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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In a day and age where relationships are initiated and maintained in online environments, the formation and management of impressions online has gained importance in more recent years and has become subject to numerous studies (e.g., Tong, Van Der Heide, Langwell, & Walther, 2008; Walther, Van Der Heide, Kim, Westerman, & Tong, 2008). With social networking sites such as Facebook and Myspace, and online dating sites like Match.com and Eharmony, individuals have the ability to create images of themselves without being constrained by time or space. These circumstances allow individuals to have ample time to manage their impressions while the geographical distance between interactants makes questioning more difficult. Internet users visit social networking sites and create public or private profiles that present themselves strategically in ways they would like to be perceived by others. Users’ authenticity and honesty has been questioned in recent years, as it has led to appalling developments, such as online predators. This study examines how individuals’ personality traits and concern for secondary goals (e.g., identity goals, relational resource goals, and arousal management goals) impact the self-presentation tactics they employ when communicating on Facebook.

According to Schlenker (1980), individuals try to increase rewards and decrease costs when attempting to lead others to form certain impressions of them. As Leary (1996) put it, “[i]n most instances in which people engage in impression management they do so because they believe, rightly or wrongly, that important outcomes are riding on the impressions they make on others” (p. 40). Further Leary notes that self-
presentation has three primary functions for individuals, including interpersonal influence, enhancing the construction of personal identity and the maintenance of self-esteem, and finally promoting positive emotions. Given that one of the primary functions for self-presentation is interpersonal personal influence (Schlenker, 1980), in that individuals try to convince others to perceive them in certain ways, goals-planning-action theory allows for further investigation of the persuasiveness of impression management, more precisely self-presentation tactics used by interactants.

Goals-planning-action theory links personality traits to goals, which previous studies have not addressed (Dillard, Anderson, & Knoblauch, 2002). The relationship between self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking, as psychological traits, and communicative adaptability, a behavior-oriented trait, will be examined and linked to individuals’ concern for secondary goals. Finally, one’s concern for secondary goals will be investigated as it relates to self-presentation tactics chosen by individuals (see page 6 for full model). Goal-planning-action will help to shed light on the goal-assessment process, the planning involved in impression management, and finally the execution of these plans. In other words, personality traits and communicative adaptability will be examined in relation to the self-presentation tactics used to achieve one’s goal of creating a desired self-impression.

Goal-planning-action is based on the assumption that social actors have to confront the issues related to their behavior in order to create a desired impression of themselves (Marwell & Schmitt, 1967). Deriving from this assumption, a distinction between primary and secondary goals is made. Primary goals are related to an individual’s desire to cause behavioral change in another person when engaging in
interpersonal influence attempts (Dillard, Segrin, & Harden, 1989). Secondary goals, on the other hand, are general motivations that continue to occur in an individual’s life, such as identity goals, interaction goals, relational resource goals, personal resource goals, and arousal management goals (Dillard et al., 1989). Secondary goals are an integral part of this study, as they encompass ongoing concerns individuals have during persuasive instances. According to Dillard and colleagues (1989), identity goals are individuals’ internal standards for behavior, interaction goals are related to the desire of managing one’s impression, resource goals are linked to the maintenance of valued assets, and arousal management goals are related to one’s attempt to remain within certain preferred arousal boundaries. In this particular study, secondary goals will tap into the impression management component by shedding light on how people attempt to create a desired impression by employing self-presentation tactics.

Even though behavioral change, in its traditional meaning, is not necessarily the primary goal when managing impressions, individuals do seek to create a desired impression of themselves when interacting with others in various communicative situations, and employ various self-presentation tactics to do so. The use of tactics points to the notion that because individuals want to be perceived in a certain light, they act accordingly. The actor’s self-presentational efforts affect the recipient’s behaviors, from which an individual assesses whether the intended impression was achieved (Leary, 1996). Therefore, the behavioral changes sought by individuals during interactions on social networking sites for affiliative or impression management reasons could be comparable, according to goals-planning-action, to persuasive communication acts.
To account for the skills-based necessities associated with successful impression management, the concept of communicative adaptability will be used to examine one’s behavioral flexibility when communicating with others (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking, on the other hand, will be the personality traits that will aid in attaining a better understanding of how people may differ in relation to the self-presentation tactics individuals choose.

Personality traits are important to include because the degree to which people manage impressions can vary greatly among individuals (Leary, 1996). To account for the differing levels of awareness when managing impressions, self-monitoring has been used widely to describe a person’s ability to recognize socially appropriate behavior as well as one’s concern for self-presentation (Snyder, 1974). However, self-monitoring alone will not suffice. Individuals must possess the behavioral repertoire to act according to what the situation requires of them. Therefore, communicative adaptability is necessary to be able to assess which self-presentation tactics will be most useful in any given communicative instance, which impacts the likelihood of creating desired impressions.

Individuals scoring high on self-monitoring are similar to individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism in that they are skilled impression managers (Ickes, Reidhead, & Patterson, 1986). Despite the similar outcomes, Machiavellianism is characterized by a willingness and ability to manipulate others for one’s own benefit (Christie & Geis, 1970), whereas self-monitoring points to the adjustability of one’s behavior in various situations (Snyder, 1974). According to Ickes and colleagues (1986), high Machs, or individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism, and high self-monitors manage their
impressions differently and most importantly, for different reasons. Therefore, this study will explore both self-monitoring and Machiavellianism and their relationship to communicative adaptability.

Regardless of individuals’ desired impressions, generally speaking, people want to be liked by others (Daly & Kreiser, 1994). To get others to like them, individuals engage in active processes, such as self-presentation tactics, in hopes of achieving this goal. The concept of wanting to be liked by others is known as affinity-seeking (Bell & Daly, 1984) and will be used to investigate further the relationship between affinity-seeking and communicative adaptability (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Unless an individual demonstrates behavioral flexibility that allows him or her to adjust to various communication contexts and situations, wanting to be liked by others will not suffice to achieve this goal. Various motivations for impression management exist and will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections, however affinity-seeking is based on one of the most fundamental needs of individuals: wanting to be liked by others (Rubin, Rubin, & Martin, 1993). Therefore, affinity-seeking will be examined in the light of communicative adaptability.

Although self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974), Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970), and affinity-seeking (Duran, 1983) are personality traits that are relatively stable across situations, communicative adaptability captures an individual’s ability to recognize the distinct characteristics of a socio-interpersonal relationship and adapt one’s communicative behaviors and goals accordingly (Duran, 1983). A goal of this study is to investigate the relationship between personality traits and communicative adaptability (a behavioral trait) (Duran, 1983). Further, this study seeks to determine the relationship
between communicative adaptability and one’s concern for secondary goals. In other words, the goal is to clarify whether or not individuals’ behavioral flexibility is related to the amount of concern they have for secondary goals. Lastly, one’s concern for secondary goals will be investigated in relation to self-presentation tactics individuals employ in hopes of achieving desired impressions. Thus, the following conceptual model will be tested to determine the relationship between these variables.

Figure 1: Conceptual model of self-presentation tactics on Facebook
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Impression Management

The Nature of Impression Management

Individuals spend most of their lives interacting with others. These interactions shape their view of themselves, which is reflected in the ways they present themselves during interactions. Symbolic interactionism captures the ongoing processes between one’s self, social interactions, and their links to developing meaning. According to Blumer (1986), symbolic interactionism rests on three simple premises: (1) individuals act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them; (2) meaning of such things derive from or develop out of social interactions with other individuals; and finally (3) meanings are handled and altered during interpretative processes used by individuals when dealing with various things. One’s self-concept is therefore crucial for not only how an individual interacts with others, but also how others approach and deal with him or her. Finally, the way one interprets and assigns meaning to various aspects of social life is also related to how one sees him or herself, which subsequently affects one’s self-presentation.

The exact causal relationship between interactions and self-identity is impossible to determine, however researchers examining self-presentation and impression management have been investigating this relationship for more than five decades (e.g., Goffman, 1959; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Leary, 1996; Pontari & Schlenker, 2006; Snyder, 1974). According to Leary (1996), people manage impressions for three general reasons: (1) to influence others to respond in desirable ways, (2) to establish and maintain one’s
private self-identity and self-esteem, and (3) to regulate their emotional experiences. Further, the author notes that impression management might also be traced back to one’s inherent need to be accepted and included.

In a review of literature on self-presentation, Buss and Briggs (1984) identify two emerging themes: (1) self-presentation is part of social behavior and (2) self-images influence the form of self-presentation. Both of these themes are integral components in the symbolic interactionist view of communication (Blumer, 1986). One of the first authors to argue that interactions serve a function of presenting an image of the self was Goffman (1959), who asserted that people engage in strategic actions to create and maintain a desired image. Goffman (1959) believed that individuals not only try to convince others to see them as just, respectable, and moral individuals, but also that people want to maintain the established positive impressions (Lemert & Branaman, 1997).

According to Goffman (1959), individuals play roles and wear masks that are representations of the ways they see themselves or of the ways they desire to be seen by others. Self-presentation also serves to manage others’ impressions of the self (Goffman, 1959). Similarly, Tedeschi and Riess (1981) argue that the goal of self-presentation is impression management and the two concepts are therefore inseparable. In fact, Buss and Briggs (1984) go as far as saying that self-presentation and impression management are “twins”. For the purpose of this study, the terms impression management and self-presentation will be used interchangeably as others have done so in the past (e.g., Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Lee, Quigley, Nesler, Corbett, & Tedeschi, 1999).
Impression management, according to Goffman (1959, p. 249), can be described as how:

The individual tends to treat the others present on the basis of the impression they give now about the past and the future. It is here that communicative acts are translated into moral ones. The impression that the others give tend to be treated as claims and promises they have implicitly made, and claims and promises tend to have moral character. In his mind the individual says: ‘I am using these impressions of you as a way of checking up on you and your activity, and you ought not to lead me astray’.

Research on self-presentation and impression management has shown that individuals manage their impressions for others, especially when the other person is considered to be of high status, powerful, attractive and/or likable (Schlenker, 1980). When anticipating an interaction with a desirable person (e.g., a physically attractive person), individuals are motivated to present themselves in a more favorable light in order to create a more desirable image of themselves (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Despite the fact that individuals always want to be seen favorably, these findings indicate that the more desirable the interactant, the more concerned the individual is with presenting a desirable image of him or herself as well, even if it is inconsistent with previous expressions of the self (e.g., Schlenker, 1985; Schlenker & Weigold, 1990).

Subsequently, different attributes are considered to be desirable in different situations and contexts. A study by Pontari and Schlenker (2006) revealed that individuals like and, in fact, prefer friends who stretch the truth (by exaggerating or
lying) to protect their friends. However generally speaking, people who tell the truth are more respected. These findings support the notion that although honesty is a highly valued characteristic, one’s willingness to stretch the truth to protect a friend can be a valued trait as well. Overall, these results point to the fact that depending on the situation and the relationship between interactants, different attributes might be more desirable than others.

All approaches to studying impression management are based on the assumption that individuals want to be perceived favorably by others and therefore act accordingly (Leary, 1996). However, the ways in which motivations for self-presentational acts are viewed can vary across approaches. For example, Jones and Pittman (1982) view self-presentation as an attempt to increase one’s power over another. Baumeister and Tice (1986), on the other hand, conceptualize impression management as an effort to construct a public identity.

Regardless of the approaches researchers take to the study of impression management, various motivations exist for why individuals engage in impression management. The subsequent section will discuss concepts that motivate individuals to manage their impression and the tactics they employ to achieve their goal of creating a desired impression of themselves.

*Motivations and Tactics for Managing Impressions*

According to Leary (1996), just because individuals are constantly monitoring impressions, it does not necessarily mean that they are engaging in impression management. Impression management often occurs when an individual makes an undesired impression and then attempts to restore the desired impression (Leary &
Schlenker, 1980). For example, an individual is asked to help a friend move to a new apartment, but has plans for the moving date already. To show that the individual is a good friend and willing to help, he or she will offer to help on a different day. By not being available on the moving date, the individual may be perceived as someone who is not willing to lend a friend a hand. To restore the desired impression of being a caring and helpful friend, the individual offers to help in other ways. However, there are various situations that motivate individuals to engage in impression management that do not necessarily have to be linked to having made a less favorable impression at some point in time, such as meeting new people or maintaining existing friendships.

According to Schlenker (1980), individuals’ motivation to manage impressions stems from the notion that people try to minimize costs while maximizing rewards associated with their behavior. Three primary motivations for managing impressions have been identified by Leary (1996) and include goal-relevance, value of desired impression, and discrepancies between the current and the desired impression. Each of these motivations will be discussed in greater detail in the subsequent sections.

Individuals are motivated to manage their impression when they believe that creating a certain impression will aid them in the achievement of a certain goal. Leary (1996) stated that the more crucial the impression is thought to be in relation to one’s goal attainment, the more motivated an individual will be to achieve a desired impression. For instance, a job interview presents a situation where achieving a desired impression can be crucial for the outcome. Therefore, people pay close attention to their appearance as well as their behavior during interviews.
Research also has shown that the more public one’s impression is, the more likely the individual is to engage in impression management (e.g., Schlenker & Weigold, 1992). Leary (1996) defines the publicity of an individual’s behavior as “the degree to which others might observe it firsthand or learn about it from secondhand sources” (p. 54). The author further explains that publicity increases impression management motivation, because if undesirable information is publicly available, it may inhibit the individual from attaining a goal. For instance, if a job applicant maintained a public Facebook profile and the potential employer found inappropriate information about the candidate, it could prevent the applicant from being offered the job, regardless of the impression he or she made during the job interview. This example illustrates the publicity of computer-mediated communication on social networking sites, such as Facebook.

Also, the degree to which a desired outcome is dependent on another person plays a significant role for the impression management motivation (Leary, 1996). If an individual relies on another person to achieve his or her goal, he or she is more likely to engage in impression management. This concept is often referred to as dependency. Another factor affecting individuals’ motivations for managing their impressions is whether individuals are anticipating future interactions with the other person. As the likelihood of future interactions increases, the motivation for managing one’s impressions increases as well (Leary, 1996).

Among the availability of resources and the characteristics of the target, the weight individuals puts on others’ approval of their person affects their motivation to manage their impressions (Leary, 1996). Individuals who fear negative evaluation or exclusion are more like to engage in impression management. Lastly, the discrepancy
that exists between the current and the desired impression of an individual facilitates the management of impressions. Motivations to engage in impression management do not suffice in making a desired impression on others. Individuals engage in various self-presentation tactics to present themselves in favorable ways.

Researchers concerned with self-presentation have provided ample support for the existence and use of various self-presentation tactics (e.g., Jones & Pittman, 1982; Lee et al., 1999; Lewis & Neighbors, 2005). According to Lee and colleagues (1999), “[s]elf-presentation tactics are behaviors used to manage impressions to achieve foreseeable short-term interpersonal objectives or goals” (p. 702). Given this definition, the authors distinguish between defensive and assertive self-presentation tactics.

Defensive self-presentation occurs when a specific event is perceived to be endangering or spoiling one’s desired impression. Further, defensive self-presentation is likely to be used when a desired impression is being restored or negative effects of an event have to be alleviated (Lee et al., 1999). On the other hand, assertive self-presentation refers to proactive behavioral efforts to establish and maintain a certain impression. According to Lee, et al. (1999), defensive and assertive self-presentation tactics serve different interpersonal purposes. Whereas assertive self-presentations are intended to create and maintain impressions, defensive self-presentations are meant to restore or defend spoiled impressions.

The model from which assertive and defensive self-presentation tactics emerged consists of numerous dimensions (Lee et al., 1999). Defensive self-presentation tactics include excuses, justifications, disclaimers, self-handicapping, and apologies. Assertive
self-presentation tactics, on the other hand, include ingratiation, intimidation, supplication, entitlement, enhancement, blasting, and exemplification.

Regardless of the tactics individuals choose when engaging in impression management, the computer-mediated environment provides a novel context for examining impression management efforts. By looking at the motivations that drive individuals to engage in impression management (Leary, 1996), it becomes clear that individuals are motivated to manage their impression in computer-mediated environments just as much as in face-to-face contexts.

