

6-4-2015

Spotting the Self-Monitor: Accuracy in self-monitoring based on Facebook profiles

Elizabeth Danielle Ramirez

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rio.tamtu.edu/etds>

Recommended Citation

Ramirez, Elizabeth Danielle, "Spotting the Self-Monitor: Accuracy in self-monitoring based on Facebook profiles" (2015). *Theses and Dissertations*. 30.
<https://rio.tamtu.edu/etds/30>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Research Information Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Research Information Online. For more information, please contact benjamin.rawlins@tamtu.edu, eva.hernandez@tamtu.edu, jhatcher@tamtu.edu, rhinojosa@tamtu.edu.

SPOTTING THE SELF-MONITOR: ACCURACY IN RATINGS OF SELF-MONITORING
BASED ON FACEBOOK PROFILES

A Thesis

by

ELIZABETH DANIELLE RAMIREZ

Submitted to Texas A&M International University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2015

Major Subject: Counseling Psychology

SPOTTING THE SELF-MONITOR: ACCURACY IN RATINGS OF SELF-MONITORING
BASED ON FACEBOOK PROFILES

A Thesis

by

ELIZABETH DANIELLE RAMIREZ

Submitted to Texas A&M International University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved as to style and content by:

Chair of Committee,	Mónica E. Muñoz
Committee Members,	Roberto R. Heredia
	Bonnie A. Rudolph
	Kevin Lindberg
Head of Department,	José Lozano

May 2015

Major Subject: Counseling Psychology

DEDICATION

For my husband, José Manuel, and our beautiful daughter, Isabella Regina. With your support and love, all is possible.

ABSTRACT

Spotting the Self-Monitor: Accuracy in Ratings of Self-Monitors Based on Facebook Profiles
(May 2015)

Elizabeth D. Ramirez, B. A., Texas A&M International University;

Chair of Committee: Dr. Mónica E. Muñoz

Past studies have examined the relationship between social network usage and certain personality traits. For instance, correlations have been found between Facebook usage and personality aspects such as narcissism, shyness, and interdependence. However, previous research has only looked at self-ratings and researcher coding of such personality traits in order to look at these relationships. Furthermore, few studies have examined how accurately individuals are perceived or how accurately they present themselves using Facebook profiles. The current study examined the relationship between self-ratings and perceiver ratings of self-monitoring and likability. In the first phase of the study, a self-rating scale was used among college students ($N = 25$) to collect Facebook profile screenshots of high and low self-monitors. These screen shots were then used as the stimuli for the second phase of the study, where a second pool of college students ($N = 221$) rated those individuals on self-monitoring and likeability based solely on the information gathered from the Facebook profiles. It was predicted that there would be a significant difference between perceiver and self-ratings. Independent *t*-tests was used to compare the mean perceiver self-monitoring score to self-ratings. The results were significant, meaning perceivers did not accurately detect targets' self-monitoring based on

the way the individuals presented themselves on their Facebook profiles. It was also predicted that high self-monitors would be seen as less likable than low self-monitors. An analysis of variance found that those who were perceived as high self-monitors were in fact rated as less likable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of my professors and mentors at Texas A&M International University (TAMIU). I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Mónica Muñoz, Dr. Roberto R. Heredia, Dr. Bonnie A. Rudolph, and Dr. Kevin Lindberg for their support and expertise. I would also like to thank the D.D. Hachar Honors Program, the Graduation Retention Enhancement at TAMIU (G.R.E.A.T.) Grant, and the Lamar Bruni Vergara Scholarship fund for the educational and financial opportunities given to me during my undergraduate and graduate studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
FACEBOOK: THE SOCIAL MEDIA NETWORK	1
SOCIAL PERCEPTIONS AND IMPRESSION FORMATION	3
SELF-PRESENTATION AND SELF-MONITORING.....	8
SELF-MONITORING AND NEGATIVE IMPRESSIONS	10
EFFECTS OF FACEBOOK ON SOCIAL INTERACTIONS	14
THE PRESENT STUDY	19
METHODS.....	20
Participants.....	20
Materials	20
Procedure	24
RESULTS	25
DISCUSSION	28
Future Directions	31
REFERENCES	32
APPENDICES	
A SELF-MONITORING SCALE	36
B OUTSIDE OBSERVER: SELF-MONITORING SCALE	38

