness of behavior, (2) attention to social comparison information, 3) ability to control or change one's self-presentation, (4) use of that ability in certain situations, and (5) cross-situational variability of social behavior. Concern for social appropriateness of behavior refers to whether people do things that they think others will like. The attention to social comparison information assesses whether individuals look at the way other people are behaving in situations where they do not know how to act. Ability to control or change one's self-presentation measures whether individuals can act like they are telling the truth when they lie. The use of that ability in certain situations examines whether individuals can choose appropriate times and effectively exercise that ability. Finally, cross-situational variability of social behavior explores whether individuals act like different people when they are around different groups of people.

However, scale development and testing revealed that the measure only accurately assessed three components: acting ability, extraversion, and other directedness (Lennox, 1982). Lennox and Wolfe (1984) determined that Snyder's original self-monitoring scale was

measuring more variables than necessary; they focused on assessing "Ability to Modify Self-Presentation" and "Sensitivity to Expressive Behavior of Others" in their research, which offered a revision of Snyder's (1974) original measure.

Both the Snyder (1974) and Lennox and Wolfe (1984) scales were developed and adapted for face-to-face communication. Although some studies have attempted to use them for online contexts, neither measure has been revised or modified to integrate aspects of computer-mediated communication into the measure itself. The unique characteristics of self-presentation in computer-mediated environments create the need for a scale specific to self-monitoring online.

Computer-Mediated Communication

Computer-mediated communication (CMC) is communication that takes place over computer-related technologies; it is defined as "synchronous or asynchronous electronic mail and computer conferencing, by which senders encode in text messages that are relayed from senders' computers to receivers" (Walther, 1992, p. 52). In addition to those message exchanges, CMC can also describe web-browsing (Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000). CMC offers many avenues for studying interpersonal communication and concepts, as CMC relationships range from formal to informal or from casual to intimate.

There are important differences between CMC and face-to-face (FtF) communication. Many communication cues that assist people in making first impressions in FtF communication do not exist in CMC. Telling physical features such as physical build, posture, gesture, facial expression, and voice are not available in some forms of CMC. Many perspectives on CMC suggest that the reduction in nonverbal cues reduce individuals' abilities to form and manage impressions of each other (Sproull & Kiesler, 1986); however, Walther's (1992, 1993, 2007) perspective is that impressions and relationships develop anyway through the adaptation of

language to carry context cues. There are various, sometimes conflicting, theories about how interpersonal CMC occurs.

Much founding CMC research focused on the "cues-filtered-out" approach. The assumption of studies employing a cues filtered out approach is that CMC lacks many of the social context cues available in FtF communication (Culnan & Markus, 1987). Some research indicates that limited nonverbal cues impact the quality of CMC (Sproull & Kiesler, 1986), such that it was assumed that individuals cannot achieve the level of interpersonal closeness in CMC that they do in FtF communication. The two main theories that adopt this approach are media richness and social presence. Media richness theory posits that individuals choose communication channels based on the intrinsic properties of the media (Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000). The more ambiguous a message is to the receiver, the more rich a medium needed to communicate it (Rice, 1993). The richest medium would be face-to-face interaction, while an interoffice memo would be far less rich. The assumption is that many forms of CMC have different intrinsic properties, thus less richness, than other modes of communication. Social presence builds upon media richness, but focuses more on the connectedness of the people than on the richness of the medium. Social presence is the "feeling that other actors are jointly involved in communicative interaction" (Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976, p. 65). From this perspective, the reduced nonverbal cues of most forms of CMC would suggest there is less social presence in CMC than in other media.

Many theorists have used cues-filtered out theories to support the claim that CMC is an inferior method of communication. Several studies have indicated that CMC is more effective for task-oriented communication and less personal than FtF communication (Rice, 1984; Rice & Love, 1987). CMC also includes many more instances of profanity usage than FtF

communication. For these reasons, some researchers consider CMC to be depersonalized (Rice, 1984, 1993). "CMC, because of its lack of audio or video cues, will be perceived as impersonal and lacking in normative reinforcement, so there will be less socioemotional content exchanged" (Rice & Love, 1987, p. 88). However, the lack of consistent outcomes to support the cues-filtered-out CMC theories led to the development of alternative theories.

Social Information Processing Theory

Walther (1992) argues that CMC can be a personal form of communication. As CMC develops over time, individuals adapt their language and text strategies to enhance immediacy and manage CMC relationships. In Social Information Processing Theory (SIP), Walther suggests that people decode textual cues as a substitute to nonverbal cues. SIP predicts that individuals get to know each other online, but more slowly than in FtF communication (Walther, 1992). Therefore, SIP posits that CMC users should be able to develop personal, rewarding, and complex relationships over time.

Previous CMC theorists suggest that the reduced nonverbal cues in CMC can cause users to lose interest in each other as individuals and prevents individuals from expressing emotional and relational messages. However, SIP presumes that individuals are motivated to form friendships and relationships no matter what medium of communication they use. If nonverbal cues are not available, as in email or instant messaging, language and writing cues are adapted to compensate for the reduced nonverbal cues (Walther, 1996).

Walther and Burgoon (1992) found that, over time, both CMC and FtF situations had similar affiliative levels of relational communication. Additionally, they found that CMC groups were actually more socially oriented than FtF groups. Through his studies, Walther (1995) concludes that mediated interaction is rarely impersonal, CMC is interpersonal when users take

the time and interest to interact on a relational level, and CMC is hyperpersonal when users can manage relationships and impressions in more effective ways than with face-to-face communication or other channels.

The Hyperpersonal Model

The hyperpersonal model suggests that nonverbal factors are compensated for by the willingness of CMC participants to get to know one another using the channels that are available to them like when messages are sent or tones of messages. "CMC users selectively self-present, revealing attitudes and aspects of self in a controlled and socially desirable fashion" (Walther, 2007, p. 2539). Users can continually edit their personal information when using CMC. Some people choose to explore certain sides of their personalities or even to invent a virtual personality different from their "real life" personality. An individual can use CMC to reinvent him or herself online.

Walther (2006) described the processes that aid self-presentation online: (1) CMC allows users to reflect on what they have written, as users can change what they write before, and sometimes after, submitting messages; (2) the user has nearly unlimited time to construct and refine a message before sending it; (3) involuntary cues of the interactants are masked because the sender is in physical isolation from the receiver; and (4) the user reallocates cognitive resources from environmental scanning and nonverbal management toward message composition. According to the hyperpersonal perspective, if these processes are used, impressions can be monitored and relationship quality can exceed the level of those achieved in FtF relationships.

Social Identity Model of Deindividuation Effects

In contrast to Walther, Lea and Spears (1992) argue that the increase in time to decide what information to share leads to a process of overattribution and increased stereotyping online. From this perspective, there is an overdependence on the information that is shared in entirely CMC-based relationships that can lead to individuals being deindividuated. According to the Social Identity Model of Deindividuation Effects (SIDE), the anonymity of CMC interaction can cause a state of reduced awareness and a loss of self. This deindividuation can come from a lack of social contextual cues that can reduce levels of self-regulation (Sassenberg & Boos, 2003).

Consistent with SIDE, individuals are able to continually confront their self-presentation choices when they look at a chat conversation or the information displayed on their social networking profiles. This awareness can increase the self-consciousness of CMC users (Spears & Lea, 1994). The increased self-consciousness can lead to increases in user self-censorship and monitoring of the impression created. CMC is used and interpreted differently by each user, but it has an impact on the user's identity (Leonard, Withers, & Sherblom, 2010). This potential for increased self-consciousness leaves many options for the study of impression management in the context of social media. For the purpose of this study, both SIP and the SIDE model are of importance. SIP is important to consider because individuals are cognizant of the idea that others make judgments of them based on things posted on Facebook. Additionally, the SIDE model has merit because users constantly confront their self-presentation choices when choosing what to include and not include on their Facebook profiles.

Social Media

Social media sites have become a prominent part of the Internet and computer-mediated communication. In order to understand social media as a concept, one must understand Web 2.0

and User Generated Content (UGC). Applications such as personal web pages, Encyclopedia Britannica Online, and content publishing began in the era of Web 1.0; they were replaced by blogs, wikis, and collaborative projects in Web 2.0. Although Web 2.0 does not refer to any specific technical update to any particular aspect or part of the World Wide Web, there is a set of basic functionalities, such as Adobe Flash and Java Script, that are necessary for its function. The term "social media" achieved broad popularity in 2005 and is usually applied to describe the various forms of media content that are publicly available and created largely by end-users (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). User Generated Content (UGC) can be seen as the sum of all ways in which people make use of social media.

According to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2007), online content needs to fulfill three basic requirements in order to be considered UGC: (1) it needs to be published either on a publicly accessible website or on a social networking site accessible to a selected group of people; (2) it needs to show a certain amount of creative effort; and (3) it needs to have been created outside of professional routines and practices. Social media refers to Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0 and that allow the creation and exchange of UGC (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010).

Social media sites are web-based interactive sites where users create personal profiles with information about themselves and their interests. Users interact with other members in the system, sharing information with friends, family, and others. Social networking sites are a specific type of social media. On these websites, users display information about themselves and keep in contact with friends, acquaintances, family members, coworkers, and businesses and organizations. They offer a variety of both static and changing features on one's "profile," where

one can share personal information, and where others can share information about the individual (OECD, 2007).

New types of technology can bring up new issues and provide new ways to communicate and develop impressions of one another (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Facebook's popularity makes it a special case within the realm of social networking. Facebook is the most frequently used SNS in the world ("Google and Facebook," 2011).

Facebook. Many studies have explored Facebook as a communication tool. Uses and gratifications research (Urista, Dong, & Day, 2008; Quan-Haase, & Young, 2010), an approach that suggests users choose media that meets their needs and benefits them, has shown individuals' main uses for Facebook: users learn about and keep up with friends and share information with many others in a single post. Facebook can also be used to acquire information about others, such as their relationship status, where they live, or what type of music they like. Individuals also use Facebook to gauge their depth of intimacy with others. If one posts something and another person comments on it, it shows that the person pays attention to the other's life (Urista, Dong, & Day, 2008). Sheldon (2008) found that Facebook is used primarily to continue and maintain already existing interpersonal relationships.