When considering online environments, specifically the social networking site Facebook, two motivations for impression management (Leary, 1996) are particularly interesting to examine. Facebook allows users to create profiles, which are visible to either all Facebook users or are restricted to a select group of people (one’s Facebook “friends”). Therefore, the public nature of one’s impression will motivate people to manage their impressions more carefully. Also, future interactions with one’s Facebook “friends” are highly likely, which will increase one’s motivation to monitor his or her impressions more closely. To attain a better understanding of the nature of computer-mediated communication in general and Facebook, more specifically, the subsequent sections will discuss the various aspects of communication in these online environments.

*Computer-Mediated Communication*

*The Nature of Computer-Mediated Communication*

Understanding communication media is critical due to their capacity to reshape social relationships, cultural groups, and personal identities in ways that are difficult but important to predict (Leung & Lee, 2005). Particularly, the Internet has grown into a
medium that facilitates the development and maintenance of personal relationships. Relationships formed within online communities and chat rooms are defined as exclusively computer-mediated relationships, whereas non-Internet relationships refer to relationships developed within face-to-face contexts (Wright, 2000a).

The social networking site, Facebook, presents a platform where boundaries between non-Internet and exclusively computer-mediated relationships become blurred. Whereas some relationships on Facebook may be exclusively computer-mediated relationships, Facebook users might use this platform to maintain face-to-face relationships by moving some of their communication online. In other words, relationships can be established on and maintained through Facebook, however Facebook is also used to maintain face-to-face relationships. Although it is possible that some individuals form computer-mediated relationships on Facebook, this social networking site is mainly used to reconnect with old friends and keep in touch with family and friends around the world. Computer-mediated communication is a common occurrence in this day and age. Therefore, this study seeks to explore how personality traits, communicative adaptability, and one’s concern for secondary goals are related to self-presentation tactics employed by Facebook users.

Researchers often emphasize the positive influence of the Internet on personal relationships because the Internet lowers communication barriers of space and time (e.g., increased speed of transactions creates more time for other activities, such as face-to-face interactions) (Braithwaite, Waldron, & Finn, 2000; Hlebec, Manfreda, & Vehovar, 2006; Wright, 2000b). Similarly, online communities promote greater relatedness among members of society by reducing barriers of time, distance, and social status through the
formation of virtual communities (Braithwaite et al., 2000). Facebook, just like other social networking sites, decreases these communication barriers.

Given the asynchrony of most Facebook communication, it is particularly interesting to explore how it is used for impression management. From an impression management perspective, individuals have more time to think about what kinds of impressions they want others to have of them and can also take their time when crafting images of themselves. At the same time, receivers have ample time to expose themselves to the information provided by the sender and can take their time when forming their impressions.

Even though most studies have examined relationship development and maintenance in online environments, some studies have examined impression formation in computer-mediated environments, such as on Facebook. The subsequent section will review research findings from studies that have examined how impressions are formed on Facebook.

*Facebook and Impressions*

Facebook is a social networking site that allows users to post information about themselves. Facebook users create profiles that allow them to upload a profile picture, post contact information, publish what they are currently doing or thinking, and so forth. According to Facebook’s mission statement, it exists is to make the world a more open and connected place by allowing individuals to stay in touch with friends, upload photos, share links, and learn about the people they meet. Facebook contains a so-called “wall”, which allows the profile owner as well as their friends to post comments, links and photos that other friends of the user can see.
There are various sources of information on Facebook pages. First, as mentioned earlier, the user is able to disclose information on his or her profile. Second, other users, or “friends”, can post comments on walls, which also impact perceptions related to the user. On average a Facebook user is linked to 246 friends through the social networking site (Walther et al., 2008). Lastly, the computer system itself publishes information on an individual’s profile, such as the number of friends on Facebook. According to Tong and colleagues (2008), “[g]iven these kinds of linkages that Facebook and similar systems provide, the sites are all the more interesting to communication researchers because they are specifically dedicated to forming and managing impressions, relational maintenance, and relationship-seeking” (p. 532).

A study by Walther and colleagues (2008) examined how posts made by a Facebook user’s friends impact observers’ ratings of the social attractiveness and credibility of the profile owner. The study utilized the Brunswikian Lens Model, which suggests that observers pick up on non-behavioral clues that are found in a social actor’s environment and make inferences about the actor’s personality based on those clues.

Using this model, study findings revealed that the physical attraction of one’s Facebook friends was related to ratings of the owner’s physical attractiveness. In other words, the more physically attractive one’s Facebook friends were perceived to be, the more attractive the owner was thought to be, as well. Walther and colleagues (2008) also found that comments made by one’s Facebook friends impacted the profile owner’s rating of social attractiveness and credibility. Negative posts, for example posts related to excessive drinking, decreased the profile owner’s ratings of social attractiveness, whereas posts alluding to pro-social behavior of the profile owner resulted in more favorable
ratings. These findings suggest that Facebook friends use information provided by sources other than the profile owner him or herself when forming impressions.

Another study by Tong and colleagues (2008) found that the more Facebook friends a profile owner had, the more socially attractive he or she was perceived to be. Interestingly, further results showed that ratings of a profile owner’s extraversion were highest with a moderate number of friends. Even though some information found on one’s Facebook profile is not strategically placed there, it still contributes to the overall impressions others make of an individual.

Unlike early studies on CMC (e.g., Hiltz, Johnson, & Turoff, 1986; Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976; Trevino, Lengel, & Daft, 1987), more recent studies were able to provide support for the assumptions related to CMC being able to facilitate interpersonal communication. More specifically, CMC facilitates interpersonal communication that aids in the establishment and maintenance of relationships (e.g., Tidwell & Walther, 2002; Utz, 2000), as well as the formation and management of impressions (e.g., Walther, Anderson, & Parks, 1994; Walther et al., 2008). By communicating in online environments, individuals can meet and get to know new people and keep in touch with family members, friends, and colleagues. The Internet has become a medium that facilitates personal and relational communication (Walther & Parks, 2002).

Self-presentation, or impression management, is a concept that illustrates that even the seemingly most mundane behavior serves a purpose. For example, even the choice of clothing or one’s tone of voice when saying “good morning” can contribute to the impression others form about an individual. Individuals are goal-oriented in their
communication behaviors, whether it is face-to-face or in online environments (Berger, 2002). In other words, there is always a goal behind every communicative act.

Self-presentation and impression management are both conscious efforts to control selected behaviors to make a desired impression on a particular audience (e.g., Leary, 1996; Schlenker & Pontari, 2000). Desired impressions are defined as impressions an individual wants others to have of him or her (Leary, 1996). Making a desired impression on an audience is a goal individuals attempt to achieve, however before engaging in self-presentation tactics, individuals first have to establish what their desired impression is. Once a desired impression is determined, the individual can then begin to plan how he or she will attempt to create the desired impression and finally put the plan into action. The subsequent section will review individuals’ goal-orientation, how interactants develop plans to achieve their goals, and finally how these plans are put into action.

Goals-Planning-Action

Individuals communicate for a reason and behavior is purpose-driven. The notion of social or communicative goals is prominent in the literature and has generated considerable research (e.g., Dillard et al., 1989; Greene & Graves, 2007; Waldron & Applegate, 1994). In fact, Berger (2002) stated that it is largely agreed upon that human action is goal-directed and that human cognition is shaped by this goal-directedness. Deriving from previous research on goals, plans, and action, Dillard (1990b) proposed a theoretical framework, known as goals-planning-action (GPA), which seeks to explain interpersonal influence.
Figure 2: Goals-planning-action model

This model illustrates the various stages of the goals-planning-action model. According to Dillard (1990b), “the source may go first to the engagement decision point or to the tactic generation process” (p. 51). The model suggests that only one of the two paths can be taken at a time. The dashed arrows illustrate one of the two possible paths, whereas the dotted arrow demonstrates the other path. After assessing goals, generating plans, and deciding to engage in an influence attempt, the actor, or source, selects a plan appropriate for the occasion. Following the plan selection, an individual will implement the chosen tactic. Finally the target will respond to the influence attempt, which will then cause the actor to either assess new goals or select a new plan. This model is known as the goals-planning-action (GPA) model. To explain the framework in greater detail, it is necessary to define underlying terms and their dynamics.

Goals

Formulating goals leads to planning, which in turn leads to actions intended to accomplish goals (Dillard, 1990a). According to Dillard (1990b), “[g]oals are defined as
future states of affairs which an individual is committed to achieving or maintaining” (p. 43). Individuals pursue multiple goals at the same time and these goals vary in the degree of abstraction. The hierarchy of goals is often determined by any given moment in time, which causes different goals to be dominant at different times (Dillard, 1990b).

The main difference between goals and motives is the fact that motives are broad and abstract, therefore most often conceptual. Goals, on the other hand, are empirical, meaning that goals can be observed in individuals’ behavior (Dillard, 1990b). It is also important to note that a single motive is capable of generating a primary, often referred to as influence goal, as well as a secondary goal. Dillard further notes that the influence goal is a motivating one, however the potential costs associated with interaction mismanagement, the damage to the relationship, or anxiety, can prevent the goals-planning-action process to continue.

In general, there are two types of goals: influence, also known as primary, goals and secondary goals (Dillard, 1989, 1990b). The main distinction between the two types of goals is related to their centrality to the influence attempt and their causal relationship to one another. According to Dillard (1990b), primary goals can be thought of as bracketing the attempt, which also provides explanation for the interaction. In other words, the primary goals provide reasons and explanations for why a particular behavior was enacted. At the same time, primary goals are also influenced by secondary goals. In order to explain further the relationship between primary and secondary goals, a more detailed discussion is necessary.

Primary goals. Primary goals are related to an individuals’ desire to cause behavioral or attitudinal change in another person through interpersonal influence
When an actor perceives a discrepancy between the current state and the desired state, the actor becomes more aware of the primary, or influence, goals. This process then further causes the actor to engage in a goals-planning-action (GPA) sequence, given that the perceived magnitude of the discrepancy is significant enough (Dillard, 1990b). Primary goals impact the amount of thought and effort put into the planning process, as well as the degree to which evidence and reason is used (Dillard et al., 1989).

Compliance-gaining literature identified a typology of influence goals, including initiating a relationship, obtaining permission, gaining assistance, escalating a relationship, giving assistance, protecting a right, and normative requests (for further discussion see Cody, Canary, & Smith, 1994). However, in the context of this study, the influence goal is the desired impression the actor seeks to achieve. Hence, the influence goal is the impression goal, given that self-presentation and impression management is the focus of this study.

Secondary goals. Secondary goals are reoccurring motivations in an individual’s life and include identity goals, interaction goals, personal and relational resource goals, and arousal management goals (Dillard et al., 1989). More precisely, secondary goals “act as a counterforce to [the influence episode] and as a set of dynamics that help to shape planning and message output” (Dillard, 1990b, p. 46). Rather than directly affecting the influence episode, secondary goals can be viewed as constraints that shape how the influence attempt is approached and enacted.

For example, individuals engage in editing of message features and monitoring of their behavior. These editing and monitoring behaviors are results of individuals’ abilities
to assess possible outcomes deriving from the messages they produce (Meyer, 1997). In other words, based on episodes stored in one’s memory, people can estimate the outcomes associated with their behaviors and therefore edit and monitor their actions. Therefore, the above-mentioned constraints can subsequently impact the success of influence attempts.

As previously mentioned, secondary goals are composed of various reoccurring motivations (Dillard et al., 1989). These motivations are either self-orientated or are directed toward both interactants, actors as well as targets. Interaction goals and relational resource goals take into consideration the actor as well as the target, whereas identity goals, personal resource goals, and arousal management goals are more directed toward the actor.

*Interaction goals* are related to the social appropriateness of one’s actions. They involve an individual’s desire to manage one’s impression successfully while avoiding face-threats directed toward either party. According to Dillard (1990b), interaction goals are also related to the desire to create relevant and coherent messages. The notion that individuals will attempt to increase and maintain valued relational assets is formulated by *relational resource goals*. These goals focus on an individual’s desire to increase or maintain attention, emotional support, as well as social comparison (Dillard, 1990b).

Whereas interaction goals and relational resource goals are concerned with the actor as well as the target, *identity goals* are primarily related to an individual’s self-concept. Identity goals “derive from one’s moral standards, principles for living, and personal preferences concerning one’s own conduct” (Dillard et al., 1989, p. 20). Similarly to relational resource goals, *personal resource goals* are related to the
maintenance or increase of material, physical, mental, and temporal assets an individual may have (Dillard, 1990b). Finally, *arousal management goals* are based on the notion that individuals like to maintain certain boundaries, within which they feel comfortable. For example, an individual who is particularly anxious during confrontations will most likely avoid such situations, even if confrontation would be the most effective way to achieve their primary goal.

Secondary goals tend to inhibit the approach force, whereas primary goals make up the approach dynamic. When primary and secondary goals act together, the actor may choose to engage in an influence attempt. Each goal is assigned a weight, which impacts the decision to either engage or not to engage in an influence attempt (Dillard, 1990b). When secondary goals outweigh the primary goals, an individual will be less likely to engage in an attempt. For instance, when an individual anticipates asking someone for a big favor that has the potential to hurt the relationship, he or she will be less likely to ask the target.

Individuals consider the ways in which they ought to behave in order to achieve the desired outcome. This process is the basis for goal-oriented behavior and fundamental to this line of research (Berger, 2002). Primary goals are directly related to the desired outcome, whereas secondary goals are constraints that shape an individual’s plans and action as to how to achieve a particularly goal (Dillard, 1990b; Dillard et al., 1989). Goal-directed behavior alone does not guarantee success in attaining the desired outcome. Rather, it is the planning process and the actions taken that determine the success of any influence attempt.
Plans and Planning

Once a person decides to engage in an influence attempt, the planning process takes place. Goals guide individuals’ actions, however before action can be taken, planning has to occur. Berger (1988) describes plans as the elaboration on the set of actions that are required to achieve a goal. Greene and Graves (2007) noted that “plans specify a series of steps for accomplishing a goal” (p. 33). Therefore, plans follow goals. In other words, it is through plans that individuals formulate action necessary to achieve a certain goal.

According to Dillard (1990b), tactic plans are “representation[s] of a set[s] of verbal and nonverbal actions that might modify the behavior of the target” (p. 48) and can vary along three dimensions, which include hierarchy, complexity, and completeness. The more important a primary goal is to an individual, the more likely he or she is to engage in systematic planning to attain the goal. According to Berger and Bell (1988), plans that are more complex tend to be judged as more effective. In fact, complex plans developed online over time appear to be more effective than simple plans (Waldron & Applegate, 1994). Further findings of Waldron and Applegate’s (1994) study also suggest that individuals who incorporate the target’s goals into their planning process are more likely to achieve their desired goals. This is particularly interesting in the light of the present study, which seeks to explain individuals’ self-presentation tactics on Facebook and how secondary goals affect the types of tactics chosen by Facebook users.

Plans exist as psychological entities and find their way into the empirical world as actions (Dillard, 1990b). The fact that plans are psychological entities is important, given that plan execution is dependent on an individual’s cognitive capacity. Before engaging
in an influence episode, individuals generate plans appropriate for the occasion and then choose the preferred approach. This process is also influenced by secondary goals, which are affected by situational and individual differences, such as self-monitoring. However, planning alone does not suffice when trying to attain a goal. Interactants have a chance at achieving their primary goal, only when they put their plans into action.

**Action**

The final stage of the goals-planning-action (GPA) framework is when plans are put into action. However, there are two main problems when implementing plans (Dillard, 1990b). The first type of problem is the required materials to execute the plan. For instance, if an individual’s primary goal is to buy a vehicle from a dealership for a certain price, but does not have the monetary resources to come to a reasonable compromise with the seller, one’s plan will not be able to be executed. The second type of problem is related to power-based tactics, such as threats made by the actor. Unless situational and personal resources are available to follow through with a threat, for example, should the actor choose to make the threat in the first place, the plan cannot be executed and is therefore ineffective.

One of the most important aspects of putting plans into action is an individual’s cognitive capacity. Whereas some plans are straightforward, others can be very complex. Depending on the plan’s complexity, the execution can require great cognitive effort and therefore might be constrained by factors related to cognitive capacity. According to Dillard (1990b), such factors tend to be linked to an individual’s ability to create the behaviors necessary either to elaborate on an incomplete plan or put a plan into action.
For instance, increased arousal has a negative effect on an individual’s ability to use logic (Dillard et al., 1989). This finding emphasizes that when an individual is not comfortable with the level of arousal during a particular situation, he or she will be restricted in his or her use of logic during an influence attempt. Increased arousal constitutes one of the five dimensions of secondary goals, namely arousal management goals. Secondary goals are constraints that shape influence attempts (Dillard, 1990b) and given that increased arousal impact one’s ability to execute plans using logic, other dimensions of secondary goals (interaction goals, relational resource goals, and identity goals) are expected to be related to tactics individuals choose during influence attempts.