C	LIKABILITY SCALE	41
D	FACEBOOK USAGE SURVEY.....	43
VITA.....		46

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: SELF-MONITOR (SM) SELF-RATING SCORES.....	23
Table 2: SELF-RATED SELFMONIROTING (SM) BY PERCEIVER-RATED SM AND STANDARD DEVIATION (SD), T-SCORES (T) AND PROBABILITY VALUES (P)	26
Table 3: PERCEIVER’S LIKABILITY RAITNGS OF TARGET INDIVIDUALS NUMBER (N), MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION (SD).....	27
Table 4: LIKABILITY BASED ON PERCEIVER SELF-MONITORING.....	27
Table 5: LIKABILITY BASED ON SELF-RATED SELF-MONITORING	27

FACEBOOK: THE SOCIAL MEDIA NETWORK

The increased use of technology during the last three decades has allowed interpersonal communication to evolve and expand rapidly. Individuals have access to a variety of electronic devices, such as personal data assistants, cell phones, and computers, as well as widespread use of the Internet and access to the World Wide Web. One popular means of interpersonal communication via the Internet is social media sites such as Twitter, Myspace, and Facebook. Originally created exclusively for college student use in 2004, Facebook has expanded to allow anyone with Internet access to create a profile and become an active user, and as of 2011, there were over 483 million active Facebook users (Qiu, Lin, Leung, & Tov, 2012; Wise, Alhabash, & Park., 2010). Facebook users are able to create a Facebook profile and communicate with others via electronic messages, chat, and *updates*. Updates are statements, photos, videos, or any other information given by the Facebook user which are presented on the person's Facebook profile. Facebook users add *Facebook friends* to their page and are then able to view their friend's profiles as well. A Facebook friend is another Facebook user added to an individual's profile who is allowed access to information presented on the profile; being a Facebook friend is not necessarily indicative of a relationship outside of the social networking site. A *timeline photo* is an image located at the very top of the profile page, a profile photo is located next to the user's name, and the user is able to edit their basic information to describe themselves. Options for this information includes, but are not limited to, relationship status, sexual orientation, languages spoken, education level, and jobs both currently and past held.

This thesis follows the style of *Cyberpsychology, Behavior & Social Networking*.

Users are also able to share information by liking other pages. Likes can be given to organizations, companies, social events, political causes, and other Facebook friend statuses and pictures.

Since Facebook profiles are the electronic representation of the self, it is the “ideal platform for impression management and selective self-presentation” (Qiu, Lin, Leung, & Tov, 2012, p. 569). According to Snyder and Gangestad (1986), high self-monitors “are thought to regulate their expressive self-presentation for the sake of desired public appearance” while low self-monitors “lack either the ability or the motivation to so regulate their expressive self-presentations” (p. 125). The nature of Facebook, which allows the user to edit information about the self in a selective manner, serves as a platform for this act of impression management or self-monitoring.

SOCIAL PERCEPTIONS AND IMPRESSION FORMATION

Decades of research on social perception have shown how various types of information can influence one's impressions of others. According to Asch (1943), the impression we make of another person is immediate; within the first few seconds of meeting another person, an attribution is made. A judgment is made on the entire person and when two or more traits are attributed to that person, those traits are understood to belong to the person "and they cease to exist as isolated traits" (Asch, 1943, p. 284). Asch's experiment asked two different groups of individuals to determine whether a set groups of words, such as intelligent, skillful and industrious, were character qualities of a person. The first group was told that the person they were to describe was "warm" while the other was told that the other was "cold." Generally, the qualities given to the person described as warm were positive, such as generous, happy, social, popular, and imaginative while the "cold" person was described with negative terms, such as shrewd, irritable, ruthless, and self-centered. According to Solomon Asch, this shows that when individuals are given only one quality (warm or cold), there is an assumption of their entire personality. As information about a person is collected, the perceiver combines all this information and creates a broad judgment or impression of the person based on the little bit of information gathered. These impressions are made not only on traits, but are also based on the person's behaviors and the perceiver's pre-existing stereotypes (Kunda & Thagard, 1996).