Facebook was originally designed as a SNS for college students, but it is now open to anyone over the age of 13 who has Internet access and an email address. Facebook provides users with a pre-formatted profile where they can enter information such as their birthdate, email address, hometown, academic background, employment experience, hobbies, relationship status, interests, likes and dislikes, photos, and a main profile picture chosen by the user (Smock, 2010). In addition to the profile information, users have a "wall" or "timeline" where their friends can leave public messages.

More than half of Facebook users report having learned something new and important about friends from Facebook (Tufekci & Spence, 2007). Even when individuals meet somewhere other than on Facebook, they often check the other person's Facebook profile to learn more about the other person (e.g., common interests or mutual friends; Walther, et al., 2008).

Facebook and impression management. Social networking sites provide a unique opportunity for relationship research because the sites are dedicated specifically to forming and maintaining relationships by managing impressions (Tong, Van Der Heide, Langwell, & Walther, 2008). Individuals can present themselves as socially desirable through self-created online profiles. In 2008, a study relating the number of Facebook friends with interpersonal impressions found that there was a relationship between number of friends and the perceived social attractiveness of an individual (Tong et al., 2008). Additionally, Walther and colleagues (2008) suggested that the physical attractiveness of one's Facebook friends' photos affects the perceived attractiveness of the profile owner.

Kramer and Winter's (2008) research examined the relationship between personality traits and impression management on Facebook. They indicated that self-efficacy with regard to impression management is strongly related to the number of virtual friends, the level of profile detail, and the style of the personal photo. The results also suggested extraversion would have an influence on an individual's impression management behaviors on Facebook.

Studies have also looked at the ways in which Facebook use affects the credibility of the Facebook user. According to Mazer, Murphy, and Simonds (2007) in their study of Facebook use and its impact on teacher credibility, students appreciate disclosures of their teachers on Facebook, but teacher use of Facebook could also make the teacher look less professional in the eyes of the students. A later study suggested that teacher self-disclosure on Facebook can have a

positive effect on the student/teacher relationship, but can become problematic if the disclosures on Facebook do not match up with an instructor's classroom behavior (Mazer, Murphy, & Simonds, 2008).

There have been few studies, however, dedicated to the strategies used by Facebook users to manage their impressions. Facebook has various features that allow users to manage and control the image, or face, they wish to display. Features directly controlled by the user include his or her profile information, profile picture, and other information. The other information includes the users' activities, interests, likes, and dislikes. Users also have control over their privacy settings, so users can decide who can see what parts of their profiles (Butler, McCann, & Thomas, 2011). However, not all profile information is directly controlled by the user. Friends of the user can also post information on a user's wall, post pictures on Facebook and "tag" a user, and comment on posts on a user's wall/timeline. Though the user did not initiate them, others' comments on users' walls/timelines could have an effect on the way the user is perceived by third party viewers. Future FtF interaction with one's Facebook friends is considered to be highly likely, so individuals are motivated to monitor their Facebook impressions closely (Rosenberg & Egbert, 2011).

Facebook audiences. Images of self are influenced by audiences or potential audiences. Specifically, individual behavior occurs in relation to real or imagined audiences, and those audiences can influence an individual's thoughts, behaviors, and actions. Individuals can change their self-presentation to suit different audiences (Schlenker, 2003). When presented with multiple audiences simultaneously, individuals attempt to create messages with shared codes or keywords that can only be deciphered by specific audiences (Fleming, Darley, Hilton, & Kojetin, 1990). For example, although Facebook messages can be seen by many different audiences and

friends at once, messages are frequently tailored just toward one or certain friends. In addition, these messages may be interpreted differently by different individuals or friend groups.

Presentation for different audiences is especially interesting in the context of Facebook. Since different audiences require different impression management strategies (Schlenker, 2003), the constant presence of multiple audiences on Facebook creates complications. Ellison, Steinfeld, and Lampe (2007) found that Facebook users perceive that their profiles have different audiences, but treat the individuals with whom they have an offline friendship as their primary audience. Individuals might choose to limit information they post to their account for the multiple audiences; this editing of their presentation of personal information has implications for impression management. For example, if a user is posted in a picture from a wild party, it is more likely to be taken down, or de-tagged, to maintain an impression with co-workers than if the audience were comprised entirely of peers. The variety of audiences may create a need for some users to juggle and maintain many faces.

Online Self-Monitoring

Self-monitoring literature indicates a strong correlation between self-monitoring and impression management in both face-to-face (Gangstead & Snyder, 2000; Turnley & Bolino, 2001) and online contexts (Tal-or & Drukman, 2010). It is likely, then, that self-monitoring and impression management are correlated in the context of online social networking sites. However, previous studies of self-monitoring in CMC have used either Snyder's (1974) or Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) self-monitoring measures, which were designed for face-to-face interactions.

The problems associated with the use of the Snyder or Lennox and Wolfe scales become apparent if one looks at the individual items on the measures. For example, "I am often able to read people's true emotions correctly through their eyes" or "I can usually tell when I've said

something inappropriate by reading the listener's eyes" (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984, p. 1361). These items are not directly applicable to most online contexts; Lennox and Wolfe's scale needs to be adapted before it is used to analyze self-monitoring in computer-mediated communication.

This study develops a self-monitoring measure specific to computer-mediated communication. Previous findings indicate that self-monitoring online, using Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) or Snyder's (1974), has a positive correlation with impression management in general (Rosenberg & Egbert, 2011; Tal-or & Drukman, 2010). This study analyzes whether there is a positive correlation between online self-monitoring and the use of impression management strategies used on Facebook.

H1: Online self-monitoring is positively correlated with impression management strategies used on Facebook.

Online Audiences and Impression Management

Numerous studies have examined impression management online (Becker & Stamp, 2005; Leonard, et al., 2010; Walther, 2006), including some focusing on impression management on Facebook. Rosenberg and Egbert (2011) found that goals and personality traits are related Facebook users' impression management strategies. Additionally, Walther and colleagues indicated that physical appearance of a profile owner's Facebook friends affects third-person impressions of the profile owner (Walther, et al., 2008). In 2008, Tong and colleagues suggested that there is a curvilinear relationship between the number of Facebook friends and impressions of the Facebook profile owner (Tong, et al., 2008). Does one's number of Facebook friends affect one's use of impression management strategies?

RQ1: Is there a positive relationship between number of Facebook friends reported and impression management strategy use on Facebook?

Further, the Facebook friends' relationship to the profile owner is also important to the profile owner's impression management strategies. Users with a greater number of Facebook audiences (e.g., family, friends, or co-workers) are likely to be more conscious of what they post and what is posted about them on Facebook, so they do not lose face with members of their various Facebook audiences. As such, it is predicted that number of different audiences a Facebook user has is also positively related to the profile owner's use of impression management strategies.

H2: Number of audiences is positively correlated with impression management strategy use on Facebook.

- 2a: Number of audiences is positively correlated with use of privacy controls on Facebook.
- 2b: Number of audiences is positively correlated with the likelihood to delete others' posts on Facebook.
- 2c: Number of audiences is positively correlated with omitting information on Facebook.
- 2d: Number of audiences is positively correlated with changing to match others' Facebook habits.
- 2e: Number of audiences is positively correlated with separating personal from professional on Facebook.

Although research has begun to scratch the surface to understand impression management and self-monitoring on Facebook, there are still many gaps that need to be filled. First, it is important to develop a reliable online self-monitoring measure. Additionally, though research has previously examined impression management strategies and impressions online,

these factors have not been studied in relation to number of Facebook friends or for breadth of Facebook audiences.

With more 137 million unique visitors a month in 2011 (“Google and Facebook,” 2011), Facebook use is an area that should be studied thoroughly. Many individuals worldwide use and are addicted to using Facebook ("Facebook and Twitter," 2012), so understanding how they use it could provide great insight into understanding a large part of the online population’s behavior.

The following chapters explain how the previously proposed research question and hypotheses were tested. The results are then explained, followed by an in-depth discussion of the implications this study has for the study of self-monitoring, impression management research, computer-mediated communication, and the communication discipline.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter examines the ways in which the variables in the study were measured and how data were collected. The following areas are discussed: (a) design, (b) participants, (c) measurement, (d) procedure, (e) data treatment, and (f) data analysis.

Design

This study aimed to examine the ways in which self-monitoring and impression management strategies are used on Facebook. To address the research question and two hypotheses, cross-sectional survey data were collected and analyzed. A quantitative survey design, as opposed to other types of design, provides more generalizable data that are useful for drawing conclusions about the larger population of Facebook users from a representative sample (Jick, 1983). The survey data provided valuable information for understanding self-monitoring and impression management behavior in an online social network. Additionally, the surveys were conveniently accessible for both the researcher and the participants. Internet-based research is relatively inexpensive, enables rapid collection, provides access to large subject pools, and reduces the effect of social desirability on sensitive data (Kiesler, Walsh, & Sproull, 1992). The closed question survey design provided statistical feedback that allowed the researcher to gain insight into how a variety of individuals use Facebook. For these reasons, a quantitative survey design was selected.

Participants

A total of 204 participants were included in this study. Thirteen participants were undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory communication course at a large (about

21,000 undergraduate students) public Midwestern university. These students were offered extra credit by their instructor for participation. Participants were recruited based on their enrollment in a communication course; therefore, this study employed a convenience sample. However, university students use Facebook at a high rate (Junco, 2012), and are, therefore, a good group to study to understand the ways in which self-monitoring and impression management are used on Facebook.