To assess the relationship between secondary goals and the various self-presentation tactics used on Facebook, the statistical analysis controlled for gender, age, the number of Facebook friends, and the number of Facebook log-ins per week. The number of Facebook friends and Facebook log-ins per week was controlled for to account for varying levels of familiarity (due to frequency of use) with the social networking site. Gender and age were controlled for to ensure that the relationships between secondary goals and self-presentation tactics were not due to these demographic variables. To attain a better understanding of how individuals’ concerns for secondary goals are related to the self-presentation tactics they choose, following research question is posed:

RQ1: Controlling for demographic variables, how do personality traits, communicative adaptability, and secondary goals incrementally improve prediction of self-presentation tactic use?

Regardless of the primary and secondary goals individuals might wish to achieve, plans can only be put into action when individuals possess the necessary skills to do so.
In the case of impression management, individuals have to be able to assess the situation and context, and adapt their actions accordingly. A concept known as communicative adaptability, which refers to the one’s behavioral flexibility during communication instances (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989), will aid in exploring how communication skills are related to self-presentation tactics chosen by actors during online impression management.

**Communicative Adaptability**

Communicative adaptability is a concept related to communicative competence, which is a widely studied concept in the realm of communication. As Spitzberg and Cupach (1989) note, competence, at the most general level of its meaning, means being fit or having the ability to perform.

Communicative adaptability emerged from communicative competence research and therefore is closely related to competence. Behavioral flexibility and repertoire are integral parts of communicative competence (e.g., Rubin, 1990). Duran (1983) defines communicative adaptability as a cognitive and behavioral “ability to perceive socio-interpersonal relationships and adapt one’s interaction goals and behaviors accordingly” (p. 320). Further, Duran (1992) notes that adaptability can be accomplished “by perceiving contextual parameters and enacting communication appropriate to the setting” (p. 254). As noted by Spitzberg and Cupach (1989), flexibility and behavioral repertoire, as to one’s ability to adapt one’s goals and behaviors, are integral aspects of Duran’s (1983) view on communicative adaptability as well.

According to Spitzberg and Cupach (1989), there are three themes that emerge from communicative competence literature, including control, collaboration, and
adaptability. Adaptability is often referred to as behavioral flexibility and constitutes the single most-quoted characteristic of socially competent individuals (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Behavioral flexibility consists of having a diverse behavioral repertoire that allows individuals to adjust in changing social contexts, while at the same time avoiding habitual behavioral patterns that would impede flexibility. According to Spitzberg and Cupach (1989), “[b]ehavioral repertoire constitutes an individual’s strategic and tactical options during interactions. Flexibility implies matching one’s responses to one’s goals, as well as tailoring responses to the constraints and exigencies of the particular situation” (p. 22). In other words, flexibility allows an individual to adapt one’s actions to various physical, social, as well as relational contexts.

Duran and Spitzberg (1995) state that the cognitive dimension of competence is an important one and consists of various mental processes that include numerous abilities, such as the ability perceive situational variables, the ability to choose behaviors according to the situation, and the ability to anticipate consequences deriving from behaviors. Spitzberg and Cupach (1989) stated that goals represent objectives or outcomes desired by a person and vary in terms of salience. What the authors refer to as salience, Dillard (1990b) calls hierarchy of goals. These researchers all believe that underlying goals there are motivations that drive individuals to pursue a certain goal.

In terms of communicative adaptability, this statement means that motivation consists of factors that either facilitate or impede an individual’s ability and willingness to approach social situations (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Such factors could be related to those known as secondary goals, which include identity goals, interaction goals, personal and relational goals, and arousal management goals (Dillard et al., 1989).
Secondary goals are known to be constraints that shape how influence attempts are enacted (Dillard, 1990b, p. 46) and could therefore be related to an individuals' behavioral flexibility (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Similar to Research Question 1, the effects of gender, age, the number of Facebook friends, and the number of Facebook log-ins per week were controlled to assess the relationships between communicative adaptability and one’s concern for secondary goals. Further, it is important to note that the model does not suggest that communicative adaptability fulfills a mediating role.

Based on previous literature and research, following research question is being posed:

RQ2: Controlling for demographic variables how do personality traits and communicative adaptability improve prediction of secondary goals on Facebook?

Even though skills have been highlighted in communicative competence research, numerous studies have examined other aspects of communicative competence (e.g., personality traits). A number of studies have examined various personality traits and their relationship to communicative competence (e.g., Roloff & Kellermann, 1984; Snyder, 1974; Weinstein, 1969). For example, Weinstein (1969) found that empathy and Machiavellianism are both traits that promote interpersonal competence, whereas rigidity impedes the development of competency. Also, Roloff and Kellermann (1984) and Snyder (1974) determined that self-monitoring facilitates competence, as well. For the purpose of this study, a skills-based perspective on communicative competence and communicative adaptability will be taken, as this choice will allow for further investigation of personality traits’ impact on communicative adaptability, which will then be linked to one’s concern for secondary goals and self-presentation tactics.
From a skills-based perspective, there are factors that either impede or facilitate one’s willingness and ability to approach social situations (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). These factors include personality traits that have been linked to communicative adaptability. Communicative adaptability researchers have examined various personality traits and their relationship to adaptability. For example, research on communicative adaptability found that cognitive complexity is related to communicative adaptability (Delia & Crockett, 1973). Cognitive complexity has been found to be associated with individuals’ ability to adapt their behaviors and message strategies to various contexts. More specifically, Delia and Crockett (1973) found that construct schemas are related to individuals’ listening skills and message strategies, which, in turn, impact the adaptation of their behavior.

Other personality traits related to communicative adaptability are social confirmation, social composure, and appropriate disclosure (Duran, 1983). Given the findings from previous studies on personality traits and communicative adaptability, this study examines the relationship between communicative adaptability and self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking. Therefore, the subsequent section will discuss each of the personality traits, namely self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking, and their hypothesized relationship to communicative adaptability.

**Personality Traits**

*Self-Monitoring*

Individuals vary in the degree to which they manage impressions of themselves (Snyder, 1974). Some people give careful consideration to how others perceive them, whereas some individuals rarely pay attention to their public image and hardly ever
attempt to manage their impressions (Leary, 1996). Individual characteristics often contribute to these differences. One of the most studied personality traits in association with impression management is self-monitoring (e.g., Berscheid, Graziano, Monson, Dermer, 1976; Dabbs, Evans, Hopper, & Purvis, 1980; Fandt & Ferris, 1990; Jones & Baumeister, 1976; Leone & Corte, 1994; Turnley & Bolino, 2001).

Self-monitoring refers to the process whereby individuals regulate their own behavior to showcase traits that are desirable and perceived favorably by others (Snyder, 1974). According to Snyder (1987), there are “differences in the extent to which people monitor (observe, regulate, and control) the public appearances of the self they display in social situations and interpersonal relationships” (p. 4). In other words, self-monitoring assesses the degree to which an individual alters one’s self-presentation to adapt to a particular situation and/or social climate (Wright, Holloway, & Roloff, 2007).

According to Lennox and Wolfe (1984), self-monitoring is an individual’s sensitivity to the other’s self-presentation. There are two components that comprise self-monitoring: 1) an individual’s ability to adapt self-presentation and 2) an individual’s sensitivity to an other’s expressive behavior. Spitzberg (1990) found that self-monitoring is significantly correlated with communication knowledge, which also was found to be significantly related to the ability to modify self-presentation, as well as the sensitivity to other’s expressive behavior. These findings suggest one’s ability to adapt self-presentation and one’s sensitivity to other’s behavior are related concepts. Other aspects affecting an individual’s level of self-monitoring are individual differences.

Considerable evidence exists that there are important individual differences that enable or inhibit individuals from characteristically engaging in impression management.
According to Leone and Corte (1994), individuals differ in their motivations as well as their abilities “to control their nonverbal behavior, expressions of affect, and self-presentation” (p. 305). Therefore, one’s ability to create a desired impression is dependent on one’s level of self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974).

The concept of self-monitoring distinguishes between high and low self-monitors. High self-monitors are able to monitor their behavior to fit different situations, whereas low self-monitors tend to be more consistent across various types of contexts (Snyder, 1974). Snyder (1974) described a high self-monitor as an individual who, “out of a concern for social appropriateness, is particularly sensitive to the expression and self-presentation of others in social situations and uses these cues as guidelines for monitoring (observing and controlling)” (p. 528) his or her self-presentations.

*High self-monitors.* High self-monitors often ask themselves the question “Who does this situation want me to be and how can I be that person?” (Snyder, 1987, p. 46). Being particularly concerned with the social and situational appropriateness of their behavior, high self-monitors engage in social comparison more frequently than low self-monitors. The notion of concern for social appropriateness is also central to Dillard’s (1990b) interaction goals, as these goals involve one’s desire to manage impressions successfully while avoiding face-threats to either party. Further, high self-monitors have access to a greater repertoire of social roles as well as scripts, which enables them to be more strategic, as they are always attempting to be the right person at the right time (Leone & Corte, 1994). Spitzberg and Cupach (1989) stated that the availability of a greater behavioral repertoire is also related to communication competence.
In other words, high self-monitors tend to be highly concerned with the social appropriateness of their actions, use social comparison information, and monitor their behaviors to fit specific situations (Snyder, 1974, 1987). According to Daly (2002), individuals who score high on self-monitoring are attentive to what others do and are skilled at controlling images of themselves and adapt to social situations by assessing what is required of them. Their greater sensitivity to social contexts allows them to tailor their images in ways that best serve their goals (Snyder, 1987).

Research has shown that, as compared to individuals who score low on self-monitoring, high self-monitors are more active and talkative in groups (Dabbs et al., 1980). Findings from a study conducted by Leone and Corte (1994) suggest that high self-monitors are more likely to experience audience segregation difficulties, as they are constantly attempting to meet the expectations of multiple, different, audiences at the same time. High self-monitors also tend to be better at detecting others’ manipulative tactics during interactions (Jones & Baumeister, 1976), as well as remembering more information about others (Berscheid, Graziano, Monson, & Dermer, 1976), which allows them to tailor their behavior better to the particular situation and audience. Generally, individuals scoring high on self-monitoring are more likely to manipulate information to present a more desirable image of themselves (Fandt & Ferris, 1990). Similarly, Turnley and Bolino (2001) found that high self-monitors are more effective at managing impressions, whereas low self-monitors’ impression management tends to be viewed more negatively due to the obvious nature of their self-presentational strategies.

Low self-monitors. Individuals scoring low on self-monitoring are less sensitive to social cues, and therefore are less skilled at assessing appropriate behaviors and self-
presentation in various situations (Leary, 1996). Although Snyder (1974) originally asserted that low self-monitors are more inner-directed, and therefore less responsive to social cues, more recent research has shown that this is not a result of being more inner-directed.

Low self-monitors are particularly concerned with self-congruence, and therefore appear to be driven by their attitudes, traits, needs, other personal attributes (Leone & Corte, 1994). Unlike high self-monitors, individuals scoring low on self-monitoring tend to have a limited repertoire of self-regulatory skills and choose actions and words in accordance with their dispositions.

Although it may seem that high self-monitors are generally viewed as more likable, low self-monitors are more likely to form deeper and more trusting relationships (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). These findings might be related to the fact that individuals scoring high on self-monitoring are more likely to date many different people and feel less committed to their partners as compared to low self-monitors (Snyder & Simpson, 1987). Therefore, it is possible that individuals scoring low on self-monitoring are more concerned with what Dillard (1990b) calls relational resource goals.

Given that self-monitoring refers to an individual’s ability to adapt one’s self-presentation to various social climates (Wright et al., 2007), behavior flexibility is implied in the self-monitoring. Whereas self-monitoring is related to one’s ability to adjust one’s self-presentation (Snyder, 1974), communicative adaptability involves one’s overall ability to adjust communicatively (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984) and is not limited to self-presentational efforts.
Overall findings suggest that individuals who score high on self-monitoring are more skillful in their self-presentational endeavors by being able to assess social situations and adjust their behavior accordingly (e.g., Berscheid et al., 1976; Dabbs et al., 1980; Jones & Baumeister, 1976). Research has demonstrated that self-monitoring is related to competent communication (Roloff & Kellermann, 1984; Snyder, 1979) and that self-monitoring includes, but is not limited to, the ability to adapt to various social climates (Wright et al., 2007). Therefore, following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Self-monitoring will be positively related to communicative adaptability.

As previously mentioned, high self-monitors are skilled in managing impressions (Leone & Corte, 1994). However, skilled impression management is not exclusive to high self-monitors. Individuals high in Machiavellianism are also skilled impression managers, although they manage their impressions for different purposes (Ickes et al., 1986). To further explore the link between Machiavellianism and communicative adaptability, the subsequent sections will discuss findings related to Machiavellianism and self-presentation.

Machiavellianism

People who are manipulative and are often willing to fabricate impressions of themselves are known as Machiavellian (Leary, 1996). This trait was named after Niccolo Machiavelli, who endorsed political leaders’ managing their impressions to conceal corrupt actions while still seeming to be acting in the state’s best interest.

Individuals scoring high in Machiavellianism have a tendency to be calculated and strategic in their actions, and are therefore more likely to cheat or lie to attain their
goals. In other words, Machiavellians tend to have a “utilitarian rather than a moral view of their interactions with others” (Christie & Geis, 1970, p. 3). Even though high Machs (individuals scoring high in Machiavellianism) act in a calculated and highly goal-oriented manner, they do not lack morals. Rather, high Machs tend to share the belief that there are no moral values that apply to all situations (Leary, Knight, & Barnes, 1986).

Despite the fact that both high self-monitors and Machiavellians are skilled in presenting themselves in a certain light, their motives are vastly different (Leone & Corte, 1994). High self-monitors are other-oriented and therefore accommodative, whereas individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism tend to be self-oriented and assimilative (Ickes et al., 1986). Even though Machiavellians and high self-monitors may employ the same self-presentational strategies, they do so for divergent purposes (Leone & Corte, 1994).

According to Christie and Geis (1970), Machiavellians, or “Machs,” are characterized by their willingness and ability to manipulate others. Further, Machiavellians tend to act with little or no regard to ethical norms, and they skillfully employ strategies to exploit situations and people for their personal benefit (Grams & Rogers, 1990). These Machiavellian traits suggest that high Machs might be more concerned with what Dillard (1990b) calls identity and personal resource goals.

An experiment conducted by Grams and Rogers (1990) revealed that when high Machs were presented with a situation that required them to make an influence attempt, they were more likely to choose nonrational than rational tactics (e.g., threat as opposed to reason), and preferred indirect tactics as opposed to direct tactics (e.g., hinting as opposed to bargaining). Further, findings suggest that high Machs are more likely to use
deceit and emotional appeals, with which they attempt to plant ideas into the target’s mind. Grams and Rogers (1990) further noted that low Machs preferred to influence their targets using logic and simple statements. During instances in which targets rejected a low Mach’s logic, low Machs found it difficult to comprehend.

Further, Grams and Rogers (1990) found that high Machs are more effective in interpersonal settings and are therefore better at negotiating and bargaining, while also being able to withstand social pressure (Christie & Geis, 1970). Machiavellians are also better at telling lies without being detected. A study by Geis and Moon (1981) revealed that even though observers were not able to tell whether a high Mach was lying or not, they were able to tell when a lie was told by a low Mach. These findings suggest that high Machs are more skilled liars, whereas low Machs engage in more obvious attempts when telling a lie. Other research findings support the notion of high Machs being more skilled in interpersonal settings. For example, Weinstein (1969) found that Machiavellianism promotes interpersonal competence, which is a related concept to communicative adaptability. Therefore, following hypothesis is proposed:

H2: Machiavellianism will be positively related to communicative adaptability.