Another concept that is used to explain the judgments made of other is the *halo effect* (Mensch & Wishner, 1947). The halo effect, as defined by Nisbett and Wilson (1977), is the "influence of a global evaluation on evaluations of individual attributes of a person" (p. 250). When a perceiver makes a judgment on another, his or her feelings towards that person's character are also determined. Often one positive judgment will automatically be attributed to other positive

assumptions. In Nibett and Wilson's experiment, two groups of subjects viewed a videotape interview of a college professor. In one video, the professor was warm and friendly; in the other, the same professor was cold and distant. Globally, the warm and friendly professor was rated more positively than the cold and distant professor. Some aspects, however, were seen as neutral for the warm professor while they were seen as negative traits for the cold professor.

Specifically, subjects found that the professor's mannerisms, appearance, and British accent lowered his likability for the "cold" condition. Although the same mannerisms and accent were the same in either condition, because the professor was seen as cold, those same attributes were seen as negative.

According to Back (2011), there are basically four definitions of interpersonal perceptions. The first is "inferences of another person's personality, cognitions, or emotional and motivation states" (p. 95). In the case of Facebook profiles, these inferences are drawn only from the amount of information that person has selectively chosen to present. The second given by Back is "a person's own feelings, cognitions, or emotional and motivational states," which are only perceived by written words and selected photos when interacting through Facebook; the intricacies of interpersonal interaction, which include body language, tone, facial expressions, etc. are grossly minimized, which may alter interactions between persons (p. 95). The third definition is "metaperceptions of other persons' perceptions" (p. 95). Again, in the case of interactions via Facebook, our metaperceptions, or the way one thinks about the self, is altered by the fact that information about the self is skewed. The final definition given by Back is "momentary self-perceptions related to the interaction" (p. 95). The "interactions" through Facebook are selected by the individuals and are also able to be edited (i.e., Facebook users are able to delete or alter statements made on Facebook at any given point) which is not possible

with face-to-face interactions, which alters the traditional sense of interpersonal interactions.

According to Leary and Allen (2001), people assume that when engaging with others, they are interacting with that person and responding to the way they presents themselves.

However, this may be incorrect. When interacting with another, individuals are not interacting with the way others are presenting themselves, but instead individuals interact with that person based on the way they perceive others. Ideas of interpersonal perceptions are often false in face-to-face interactions, as one is interacting with the impression they have formed of that individual and not the actual person. This may be magnified when using online accounts, such as those created on Facebook, as the interaction is based only on the minute amount of information presented and do not have any additional information, such as accent or mannerisms, on which we base our impressions. In order to understand the nature of social interactions done on sites like Facebook, it is important to understand how Facebook users are perceived as judgments are made based on those perceptions.

A study done by Stopfer, Egloff, Nestler, and Back (2014), found that perceivers were able to accurately judge a social network user's personality based only on their profile. The researchers had one hundred three social network users complete Big Five Inventory (BFI-10). The BFI-10 is a ten item survey that measures neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Along with the targets' self-ratings, their ratings of desired impression (how they want to be viewed on the social network) and their meta-perceptions (how they think others see them on the social network) were also gathered. Twenty-seven coders, including research assistants or undergraduates, categorized and counted information available on the social network users' profiles. Then fifty six perceivers rated the social network users on a Likert type scale similar to the BFI-10. When the perceivers' scores were compared to the social

network users' scores using pairwise intraclass correlation, it was found that neuroticism was the only trait that was not accurately judged, while openness, self-esteem, need of popularity, conscientiousness, extroversion, and agreeableness were all accurately judged.

Similarly, Qiu, et al. (2012) found that Facebook users are more likely to express positive emotions on Facebook. In their first study, 185 participants were asked to complete a survey on disclosure of positive and negative emotional experience on Facebook and in real life, on a 7 point Likert scale. A 2 x 2 repeated measure analysis of variance with positive and negative emotions and Facebook vs. real life as two within subject factors found that Facebook users were more likely to disclose positive emotions online ($F(1, 184) = 138.40, p < 0.001, n^2 = 0.429$). The second part of the study asked thirty-seven college students to rate three close and three general friends' happiness. They were then asked to look at those individuals' Facebook profiles for three minutes and rate how happy the friends portrayed themselves on Facebook. The researchers used a simple effect analysis to find that participants felt that their friends portrayed themselves as more happy on Facebook than they were in real life ($F(1, 36) = 88.76, p < 0.001, n^2 = 0.71$). When using social networks, individuals also tend to express the same personality traits that are associated with the need for social approval, which is seen in individuals who are high self-monitors (Stopfer et al., 2014). It seems that people tend to be selective in their Facebook posts in order to present a more socially desirable self. However, when people feel that self-presentation is misleading, they see that individual as untrustworthy and hypocritical (DeAndrea & Walther, 2001). The personality traits which are accurately predicted by viewers create a certain impression of the Facebook user. However, when a Facebook user selects information to present to his or her viewers, that user can only assume how others will react. Although the Facebook user is attempting to be positive and appear