Because the study was conducted during the summer months, fewer on campus students were available for participation. As a result, an additional 191 participants were recruited online through a Facebook group and a Facebook advertisement linking participants to the informed consent page on SurveyMonkey.com. As many of the participants were recruited from the social network of the researcher and her acquaintances, convenience sampling was the method used to recruit these participants. As a result, caution should be used when generalizing to other individuals who use Facebook (Barabas & Jerit, 2010). However, as Facebook use was a requirement for participation, Facebook was a useful way to recruit participants. Additionally, this method allowed for a larger variety of age groups and academic backgrounds that would not have been otherwise accessible. Eighteen questionnaires were not fully completed and were removed from further analysis, leaving 186 participants with ages ranging from 18 to 73 (M = 28.41) in the final analysis.

Measures

Demographic information. Each participant was asked to provide his or her age, career information, biological sex, and racial/ethnic identification in the first part of the questionnaire (Appendix A). These questions were designed to gather descriptive information about the participant group. This information also provided important data to the generalizability of the

study. Additionally, the data provided useful information about gender or career level differences in using Facebook. Of the 186 participants, 129 identified themselves as female, 55 participants identified themselves as male, and 2 participants did not indicate a gender. Participants were working professionals (n = 90), graduate students (n = 45), college students (n = 30), stay at home parents (n = 6), working part-time (n = 5), or retired (n = 4). Six participants did not specify an occupation.

Facebook information. The second part of the questionnaire asked for information about the participants' Facebook usage. Participants were asked to indicate an approximate number of Facebook friends. For the research question, the independent variable was the total number of Facebook friends. Because this question was straightforward, it was operationalized using a single-item measure; respondents were asked to enter a whole number indicating their approximate number of Facebook friends (Appendix B). The responses ranged from three to 2000 (M = 510).

The second hypothesis's independent variable was the number of potential Facebook audiences who may view the participant's profile or timeline posts. To measure this variable, participants were asked to choose all of the potential Facebook audiences from a list of 22 possible audiences (Appendix B). They were also given the option of selecting "other" and writing in additional audiences not included in the provided options. The number of audiences they selected was totaled to determine a total number of audiences for each participant. The selections of "other" were added into the total as well. Participants selected between 1 and 18 audiences (M = 8). The most frequently selected audiences were high school friends (n = 160), siblings (n = 143), cousins (n = 135), other relatives (n = 121), and co-workers (n = 119).

Online self-monitoring. Online self-monitoring was the independent variable in the first hypothesis. In the third section of the questionnaire, self-monitoring was measured using an adaptation of Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) Revised Self-Monitoring Scale. Snyder's (1974) original Self-Monitoring Scale was criticized for its lack of construct validity (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; O'Cass, 2000). Lennox and Wolfe's revised scale eliminated unnecessary items and changed to a 6-point bipolar measure; the measure greatly improved validity over the original (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). The Revised Self-Monitoring Scale is a 13-item instrument that analyzes two styles of self-monitoring behavior: Ability to Modify Self-Presentation (Items 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 13) and Sensitivity to the Expressive Behavior of Others (Items 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 11). Items 9 and 12 are reverse scored. The scale uses a 6-point format, rating from 0 "certainly always false" to 5 "certainly always true."

In past studies, a Cronbach's alpha of .86 was reported for the entire revised scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). For the present study, the measure was adapted to create a self-monitoring measure specific to the CMC context (Appendix C). For example, instead of "I can usually tell when I've said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener's eyes" on the Lennox and Wolfe scale, the measure now reads "I can usually tell if I've posted something inappropriate based on other people's responses." In the current study, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.78 was found for the online self-monitoring scale. The means of the individual items in the scale can be found in Appendix G.

Impression management strategy use. The dependent variable in both the research question and both hypotheses was use of impression management strategies. To analyze use of impression management strategies, a previously established Facebook Impression Management Scale (Smock, 2010; Cronbach's alpha, α= 0.82) was utilized (Appendix D). The original

measure contained 13 items but was expanded to 23 items to update the scale to newer Facebook features and to expand the coverage of the measure. The new 23-item measure examined the strategies used on Facebook to maintain impressions for Facebook friends.

In order to observe the use of certain categories of strategies, the scale was broken down into five subcategories of impression management strategies: adjusting privacy controls (items 15, 17, 21, 22), deleting others' posts (items 9, 10, 11, 12, 20), omitting information (items 1, 4, 7, 16), changing to match others on Facebook (items 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 19), and separating private life from professional life (13, 14, 18, 23). The measure used a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). For the present study, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.84 was found for the entire measure (adjusting privacy controls scale, $\alpha = .60$; deleting others' posts scale, $\alpha = .74$; omitting information scale, $\alpha = .66$; changing to match others' Facebook habits scale, $\alpha = .82$; separation of private and professional life scale, $\alpha = .33$). Due to the low reliability of the separation of private and professional life subscale, it was dropped from further analysis. The means of the individual items in the Facebook Impression Management Scale can be found in Appendix H.

Procedures

The informed consent form and the questionnaire were hosted online at SurveyMonkey.com, a professional web-based service that offers survey creation tools and hosting/server space for professional surveys. Two invitations to participate were issued: an email was sent out to an introductory communication course offering the survey as extra credit to the class and providing the link to the survey informed consent page (Appendix F), and participants were also recruited via Facebook.com. A Facebook group was created to provide a link to the informed consent page. The researcher invited her Facebook friends and asked that

her friends would invite their friends to the group as well. The researcher also ran a Facebook advertisement linking potential participants to the informed consent page. All potential participants were told that they had a chance to win one of three $10 iTunes gift cards.

The participants were directed to the informed consent form that provided details about the study and reminded the participant about his or her rights, including the right to cease participation at any time in accordance with the university's Institutional Review Board policies. Participants gave their informed consent by typing their name into a field as an electronic "signature." By typing their signature, participants indicated that they had read and understood all of the information provided in the informed consent form and voluntarily offered to participate in the project. Those wishing to be entered in the drawing for the gift cards were asked to type their email address into a field so they could be contacted if they won one of the gift cards. Only after the participant had electronically signed the informed consent form was he/she automatically directed to the online survey page. The identifying information and the actual survey responses were kept in separate databases on SurveyMonkey.com to protect participants' anonymity.

All participants were asked to complete all portions of the questionnaire and were given as much time as they needed to do so. They began with demographic questions including their name, age, sex, and general questions about their Facebook usage, followed by the measures of self-monitoring and impression management strategies. Once they completed the survey, the questionnaire was submitted to the database. Each participant completed the questionnaire only once. The use of online surveys offered a convenient way for participants to access the surveys and they were able to work at their own pace.

Data Treatment

First, the data were downloaded from Surveymonkey.com and opened in SPSS. Questionnaires were discarded if they were incomplete. There were a total of 186 usable questionnaires out of 204. The data were examined to ensure that all participants had answered questions within the realms of the questionnaire and to ensure that all participants were over the age of 18. Due to the use of an online survey collection tool, minimal data cleaning was required.

Two of the items on the online self-monitoring measure were reverse scored. Items 9 and 12 were changed to reflect the correct rankings in SPSS. After the items were reverse scored, reliability analyses were performed on each of the scales and subscales: the online self-monitoring measure and on the Facebook impression management strategies measure (and its subscales: adjusting privacy controls, deleting others' posts, omitting information, and changing to match others on Facebook).

In preparation for data analysis, the mean scores for online self-monitoring measure and the Facebook impression management strategies measure were calculated. Additionally, the number of Facebook audiences selected was summed.

Data Analysis

Hypothesis one. To determine whether there was a correlation between participants' online self-monitoring and their use of impression management strategies on Facebook, a Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation analysis was conducted. The mean of the 13-item online self-monitoring scale was correlated with the mean of the 22-item Facebook impression management scale. High scores on the online self-monitoring scale indicated that an individual was a high self-monitor and, thus, was very conscious about the things he/she posted online and wanted to fit with the way that others posted online. A high score on the Facebook impression

management scale indicated that the participant took more actions to make sure to appear a particular way to others through Facebook.

Research question. To determine whether there was a correlation between an individual's number of Facebook friends and his/her use of impression management strategies on Facebook, a Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was conducted. The number of Facebook friends indicated by the participant was correlated with the mean of the 22-item Facebook impression management scale. A higher number of Facebook friends indicated that a larger number of people would have the ability to look at an individual's Facebook profile. Again, a high score on the Facebook impression management scale indicated that a participant would take a greater amount of actions to appear a particular way to those who look at their Facebook page.

Hypothesis two. To see if there was a correlation between the number of Facebook audiences selected and participant use of Facebook impression management strategies, a Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was conducted. The number of total audiences selected by participants was correlated with the mean of the 22-item Facebook impression management scale. A high score on the audiences measure indicated that a respondent perceived to have a larger variety of groups of people looking at their Facebook page. Once again, a high score on the Facebook impression management scale indicated that a participant would take a greater amount of actions to appear a particular way to those who look at their Facebook page.

This hypothesis was also broken down into five parts to examine whether the number of Facebook audiences was associated with the use of certain strategies. The number of total audiences was correlated with the mean of each section of impression management strategies. The number of audiences was correlated with the means of adjusting privacy controls (items 15,

17, 21, 22), deleting others' posts (items 9, 10, 11, 12, 20), omitting information (items 1, 4, 7, 16), and changing to match others on Facebook (items 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 19).