Regardless of how aware individuals are of the impressions they are making and how skilled they are creating desired impression by employing various self-presentation tactics, impression management itself can be traced back to individuals’ inherent need to be accepted and included (Leary, 1996). Liking is often the underlying factor when engaging in behaviors that are meant to facilitate acceptance and inclusion. These behaviors are nonverbal and verbal
communicative efforts through which individuals try to get others to like them (Daly & Kreiser, 1994). However, the sole desire to be liked by others does not suffice. Being liked by others requires individuals to have the ability to communicatively adapt to various situations, contexts, and interactants. Therefore, the subsequent section will discuss affinity-seeking and its hypothesized relationship to communicative adaptability.

**Affinity-Seeking**

Affinity seeking is based on the notion that individuals want others to like them, which is one of the most basic, and possibly even most defining, characteristics of human beings (Daly & Kreiser, 1994). According to Bell and Daly (1984), affinity seeking is defined as “the active social-communicative process by which individuals attempt to get others to like and to feel positive toward them” (p. 91). Affinity seeking is an active and strategic process (Daly & Kreiser, 1994). Despite the fact that affinity seeking has been studied by various disciplines, Daly and Kreiser (1994) emphasize its centrality as a communication construct. After all, it is through nonverbal and verbal communication that individuals try to get others to like them.

Individuals need to be liked by others and therefore use various affinity-seeking strategies to enhance others’ affect towards them (Rubin et al., 1993). As previously stated, self-presentation and impression management are conscious attempts to control behaviors to make a desired impression on a particular audience by employing various self-presentation tactics (e.g., Leary, 1996; Schlenker & Pontari, 2000). A desired image often includes wanting to be liked by others, which is therefore related to impression management.
The ultimate “goal of affinity is to generate, maintain, or enhance liking of one person by another” (Daly & Kreiser, 1994). There are three main antecedent factors in affinity-seeking behaviors: interaction goals, motives for affinity seeking, and level of consciousness. It is important to note that individuals often pursue multiple goals at the same time (Dillard, 1990b). Competent communication is one way to accomplish these multiple goals. Whereas affinity can be one of many goals, in certain social contexts it can be the main goal (Bell & Daly, 1984; Daly & Kreiser, 1994). For example, affinity might be the primary goal during a blind date, it might not be as important during a dispute with one’s property manager.

In communication research, the desired outcome of persuasion is attitude or behavioral change. When considering affinity seeking, liking is the desired outcome and persuasion is the way to achieve this goal (Daly & Kreiser, 1994). According to Bell and Daly (1984), there are also multiple motives for affinity. However, “one can suppose a very basic motive is the seemingly innate sociability of human beings; relationships demand affinity” (Daly & Kreiser, 1994, p. 113). Whether affinity is a primary goal during an influence attempt or is related to one’s concerns for secondary goals, it is a desired outcome. Goals-planning-action theory posits that individuals have goals which they pursue by putting plans into action (Dillard et al., 1989). Daly and Kreiser (1994) note that regardless of the goals being pursued, affinity aids their accomplishment. For example, affinity-seeking behaviors and nonverbal immediacy increase student learning and motivation (Roach & Byrne, 2001). Although affinity is not the primary goal of instructors, it aids in accomplishing their primary goal of teaching students.
Bell and Daly (1984) identified 25 commonly used affinity-seeking strategies, including presenting an interesting self, self-concept confirmation, similarity, and so forth. The application of these strategies can impact significantly how well an individual is liked by others. Affinity-seeking has been examined in various relational contexts, such as marital relations (e.g., Daly & Kreiser, 1994) and initial interactions (e.g., Martin & Rubin, 1998). Findings support the notion that affinity-seeking behavior is not only important in interpersonal relationships, but its frequent use increases an individual’s liking and effectiveness of communication (Bell & Daly, 1984). Bell, Tremblay, and Buerkel-Rothfuss (1987) found that individuals scoring high on affinity-seeking tend to be less lonely and are more socially capable and assertive.

However, not all individuals are equally well-equipped or skilled in making others like them or feel attracted to them. The ability to develop positive relationships effectively, and to communicate in ways that make one more attractive to others, is also known as affinity-seeking competence (Rubin et al., 1993). Based on the research findings mentioned above, following hypothesis is being proposed:

**H3:** Affinity-seeking will be positively related to communicative adaptability.

*Summary*

In addition to testing the proposed hypothesis that affinity-seeking will be positively related to communicative adaptability (H3), the hypothesized positive relationship between Machiavellianism and communicative adaptability will be tested (H2). It is further hypothesized that self-monitoring will also be positively related to communicative adaptability (H1). Finally, this study seeks to answer
two research questions. The first research question seeks to determine the relationship between individuals’ concerns for secondary goals and self-presentation tactics they employ while controlling for demographic information (gender, age, number of Facebook friends, and number of Facebook log-ins per week), which were entered in the first block of a series of multiple hierarchical regression analyses (RQ1). The second research question investigates how communicative adaptability is related to one’s concerns for secondary goals, while controlling for demographic variables, which were again entered in the first block of the series of regressions (RQ2). Lastly, the viability of the proposed conceptual model (illustrated below) will be tested.

![Diagram](image-url)

Figure 3: Conceptual model of self-presentation tactics on Facebook with hypotheses and research questions
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Given the exploratory nature of this study, a cross-sectional survey was used to gather descriptions, as well as determine the relationships between variables (Babbie, 1998), such as self-monitoring and communicative adaptability (H1). Cross-sectional surveys are time-efficient. However, they have an inherent problem, which is related to conclusions being based on observations made at one point in time (Babbie, 2007). Change over time can therefore not be examined using cross-sectional survey methods. However, cross-sectional surveys are a suitable method for data collection for exploratory or descriptive studies, such as the exploratory model proposed here.

Participants and Procedures

The population for the proposed study consisted of individuals who own a Facebook account and maintain a Facebook profile. Before contacting potential subjects on Facebook, approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) was obtained. Participation was voluntary and subjects were recruited on Facebook. In order to recruit subjects on Facebook, a Facebook group named “KSU Researcher” was created. The group’s page contained a brief description of the purpose of the study in lay language and a link to the online survey, which was posted on Qualtrics.com. The group’s page emphasized that participation was voluntary, that responses were handled anonymously to protect subject privacy, and that subjects could terminate their participation at any time without penalty. The KSU Researcher group is an “open group,” which means that anyone who owns a Facebook account could join the group.
Participants were recruited using a snowball sampling method. The researcher contacted her Facebook friends with an invitation to join the group. The invitation asked them to forward the group invitation to their Facebook friends, who, in turn, forwarded it to their friends. The principle investigator’s Facebook friends were specifically asked not to complete the survey so as to avoid socially desirable responses. In addition to recruiting participants on Facebook, an email containing a link to the online survey was sent to individuals subscribed to the Communication, Research and Theory Network (CRTNET), which is managed by the National Communication Association (NCA). The final 120 subjects were recruited using this method.

According to Gorusch (1983) and Hatcher (1994), a minimum subject to item ratio of 5:1 is recommended. In this study, the self-presentation tactics scale (Lee et al., 1999) was the scale containing the highest number of items. Given that this scale consists of 64 items, a minimum of 315 subjects had to be recruited for this study. Comfrey and Lee (1992) consider a sample of 300 subjects or more to be sufficient and good for survey research.

The sample consisted of 487 subjects. Out of the 487 subjects who completed the survey, 75.6% were female and 23% were male (1.4% of the subjects chose not to answer this question). The sample was predominantly Caucasian (88.9%) with less than 2% of African American (1.2%), Asian American (1.8%), Hispanic (0.4%), and Native American (1%) subjects. The mean age of the sample was 33.14 years of age ($SD = 10.81$). The majority of the sample completed graduate degrees (50.3%); 29.8% completed undergraduate degrees; 14.4% completed high school degrees; and 4.1% completed associate degrees. Participants were also asked to indicate their socio-
economic status. Out of the 487 participants who completed the survey, 54.8% considered themselves middle class, 19.5% upper middle class, 17.5% lower middle class, 5.5% lower class and 0.4% upper class.

Limitations associated with this sampling method were related to the sample not being a random sample. Individuals who are linked to the researcher on Facebook through their social networks had a greater chance of being invited to the group. Even though the group itself did not require an invitation or approval from the researcher, Facebook users who were not linked to the researcher through their social networks were less likely to find and join the group, and therefore take the survey. Nevertheless, this method allowed for reaching a large number of people and yielded a sample that is somewhat diverse along various demographic dimensions, such as age, education, and so forth. However, the data was likely be skewed in favor of younger, Caucasian, educated people with higher socio-economic status. Given the exploratory nature of this study and the fact that these factors were controlled statistically, this method was appropriate for this study.

Once a Facebook user joined the group, he or she could decide whether or not to participate in the survey. If the Facebook user decided to participate, he or she followed the link provided on the group’s page, which directed the user to the survey posted on Qualtrics.com.

Before beginning the survey, an online consent form informed the potential participant that he or she had to be at least 18 years of age. Participants were informed that by clicking the link to load the survey, they have read and understood the terms of the study and verified that they are at least 18 years of age. The survey consisted of
various pre-existing measures and scales, as well as basic demographic information such as age, sex, and questions related to their Facebook use. For the complete survey see Appendixes A-G, however some questions that were included were “On average, how many times a day do you log on to Facebook.com?” and “Approximately, how many friends do you have on Facebook?” On average, participants logged onto Facebook 19 times per week ($M = 18.66$, $SD = 22.98$) and had approximately 256 Facebook friends ($M = 255.35$, $SD = 261.2$). The subsequent section discusses the additional measures and scales that were included in the survey.

**Measurements**

The complete survey consisted of six measures: self-presentation tactics, secondary goals, communicative adaptability, self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking. In addition to the six measures, respondents were also asked to provide demographic information along with information related to their Facebook use. The complete survey consisted of 168 items and took approximately 25 minutes to complete.

**Self-presentation tactics.** Self-presentation tactics are behaviors that are used to manage impressions and achieve interpersonal goals (Lee et al., 1999). The self-presentation tactics scale, as proposed by Lee, et al. (1999), was used to assess the various tactics associated with impression management. The self-presentation tactics scale consists of statements after which respondents are asked to rate using a 9-point Likert-type scale ranging from “very infrequently” to “very frequently”. In previous research, the 64-item scale suggested a 2-factor structure consisting of assertive as well as defensive self-presentation (Lee et al., 1999). The factor of defensive self-presentation (.88) consisted of five sub-dimensions derived from a second-order exploratory factor
analysis, which included excuse (.71), justification (.70), disclaimers (.75), self-handicapping (.83), and apologies (.51). The factor of assertive self-presentation (.87), on the other hand, consisted of seven sub-dimensions, including ingratiation (.81), intimidation (.79), supplication (.85), entitlement (.77), enhancement (.80), blasting (.75), and exemplification (.73). Lee and colleagues (1999) conducted five separate studies in which the scale was tested for reliability as well as validity. The scale was found to be both reliable and valid. The overall Cronbach’s alpha was reported as .89 (Lee et al., 1999).

A study by Lewis and Neighbors (2005) utilized the self-presentation tactics scale to assess tactics used by individuals during impression management episodes and reported following Cronbach’s alphas for each of the 12 dimensions: excuse (.83), justification (.81), disclaimer (.73), self-handicapping (.56), apology (.66), ingratiation (.81), intimidation (.84), supplication (.71), entitlement (.79), enhancement (.72), blasting (.76), and exemplification (.82). The self-presentation tactics scale consisted of items such as: “When I am blamed for something, I make excuses” (excuse), “I offer socially acceptable reasons to justify behavior that others might not like” (justification), “I offer explanations before doing something that others might think is wrong” (disclaimer), “I intimidate others” (intimidation), “I ask others to help me” (supplication), and “I claim credit for doing things I did not do” (entitlement). The complete modified self-presentation tactics scale can be found in Appendix A.

Due to the limited use of this scale in previous studies, its multidimensionality, and the modifications made to the scale to fit the context of this study, a principal components exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted on the
responses from the 64-item Self-Presentation Tactics Scale. The results of the factor analysis are outlined in the subsequent chapter and Table 3 provides a detailed description of the final 4-factor solution. The final 4-factor solution consisted of manipulation (.97), damage control (.88), self-promotion (.87), and role-model (.88); a total of 38 items were retained for the final analysis.

Secondary goals. Secondary goals present constraints that enhance or impede successful goal attainment (Dillard, 1990b). For the current study, secondary goals were used to determine how concerned individuals were with certain aspects of their communicative behavior during episodes of impression management on Facebook.

To assess an individual’s concern during impression management episode, various goals scales were used, as proposed by Dillard, Segrin, and Harden (1989). The goals scale consisted of statements which respondents are asked to rate using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. The 25-item measure consisted of six dimensions, including an influence scale, an identity scale, interaction scale, a relational resource scale, a personal resource scale, and an arousal management scale.

Dillard and colleagues (1989) reported Cronbach alphas obtained from two distinct samples ranging from .85 to .87 for the influence scale, .76 to .78 for the identity scale, .71 to .72 for the interaction scale, .71 to .76 for the relational resource scale, .71 to .80 for the personal resource scale, and .75 to .76 for the arousal management scale. The scale was modified to fit the context of the proposed study. First, all items in the original scale were written in past tense and therefore had to be changed to present tense. The secondary goals scale (Dillard et al., 1989) asked respondents to rate a recent influence
attempt, however the goal of the current study is to explore general tendencies of respondents, rather than a specific event. Therefore, present tense was applied. For instance, “I was concerned about being true to myself and my values” was changed to “I am concerned about being true to myself and my values”.

Second, whereas some items remained the same except for the change in time, some statements had to be modified to fit the context of Facebook. For example, “I was very concerned about getting what I wanted in this persuasive attempt” was modified to “I am very concerned about making the impression I want on my Facebook page”, “I didn’t want to look stupid while trying to persuade this person” was modified to “I do not want to look stupid when communicating on Facebook,” and “This situation’s potential for making me nervous and uncomfortable worried me” was modified to “Facebook’s potential for making me nervous and uncomfortable worries me”.

Given the considerable changes made to the original measure, a pre-test was administered to a sample of 83 undergraduate students enrolled in a communication course at a large mid-western university. The pre-test revealed a Cronbach’s alpha of .85, which is similar to the alphas reported by Dillard and colleagues (1989). Upon testing the various dimensions – influence (.84), identity (.69), interaction (.84), personal resource (.84), arousal management (.70), and relational resource (.48). Due to low reliability, the relational resource scale consisting of 3 items was not included in the final data analysis. Before conducting the data analysis, the reliability of the scale was again tested and revealed an overall Cronbach’s alpha of .84. For the complete 22-item modified secondary goals scale, refer to Appendix B.
Communicative adaptability. Communicative adaptability is defined as an individual’s ability to perceive social cues in interpersonal relationships and adapt his or her behavior and interaction goals accordingly (Duran, 1983, p. 320). The concept of communicative adaptability was assessed using Duran’s (1983) 30-item measure of communicative adaptability. This multidimensional measure contains items assessing social composure, social confirmation, social experience, appropriate disclosure, articulation, and wit. These six dimensions coincide with the notion of communicative adaptability as elaborated on by Spitzberg and Cupach (1989).

Other measures of competence have been reviewed, however the communicative adaptability scale (Duran, 1983) emerged as the most useful measure for two reasons. First, a number of communicative competence measures are other-reports, meaning that an individual other than the participant him or herself completes the measure. This method of assessing communicative competence does not fit with the cognitive nature of goals-planning-action theory. However, communicative adaptability consists of a cognitive as well as a behavioral component (Duran, 1983; Duran & Kelly, 1988).

In a review of communicative adaptability, Duran (1992) noted that the average Cronbach alphas for each dimensions are the following: social composure (.82), social confirmation (.84), social experience (.80), appropriate disclosure (.76), articulation (.80), and wit (.74). Further, the author reported that considering all six dimensions across 10 studies, the dimensions are only moderately correlated with one another, with correlations ranging from .17 to .53. Duran (1992) explained that these correlations are “best understood in relation to the dependent variables of shyness, communication apprehension, and loneliness” (p. 262). Cupach and Spitzberg (1983) reported a
coefficient alpha of .81 for the entire scale, which is similar to the Cronbach’s alpha of .86 found in this study.