happier online, which by be assumed to be a positive trait, if their Facebook friends can tell they are being misleading, as was seen in Qiu et al.'s (2012) study, those individuals may be perceived negatively.

SELF-PRESENTATION AND SELF-MONITORING

It is important to consider how information is selectively chosen when it is done with a specific target audience in mind (i.e. Facebook “friends,” in this research). The psychological theory called “the looking-glass self” is explained in the following: *I am not what I think I am and I am not what you think I am; I am what I think that you think I am* (Cooley, 1995). This basically occurs when an individual acts in the way he or she believes the other person expects them to behave. For example, in the presence of a church clergyman, an individual may act quiet and respectful, as he or she assumes the clergyman expects him or her to behave. However, this same individual may be loud and forceful in front of an athletic component, as that individual assumes the athletic component expects him or her to behave in such a manner. So as this person molds his or her behavior according to assumed expectations and believes the other person is reacting to his or her presentation of self, the behavior becomes solidified. Much like operant conditioning, as the person receives the expected response (such as the clergyman smiling or the component showing anger), the behavior is reinforced, causing the behavior to continue. The problem with this, as mentioned before, is that one can only *assume* what others thinking, how one should act, and thus how others react to this self-presentation.

When an individual shapes his or her behavior, it is considered self-monitoring. Often people will self-monitor in order to achieve a desired goal, like getting a promotion at work, or in social situations that demand a “false” representation of the self, such as going to a funeral of someone disliked. The self-monitoring occurs because of the assumption that others are responding positively to our self-presentation. It is also possible that self-monitoring is done for survival and social desirability.

So when are we more likely to self-monitor? According to Leary and Allen (2011),

those who consciously think about their public self and how others see them are more likely to self-monitor due to their fear of negative evaluation. Also, those who are more open and self-disclosing are more likely to self-monitor. This occurs because as more private information about the self is given, the person must try more to manage perceived negative evaluations that occur from others knowing “too much” about them.

SELF-MONITORING AND NEGATIVE IMPRESSIONS

Self-monitoring affects the relationship one has with others when it comes to interpersonal interactions. According to several studies, Facebook can also have a negative impact on romantic relationships (Darvell, Walsh, & White (2011); Elphinston & Noller, (2011); Gershon (2011); Leone & Hawkins (2006); Muise, Christofides, Desmarais (2009); and Norris (1999)). The use of Facebook to communicate with others and observe significant other's interactions can cause strain to the relationship.

According to Norris (1999), high self-monitoring has a negative effect on the amount of trust one has in their romantic partner. In this study, thirty eight couples completed Snyder's *Self-Monitoring Scale* and Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna's *Trust scale*. A correlation was found between self-monitoring and trust in the relationship ($r(38) = .47, p < .003$). Those who are higher self-monitors are typically seen as less trustworthy by their partners, while those who are low self-monitors tend to have more trust within the relationship. Although this study was very simple, it shows the effect self-monitoring can have in the relationship. Those that spend more time altering the way they present themselves may be seen as less trustworthy. Although self-monitoring is not to be equated with lying, it may have a similar effect on romantic relationships. The effects of self-monitoring extend beyond romantic relationships. In addition to romantic relationships, levels of self-monitoring affects friendships, cohabitation and marriage (Leone and Hawkins, 2006). Theoretically, those who are low self-monitors are more likely to engage in tactics that facilitate strong relationships, such as being calm communicators, displaying affection and coming to a consensus on important financial and life issues (Leone & Hawkins, 2006).