Summary

This chapter described the methods used to conduct this study with the goal of better understanding the nature of self-monitoring and impression management in the social media environment. First, there was a justification for choosing an online quantitative survey research design; second, details about the recruitment of the 204 participants were provided; third, the details of each portion of the questionnaire were discussed (demographic information, Facebook information, online self-monitoring, and Facebook impression management); and fourth, the procedures for conducting the research were detailed. Finally, the data treatment and scoring of the measures was detailed.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The data collected in the present study were used to measure relationships between self-monitoring and impression management in an online environment. Additionally, the relationships between number of Facebook friends and audiences were examined with the use of Facebook impression management strategies. In this chapter, the statistical tests used and the results of those tests for the two hypotheses and the research question will be discussed, and that will be followed by a post analysis of data not directly related to this study's research question or hypotheses. For all statistical tests, the statistical significance was set at, $p < .05$. This chapter examines the hypothesis and research question outcomes.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one predicted a positive correlation between online self-monitoring (M = 3.25, SD = .63) and use of Facebook impression management strategies (M = 2.83, SD = .59). To test this hypothesis, a one-tailed Pearson's Product-Moment correlation analysis was performed. The result was almost neutral and not statistically significant, r (186) = -.01, p = .428. Hypothesis one was not supported.

Research Question

The research question asked if there was a significant positive correlation between the number of Facebook friends (M = 510.28, SD = 332.24) and use of Facebook impression management strategies (M = 2.83, SD = .59). A one-tailed Pearson's Product-Moment correlation analysis was used. The result was statistically significant, r (185) = .143, p = .026,

indicating that the more Facebook friends an individual has, the more likely he/she is to use Facebook impression management strategies.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two predicted a significant positive relationship between the number of Facebook audiences (M = 7.92, SD = 3.53) looking at someone's profile and the use of Facebook impression management strategies (M = 2.83, SD = .59). To test this hypothesis, a one-tailed Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was used. The result was positive and statistically significant, r (185) = .231, p = .001, meaning that individuals who have a greater number of audiences on Facebook are more likely to use Facebook impression management strategies.

Hypothesis two, part A. Hypothesis two was then broken down to look at sets of Facebook impression management strategies. Hypothesis 2a predicted a positive correlation between the number of Facebook audiences (M = 7.92, SD = 3.53) and use of privacy controls on Facebook (M = 3.41, SD = .97). A one-tailed Pearson's correlation analysis was conducted to test this relationship. The result was positive and statistically significant, r (185) = .219, p = .001, indicating that those who have a greater number of Facebook audiences are more likely to use privacy controls to manage their appearance to others on Facebook.

Hypothesis two, part B. Hypothesis 2b predicted a positive relationship between the number of Facebook audiences (M = 7.92, SD = 3.53) and the likelihood of deleting others' posts on Facebook (M= 2.70, SD = .92). A one-tailed Pearson's correlation was performed to test the relationship. The result was positive and statistically significant, r (185) = .201, p = .003, indicating that those with a greater number of Facebook audiences are more likely to delete others' posts on Facebook.

Hypothesis two, part C. Hypothesis 2c predicted a positive correlation between the number of Facebook audiences (M = 7.92, SD = 3.53) and the likelihood of omitting information on Facebook (M = 2.89, SD = .78). A one-tailed Pearson's correlation was conducted to test the relationship. The result was positive but not statistically significant, r (185) = .074, p = .158, indicating that there is not a significant relationship between one's number of Facebook audiences and his/her likelihood to omit information on Facebook.

Hypothesis two, part D. Hypothesis 2d predicted a positive correlation between the number of Facebook audiences (M = 7.92, SD = 3.53) and an individual's likelihood of changing his/her Facebook posts to match others' (M = 2.93, SD = .85). A one-tailed Pearson's correlation was used to test the relationship. The result again was positive, but not statistically significant, r (185) = .103, p = .082, indicating that there is not a statistically significant relationship between one's number of Facebook audiences and his/her likelihood of changing his/her Facebook posts to match others'.

Post Hoc Analysis

The research question and hypotheses were designed to examine the relationship between the variables: self-monitoring, impression management strategy use, number of friends, and number of audiences; however, data were also collected about participants' extraversion. Individuals with high levels of extraversion are typically considered to be sociable, talkative, assertive, and excitable (John & Srivastava, 1999). On the other side, those with low levels of extraversion, introverts, who are typically described as quiet and less involved in social situations (Eysenck, 1967). Extraversion was assessed using John's ACL Introversion/Extraversion Scale (1990; Appendix E). This scale asks participants to rate a list of words on how descriptive of them they are. The scale used a 5-point format, where 1 = "not at all

descriptive of me" and 5 = "very descriptive of me." In the present study, the 21-item scale was found to have Cronbach's alpha of .91. Correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between extraversion and online self-monitoring and the relationship between extraversion and use of Facebook impression management strategies.

Self-monitoring and extraversion. In order to examine the relationship between online self-monitoring (M = 3.25, SD = .63) and extraversion (M = 3.38, SD =.62), a two-tailed Pearson correlation analysis was performed using the mean of the online self-monitoring scale and the mean of the extraversion scale. The result was not statistically significant, r (182) = .122, p = .10.

Impression management and extraversion. To examine the relationship between the use of Facebook impression management strategies (M = 2.83, SD = .59) and extraversion (M = 3.38, SD =.62), a two-tailed Pearson correlation analysis was performed using the mean of the Facebook impression management scale and the mean of the extraversion scale. The result was a positive, statistically significant correlation, r (182) = .223, p < .01. This result indicates that the more extraverted an individual, the more likely he or she is to use Facebook impression management strategies.

Summary

To summarize, this study sought to better understand self-monitoring and impression management on Facebook by focusing on individuals' use of Facebook impression management strategies, individuals' levels of self-monitoring, and the number of Facebook friends and audiences of participants. The results indicate that one's number of Facebook friends is associated with the increased use of several Facebook impression management strategies. Additionally, the results indicate that one's number of Facebook audiences is also related to the increased use of Facebook impression management strategies. In particular, one's number of

Facebook audiences is significantly positively related with the use of privacy controls and likelihood of deleting others' posts. Furthermore, the results indicate no significant relationship between an individual's CMC self-monitoring level and their likelihood to use Facebook impression management strategies.

The statistical tests show significant positive correlations between several of the variables. The post hoc analysis also shows a positive correlation between extraversion and impression management. The next chapter will further explain these findings and provide implications for this information for Facebook users and the study of communication. Also, limitations of this study will be discussed along with suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the following ideas: (a) the nature of the relationship between online self-monitoring and impression management strategy use on Facebook, (b) whether an individual's number of Facebook friends affects his/her use of impression management strategies, and (c) whether having a greater variety of types of Facebook audiences has an effect on individuals' use of Facebook impression management strategies. The study looked at those questions and examined which impression management strategies would be used by individuals with a greater number of Facebook audiences.

To examine these ideas, previously developed self-monitoring and impression management strategy measures were adapted and used. Quantitative measures were employed for the purposes of generalizability to a larger public (Jick, 1983) of Facebook users. Understanding how individuals self-monitor and manage impressions on Facebook provides valuable information about the interpersonal implications of social networking sites.

This chapter presents four sections. The first section briefly summarizes the findings. Second, the study's implications are discussed. The third section examines the limitations of this study. The fourth section makes suggestions for future research. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the study as a whole.

Brief Summary of Findings

Hypothesis one predicted that high self-monitors online would engage in a greater number of impression management strategies on Facebook. Hypothesis one was not supported. There was not a statistically significant positive relationship between online self-monitoring and use of Facebook impression management strategies. The study's research question asked about a

possible association between the number of Facebook friends and use of Facebook impression management strategies. A statistically significant positive correlation was found between one's number of Facebook friends and use of impression management strategies. This finding suggests that individuals with a larger number of Facebook friends are more likely to take the time to manage their face with their Facebook friends. The finding could also suggest that individuals who make an effort to manage their self-presentation have more Facebook friends.

Hypothesis two predicted a positive association between the number of Facebook audiences and the use of Facebook impression management strategies. A Facebook audience is a classification of individuals who might look at a Facebook user's profile, such as parents or co-workers. Hypothesis two was supported. As predicted, as participants reported a greater number of audiences viewing their Facebook profile; they also reported using more impression management strategies. This finding suggests that individuals are more cautious of the impressions they give off when they are trying to cater to a larger variety of people looking at their Facebook profile. It also indicates that as people who make an effort to manage their self-presentation are more willing and able to be Facebook friends with individuals from a variety of audiences. To further understand the use of particular types of impression management strategies, hypothesis two was broken down into several parts.

Hypothesis 2a predicted a positive association between number of Facebook audiences and the use of privacy controls on Facebook. This hypothesis was supported, indicating that participants utilize more privacy controls to manage their impressions on Facebook as their number of different audiences increases. Hypothesis 2b looked at the relationship between number of Facebook audiences and the likelihood to delete others' Facebook posts. There was support for this hypothesis; as participants' number of audiences increased, so did the likelihood

of deleting others' Facebook posts to manage impressions on Facebook. This finding means that individuals delete posts that are not consistent with the impression they want to portray with their Facebook profile. Hypotheses 2c and 2d were not supported. Hypothesis 2c predicted a positive correlation between an individual's number of audiences and the likelihood of omitting information from Facebook. Hypothesis 2d predicted a positive association between number of audiences and an individual's likelihood of changing his/her Facebook profile to match others'. For both hypotheses, the results were in the predicted direction, but the relationship was not statistically significant. The next section discusses the findings and their theoretical implications in greater detail.

Implications

It is important to understand what these findings mean on a broader scale. The purpose of this study was two-fold; it was designed to develop a self-monitoring measure specific to online communication and to explore and understand the impression management strategies used on Facebook. The study provides good information that both supports and supplements existing research. This section will examine the implications for Face Theory, impression management, self-monitoring, and computer-mediated communication.

Face Theory. Face Theory was this study's main theoretical basis. The concept of face is that individuals act in ways to maintain a particular public image (Goffman, 1967). Facebook, in many ways, has become a large part of an individual's public image. Facebook is a popular computer-mediated forum where individuals present themselves to others. One implication of this study is an illumination of the actions individuals take to maintain a particular face on Facebook. As indicated by hypothesis two, individuals take action to try to maintain positive face (Brown & Levinson, 1987) as the number of audiences viewing their profiles increases.