The communicative adaptability measure (Duran, 1983) is comprised of a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from “never true of me” to “always true of me”. Items included in the communicative adaptability measure include: “I feel nervous in social situations,” “I find it easy to get along with new people,” “When speaking I have problems with grammar,” and “When I embarrass myself, I often make a joke about it.” To view the complete communicative adaptability measure, refer to Appendix C.

**Self-monitoring.** Self-monitoring was assessed using the revised self-monitoring scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). Snyder’s (1974) original 25-item self-monitoring scale has been criticized for lack of construct validity. Lennox and Wolfe (1984) stated that “the total score on Snyder’s (1974) scale tends to defy interpretation: it is impossible to determine what the scale as a whole might be measuring” (p. 1350). After reviewing both scales and criticisms associated with them (for thorough discussion see O’Cass, 2000), the revised self-monitoring scale emerged as the more reliable measure. Lennox and Wolfe (1984) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .86 for the entire scale. This study was able to confirm the reliability of the scale with a Cronbach’s alpha of .87.

Unlike the original true/false scale of Snyder (1974), the revised self-monitoring scale is comprised of a 6-point bipolar format, rating from “certainly always false” to “certainly always true”. Items included in the revised self-monitoring scale are: “In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else if called for” and “If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person’s manner of expression.” The complete self-monitoring scale can be found in Appendix D.
Machiavellianism. According to Christie and Geis (1970), Machiavellianism is defined as an individual’s ability and willingness to manipulate others for one’s own purposes. Machiavellianism was assessed using the Mach IV scale, rather than the Mach V scale, developed by Christie and Geis (1970).

Due to the fact that the Mach IV scale was criticized for strongly correlating with measures of social desirability, ranging from -.35 to -.45, Christie and Geis developed the Mach V (Fehr, Samson, & Paulhus, 1992). The Mach V uses a triadic forced-choice format. Respondents rate three statements – a high Mach statement, a non-Mach statement, and a “buffer statement” – by indicating which statement they agree with the most and which statement they agree with the least. High Machs are expected to agree with the Mach statement the most, the “buffer statement” related to social desirability the least, and leave the non-Mach statement blank. Despite efforts to eliminate socially desirable responses, the Mach V scale remains under scrutiny for correlating with social desirability, as well as issues related to reliability and construct validity (for a thorough review see Fehr et al., 1992). According to Fehr and colleagues, the “Mach V suffers from scoring problems, low internal consistency, and the underlying factor structure is not as clear as that of the Mach IV” (p. 109). Therefore, the Mach IV scale (Christie & Geis, 1970) was utilized for assessing Machiavellian tendencies.

The Mach IV scale consists of 20 statements which individuals rate using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” Items included in the Mach IV scale are: “Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives” (reverse coded), “There is no excuse for lying to someone else,” and “Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.” Half of the 20
items require reverse coding. Christie and Geis (1970) reported a .79 mean split-half reliability across 9 samples. This study revealed a Cronbach’s alpha of .71, which is slightly below the alpha reported by Christie and Geis (1970).

Three items were modified and reworded to ensure gender neutrality. For instance, “Most men are brave” was modified to “Most people are brave.” Other than replacing the word “men” with the word “people” in three items, no changes were made to the existing Mach IV scale. To view the Mach IV scale, refer to Appendix E.

Affinity-seeking. Affinity-seeking was assessed using the Affinity-Seeking Instrument (ASI) (Bell, Tremblay, & Buerkel-Rothfuss, 1987). According to Bell and colleagues (1987), affinity-seeking is defined as an active process through which individuals try to get others to feel positive toward them and like them. Their factor analysis determined that the instrument consists of two subscales, including affinity-seeking competence and strategic performance. Affinity-seeking competence measures an individual’s ability to say and do whatever makes him or her more interpersonally attractive, whereas strategic performance refers to one’s ability to play roles in order to be liked by others.

Bell, et al. (1987) reported alphas ranging from .85 to .89, which coincides with the Cronbach’s alpha of .87 found in this study. Further, the authors stated that the affinity-seeking instrument has internal consistency along with a stable factor structure, as well as concurrent and discriminant validity. The instrument consists of 13 items and respondents uses a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from “very strongly agree” (7) to “very strongly disagree” (1). Items included in the affinity-seeking instrument are: “I seldom know what to say or do to get other to like me” and “I am not very good at
"putting on a show to impress others". To view all 13-items of the affinity-seeking measure, refer to Appendix F.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Two tables were created to help describe the data in this sample. Table 1 displays the means, standard deviations, and Cronbach’s alphas for all continuous variables. Table 2 presents bivariate correlations between all continuous variables in this study. The results related to each research question and hypothesis follows.

Research Question 1

Factor Analysis

In order to respond to Research Question 1, a principal components exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted on the responses from the 64-item Self-Presentation Tactics Scale. Given the limited use of the Self-Presentation Tactics scale in past research and varying results derived from factor analyses (Lee et al., 1999; Lewis & Neighbors, 2005), as well as the modifications made to the scale, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. This initial factor analysis (n = 487) revealed 11 factors with eigenvalues of at least 1. The scree plot was consulted, suggesting that only four factors should be retained for a second factor analysis. Each item’s loadings were examined, eliminating those variables that did not cleanly load on only one factor, using the 60/40 loading criterion. Items loading with at least a .59 on only one factor were retained for further analysis. Twenty-four items were eliminated following this process, and a second factor analysis was conducted.
A second exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted on the remaining 39 items. The second exploratory factor analysis revealed four factors in the rotated factor structure. A 4-factor solution was retained. The final solution contained 38 items and accounted for 63.18% of the variance. See Table 3 for the factor loadings of the final 4-factor solution. The items of the final 4-factor solution were compared to the final factor solution derived from the initial exploratory factor analysis by Lee and colleagues (1999). The comparison did not reveal any similarities, which points to the notion that the modifications applied to the scale reflect context-specific differences. Appendix A presents the final version of the Self-Presentation Tactics Scale.

The first factor, manipulation, accounted for 40.90% of the variance (eigenvalue = 15.54) and included 20 items. Participants used Facebook to provide excuses for themselves or their behavior to get others to perceive them more positively. A mean index was computed by averaging the items (Cronbach’s alpha = .97; see Table 1 for means, standard deviations, and Cronbach’s alphas for all tactics).

The second factor that emerged was damage control (eigenvalue = 4.29, \( \alpha = .88 \)). This factor consists of six items and explained 11.30% of the variance. This tactic suggested that individuals used Facebook to justify their behavior and to apologize for harm they have caused.

Self-promotion, the third factor, was comprised of seven items (eigenvalue = 2.27, \( \alpha = .87 \)). This factor explained 5.99% of the variance. Individuals who used Facebook to self-promote emphasized their positive qualities and accomplishments, and used flattery to get others on their side.
Table 1  
*Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach’s Alphas for all Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α (reliability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring (averaged, 1-7)</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism (averaged, 1-7)</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity-Seeking (averaged, 1-7)</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Adaptability (averaged, 1-5)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Goals Dimensions (averaged, 1-5)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence Goals (averaged, 1-5)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Goals (averaged, 1-5)</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Goals (averaged, 1-5)</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Resource Goals (averaged, 1-5)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal Management Goals (averaged, 1-5)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Presentation Tactics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation (averaged, 1-9)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage Control (averaged, 1-9)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion (averaged, 1-9)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Model (averaged, 1-9)</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Male 0, Female 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (18-84)</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Log-Ins per Week (1-300)</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Friends (2-1800)</td>
<td>255.35</td>
<td>261.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Correlations among all Continuous Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facebook Log-Ins per Week</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facebook Friends</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-Monitor</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Machiavellianism</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affinity-Seeking</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Communication Adaptability</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Influence Goals</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Identity Goals</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Interaction Goals</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Personal Resource Goals</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do things to make people afraid of me on Facebook so that they will do what I want.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I claim credit on Facebook for doing things I did not do.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make excuses for poor performance on Facebook.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intimidate others on Facebook.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I threaten others on Facebook when I think it will help me get what I want from them.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am blamed for something, I make excuses on Facebook.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Facebook, I get sick when under a lot of pressure to do well.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Facebook, I do correct people who underestimate the value of gifts that I give to them.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I exaggerate the negative qualities of people on Facebook who compete with me.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Facebook, I lead others to believe that I cannot do something in order to get help.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor health has been responsible for my getting mediocre grades in school and I let others know on Facebook.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When things go wrong, I explain why I am not responsible on Facebook.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have put others down on Facebook in order to make myself look better.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to convince others on Facebook that I am not responsible</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for negative events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tell others on Facebook they are stronger or more</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent than me in order to get others to do things for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put obstacles in the way of my own success on Facebook.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make negative statements on Facebook about people belonging</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to rival groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I offer an excuse on Facebook for possibly not</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performing well before talking a very difficult test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety interferes with my performance on Facebook.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When working on a project with a group I make my contribution</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seem greater than it is on Facebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I offer explanations on Facebook before doing something that</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others might think is wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I harm someone, I apologize on Facebook and promise not to</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do it again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I justify my behavior on Facebook to reduce negative reactions</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I apologize on Facebook when I have done something wrong.</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Facebook, I try to make up for any harm I have done to</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Facebook, I justify beforehand actions others may not like.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tell people on Facebook about my positive accomplishments.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tell people on Facebook when I do well at tasks others find difficult.</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tell others about my positive qualities on Facebook.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I succeed at a task, I emphasize to others on Facebook how important the task was.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I point out the positive things I do on Facebook, which other people fail to notice.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I compliment people on Facebook to get them on my side.*</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use flattery on Facebook to win the favor of others.*</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to set an example for others to follow on Facebook.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to serve as a model on Facebook for how a person should behave.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to get others to act in the same positive way I do on Facebook.</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to induce imitation by others by serving as a positive example on Facebook.</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Facebook, I act in ways I think others should act.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>15.54</th>
<th>4.29</th>
<th>2.27</th>
<th>1.89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance Explained (%)</td>
<td>40.90</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 60/40 criterion was bent to allow for these items to be included in the factor.
The final factor that emerged, *role model*, included five items (eigenvalue = 1.89, \( \alpha = .88 \)). This factor accounted for 4.99% of the variance in the final solution.

Participants who scored high on role model behavior used Facebook to model positive behavior in hopes others would adopt it.

In sum, four tactics for self-presentation on Facebook emerged from this analysis, which will allow further exploration of Research Question 1. These tactics – manipulation, damage control, self-promotion, and role model – explained a total of 63.18% of the variance in the Self-Presentation Tactics. Mean scores were computed for each factor, which were used to address the subsequent research question.

*Overall Model: Research Question 1*

To address Research Question 1, a series of four hierarchical multiple regression analyses was used. Gender, age, and the Facebook variables (“On average, how many times a week do you log onto Facebook.com?” and “Approximately how many friends do you have on Facebook?”) were entered in the first block, and the three personality traits (self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking) were entered in the second block. Communicative adaptability was then entered in the third block, and finally the five dimensions of secondary goals were entered in the fourth block. The four self-presentation tactics dimensions – manipulation, damage control, self-promotion, and role-model – constituted the dependent variables in the series of four hierarchical multiple regressions.

Research Question 1 was posed to determine which personality traits and secondary goals predict self-presentation tactics employed by Facebook users and whether communicative adaptability emerges as a predictor. To address this question, all
steps of each of the four regression analyses were examined. Table 4 summarizes the results addressing this research question.

Facebook users’ characteristics (gender, age, number of Facebook log-ins per week, and approximate number of Facebook friends), entered in the first step of the hierarchical multiple regression, explained a significant amount of variance in employing the manipulation self-presentation tactic use on Facebook \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .07, p < .001) \), damage control tactics \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .04, p < .001) \), self-promotion tactics \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .07, p < .001) \), and role-model tactics \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .05, p < .001) \). The second block of predictors – three personality traits, namely self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking – contributed a significant amount of unique variance for the manipulation dimension \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .12, p < .001) \), the damage control dimension \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .06, p < .05) \), the self-promotion dimension \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .10, p < .001) \), and the role-model dimension \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .05, p < .05) \). Communicative adaptability was entered in the third step of hierarchical multiple regressions and did not explain a significant amount of variance of manipulation tactics \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .12, p = .72) \), damage control tactics \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .05, p = .80) \), self-promotion tactics \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .10, p = .39) \), and role-model tactics \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .05, p = .90) \). The fourth and final block of predictors – secondary goals, namely influence goals, identity goals, interaction goals, personal resource goals, and arousal management goals – contributed a significant amount of variance for all self-presentation tactics employed by Facebook users. Specifically, the conceptual model explained a significant amount of variance in the use of manipulation \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .20, p < .001) \), damage control \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .10, p < .001) \), self-promotion \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .18, p < .001) \), and role-model \( (\text{adjusted } R^2 = .31, p \)
< .001). In all four of these dimensions, the first second, and fourth block of predictors significantly explained variance in self-presentation tactics dimensions. Therefore, it is concluded that the conceptual model, with the exception of communicative adaptability, is helpful in explaining some, but not all of the self-presentation tactics dimensions on Facebook.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1, addressing the impact of Facebook user demographics, personality traits, communicative adaptability, and secondary goals on the self-presentation tactics used on Facebook, was tested with a series of four hierarchical multiple regressions (simultaneous or enter method). As depicted in the conceptual model (see Figure 3), Facebook user demographics preceded personality traits (self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking), which in turn preceded communicative adaptability, followed by secondary goals, which in turn preceded self-presentation tactics. Results of the regression analysis are summarized in Table 4. These results were used to address Research Question 1.

Manipulation dimension. Facebook users’ demographic information – gender, age, number of Facebook log-ins per week, and number of Facebook friends – collectively explained 7.7% of the variance in the use of manipulation self-presentation tactics on Facebook, \( F(4, 464) = 9.65, p < .001 \). Gender (\( \beta = -.14, p < .001 \)) and the number of Facebook log-ins per week (\( \beta = .14, p < .001 \)) emerged as significant predictors of employing manipulation self-presentation tactics. Participants who logged on to Facebook more frequently were more likely to use manipulation tactics to present themselves on Facebook.
The three personality traits, namely self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking, collectively explained 5.8% of the variance in the employment of manipulation tactics on Facebook, \( F(3, 461) = 10.28, p < .001 \).
Machiavellianism (\( \beta = .17, p < .001 \)) and affinity-seeking (\( \beta = -.12, p < .05 \)) individually predicted the use of manipulation self-presentation tactics on Facebook. Therefore, Facebook users who scored high on Machiavellianism reported using more manipulation tactics when presenting themselves on Facebook. Individuals who scored high on affinity-seeking, on the other hand, used manipulation tactics less frequently when communicating on Facebook.

Whereas communicative adaptability did not explain any of the variance \( F(1, 460) = .13, p = .72 \), secondary goals – influence goals, identity goals, interaction goals, personal resource goals, and arousal management goals – collectively explained 9% of the variance in the use of manipulation as a self-presentation tactic. Specifically, personal resource goals (\( \beta = .18, p < .001 \)) and arousal management goals (\( \beta = .13, p < .05 \)) emerged as individual predictors for the use of manipulation tactics. Therefore, individuals who were concerned about their personal resources, as well as managing their arousal levels reportedly employed more manipulation tactics on Facebook.

*Damage control dimension.* Demographic information collectively explained 4.9% of the variance in the use of damage control tactics on Facebook, \( F(3, 466) = 5.99, p < .001 \). Gender (\( \beta = -.11, p < .05 \)) and the number of Facebook log-ins per week (\( \beta = .16, p < .001 \)) individually predicted the employment of damage control tactics. Males used damage control tactics as a way to present themselves on Facebook. Further,
Facebook users who logged on to the social networking site more frequently were also more likely to use damage control tactics.

In this study, 2% of the variance in damage control tactics used on Facebook was uniquely explained by personality traits, \([F_{\text{change}}(3, 463) = 3.39, p < .05]\). Specifically, affinity-seeking \((\beta = -.14, p < .05)\) predicted the use of damage control self-presentation tactics. Therefore, participants who were more concerned with seeking affinity employed fewer damage control tactics.