Actors (Facebook users) seem to recognize that Facebook is a public stage, so they use their privacy settings to keep their "back stages" out of the sight of some of their audiences. Just as in face-to-face communication, individuals perform face maintenance on Facebook in order to keep their positive face. Individuals will attempt to maintain their face in all social interactions (Goffman, 1967) including those actions occurring in cyberspace on the Facebook stage.

Impression management. One of the purposes of this study was to examine Facebook users' use of impression management strategies. For individuals to maintain face in social interactions, individuals must manage impressions to adapt to different situations by regulating information they share (Leary, 1996). Impression management is also necessary in computer-mediated interaction. Based upon participants' responses in this study, certain strategies are more likely than others to be used to manage impressions while using Facebook. Additionally, by correlating the impression management strategies measure with number of Facebook friends and number of audiences, there is an indication of which conditions relate to an individual's use of a larger number of impression management strategies.

The findings show that as an individual's number of Facebook friends increases, so does his or her use of impression management strategies. This finding suggests that individuals become more aware of their posts as the number of individuals with whom they interact on Facebook increases. This concept is supported by past literature. According to Leary and Kowalski (1990), the publicity of behavior is a key component of impression management. The likelihood that others will be aware of one's action increases motivation to manage impressions. As users become aware of an increased number of individuals looking at their Facebook profiles, they have an increased motivation to take actions to manage impressions.

More importantly for Facebook users, this finding also suggests that individuals who make an effort to manage impressions actually have more friends. It suggests that individuals who successfully monitor their self-presentation on Facebook are more appealing to others as Facebook friends. Individuals may not want to be with individuals who do not take care to preserve a certain image of themselves. Those individuals who use fewer impression management strategies may offend others by posting about things without regard to how their friends will react to the posts.

The present study also reveals that as an individual's number of audiences increases, so does that individual's use of impression management strategies. Again, this finding is consistent with literature about impression management in face-to-face communication (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). The more audiences who are aware of someone's Facebook behaviors, the more that person will take care to manage the impression he or she portrays on Facebook. This finding also indicates that individuals who take care to manage impressions of themselves on Facebook are more willing to be friends with a variety of people on Facebook.

Through the use of the Facebook Impression Management Scale, certain strategies have been highlighted as being more likely for Facebook users to enact. There are two main areas in which individuals manage impressions on Facebook as their number of Facebook audiences increases. First, individuals tend to adjust their privacy settings as their number of audiences increases. The implication here is that individuals may not change what they post on Facebook to maintain face for others; rather, they adjust their privacy settings to control who can and cannot see certain information. For example, an individual may adjust his or her privacy settings so a parent or future employer cannot see pictures of that individual partying.

Second, individuals are more likely to delete information others post about them on Facebook as their number of audiences increases. Individuals take care to remove content posted by a third party that is contrary to the impression they attempt to portray on Facebook. This outcome has interesting consequences for impression management as it involves managing content posted by a third party. This finding indicates that Facebook users recognize that things posted about them by others have impression bearing value (Walther, et al., 2008). Facebook users balance a complicated dichotomy of monitoring who can see their content on Facebook while attempting to eliminate unflattering content posted by a third party. This finding also suggests that individuals who take care to delete information posted by others likely have more Facebook friends. Since they take care to delete unflattering posts, others see them more positively and more likely want to be their Facebook friend.

The more people or larger variety of people who view an individual's profile, the more likely that individual is to employ impression management strategies, the more he or she must balance. There is now an indication of which strategies those individuals use to maintain impressions for the viewers of their profiles. Specific strategies are likely to be used to manage impressions on Facebook without regard for the number of audiences viewing a profile. The following are the four strategies most frequently used by participants: Item 1, "I intentionally omit content from my Facebook profile that would make people think poorly of me"; Item 3, "I consider what others will think about the profile fields I fill in on Facebook"; Item 15, "I change my privacy settings to change what different friends will see on my profile"; and Item 21, "I change my Facebook privacy settings so that people I do not know cannot look at my profile information." The frequent use of those four strategies suggests that users are very concerned with what others think of their Facebook profiles.

The data support existing research about impression management. It is natural for individuals to engage in impression management behavior (Leary, 1996), and individuals are more likely to engage in impression management behaviors in public (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). As individuals believe more people will view their profile, they are more likely to engage in some Facebook impression management strategies, and individuals do what they can to enhance themselves in the public eye (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Participants recognize that their Facebook behavior is, in many ways, public. This result may indicate that individuals do not closely self-monitor their actions on Facebook, but instead, they may monitor who has access to what they say or do. Second, as the number of audiences an individual has increases, so does their likelihood of deleting others' posts on their profiles. This finding suggests that as individuals' number of audiences increases, so does their awareness of third-party content. In order to more fully understand the implications of this study, the results should be looked at in relation to self-monitoring research.

Self-monitoring. This study's implications for self-monitoring research are less clear at this time. Although the online self-monitoring scale was found to be reliable, it did not significantly correlate with impression management as the literature indicated it would (Gangstead & Snyder, 2000; Turnley & Bolino, 2001). The new scale has higher face validity than the Lennox and Wolfe (1984) scale because its items are worded in a way that is more applicable and relevant to CMC. Face validity evaluates whether a particular measure makes sense at surface value (Davis, Gallard & Lachlan, 2010). It makes more sense, then, to examine online self-monitoring behaviors using a scale that is designed for online situations.

It is reasonable to think that self-monitoring measurement should be context-specific (online vs. face-to-face environment), but it is unknown yet how or if this scale differs from the

Lennox and Wolfe measure. A direct comparison of the two measures through factor analysis is needed to better understand the similarities and differences in the underlying factor structure. Although previous literature has suggested that self-monitoring should be consistent across contexts (Gangstead & Snyder, 2000; Snyder, 1974), the items in the existing self-monitoring scales (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Snyder, 1974) are context-based and would not necessarily apply to all situations. The results in this study may suggest that self-monitoring should be considered to be a context-based variable.

The results may seem to contradict results previously found for self-monitoring. Previous self-monitoring research has indicated a strong relationship between self-monitoring and impression management in face-to-face contexts (Gangstead & Snyder, 2000; Turnley & Bolino, 2001). A positive relationship has also been indicated between self-monitoring and impression management online using the Lennox and Wolfe (1984) self-monitoring scale (Tal-or & Drukman, 2010). However, that relationship was not confirmed by this study. There is still more to learn about the relationship between self-monitoring and impression management in computer-mediated environments. Perhaps the relationship between self-monitoring and impression management in CMC interactions is different from the relationship in face-to-face interactions.

There are other possible explanations for the lack of correlation between online self-monitoring and Facebook impression management. High self-monitors are considered to have an ability to fit their behavior to whatever a particular social situation requires (Snyder, 1974). So, rather than being consistent across all social contexts, high self-monitors change their behavior based on their surroundings. This concept could explain why there was not a significant relationship between self-monitoring and use of impression management strategies. Rather than

consistently choosing a certain set of strategies, high self-monitors would instead utilize different forms of impression management at different times. High self-monitors change and adjust their behaviors for each social situation, but low self-monitors are more concerned with their self-congruence (Leone & Corte, 1994). It is possible high self-monitors consider their Facebook account to be a constant aspect in their lives rather than thinking of Facebook interactions as multiple changing social situations. By thinking of Facebook as a single social situation, high self-monitors would not see the need to adjust their self-presentation for different situations. Impression management and self-monitoring provide part of the picture. In order to fully understand the results, the implications for CMC research also need to be explored.

Computer-mediated communication. The findings have many implications for CMC. First, the results support Social Information Processing Theory. SIP suggests that individuals use online information to learn and make judgments about others (Walther, 1992). As previously mentioned, receivers make attributions about individuals based on the information available to them. This element remains true for online profiles. Individuals are judged based on the profile information available to them (Walther, 1996). Individuals recognize that they are judged by their profiles, and, as such, profile owners make adjustments for their audiences. This study helps understand how people adapt to try to ensure that others make the judgments about them that they want. Content posted by others about an individual has great impression bearing value (Walther, et al., 2008). This concept is important to understanding impression management on CMC.

The use of impression management strategies could also be affected by the richness of the Facebook medium. Individuals attempt to maintain an identity that is consistent with the identity they are portraying in face-to-face situations because they have contact with many of

their Facebook friends outside of Facebook. A variety of information is available about an individual on Facebook—photographs, content posted by the profile owner, and content posted by others—the variety of personal cues available make Facebook a rich medium compared to other CMC venues (Rice, 1993).

The results are also consistent with the SIDE model (Lea & Spears, 1992). Individuals continually confront their self-presentation choices when they look at the information displayed on their social networking profiles (Spears & Lea, 1994). Perhaps the lack of significant relationship between online self-monitoring and impression management strategies could be explained by the SIDE model. Instead, users constantly confront their own identity choices by closely examining their profiles and content that they and others post.

More specifically, this study has implications for Facebook on two levels. First, from a research standpoint, this study gives researchers an indication of how individuals manage impressions on Facebook. Previous studies have indicated that individuals are evaluated based on things posted on Facebook (Tong, et al., 2008; Walther et al., 2008), but now there is an idea of strategies used by individuals to manage the content that is available to others.

Second, this study suggests that users are aware that others look at their profile and make judgments about them from looking at their profile. However, popular news seems to indicate that individuals are not as effective at protecting their profiles as they think. Individuals still get fired over things they post on Facebook ("Chili's server fired," 2012; Gross, 2012; Wilson, 2012), so it is unclear if individuals do as much as they think to manage impressions of themselves on Facebook. This study indicates that users need to be effective at managing impressions in order to have more Facebook friends. At the very least, managing Facebook profile content is

something that should be considered by users as the consequences of not doing so could result in being fired from a job or a loss of credibility (Mazer, Murphy, & Simonds, 2007).

Walther and colleagues (2008) found that the content of friends' posts on one's Facebook wall influenced the profile owner's credibility. The present study's findings are consistent with and support Walther et al.'s results. Facebook users appear to understand that the information posted on their walls reflects on their identities; as such, they are more likely to delete unfavorable posts when they have a greater number of audiences.

Limitations

In interpreting the study's findings, it is important to keep in mind the limitations of this study. First, the way data were collected potentially led participants to answer using socially desirable responses. Although the method of recruiting participants on Facebook was very useful for contacting a large number of participants quickly, many of the participants knew the researcher and could have answered in ways to attempt to be helpful to the researcher. In addition, the participants may have answered in ways that made them look better because the data were self-reported. Despite the fact that the informed consent form (Appendix F) guaranteed anonymity to participants, it is possible that the participants did not want to answer in ways that might be perceived negatively.

Second, the sample was one of convenience, so it is difficult to generalize from the sample to the population of all Facebook users. This sampling method limited the recruitment of participants to the researcher's friends through the social network of Facebook. Further, study participants self-selected into the sample by following the survey link on the Facebook group. Since participation in the study relied on volunteers, a self-selection bias may exist, meaning that these volunteers might not be representative of the population of all Facebook users (Ellison,

Heino, & Gibbs, 2006). In fact, the pool may have represented individuals who are highly motivated Facebook users with high level of awareness in their Facebook use. However, by collecting data using a Facebook group and a Facebook advertisement, the researcher was able to recruit from a large pool and was not limited to collecting data from only college students.

Finally, the online self-monitoring measure needs more testing and direct comparison with Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) self-monitoring measure before its efficacy can be known. It is possible that some of the items still need to be clarified or reworded to decrease participant confusion and more effectively measure online self-monitoring. For example items such as, "I am often able understand the true emotions behind people's online social media posts" or "I can usually tell when others consider a post to be in bad taste, even though they may type 'LOL' or 'haha,'" may have been unclear or confusing. Because a majority of participants were recruited through Facebook, it is also possible that they responded with only Facebook in mind, while the measure was designed to apply to all online self-monitoring behavior.

Possibilities for Future Research

Based on the results of the present study and its limitations, there are several opportunities for future research. First, there are many opportunities to further develop and assess the online self-monitoring measure. It would be beneficial to design a study comparing Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) measure and the online self-monitoring measure to determine whether the new measure is more valid for online self-monitoring behavior.

A clear possibility for future research is to further explore the findings from the post hoc analysis. Extraversion was positively related to the use of impression management strategies. The data suggest that the more extraverted an individual, the more likely that person is to use Facebook impression management strategies. This finding could have important implications for

understanding how extraverts and introverts differ in their Facebook use. Previous research has suggested that individuals maintain ties to their social groups through Facebook (Ross, et al., 2009). The post hoc analysis results for extraversion are consistent with that Ross et al.'s previous research. In order to maintain those social ties on Facebook, extraverts manage their self-presentation on Facebook. Introverts may have increased success managing social ties on Facebook if they took more care to manage their self-presentation.

The post hoc results also open the door to examine how Facebook use and personality concepts (such as affinity-seeking, Machiavellianism, narcissism, or neuroticism) relate to impression management behaviors. A greater understanding of how other personality concepts influence an individual's Facebook behavior allows for a richer understanding of how and why people differ in their managing of impressions online.

It would also be helpful to explore Facebook use with a concept like communication competence to learn whether individuals with high levels of communication competence more effectively manage their impressions on Facebook. Perhaps because competent communicators have the ability to choose a communication behavior that is effective and appropriate for particular situations (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984), they would choose behaviors to manage their image on Facebook. It would be important to determine whether communication competence and Facebook impression management are related in order to understand how competent communicator use Facebook. It would also be interesting to explore how an individual's use of privacy management affects Facebook use, particularly because there was a significant correlation between number of audiences and use of Facebook privacy controls. Perhaps individuals who have a high concern for privacy would engage in a greater amount of impression management tactics on Facebook.

Additionally, there is still much room to research impression management on Facebook. The present study looked at very specific, context-related impression management strategies, and it did not tie the items to already existing interpersonal impression management scales. Future research should work to combine the two types of scales to obtain both a practical and theoretical view of impression management on Facebook.

Another possibility for future research would be the use of experimental design; research about Facebook use lends itself well to an experimental design because it allows researchers to study the behaviors of Facebook users in reaction to various contextual stimuli rather than how those users perceive their behaviors. It would be interesting to see how individuals adjust their Facebook in simulated situations rather than self-reported survey responses. By designing an experiment in which individuals react to specific situations, one could establish a list of impression management strategies based on the participants' actions that might be more context-specific than their reactions to the measure developed from the Smock (2010) scale. A future experimental study could also tap into different factors that influence an individual's need to manage impressions. Factors such as employment seeking or employment in particular industries could certainly affect individuals' impression management strategy use. Perhaps an individual who has a future interest in working in government or public service would take greater care to manage their image on Facebook.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this study, as individuals gain Facebook friends or audiences, they engage in a greater number of impression management strategies. These findings support many theoretical concepts—Face Theory, impression management, self-monitoring, and CMC research. As individuals have more, or a larger variety of, people to cater to on Facebook, they

do more to manage the appearance of their Facebook profiles. In particular, individuals adjust their privacy settings and delete others' posts to aid in their impression management as their number of audiences increases.

Although, at this time, the online self-monitoring measure is in need of additional validity testing, this initial development and use is a step in the right direction. The communication discipline has lacked a measure of self-monitoring in a computer-mediated context. Although relationships can become as close in CMC environments as in face-to-face situations, they are still formed and maintained differently (Walther, 1996). Individuals may behave differently in online situations without the pressures of face-to-face interaction (Walther, 1992).

Facebook is an area that still needs to be further explored with additional research, but this study has taken research in that area a step forward. This study has provided an understanding of the impression management strategies used by individuals to cater to their increasing number of audiences and Facebook friends. Individuals face a continual balance of restricting who can see information about them on Facebook and managing the content that others post about them. This study has made strides forward in learning about how and when individuals manage their impressions on Facebook. However, there is still more to be learned in order to further uncover the effect of third-party content on individuals' efforts to maintain positive face and how users view and manage that third-party content. Facebook is an ever changing landscape that has, in many ways, changed computer-mediated communication. The most recent profile format adjustment on Facebook was centered on individuals having the ability to design their profiles in the way they want their friends to see them (Fager, 2010). Facebook creator Mark Zuckerberg has long recognized the value users place on the ability to manage their face on Facebook. The present study sheds some light on just how users do that.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Please indicate your gender. Check one.

   ____ Female ____ Male

2. Please indicate your life status. Check one.

   ____ College Student

   ____ Graduate Student

   ____ Working Professional

   ____ Retired

   ____ Part-Time Worker

   ____ Stay at Home Parent

   ____ Other—if other please list below.

   _____

3. Please indicate your racial/ethnic identification. Check one.

   ____ Caucasian

   ____ African-American

   ____ Hispanic

   ____ American Indian or Alaskan Native

   ____ Asian or Pacific Islander

   ____ Other—if other please list below.

   _____

4. Please write your age.

   ____ years

APPENDIX B

FACEBOOK INFORMATION

1. Do you use Facebook on a regular basis? Check one.

   ____ Yes ____ No

2. How many "Facebook friends" do you have? Please write your best estimation.

   ____ friends

3. Who do you think looks at your Facebook profile page? Please check all that apply.
    1. ____ My high school friends
    2. ____ Friends from other high schools
    3. ____ People from my dorm/apartment complex
    4. ____ People from my fraternity/sorority
    5. ____ My significant other
    6. ____ A potential future significant other
    7. ____ My ex-significant other
    8. ____ My parents
    9. ____ My siblings
    10. ____ My cousins
    11. ____ Other adult relatives
    12. ____ People from my classes
    13. ____ My professors
    14. ____ Future employers
    15. ____ Current employer
    16. ____ Co-workers
    17. ____ Someone I met at a party/social event
    18. ____ Total strangers from CMU
    19. ____ Total strangers from outside of CMU
    20. ____ Law enforcement
    21. ____ People from my religious organization
    22. ____ Other—if other, please list who:

APPENDIX C

ONLINE SELF-MONITORING SCALE

Directions: When completing this survey consider "online social media" to refer to websites such as Facebook, Twitter, blog posts, or similar online forums. For each statement, please write the number that best expresses your own feelings about your social media usage.

0=Certainly false
1=Generally false
2=Somewhat false, but with exception
3=Somewhat true, but with exception
4=Generally true
5=Certainly true

1. ____ In my online social media posts, I have the ability to alter my posts if I feel something else is called for.
2. ____ I am often able understand the true emotions behind people's online social media posts.
3. ____ I have the ability to control the way I come across to people in my online social media posts, depending on the impression I want to give them.
4. ____ When chatting with others using online social media, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in mood of the person I am chatting with.
5. ____ My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others' emotions and motives from their online social media posts.
6. ____ I can usually tell when others consider a post to be in bad taste, even though they may type "LOL" or "haha."
7. ____ When I feel that the image I am portraying through social media isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does.
8. ____ I can usually tell if I've posted something inappropriate based on other people's responses.
9. ____ I have trouble changing my online behavior to suit different groups of people I connect with through social media.
10. ____ I have found that I can adjust my online social media posts to meet the requirements of any posting situation that comes up.
11. ____ If someone's lying to me through social media, I usually know it at once from that person's way of posting.
12. ____ Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front in social media posts.
13. ____ Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my social media posts accordingly.

Note: Adapted from the Self-Monitoring Scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). Items 9 and 12 are reverse scored.