Communicative adaptability, again, did not explain any of the variance in damage control tactics used on Facebook, \([F_{\text{change}}(1, 462) = .07, p = .80]\). The five secondary goals dimensions – influence goals, identity goals, interaction goals, personal resource goals, and arousal management goals – collectively explained 5.1% of the variance in the use of damage control tactics, \([F_{\text{change}}(5, 457) = 5.31, p < .001]\), however none of the secondary goals dimensions on its own explained a significant amount of variance. Therefore, participants who were generally concerned with their secondary goals used damage control as a tactic to present themselves on Facebook. However, no one secondary goals dimension emerged as an individual predictor of this relationship.

*Self-promotion dimension.* Facebook users’ demographic information – gender, age, number of Facebook log-ins per week, and number of Facebook friends – collectively explained 7.8% of the variance in the use of self-promotion tactics, \([F(4, 464) = 9.80, p < .001]\). This variance was solely explained by the number of times an individual logged onto Facebook a week \((\beta = .16, p < .001)\). Therefore, individuals who visited Facebook more frequently used self-promotion as a tactic more often present themselves on Facebook.
### Table 4

Regressing Self-Presentation Tactics on Personality Traits and Secondary Goals, Controlling for Individual Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage Control</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Model</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All betas are final standardized betas on the last step of hierarchical multiple regressions.  
*p < .05.* **p < .001.
Personality traits collectively explained 3.8\% of the variance in self-promotion tactic use on Facebook, \( F_{\text{change}}(3, 461) = 6.64, p < .001 \). Specifically, Machiavellianism (\( \beta = .15, p < .05 \)) emerged as an individual predictor for self-promotion. Participants who scored high on Machiavellianism used self-promotion tactics more frequently when presenting themselves on Facebook.

Communicative adaptability did not explain a significant amount of variance in the use of self-promotion tactics, \( F_{\text{change}}(1, 460) = .747, p = .39 \). However, secondary goals collectively explained 8.9\% of the variance in the employment of self-promotion tactics on Facebook, \( F_{\text{change}}(5, 455) = 10.17, p < .001 \). Influence goals (\( \beta = .21, p < .001 \)) and interaction goals (\( \beta = .14, p < .05 \)) individually predicted the use of self-promotion tactics. Therefore, participants who showed greater concern for influence and interaction goals used self-promotion as a tactic on Facebook.

**Role-model dimension.** Participants’ demographic information explained 5.4\% of the variance in the use of role-model tactics on Facebook, \( F(4, 465) = 6.65, p < .001 \). Age (\( \beta = .13, p < .05 \)) and the number of Facebook friends (\( \beta = .11, p < .05 \)) individually predicted the employment of role-model tactics. Participants who were older and who had more friends on Facebook were more likely to use role-model self-presentation tactics on Facebook.

Personality traits did not explain a significant amount of variance in role-model tactics used on Facebook, \( F_{\text{change}}(3, 462) = 1.72, p = .16 \), and neither did communicative adaptability, \( F_{\text{change}}(1, 461) = .211, p = .65 \). However, secondary goals – influence goals, identity goals, interaction goals, personal resource goals, and
Table 5

*Regressing Self-Presentation Tactics Dimensions on Demographics (Step 1), Personality Traits (Step 2), Communicative Adaptability (Step 3), and Secondary Goals (Step 4)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1 (Demographics)</th>
<th>Step 2 (Personality Traits)</th>
<th>Step 3 (Communicative Adaptability)</th>
<th>Step 4 (Secondary Goals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>adjusted $R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage Control</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Model</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Individuals betas on the final step of the regressions are reported in Table 4.  
*p < .05. **p < .001.
arousal management goals – collectively explained 26.3% of the variance in the use of role-model self-presentation tactics on Facebook. Specifically, influence goals ($\beta = .14, p < .05$) and interaction goals ($\beta = .36, p < .001$) individually predicted the employment of role-model tactics on Facebook. Therefore, participants with greater concern for influence and interaction goals used more role-model self-presentation behaviors to present themselves on Facebook.

Research Question 2

Overall Model: Research Question 2

To address Research Question 2, a series of five hierarchical multiple regressions were used. As in Research Question 1, gender, age, and the two Facebook variables were entered in the first block. In the second block the personality traits were entered. And finally, communicative adaptability was the third block. The five secondary goals dimensions – influence goals, identity goals, interaction goals, personal resource goals, and arousal management goals – constituted the dependent variables in the series of hierarchical multiple regressions.

Research Question 1 was posed to determine which personality traits predict individuals’ concerns for secondary goals when interacting on Facebook and whether communicative adaptability emerges as a predictor. To address this question, all steps of each of the five regression analyses were examined. Table 5 summarizes the results addressing this research question.

Facebook users’ characteristics (gender, age, number of Facebook log-ins per week, and approximate number of Facebook friends), entered in the first step of the hierarchical multiple regression, explained a significant amount of variance in one’s
concern for influence goals \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .06, p < .001)\), identity goals \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .06, p < .001)\), and interaction goals \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .02, p < .05)\). The second block of predictors – three personality traits, namely self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking – contributed a significant amount of unique variance for the influence goals dimension \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .08, p < .05)\), the identity goals dimension \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .13, p < .001)\), the interaction goals dimension \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .05, p < .001)\), the personal resource goals dimension \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .03, p < .001)\), and the arousal management goals dimension \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .04, p < .001)\). Communicative adaptability was entered in the third step of hierarchical multiple regressions and explained a significant amount of variance in influence goals \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .10, p < .001)\), personal resource goals \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .04, p < .05)\), and arousal management goals dimension \((\text{adjusted } R^2 = .09, p < .001)\). In all five of these dimensions, the first, second, and third block of predictors significantly explained variance in secondary goals dimensions. Therefore, it is concluded that the conceptual model is helpful in explaining some, but not all of the secondary goals dimensions on Facebook.

**Research Question 2**

To address the impact of Facebook user demographic information, personality traits, and communicative adaptability on Facebook users’ concern for secondary goals, Research Question 2 was posed and addressed with a series of five hierarchical multiple regression analyses. As depicted in the conceptual model (see Figure 3), Facebook user demographics preceded personality traits (self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking), which in turn preceded communicative adaptability, followed by
secondary goals. Results of the regression analysis are summarized in Table 5. These results were used to address Research Question 2.

**Influence goals.** In this study, Facebook users’ demographic information collectively explained 6.5% of the amount of variance in one’s concerns for influence goals, \(F(4, 489) = 8.50, p < .001\). Specifically, gender (\(\beta = .13, p < .05\)), age (\(\beta = .12, p < .05\)), number of Facebook log-ins per week (\(\beta = .13, p < .05\)), and the number of Facebook friends (\(\beta = .17, p < .001\)) predicted influence goals. Female participants showed greater concern for influence goals. Further, individuals who logged onto Facebook more frequently exhibited greater concern for influence goals. Similarly, Facebook users who had more Facebook friends reported greater concern for influence goals.

Personality traits – self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking – collectively explained 2.3% of the variance in influence goals, \(F change(3, 486) = 4.04, p < .05\). Self-monitoring (\(\beta = .22, p < .001\)) emerged as the sole predictor of influence goals. Therefore, higher self-monitors exhibited greater concern for influence goals.

Communicative adaptability explained 2.4% of the variance in influence goals on Facebook, \(F change(1, 485) = 13.26, p < .001\). In this study, communicative adaptability (\(\beta = -.48, p < .001\)) predicted one’s concerns for influence goals. Facebook users who were communicatively more adaptable exhibited less concern for influence goals on Facebook.

**Identity goals.** Facebook users demographic information collectively explained 6.3% of the variance in identity goals on Facebook, \(F(4, 488) = 8.22, p < .001\). Specifically, gender (\(\beta = .15, p < .001\)) and age (\(\beta = .15, p < .001\)) individually predicted
concern for identity goals. Specifically, female users were reportedly more likely to show concern for identity goals. Furthermore, older Facebook users exhibited more concern for identity goals as well.

The three personality traits – self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking – uniquely explained 8.2% of the variance in identity goals, \( F_{change}(3, 485) = 15.49, p < .001 \). Machiavellianism (\( \beta = -.26, p < .001 \)) emerged as the sole predictor of the variance in identity goals; participants who scored high on Machiavellianism exhibited less concern for identity goals. Communicative adaptability did not explain a significant amount of variance in one’s concern for identity goals, \( F_{change}(1, 484) = .598, p = .44 \).

**Interaction goals.** Demographic information explained 2.5% of the variance in interaction goals, \( F(4, 488) = 3.19, p < .05 \). Gender (\( \beta = .14, p < .05 \)) emerged as the sole predictor of this variance. Female Facebook users reported greater concern for interaction goals.

Personality traits, namely self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking, collectively explained 4.1% of the variance in interaction goals, \( F_{change}(3, 485) = 7.05, p < .001 \), however self-monitoring (\( \beta = .18, p < .05 \)) alone significantly predicted one’s concern for interaction goals. Therefore, high self-monitors were more concerned about their interaction goals. Communicative adaptability, again, did not explain significant amount of the variance in interaction goals, \( F_{change}(1, 484) = .018, p = .89 \). Interaction goals were not predicted by communicative adaptability.

**Personal resource goals.** Facebook users’ demographics – gender, age, number of Facebook log-ins per week, and approximate number of Facebook friends, did not
explain a significant amount of variance in personal resource goals, \( F(4, 485) = 1.03, p = .39 \). Therefore, demographic variables did not emerge as significant predictors of personal resource goals.

The three personality traits – self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity seeking – explained 3.2% of the variance in concerns for personal resource goals, \( [F(3, 482) = 5.36, p < .001] \). Machiavellianism \( (\beta = .16, p < .05) \) uniquely predicted personal resource goals concerns. Facebook users who scored high on Machiavellianism exhibited greater concern for personal resource goals.

In this study, 1.3% of the variance was uniquely explained by communicative adaptability, \( [F(1, 481) = 6.57, p < .05] \). Communicative adaptability \( (\beta = -.36, p < .05) \) predicted one’s concern for personal resource goals. Participants who were communicatively more adaptable showed less concern for personal resource goals.

_Arousal management goals._ Participants’ demographic data, namely gender, age, number of Facebook log-ins per week, and approximate number of Facebook friends, did not explain a significant amount of variance in arousal management goals, \( [F(4, 484) = .561, p = .69] \). Facebook users’ demographics did not emerge as significant predictors of arousal management goals.

In this study, the three personality traits – self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking – explained 5% of the variance in one’s concerns for arousal management goals, \( [F(3, 481) = 8.48, p < .001] \). Specifically, Machiavellianism \( (\beta = .14, p < .05) \) emerged as the sole predictor of arousal management goals. Therefore, participants who scored high on Machiavellianism exhibited greater concern for arousal management goals.
Table 6

**Regressing Secondary Goals on Personality Traits and Communicative Adaptability, Controlling for Individual Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Monitoring</th>
<th>Machiavellianism</th>
<th>Affinity-Seeking</th>
<th>Communicative Adaptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence Goals</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Goals</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Goals</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Resource Goals</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal Management Goals</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All betas are final standardized betas on the last step of hierarchical multiple regressions.  
* *p < .05. **p < .001
Communicative adaptability explained 4.7% of the variance in arousal management goals, \( F_{\text{change}}(1, 480) = 25.23, p < .001 \).
Communicative adaptability (\( \beta = .54, p < .001 \)) predicted one’s concern for arousal management goals. Therefore, individuals who were communicatively more adaptable showed greater concern for their arousal management goals during interactions on Facebook.

**Hypotheses 1-3**

Hypothesis 1 predicted a positive relationship between self-monitoring and communicative adaptability. There was significant positive correlation between self-monitoring and communicative adaptability (\( r = .52, p < .05 \)). Participants who scored high on self-monitoring also scored high on communicative adaptability. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported, finding evidence for the link between the two variables.

Hypothesis 2 predicted a positive association between Machiavellianism and communicative adaptability. There was significant correlation between the two variables (\( r = -.21, p < .05 \)), however the correlation was negative as opposed to positive, as was predicted. Participants who scored high on Machiavellianism scored low on communicative adaptability. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported, not finding evidence for the assertion that individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism are communicatively more adaptable.

Hypothesis 3 predicted a positive relationship between affinity-seeking and communicative adaptability. There was a significant positive correlation between affinity-seeking and communicative adaptability (\( r = .60, p < .05 \)). Individuals who were high affinity-seekers, were more likely to score high on communicative adaptability
Table 7

Regressing Secondary Goals Dimensions on Demographics (Step 1), Personality Traits (Step 2), and Communicative Adaptability (Step 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1 (Demographics)</th>
<th>Step 2 (Personality Traits)</th>
<th>Step 3 (Communicative Adaptability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence Goals</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Goals</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Goals</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Resource Goals</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal Management Goals</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.05**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Individuals betas on the final step of the regressions are reported in Table 6.  
*p < .05. **p < .001.
Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was supported, finding evidence for the positive relationship between affinity-seeking and communicative adaptability.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to propose and test a conceptual model of self-presentation tactics on a social networking website, Facebook. Specifically, goals-planning-action theory guided this study in an attempt to explain how self-presentation tactics used on the popular social networking site are impacted by personality traits, communicative adaptability, and secondary goals. In so doing, personality traits and communicative adaptability were explored as predictors for one’s concern for secondary goals and self-presentation tactics employed by Facebook users. In addition, the relationships between personality traits (self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking) and communicative adaptability were explored. In this section, the study’s findings are summarized and further implications are discussed, followed by a presentation of limitations and directions for future research.

Summary and Implications

Overall Model Exploration

The conceptual model of self-presentation tactics on Facebook suggested that personality traits predict communicative adaptability, which in turn predicts secondary goals and, finally, self-presentation tactics employed by Facebook users. With the exception of communicative adaptability, the model was found to be reasonably predictive of self-presentation tactic use on Facebook.
Personality traits – namely self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking – predicted the types of self-presentation tactics individuals employed on Facebook. Communicative adaptability, on the other hand, was not a significant predictor. Communicative adaptability suggests the ability to pick up on cues stemming from the environment (relationships, interactions, and so forth), and it was hypothesized that communicative adaptability would be related to secondary goals and self-presentation tactics. The computer-mediated environment in which communication on Facebook occurs provides reason for this assertion, because communicative adaptability was found to be positively related to the number of Facebook friends, which was positively related to the number of Facebook log-ins per week. The positive relationships found between these variables could be an indicator that communicative adaptability is related to the ability and the willingness to use Facebook on a regular basis.

Finally, secondary goals predicted self-presentation tactics employed by Facebook users. A heightened concern for particular secondary goals led individuals to choose certain self-presentation tactics over others. Overall, the conceptual model of self-presentation tactics on Facebook was found to be useful. The subsequent section discusses the findings related to the model in greater detail.

Secondary Goals and Self-Presentation Tactics

Given that secondary goals are recurring motivations that shape how individuals approach influence episodes (Dillard, 1990b), and self-presentation tactics are ongoing attempts to create desired impressions of oneself, the relationship between these two concepts was explored. The ongoing nature of both secondary goals and self-presentation tactics, led this research to explore the two concepts in relation to one another. Another
factor leading up the exploration of these two concepts is related to the dimensions of secondary goals representing concerns commonly associated with self-presentation and impression management. In other words, individuals concerned with creating a desired impression might also be concerned with their identity, interaction, personal resource, and arousal management goals, which can shape the tactics individuals choose to employ when attempting to create desired impressions of themselves. The subsequent section reviews findings related to the relationship between one’s concern for secondary goals and self-presentation tactics employed on the social networking site Facebook.

This study tested a model suggesting that personality traits and communicative adaptability will impact one’s concern for secondary goals, which, in turn, will affect self-presentation tactics chosen by Facebook users. Machiavellianism and affinity-seeking emerged as significant predictors of self-presentation tactics on Facebook, whereas self-monitoring did not predict a preference of self-presentation tactics over others.

Self-monitoring was not related to the types of self-presentation tactics used on the social networking site, which included manipulation, damage control, self-promotion, and role-model tactics. High self-monitors are characterized by an ability to fit their behavior to various different situations (Snyder, 1974). In other words, rather than being consistent across various types of contexts, high self-monitors pay close attention to their surroundings and adjust their behavior accordingly. This may be the explanation for why self-monitoring was not found to be related to any particular self-presentation tactics. Individuals high in self-monitoring did not show a preference for particular self-presentation tactics. A plausible explanation for these findings could be related to the fact
that high self-monitors change and adjust their behaviors according to what the social environment requires of them as opposed to low self-monitors who tend to be concerned with self-congruence (Leone & Corte, 1994).