APPENDIX D

FACEBOOK IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT SCALE

Directions: For each of the following items, please respond using the following scale:

1=Almost never true
2=Rarely true
3=Occasionally true
4=Usually true
5=Always true

1. ____ I intentionally omit content from my Facebook profile that I feel would make people think poorly of me.
2. ____ I choose my Facebook profile picture based on what others may think of it.
3. ____ I consider what others will think about the profile fields I fill in on Facebook.
4. ____ I only post things about myself on Facebook that I'm sure will be looked upon favorably.
5. ____ I have changed my Facebook profile content to be similar to a friend's.
6. ____ I care what others think of my Facebook profile.
7. ____ I exaggerate on my Facebook profile to make people think highly of me.
8. ____ I consider how my friends will react when I write a status update.
9. ____ I have deleted posts on my wall that I thought might offend some of my Facebook friends.
10. ____ I have untagged myself from a photo in which I looked unattractive.
11. ____ I have untagged myself from a photo when I have been tagged with unattractive people.
12. ____ I have untagged myself from photos that I feel might cause others to judge me poorly.
13. ____ I have created a second Facebook profile to keep my personal and professional life separate on Facebook.
14. ____ I do not use my full name on Facebook, so that I am not easily searched for on Facebook.

15. ____ I change my privacy settings to change what different Facebook friends can see on my profile.
16. ____ I only post positive information about myself to be seen in a more positive light by my Facebook friends.
17. ____ I create different friend groups on Facebook in order to control what certain people can see on my profile.
18. ____ I limit what information my professional contacts can see on Facebook.
19. ____ I update my status based on what my Facebook friends will think about it.
20. ____ I delete comments that my friends have made on my pictures or status updates so that I will not be seen in a negative light.
21. ____ I change my Facebook privacy settings so that people I do not know cannot look at my profile information.
22. ____ I block individual people who I do not want to look at my profile information.
23. ____ I remove individuals from my Facebook friends because I do not want to be associated with them.

Note: Scale was adapted from a previously used scale (Smock, 2010).

APPENDIX E

EXTRAVERSION SCALE

Directions: For each of the following items, please respond using the following scale:

1=Not at all descriptive of me
2=Rarely descriptive of me
3=Sometimes descriptive of me
4=Descriptive of me
5=Very descriptive of me

1. ____ Quiet
2. ____ Reserved
3. ____ Shy
4. ____ Silent
5. ____ Withdrawn
6. ____ Retiring
7. ____ Talkative
8. ____ Assertive
9. ____ Active
10. ____ Energetic
11. ____ Outgoing
12. ____ Outspoken
13. ____ Dominant
14. ____ Forceful
15. ____ Enthusiastic
16. ____ Show-off
17. ____ Sociable
18. ____ Spunky
19. ____ Adventurous
20. ____ Noisy
21. ____ Bossy

Note: From John's (1990) Scale.

APPENDIX F

CONSENT FORM

CMU
CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Consent to Participate in a Study

Study Title: Understanding the Face in Facebook: Impression Management and Self-Monitoring Behaviors on Facebook.com
Research Investigators: Alexandra Hutchinson, Dr. Lesley Withers

Contact Information for Investigators:

Alexandra Hutchinson
Communication and Dramatic Arts
Central Michigan University
356A Moore Hall
Mount Pleasant, MI 48859
Phone: (989) 774-3967
hutch1al@cmich.edu

Dr. Lesley A. Withers
Communication and Dramatic Arts
Central Michigan University
350 Moore Hall
Mount Pleasant, MI 48859
Phone: (989) 774-6673
Fax: (989) 774-2498
withe1la@cmich.edu

Invitation to Participate: You are invited to participate in a research study about your behaviors in online social networking sites. This study will ask participants to reflect on a time when they have used social networking sites such as Facebook.com. The following information should help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Alexandra Hutchinson at (989) 774-3967.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of this study is to learn about the ways in which individuals use social networking sites to communicate online. You are eligible to participate in this research because you are at least 18 years old.

What will I do in this study? If you decide to participate in this research project, you will be asked to complete several measures on topics related to your Facebook usage and your general online behavior.

How long will it take? The survey should take no more than 25 minutes to complete.

Are there any risks of participating in the study? There is little risk to participants, as the measures administered ask participants to think about situations they might typically encounter: their regular Internet usage and online communication. Participation or non-participation in this study will not adversely affect participants' grades or the relationships with their professors.

However, if you do encounter distress, please contact the CMU Counseling Center at (989) 774-3381.

What are the benefits of participating in the study? This research will give you an idea of how we collect data in the field of Communication. It may also help the researcher gain better insight into how individuals communicate in online environments and potentially provide better understanding of online social networking behavior.

Will anyone know what I do or say in this study (Confidentiality)? As you will not identify yourself on the questionnaire, there is no way for either of the investigators to know who filled out which questionnaire. Any data under the investigator's control will, if disclosed, be presented in a manner that does not reveal the subject's identity, except as may be required by law.

Will I receive any compensation for participation? Is there a different way for me to receive the compensation of this study? Individual instructors may, at their own discretion, offer extra credit or instructor discretion points for participation. If so, those who choose not to participate may still earn the credit/points by attending a campus event/speech, writing a 1-2 page reaction paper, and handing in the reaction paper to the instructor. Others may not earn any compensation for their participation in this study.

Who can I contact for information about this study? You may contact Alexandra Hutchinson at (989) 774-3967 or Dr. Lesley Withers at (989) 774-6673 with any questions you have about this study. Please take a copy of this informed consent form in case you have questions later.

You are free to refuse to participate in this research project or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in the project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled or effect on your relationship to the institution(s) involved in this research project. As previously stated, your participation or non-participation in this study will not affect your grade in any class or relationship with any professor or with the institution involved in this research project.

If you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously, if you so choose) any complaints to the CMU Institutional Review Board by calling (989) 774-6777, or addressing a letter to the Institutional Review Board, 251 Foust Hall Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, MI 48859.

Digitally "signing" this form by typing my name in the text box below indicates that all my questions have been answered. I agree to participate in the project as described above.

_____

Participant's Signature

In my judgment, the subject is voluntarily and knowingly giving informed consent to participate in this research study. I have presented this subject with the procedure(s) above and the risks involved; I believe he/she understands the contents of the consent document and is competent to give legally effective and informed consent.

Alexandra Hutchinson	April 4, 2012
Investigator's printed name	Date
Lesley A. Withers	April 4, 2012
Faculty Advisor's printed name	Date

APPENDIX G

ONLINE SELF-MONITORING SCALE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Items	*M*	*SD*
1. In my online social media posts, I have the ability to alter my posts if I feel something else is called for.	3.97	1.12
2. I am often able understand the true emotions behind people's online social media posts.	2.82	1.87
3. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people in my online social media posts, depending on the impression I want to give them.	3.27	1.37
4. When chatting with others using online social media, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in mood of the person I am chatting with.	2.78	1.30
5. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others' emotions and motives from their online social media posts.	3.12	1.14
6. I can usually tell when others consider a post to be in bad taste, even though they may type "LOL" or "haha."	2.99	1.30
7. When I feel that the image I am portraying through social media isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does.	3.28	1.28
8. I can usually tell if I've posted something inappropriate based on other people's responses.	3.87	.97
9. I have trouble changing my online behavior to suit different groups of people I connect with through social media.	3.62	1.24
10. I have found that I can adjust my online social media posts to meet the requirements of any posting situation that comes up.	3.35	1.08
11. If someone's lying to me through social media, I usually know it at once from that person's way of posting.	2.18	1.28
12. Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front in social media posts.	3.62	1.24
13. Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my social media posts accordingly.	3.64	1.03

APPENDIX H

FACEBOOK IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT SCALE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Items	*M*	*SD*
1. I intentionally omit content from my Facebook profile that I feel would make people think poorly of me.	3.65	1.27
2. I choose my Facebook profile picture based on what others may think of it.	3.31	1.30
3. I consider what others will think about the profile fields I fill in on Facebook.	3.60	1.20
4. I only post things about myself on Facebook that I'm sure will be looked upon favorably.	3.26	1.13
5. I have changed my Facebook profile content to be similar to a friend's.	1.62	.87
6. I care what others think of my Facebook profile.	3.24	1.21
7. I exaggerate on my Facebook profile to make people think highly of me.	1.66	.79
8. I consider how my friends will react when I write a status update.	3.43	1.19
9. I have deleted posts on my wall that I thought might offend some of my Facebook friends.	3.26	1.38
10. I have untagged myself from a photo in which I looked unattractive.	3.34	1.14
11. I have untagged myself from a photo when I have been tagged with with unattractive people.	1.46	.89
12. I have untagged myself from photos that I feel might cause others to judge me poorly.	3.21	1.47
13. I have created a second Facebook profile to keep my personal and professional life separate on Facebook.	1.16	.72
14. I do not use my full name on Facebook, so that I am not easily searched for on Facebook.	1.48	1.05
15. I change my privacy settings to change what different Facebook friends can see on my profile.	3.63	1.15
16. I only post positive information about myself to be seen in a more positive light by my Facebook friends.	2.97	1.13
17. I create different friend groups on Facebook in order to control what certain people can see on my profile.	2.16	1.41
18. I limit what information my professional contacts can see on Facebook.	2.76	1.57
19. I update my status based on what my Facebook friends will think about it.	2.36	1.15
20. I delete comments that my friends have made on my pictures or status updates so that I will not be seen in a negative light.	2.26	1.22
21. I change my Facebook privacy settings so that people I do not know cannot look at my profile information.	4.37	1.19
22. I block individual people who I do not want to look at my profile information.	3.52	1.65
23. I remove individuals from my Facebook friends because I do not want to be associated with them.	3.39	1.45

REFERENCES

Barabas, J., & Jerit, J. (2010). External validity in survey experiments. *American Political Science Review, 104*, 226-242.

Becker, J. A. H., & Stamp, G. H. (2005). Impression management in chat rooms: A grounded theory model. *Communication Studies, 56*, 243-260.

Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of computer-mediated communication, 13*, 210-230.

Brown, P., & Levinson S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Butler, E., McCann, E., & Thomas, J. (2011). Privacy setting awareness on Facebook and its effect on user-posted content. *Human Communication*, *14*(1), 39-55.

Caro, M. (2012, June 15). Bad celebrity tweet triggers word dilemma. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-15/entertainment/ct-ae-0617-twitter-backlash-partridge-20120615_1_tweet-twitter-aflac

Cassidy, J. (2006, May 15). Me media: How hanging out on the Internet became big business. *The New Yorker, 82*(13), 50.

Chili's server fired after Facebook tip rant. (2012, June 21). *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/21/chilis-server-fired-facebook-rant_n_1615430.html?utm_hp_ref=facebook

Craig, E., & Wright, K. B. (2012). Computer-mediated relational development and maintenance on Facebook. *Communication Research Reports*, *29*(2), 119-129.

Culnan, M.J., & Markus, M. L. (1987). Information technologies. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 420-443). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Davis, C. S., Gallard, H. P., & Lachlan, K. A. (2010). *Straight talk about communication research methods*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

Donnelly, L. (2012, July 08). Facebook and Twitter feed anxiety, study finds. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/9383609/Facebook-and-Twitter-feed-anxiety-study-finds.html

Ellison, N., Heino, R., & Gibbs, J. (2006). Managing impressions online: Self-presentation processes in the online dating environment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(2), 415-441.

Ellison, N., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook "friends:" Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 12*, 1143−1168.

Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *The biological basis of personality*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles Thomas.

Facebook and Twitter 'more addictive than tobacco and alcohol'. (2012, February 01). *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/health/healthnews/9054243/Facebook-and-Twitter-more-addictive-than-tobacco-and-alcohol.html

Facebook key facts. (2012). Retrieved from http://newsroom.fb.com/content/default.aspx?NewsAreaId=22

Fager, J. (Executive Producer). (2010, December 5). *60 Minutes: Mark Zuckerberg & Facebook* [Television broadcast]. New York, NY: CBS.

Fincher, D., (Director). (2010). *The social network* [Film]. Culver City, CA: Columbia Pictures.

Fleming, J. H., Darley, J. M., Hilton, J. L., & Kojetin, B. A. (1990). Multiple audience problem: A strategic communication perspective on social perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 593-609.

Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(4), 530–555.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.

Google and Facebook top 2011. (2011, December 29). *BBC News*. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-16356066

Gross, D. (2012, August 13). Virginia deputy fights his firing over a Facebook 'like'. *CNN*. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2012/08/10/tech/social-media/deputy-fired-facebook-like/index.html

Hampton, K., Goulet, L. S., Rainie, L., & Purcell, K. (2011, June 16). *Social networking sites and our lives*. Retrieved from Pew Internet & American Life Project website: http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2011/Technology-and-social-networks.aspx

Hutchinson, L. R., & Skinner, N. F. (2007). Self-awareness and cognitive style: Relationships among adaption-innovation, self-monitoring, and self-consciousness. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *35*(4), 551-560.

Jick, T. D. (1983). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. In J. Van Mannen (Ed.), *Qualitative methodology* (pp.135-148). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

John. O. P. (1990). The "Big Five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin, & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (pp. 231-261). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Junco, R. (2011). The relationship between frequency of Facebook use, participation in Facebook activities, and student engagement. *Computers & Education*, *58*, 162-171.

Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, *53*(1), 59-68.

Kiesler, S., Walsh, J., & Sproull, L. (1992). Computer networks in field research. In F. B. Bryant, J. Edwards, S. Tindale, E. Posavac, L. Heath, E. Henderson, & Y. Suarez-Balcazar (Eds.), *Methodological issues in applied social research* (pp. 239- 268). New York, NY: Plenum.

Kramer, N. C., & Winter, S. (2008). Impression management 2.0: The relationship of self-esteem, extraversion, self-efficacy, and self-presentation within social networking sites. *Journal of Media Psychology*, *20*(3), 106-116.

Larkin, J. & Pines, H. (1994). Affective consequences of self-monitoring style in a job interview setting. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *15*, 297-310.

Lea, M., & Spears R. (1992). Paralanguage and social perception in computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Organizational Computing, 2,* 321–341.

Leary, M. R. (1996). *Self-presentation – Impression management and interpersonal behaviour*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*(1), 34-47.

Lennox, R. D. (1982, April). *Revision of the self-monitoring scale.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Baltimore, MD.

Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(6), 1349-1364.

Leonard, L. G., Withers, L. A., & Sherblom, J. C. (2010). The paradox of computer-mediated communication and identity: Peril, promise, and Second Life®. In J. Park & E. Abels (Eds.), *Interpersonal relations and social patterns in communication technology: Discourse norms, language structures and cultural variables* (pp.1-17). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Leone, C., & Corte, V. (1994). Concern for self-presentation and self-congruence: Self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and social conflicts. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 22*(3), 305-312.

Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). I'll see you on "Facebook": The effects of computer-mediated teacher self-disclosure on student motivation, affective learning, and classroom climate. *Communication Education, 56*(1), 1-17.

Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E., & Simonds, C. J. (2008). The effects of teacher self-disclosure via "Facebook" on teacher credibility. *RCA Vestnik (Russian Communication Association)*, 30-37.

O'Cass, A. (2000). A psychometric evaluation of a revised version of the Lennox and Wolfe revised self-monitoring scale. *Psychology & Marketing, 17,* 397-419.

OECD. (2007). *Participative web and user-created content: Web 2.0, wikis, and social networking*. Paris, FR: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Papacharissi, Z., & Rubin, A. M. (2000). Predictors of internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 44,* 175-196.

Quan-Haase, A., & Young, A. L. (2010). Uses and gratifications of social media: A comparison of Facebook and Instant Messaging. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 30*(5), 350-361.

Rice, R. E. (1984). Mediated group communication. In R. E. Rice, (Ed.), *The new media: Communication, research, and technology* (pp. 129-156). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rice, R. E. (1993). Media appropriateness: Using social presence theory to compare traditional and new organizational media. *Human Communication Research, 19,* 451-484.

Rice, R. E., & Love, G. (1987). Electronic emotion: Socioemotional content in a computer-mediated network. *Communication Research, 14,* 85-108.

Rosell, M., & Hartman, S. (2001). Self-presentation of beliefs about gender discrimination and feminism. *Sex Roles, 44,* 647-659.

Rosenberg, J., & Egbert, N. (2011). Online impression management: Personality traits and concerns for secondary goals as predictors of self-presentation tactics on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 17,* 1–18.

Rosenfeld, P. R., Giacalone, R. A., & Riordan, C. A. (1995). *Impression management in organizations: Theory, measurement, and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ross, C., Orr, E. S., Sisic, M., Arseneault, J. M., Simmering, M. G., & Orr, R. R. (2009). Personality and motivations associated with Facebook use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *25*, 578-586.

Rubin, A. M. (1994). Media uses and effects: A uses and gratifications perspective. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 417-436). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sassenberg, K., & Boos, M. (2003). Attitude change in computer-mediated communication: Effects of anonymity and category norms. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relation, 6*, 405–422.

Schlenker, B. R. (1975). Self-presentation: Managing the impression of consistency when reality interferes with self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 1030–1037.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schlenker, B. R. (2003). Self-presentation. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 492–518). New York, NY: Guilford.

Sheldon, P. (2008). The relationship between unwillingness-to-communicate and students' Facebook use. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications*, *20*(2), 67-75.

Short, J. A., Williams, E., & Christie, B. (1976). *The social psychology of telecommunications*. London, UK: Wiley.

Smock, A. (2010, June). *The impact of second-party content on self-presentation within a social network site environment.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Singapore.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526–37.

Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances, private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring.* New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1994). Panacea or panopticon? The hidden power in computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research, 21,* 427–459.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1984). *Interpersonal communication competence*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sproull, L., & Kiesler, S. (1986). Reducing social context cues: electronic mail in organizational communication. *Management Science, 32*, 1492–1512.

Tal-or, N., & Drukman, D. (2010). Third-person perception as an impression management tactic. *Media Psychology, 13*(3), 301-322.

Tong, S. T., Van Der Heide, B., Langwell, L., & Walther, J. B. (2008). Too much of a good thing? The relationship between number of friends and interpersonal impressions on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13*, 531-549.

Tufekci, Z., & Spence, K. L. (2007, June). *Emerging gendered behavior on social network sites: Negotiating between the pull of the social and the fear of the stalker*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.

Turnley, W. H., & Bolino, M. C. (2001). Achieving desired images while avoiding undesired images: Exploring the role of self-monitoring in impression management. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(2), 351-360.

Urista, M. A., Dong, Q., & Day, K. D. (2008). Explaining why young adults use MySpace and Facebook through uses and gratifications theory. *Human Communication, 12*(2), 215-229.

Walther, J. B. (1992). Interpersonal effects in computer-mediated interaction: A relational perspective. *Communication Research, 19*(1), 52-90.

Walther, J. B. (1993). Impression development in computer-mediated interaction. *Western Journal of Communication, 57,* 381-398.

Walther, J. B. **(**1995**)**. Relational aspects of computer-mediated communication: Experimental observations over time. *Organization Science, 6,* 186-203**.**

Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research, 23*(1), 3-43.

Walther, J. B. (2006). Nonverbal dynamics in computer-mediated communication, or: (and the net: (‘s with you, :) and you :) alone. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *Handbook of nonverbal communication* (pp. 461–479). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Walther, J. B. (2007). Selective self-presentation in computer-mediated communication: Hyperpersonal dimensions of technology, language, and cognition. *Computers in Human Behavior, 23,* 2538–2557.

Walther, J. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1992). Relational communication in computer-mediated interaction. *Human Communication Research, 19,* 50-88.

Walther, J. B., Van Der Heide, B., Kim, S., Westerman, D., & Tong, S. T. (2008). The role of friends' behavior on evaluations of individuals' Facebook profiles: Are we known by the company we keep? *Human Communication Research, 34*, 28–49.

Wilson, T. (2012, June 19). Social media conduct could get you fired. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/small-business/sb-managing/human-resources/social-media-conduct-could-get-you-fired/article4346982/