Whereas self-monitors are concerned with the social appropriateness of their behavior (Snyder, 1974), individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism are primarily concerned with achieving their goals for personal gain (Christie & Geis, 1970). Findings from this study revealed that Machiavellianism was positively related to the use of manipulation and self-promotion tactics on Facebook. Christie and Geis (1970) characterized Machiavellians as individuals who not only have the ability, but also possess the willingness, to manipulate others for their personal gain. The manipulative streak of Machiavellians was also pointed out by Grams and Rogers (1990), who found that high Machs were more likely to use nonrational, indirect tactics to achieve their goals. In the light of past research findings on Machiavellian behaviors, the positive relationship found between manipulation and Machiavellianism is not unexpected.

Self-promotional tactics were also found to be positively related to Machiavellianism, which can be explained by the fact that high Machs tend to be self-oriented (Ickes et al., 1986). In other words, individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism are primarily concerned with themselves and their personal gain, rather than whether the strategy that is being employed is what the context calls for. Leone and Corte (1994) suggested that Machiavellians and self-monitors may employ the same self-presentational strategies, but do so for divergent purposes. For instance, an individual scoring high on Machiavellianism will use self-presentation tactics to achieve his or her goals for personal gain. This notion is supported by the findings of this study. High self-
monitors, on the other hand, will use self-presentation tactics to adjust socially to what is required of them by the social environment, which is supported by the finding related to high self-monitors not exhibiting a preference for specific self-presentation tactics.

Whereas Machiavellianism was positively related to the use of manipulation tactics used on Facebook, affinity-seeking was negatively related to manipulation and damage control tactics. Affinity-seekers use communication to establish, maintain, and enhance liking and positive feelings toward them (Bell & Daly, 1984). Using manipulative self-presentation strategies would most likely not result in long-term affinity toward the individual.

Damage control tactics, on the other hand, suggest that damage was done to the relationship or the impression that requires reparation, such as an apology. Given that Facebook is a public social networking site, it is not unexpected that high affinity-seekers would be less likely to use damage control tactics on Facebook, given that other Facebook users would see the damage control behaviors, and infer that harm occurred. High affinity-seekers would likely avoid public apologies or excuses, because it could potentially decrease liking stemming from other Facebook users. Further, as previously stated, high affinity-seekers would be less likely to have caused harm in the first place.

Communication occurring on Facebook can either be private or public, depending on whether users choose the private messaging or chat function, or choose to post on their Facebook friends’ public “walls”. The discussion of public versus private in the Facebook domain could also be reason for why communicative adaptability was not found to be significantly related to any self-presentation tactics employed by Facebook users. The survey for this study asked about general behaviors on Facebook, but did not
distinguish whether communication occurred publicly or privately. In fact, communicative adaptability not being related to specific self-presentation tactics provides support for the notion that individuals scoring high in communicative adaptability might be more skilled at recognizing whether public or private Facebook interactions are favored. Individuals scoring high in communicative adaptability have the ability to adapt their interaction goals and behaviors to what socio-interpersonal contexts require of them (Duran, 1983). Therefore, it is possible that depending on the situation, they will be more skilled at choosing public versus private modes of communication on Facebook.

Even though results related to the relationship between communicative adaptability and self-presentation tactics were statistically insignificant, findings from this study revealed that communicative adaptability plays a role in self-presentation processes occurring on Facebook. The statistical insignificance provides support for the notion that individuals who have the ability to communicatively adapt do not have a tendency to use one particular tactic.

Further, this study revealed that secondary goals were positively related to self-presentation tactics on Facebook. Specifically, interaction goals were positively related to self-promotion and role-model types of self-presentation tactics on the social networking site. According to Dillard (1990b), interaction goals are marked by a desire to create relevant and coherent messages while avoiding face-threats to either party. Using self-presentation tactics that promote oneself and exhibit behaviors that encourage others to model this behavior shows awareness for the relevancy and coherency of messages.

In other words, both of these self-presentation tactics (self-promotion and role-model) require an individual to exhibit behaviors over a longer period of time. Creating a
positive image of oneself does not occur during a single communicative instance. Rather, it is created over time by showing consistency in the messages being sent and the behaviors exhibited. For instance, an individual performs a favor for a friend in need. A single action will be less likely to create the impression that the person is a helpful individual. However, if the same person is helpful more than once and exhibits helpful behaviors towards other friends, a lasting impression will be more likely created. Therefore, the positive relationship between interaction goals and self-presentation tactics, namely self-promotion and role-model tactics, was not unexpected.

Findings derived from this study also revealed that personal resource goals and arousal management goals were both positively related to the use of manipulation self-presentation tactics on Facebook. Both types of goals (personal resource goals and arousal management goals) are what Dillard and colleagues (1989) referred to as self-oriented goals, meaning that these goals center around the actor. The use of manipulative self-presentation tactics suggests a greater concern for one’s goals and less concern for the other interactant. Exhibiting concern for one’s personal resources and one’s arousal management are both concerns that could lead individuals to use manipulation as a self-presentation tactic to prevent the loss or decrease of personal resources, as well as the management of arousal during interactions.

Overall, secondary goals predicted the use of self-presentation tactics and this section reviewed findings and discussed their implications related to these two concepts. The conceptual model of self-presentation tactics on Facebook tested in this study further explored the relationship between communicative adaptability, as it was hypothesized that communicative adaptability and one’s concern for secondary goals were related.
Therefore, the subsequent section examines findings related to the relationship between communicative adaptability and secondary goals.

*Communicative Adaptability and Secondary Goals*

Secondary goals are recurring motivations that help shape planning and message output. The goals include identity goals, interaction goals, personal and relational resource goals, and arousal management goals (Dillard, 1990b). Given that these goals act as a counterforce to influence episodes, it was hypothesized that individuals’ ability to adapt their communicative behavior to various contexts (communicative adaptability) and secondary goals will be related. The relationship between communicative adaptability and secondary goals was explored to establish the kind of relationship that exists. The subsequent section discusses findings related to communicative adaptability and secondary goals.

Even though no significant relationships were found between affinity-seeking and secondary goals, this study revealed that high self-monitoring was related to greater concern for influence and interaction goals, whereas Machiavellianism was related to greater concern for personal resource goals and arousal management goals. According to Dillard and colleagues (1989), some secondary goals are self-oriented, whereas others take into consideration both the actor and the target. High self-monitors, who are themselves more other-oriented, showed greater concern for interaction goals, which are goals related to one’s social appropriateness (Dillard, 1990b). On the other hand, high Machiavellians, who are inherently self-oriented, showed concern for personal resource goals and arousal management goals, which are both types of goals that center around the actor, as opposed to the target.
The fact that self-monitoring, but not Machiavellianism, was positively related to influence goals, also could be related to the measure used (Dillard et al., 1989), assessed as an individual’s overall concern for one’s primary, or influence, goal. The measure does not assess the primary goal of the interaction is given that the influence goal is subject to change. For instance, the measure assesses how important it is for an individual to attain his or her influence goal, however the measure does not reveal what the influence goal is. For a high self-monitor, the influence goal may be to portray oneself according to what one believes is expected in a given situation. In this particular instance, one’s concern for the influence goal implies a concern for other interactants.

This study further revealed a negative relationship between Machiavellianism and identity goals. According to Dillard and colleagues (1989), identity goals “derive from one’s moral standards, principles for living, and personal preferences concerning one’s own conduct” (p. 20). The negative relationship is not surprising given that individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism tend to have a utilitarian view of interactions with others, rather than a moral one (Christie & Geis, 1970). In other words, Machiavellians are more concerned with achieving their goals, rather than following their personal moral and ethical codes of conduct.

Communicative adaptability was negatively related to influence goals. Influence goals are the primary goals within an interaction. In other words, individuals who score high on communicative adaptability are less concerned with their primary goals; rather than focusing on the primary (influence) goal, individuals high in communicative adaptability are more concerned with their social appropriateness of their communicative behaviors.
A negative relationship was found between communicative adaptability and personal resource goals. Individuals who pay particular attention to personal resource goals are generally concerned with the maintenance or increase of material, mental, physical, and temporal assets (Dillard, 1990b). The results of this study suggest that individuals high in communicative adaptability may show greater concern for enacting context-appropriate behaviors, rather than for their personal assets. However, it is important to note that context-appropriate behaviors and personal assets are not mutually exclusive.

Another finding of this study indicates that arousal management goals are positively related to communicative adaptability. Arousal management goals are related to an individual’s concern for personal comfort level during interactions (Dillard, 1990b). If the comfort level decreases to an extent that the individual is not comfortable, the individual will find it difficult to be an effective communicator. In other words, the ability to perceive situational variables, to choose behaviors according to the situation, and to anticipate consequences from one’s behavior (Spitzberg, 1995), may be inhibited by increased levels of arousal. Therefore, the positive relationship found between communicative adaptability and arousal management goals is not surprising.

_Personality Traits and Communicative Adaptability_

**Self-monitoring.** Individuals who have the cognitive and behavioral ability to react to interpersonal relationships and adapt their interaction goals and behaviors to such are considered to be communicatively adaptable (Duran, 1983). Past research suggests that self-monitoring is significantly correlated with communication knowledge (Spitzberg, 1990), and that the availability of a greater behavioral repertoire is related to
communication competence (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1989). Given these links, this study predicted a positive relationship between self-monitoring and communicative adaptability. A significant, positive correlation between communicative adaptability and self-monitoring was found.

Having the ability to pick up on various interpersonal cues during interactions allows individuals to determine what constitutes appropriate and desired behavior in various communicative instances. High self-monitors are characterized as having greater concern for social appropriateness (Snyder, 1974), which leads them to pay closer attention to what is required of them when interacting with others. Further, motivation to exhibit socially appropriate behavior during interactions (self-monitoring) allows individuals to adapt their communication behavior (communicative adaptability). The positive relationship between self-monitoring and communicative adaptability may be related to the fact that high self-monitors are motivated to present themselves according to what the interaction calls for, which equips them with greater alertness and a greater repertoire to react accordingly. Further, the two scales used to assess communicative adaptability and self-monitoring are both concerned with awareness for social appropriateness and the ability to alter behaviors. Therefore, the significant positive correlation between communicative adaptability and self-monitoring is understandable.

*Machiavellianism.* Similar to high self-monitors, individuals who score high on Machiavellianism are skilled self-presenters. Hence, a positive relationship between communicative adaptability and Machiavellianism was predicted. Contrary to the prediction, a significant, negative relationship was found. As noted by Leone and Corte (1994), both self-monitors, as well as individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism, are
skilled at presenting themselves in a certain light, yet are vastly different in their underlying motives to do so. This may be the cause for the unexpected finding that communicative adaptability and Machiavellianism are negatively related.

Even though Weinstein (1969) found that Machiavellianism promotes interpersonal competence, the competence centers around the ability to be manipulative for one’s own purpose (Christie & Geis, 1970). In other words, individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism are self-oriented (Ickes et al., 1986) and are concerned about their own personal gain (Christie & Geis, 1970), which could be the root of the negative relationship to communicative adaptability. As noted by Duran (1982, 1983), communicative adaptability is the ability to recognize contextual parameters and communicate appropriate to the setting. Even though Machiavellians are more effective communicators in that they have the ability to withstand social pressure, for instance, they are more likely to use nonrational tactics, such as threats, to achieve their desired goals (Grams & Rogers, 1990). The use of threats, for instance, shows little to no concern for the other interactant and therefore seems to be less likely to be used by someone who is high communicative adaptability. These findings provide reasons for the negative relationship that was found.

Although individuals scoring high on Machiavellianism are skilled at achieving their desired goals, they do so with little regard to what the interactional environment requires of them. Whereas high self-monitors showed concern for the communication processes by paying close attention to the impression they are making, individuals scoring high in Machiavellianism are more concerned about the outcome.
Affinity-seeking. Wanting to be liked by others (affinity-seeking) shows an other-orientation, similar to the orientation found in high self-monitors (Ickes et al., 1986). A positive relationship between affinity-seeking and communicative adaptability was predicted and also found. Through verbal and nonverbal communication, individuals try to get others to like them (Daly & Kreiser, 1994), which supports the notion that individuals who seek affinity are concerned with the communication processes and therefore attempt to adapt to what is expected of them.

Exhibiting affinity-seeking behaviors enhances liking and communication effectiveness (Bell & Daly, 1984), which could be the reason for why a significant positive relationship was found between affinity-seeking and communicative adaptability. The concept of affinity-seeking competence, which is the ability to carry favor with others (Rubin et al., 1993), also points to the link to communicative adaptability. Individuals who have a desire to be liked by others will pay closer attention to what is required of them in any given situation, so they can adapt their communicative behaviors accordingly.

Limitations and Strengths

Despite the study’s findings and implications, there were some strengths as well as limitations to consider when interpreting these conclusions. The limitations of this study concern the research design, measurement, and the sample. The subsequent section reviews and elaborates on the limitations and strengths related to the study’s conclusions.

A limitation is related to the research design of this study. Cross-sectional survey methods have inherent problems associated with them, namely that the data collection occurs at one point in time, rather than over a longer period of time like in longitudinal
studies. Results deriving from this type of research show relationships between variables based on a single instance of information gathering.

There was another limitation associated with this study, which is related to the measurements used to assess secondary goals and self-presentation tactics. Upon testing the reliabilities of the various dimensions of the secondary goals measure, one of the dimensions – relational resource goals – had to be deleted to maintain the overall reliability of the scale. This could be related to the modifications that were made to the measure to make it more context-specific for the purpose of this particular study. The modifications applied to the scale included tying items directly to Facebook. The limited application of the self-presentation tactics scale in previous studies and the modifications applied to the measure required a factor analysis, which revealed diverging results from previous factor analyses. Even though all necessary measures were taken to ensure the validity and reliability of results, replication of the study may be necessary.

The convenient sampling method is another limitation of this study. Even though the participants were recruited from a diverse population consisting of Facebook users, the sampling occurred by contacting the researcher’s Facebook friends to invite their Facebook friends to take the survey, as well as an invitation through CRTNET to participate in the study. This sampling method results in participants being linked to the researcher through their social networks created on Facebook. Further, study participants self-selected into the sample by following the survey link on the Facebook group “KSU Researcher” page. Therefore, it can be implied that individuals who completed the survey are likely active and participatory Facebook users who exhibit above-average levels of Facebook literacy and awareness of their actions on the social networking site. Despite
the limitations related to this study’s findings, a strength of the study is related to the theoretical choice, which will be discussed in the subsequent section.

Goals-panning-action theory was used as the theoretical framework for this study, however the theory has not been applied in its entirety. Specifically, the goals-planning-action model has not been tested in relation to self-presentation tactics; rather a new conceptual model was proposed utilizing parts of the theory. The notion of goals preceding plans, which are followed by actions during influence episodes, has not been tested in the traditional view of this theory in the context of self-presentation or impression management. This study used personality traits as indicators to predict one’s desire to manage impressions. In other words, self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and affinity-seeking were used to assess one’s willingness to create desired impressions of oneself on Facebook. Rather than assessing individuals’ goals when managing impressions and plans on how to achieve these specific impressions, it was hypothesized that these personality traits would be linked to goals. By hypothesizing that personality traits would be related to goals associated with successful impression management, it was further assumed that such goals would encourage planning processes to occur.

Further, communicative adaptability was used to take into consideration the skill set necessary to put plans into action by assessing one’s ability to adapt to various social and situational factors that impact communication processes. A skill component is not part of goals-planning-action theory per se, and was added for the purpose of this study, more specifically the computer-mediated context of this research.

Overall, goals-planning-action theory was applied as a general theoretical framework to guide this study. Variables were chosen based on the context of this study,
rather than implications derived from the theory itself. Although goals, plans, and actions were central to the study, they were explored using context-specific variables, not variables suggested by the goals-planning-action model. The strengths and limitations of this study point to several suggestions for future research.

*Future Research Directions*

Scholars should continue to explore Facebook users’ communication behaviors related to self-presentation because impression management is an integral part of not only owning and maintaining a Facebook profile, but also of the communication occurring privately and publicly on Facebook. This study provides a foundation for future research on self-presentation on Facebook and was largely interpersonal. Given that individuals choose Facebook friends based on their real-life friends, the impressions they want to create will be similar to those they wish to achieve in face-to-face settings. Therefore, Facebook provides fertile ground for future research for interpersonal as well as mass media scholars, and should not be overlooked due to its centrality in individuals’ communication patterns. Further, Facebook presents a bridging between disciplines of mass media and interpersonal research.

The present study took an interpersonal approach to explore individuals’ self-presentation tactics on Facebook, however focused solely on self-report data. Future studies should link self-report data with information about the ways in which individuals present themselves on Facebook using their actual Facebook profiles. Rather than just asking participants about their self-presentation tactics on Facebook, the coding and evaluation of Facebook profiles would add more predictive and explanatory value to results of such studies. For instance, the self-report data would then be able to be linked
to patterns found on Facebook profiles. Coding and evaluating Facebook profiles could include exploring profile pictures, amount and type of information provided by the individual, as well as frequency and types of disclosures by others on the public Facebook “wall”.

Even though this study was largely interpersonal, aspects related to the medium, in this case Facebook, could add interesting insights into the study of self-presentation on Facebook. For instance, this study did not take into consideration ongoing intrapersonal processes related to public versus private communication on Facebook. Exploring the use of privacy settings would be an area in which scholars would be able to provide insights as to the extents to which individuals are concerned with not only their privacy, but also the impressions they are creating. Specifically, it could be hypothesized that high self-monitors, for instance, would be more likely to take advantage of the various privacy setting options provided on Facebook than low self-monitors, because they would show greater concern for who can see what on their Facebook profile. Overall, Facebook is a medium that bridges communication disciplines and allows researcher to explore interpersonal communication in a mediated environment.

In a similar vein, future research on self-presentation on Facebook should specifically ask about the types of communication occurring publicly (e.g., notes, wall-posts, & status updates) and communication occurring on Facebook that is private (e.g., private messages & chats). Individuals’ choice to communicate certain things privately instead of publicly can be valuable in the study of self-presentation. In other words, Facebook users might choose to communicate certain things privately, because these things could potentially hinder their desired impressions of being achieved.
For instance, Facebook users might choose not to share that they are upset in their status update, because it could potentially communicate to others that they are not fun to be around. However, the same user could still choose to share these feelings in a private message. Not only does this example illustrate the awareness some individuals have for the public versus private nature of communication on Facebook, but it also shows how audience segregation issues can arise.

Future researchers interested in self-presentation on Facebook could also consider studying the effect of audience segregation and how individuals deal with problems of multiple audiences having access to their profile and being witnesses to their activity on Facebook (e.g., friends versus family members). When parents add their children as their Facebook friends, for instance, the child may experience uncertainty related to how he or she is perceived by their parents based on the information and the interactions occurring on Facebook. Even though some questions have been addressed in this study, many more questions arose as a result of this research, some of which have been discussed in this section. Self-presentation on Facebook provides promising ground for future research, especially as the social networking site continues to grow in popularity.

Conclusion

This study explored personality traits and their relationship to communicative adaptability. Further, the research investigated how communicative adaptability is related to the four dimensions of secondary goals – identity goals, interaction goals, personal resource goals, and arousal management goals. Finally, dimensions of secondary goals were examined in relation to the four dimensions of self-presentation tactics (manipulation, damage control, self-promotion, and role-model). Goals-planning-action
theory was used as the guiding framework for this study, as it allowed for further exploration of the impact of secondary goals as predictors of self-presentation tactics.

The information gained from this research serves as evidence to the utility of persuasion theory to self-presentation and impression management. Even though goals-planning-action theory was applied generally in this study, evidence shows that a more specific application of this particular theory could provide interesting new insights into the study of self-presentation on Facebook. The conceptual model proposed in this study indicates that persuasion may, in fact, be central to self-presentation, and despite the fact that scholars (such as Leary, 1996) have discussed the persuasiveness of self-presentation in their writings, little empirical evidence can be found to support this relationship. This study attempted to bridge this gap and now serves as encouragement to investigate self-presentation and impression management further from a persuasive perspective.

Given the rapid growth of new technologies and the growing complexity and flexibility of the social networking site Facebook, more specifically, it is crucial for scholars to build upon previously-established theoretical foundations. Even though technologies continuously change and alter the ways in which individuals communicate, traditional theoretical approaches can still aid in the exploration of new communication contexts. In the case of Facebook, research exploring various aspects of the social networking site is only now beginning to surface (with the exception of Tong et al., 2008 and Walther et al., 2008).

Facebook has gained popularity in recent years and has become the preferred mode of communication for many—whether it is to re-connect with old friends or distant family members, maintain friendships, or stay in touch with colleagues, friends, or
family. This study provides evidence that impression management is an integral part of communication occurring on Facebook and that Facebook users ought to be more aware of their own as well as others’ self-presentation tactics used on Facebook. First and foremost, Facebook is a semi-public platform, meaning that individuals’ information is public, however users have to option of determining who can see how much of the information. Given the nature of Facebook, this choice can have serious effects on individuals’ private as well as professional lives. Understanding that one’s Facebook friends have self-presentational goals when communicating on the social networking site, users should be more conscious of their friends’ activities and the ways in which they choose to respond, as this can have an indirect effect on how they themselves are viewed by others.

The overall goal of this study was to shed light into the intrapersonal as well as social processes that shape self-presentation of Facebook. The aim was to identify key personality traits that would aid in the exploration of self-presentation tactics used on Facebook by linking personality traits to communicative adaptability and secondary goals. The purpose of proposing a conceptual model of self-presentation tactics on Facebook was to examine various aspects of personality traits as well as social aspects (communicative adaptability and secondary goals) and how these aspects relate to impression management on Facebook. In so doing, the goal was to move from intrapersonal predictors to socially-oriented predictors that would aid in the exploration of self-presentation tactics employed by Facebook users. This study is merely the beginning of an (empirical) attempt to move toward a theory of self-presentation taking into consideration both cognitive as well as social components.
The present study has implications related to self-presentation tactics used on Facebook, even though this research merely started building a foundation for future research. More questions arose than were answered, which leaves future research with many possibilities of addressing various interpersonal as well as media-related processes in the study of self-presentation on Facebook. This study attempted to bridge interpersonal and mass media research, however one of the most significant implications of the present research shows that in order to acquire a more complete understanding of individuals’ activities on Facebook, both interpersonal, as well as media-related aspects, have to be taken into account and studied together.
MODIFIED SELF-PRESENTATION TACTICS SCALE (LEE ET AL., 1999)

On the following pages you will be asked a number of questions dealing with your perceptions of yourself on Facebook. Please read the instructions carefully and try to respond to all the items as openly and honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. In responding to the items, please click the number on the scale which most closely represents your behavior on Facebook.

Very infrequently 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very frequently

1. I do things to make people afraid of me on Facebook so that they will do what I want.
2. I claim credit on Facebook for doing things I did not do.
3. I make excuses for poor performance on Facebook.
4. I intimidate others on Facebook.
5. I threaten others on Facebook when I think it will help me get what I want from them.
6. When I am blamed for something, I make excuses on Facebook.
7. On Facebook, I get sick when under a lot of pressure to do well.
8. On Facebook, I do correct people who underestimate the value of gifts that I give to them.
9. I exaggerate the negative qualities of people on Facebook who compete with me.
10. On Facebook, I lead others to believe that I cannot do something in order to get help.
11. Poor health has been responsible for my getting mediocre grades in school and I let others know on Facebook.
12. When things go wrong, I explain why I am not responsible on Facebook.
13. I have put others down on Facebook in order to make myself look better.
14. I try to convince others on Facebook that I am not responsible for negative events.
15. I tell others on Facebook they are stronger or more competent than me in order to get others to do things for me.
16. I put obstacles in the way of my own success on Facebook.
17. I make negative statements on Facebook about people belonging to rival groups.
18. I offer an excuse on Facebook for possibly not performing well before talking a very difficult test.
19. Anxiety interferes with my performance on Facebook.
20. When working on a project with a group I make my contribution seem greater than it is on my Facebook.
21. I offer explanations on Facebook before doing something that others might think is wrong.
22. If I harm someone, I apologize on Facebook and promise not to do it again.
23. I justify my behavior on Facebook to reduce negative reactions from others.
24. I apologize on Facebook when I have done something wrong.
25. On Facebook, I try to make up for any harm I have done to others.
26. On Facebook, I justify beforehand actions others may not like.
27. I tell people on Facebook about my positive accomplishments.
28. I tell people on Facebook when I do well at tasks others find difficult.
29. I tell others about my positive qualities on Facebook.
30. When I succeed at a task, I emphasize to others on Facebook how important the task was.
31. I point out the positive things I do on Facebook, which other people fail to notice.
32. I compliment people on Facebook to get them on my side.
33. I use flattery on Facebook to win the favor of others.
34. I try to set an example for others to follow on Facebook.
35. I try to serve as a model on Facebook for how a person should behave.
36. I try to get others to act in the same positive way I do on Facebook.
37. I try to induce imitation by others by serving as a positive example on Facebook.
38. On Facebook, I act in ways I think others should act.

Note: Manipulation items are 1-20, damage control items are 21-26, self-promotion items are 27-33, and role-model items are 33-35.
APPENDIX B

Modified Secondary Goals (modified from Dillard et al., 1989)

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements as they apply to you and your communication on Facebook.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree
5 = strongly agree

1. It is very important to me to convince others to see me the way I want to be seen by them.
2. I am very concerned about making the impression I want on my Facebook page.
3. I really do not care that much how others perceive me.
4. The impression others make of me on my Facebook page has important personal consequences for me.
5. Although I want others to perceive me a certain way, it really is not that important an issue.
6. When on Facebook, I am concerned about not violating my own ethical standards.
7. When on Facebook, I am concerned about maintaining my own ethical standards.
8. I am concerned about being true to myself and my values.
9. I want to behave in a mature, responsible manner.
10. I am not concerned with sticking to my own standards.
11. I am concerned with making (or maintaining) a good impression when communicating on Facebook.
12. When on Facebook, I am careful to avoid saying things which are socially inappropriate.
13. I am very conscious of what is appropriate and inappropriate when communicating on Facebook.
14. I am concerned with putting myself in a “bad light” when communicating on Facebook.
15. I do not want to look stupid when communicating on Facebook.
16. I am not willing to risk possible damage to a relationship in order to make (or maintain) a good impression.
17. Making (or maintaining) a good impression is more important to me than preserving a relationship.
18. I do not really care if I made the other person mad or not.
19. Others could make things very bad for me if I do not make the right impression.
20. Others might take advantage of me if I do not make the right impression.
21. I am worried about being hurt if I fail to make the right impression.
22. When trying to maintain a good impression on Facebook, I avoid saying things which might make me apprehensive or nervous.
23. Communicating on Facebook does not seem to be the type of situation to make me nervous.
24. Facebook’s potential for making me nervous and uncomfortable worries me.
25. I am afraid of being uncomfortable or nervous.
APPENDIX C

Communicative Adaptability (Duran & Kelly, 1988)

Instructions: The following are statements about communication behaviors. Answer each item as it relates to your general style of communication (the type of communicator you are most often) in social situations.

Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provided.

5 = always true of me
4 = often true of me
3 = sometimes true of me
2 = rarely true of me
1 = never true of me

1. I feel nervous in social situations.
2. In most social situations I feel tense and constrained.
3. When talking, my posture seems awkward and tense.
4. My voice sounds nervous when I talk with others.
5. I am relaxed when talking with others.
6. I try to make the other person feel good.
7. I try to make the other person feel important.
8. I try to be warm when communicating with another.
9. While I’m talking I think about how the other person feels.
10. I am verbally and nonverbally supportive of other people.
11. I like to be active in different social groups.
12. I enjoy socializing with various groups of people.
13. I enjoy meeting new people.
14. I find it easy to get along with new people.
15. I do not “mix” well at social functions.
16. I am aware of how intimate my disclosures are.
17. I am aware of how intimate the disclosures of others are.
18. I disclose at the same level that others disclose to me.
19. I know how appropriate my self-disclosures are.
20. When I self-disclose I know what I am revealing.
21. When speaking I have problems with grammar.
22. At times I don’t use appropriate verb tense.
23. I sometimes use one word when I mean to use another.
24. I sometimes use words incorrectly.
25. I have difficulty pronouncing some words.
26. When I am anxious, I often make jokes.
27. I often make jokes when in tense situations.
28. When I embarrass myself, I often make a joke about it.
29. When someone makes a negative comment about me, I respond with a witty comeback.
30. People think I am witty.

Note: Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 are reverse-coded. Social Composure items are 1-5, Social Confirmation items are 6-10, Social Experience items are 11-15, Appropriate Disclosure items are 16-20, Articulation items are 21-25, and Wit items are 26-30. Items should be rearranged randomly before use.
APPENDIX D

Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984)

For each statement indicate your general perception of your abilities.

   Very strongly agree (7)
   Strongly agree (6)
   Agree (5)
   Neither (4)
   Disagree (3)
   Strongly disagree (2)
   Very strongly disagree (1)

1. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for.

2. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.

3. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn’t working, I can readily change it to something that does.

4. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

5. I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation in which I find myself.

6. Once I know what a situation calls for, it’s easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.

7. I am often able to read people’s true emotions correctly (through their eyes).

8. In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person with whom I am conversing.

9. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding the emotions and motives of others.

10. I can usually tell when others consider a joke to be in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.

11. I can usually tell when I’ve said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener’s eyes.

12. If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person’s manner of expression.
APPENDIX E

Modified Machiavellianism – Mach IV (Christie & Geis, 1970)

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = somewhat disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = no opinion
5 = slightly agree
6 = somewhat agree
7 = strongly agree

1. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
2. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons
   for wanting it rather than giving reasons which might carry more weight.
3. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.
4. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.
5. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.
6. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out
   when they are given a chance.
7. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.
8. One should take action only when sure it is morally right.
9. It is wise to flatter important people.
10. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than important and dishonest.
11. Barnum was very wrong when he said there’s a sucker born every minute.
12. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put
    painlessly to death.
13. It is possible to be good in all respects.
14. Most people are basically good and kind.
15. There is no excuse for lying to someone else.
16. Most people forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their
    property.
17. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.
18. Generally speaking, people won’t work hard unless they’re forced to do so.
19. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals
    are stupid enough to get caught.
20. Most people are brave.
APPENDIX F

Affinity-Seeking Instrument (Bell, Tremblay, & Buerkel-Rothfuss, 1987)

For each of the following statements, please indicate your perception of your general abilities. That is, consider how you generally behave, rather than any specific conversation or event. Circle the letters that represent the following categories:

- Very strongly agree – VSA
- Strongly agree – SA
- Agree – A
- Undecided – U
- Disagree – D
- Strongly disagree – SD
- Very strongly disagree – VSD

1. I seldom know what to say or do to get others to like me.
2. If I put my mind to it, I could get anyone to like me.
3. I have trouble building rapport with others.
4. I have difficulty getting others to want to spend time with me.
5. If I want someone to like me, I can usually create positive feelings between us.
6. I just can’t seem to get others to like and appreciate me.
7. I am good at getting others to want to hang around with me.
8. I do not seem to know what to say and do to make myself popular with others.
9. When necessary, I can put on an act to get important people to approve of me.
10. I am not very good at putting on a show to impress others.
11. I am very good at playing roles to draw people to me.
12. I can present myself as more likeable than I really am.
13. I can put on excellent social performances to get others to approve of me.
APPENDIX G

Demographic and Descriptive Information

1. Gender: Female □   Male □

2. Ethnicity: □ African American
□ Asian American
□ Caucasian
□ Hispanic American
□ Native American
□ Other: __________

3. Number of years at last birthday: ________

4. Highest level of education to date:
□ High school
□ Associate degree
□ Undergraduate degree
□ Graduate degree

5. Socio-economic status: □ Lower class
□ Lower middle class
□ Middle class
□ Upper middle class
□ Upper class

6. On average, how many times a week do you log on to Facebook.com?

__________

7. Approximately how many friends do you have on Facebook?

__________

8. What is your primary purpose for using Facebook?
□ Meeting new people
□ Keeping in touch with friends
□ Keeping in touch with family
□ Keeping in touch with colleagues
□ Updating my Facebook friends about what is going on in my life
□ Other
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