According to Elphinston and Noller (2011), the habit of using Facebook to monitor a

partner's behavior even has an addictive quality to it. The study consisted of 342 undergraduate students who completed the Facebook Intrusion Questionnaire (FIQ) which was based on Brown's questionnaire on behavioral addiction and Walsh et. al.'s mobile phone involvement questionnaire. Romantic jealousy and relationship satisfaction were also measured. According to the researchers, there was a relationship between Facebook intrusion (using or thinking about Facebook while with a significant other) and relationship satisfaction ($t = -2.75, p < 0.01$). The amount of time spent on Facebook increases the likelihood that a third party would interfere with a romantic relationship; the researchers used the term "Facebook intrusion" to describe this event. It was also found that Facebook intrusion and relationship dissatisfaction is mediated by how jealous the individual is and how likely that individual is to monitor his or her partner's Facebook usage.

Gershon (2011) found that Facebook negatively affected relationships as it "sparked their suspicions" when their significant other edited his or her profile (p. 888). Gershon interviewed 72 people and questioned them on Facebook usage and how it affected their relationships. Part of the self-monitoring that is allowed when using a social networking site is the ability to delete and edit comments posted on the individual's profile. The issue that Gershon found with this in regards to relationships is that should a comment be posted on an individual's wall, especially by a person of the opposite sex, the option to delete the comment is there, but doing so is not always the best choice. The ability to edit Facebook profiles contributes to relationship turmoil as "deletion [of that comment] itself [is] ambiguous: was this a gesture of care or a gesture of concealment?" (p. 888). Gershon also found that many couples use Facebook as a means of monitoring their partner's behavior, which can often lead to feelings of paranoia "hazardous" to relationships (p. 890). Although this study was very qualitative, it does shed light

on personal opinions of Facebook usage.

It may be that the frequency with which one self-monitors their Facebook profile- or more importantly, how visible the self-monitoring is- has an impact on romantic relationships. Building on the research previously discussed, should self-monitoring be visible to others on Facebook and should that visibility affect the likability of that person, it could affect the amount of jealousy, as the downfall of self-monitoring is that honesty is found to be important in interpersonal relationships. According to Klein (2004), "...the higher the level of self-monitoring, the more likely communicators were to express attitudes consistent with those of their anticipated audiences" (p. 310). Because high self-monitors are more eager to present themselves in a manner which their observers find desirable, they are more likely to be dishonest on their Facebook profile. A study done by Hall and Pennington (2013) found that there was a strong negative correlation between self-monitoring and honesty. Hall and Pennington were some of the few researchers to use perceiver ratings of Facebook users. In this study, 35 perceivers (observers) viewed 100 Facebook user profiles. The observers completed the Big Five Inventory on each of the Facebook users based on the information gathered from the profiles. Those that were low self-monitors were more likely seen as honest by perceives. A correlation matrix was used to compare extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, self-monitoring, and Facebook honesty (rated by perceivers) compared with the Facebook users' self-reports. Those that rated themselves as higher self-monitors were rated as less honest by perceivers ($r = -.36, p < .01$). Although this information is only correlational (it is not proven that those who are higher self-monitors are less honest), there does seem to be some aspects that influence perceivers assumptions of the Facebook users' traits. It is possible that the perceivers were picking up on the targets' self-monitoring habits, such as the kind of profile picture they use or the kinds of

updates the user posts.

According to a study done by Brambilla, Sacchi, Rusconi, Cherubini, and Yzerbyt (2012), moral traits, specifically honesty, have a great effect on the likelihood of an individual giving a positive impression to others. In this study, one hundred and twelve students completed surveys after randomly being assigned to one of eight groups; the study was a 2 (morality high vs. low) by 2 (competency high vs. low) by 2 (socialability high vs. low) between participants design. The surveys were on group impression formation about an unfamiliar ethnic group which were scored on a seven-point Likert scale. An ANOVA found that the group favored the high morality condition ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 1.53$) more than the low morality condition ($M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.06$) ($F(1, 104) = 94.19$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .48$). Although the Honesty seems to be a greater factor than even sociability or competence in the impression formation of others. Applying this theory to Facebook profiles, observers would be more likely to rate individuals positively if they believe those people to be honest. Should it be known that the individual is dishonestly editing their profile for the sake of desired formation impression, then observers may be likely to rate them negatively. Theoretically, high self-monitors would be more likely to edit their profiles in order to create a more positive impression. If observers can identify these self-monitors, then attempts at editing profiles for the sake of positive impression formation may be counterproductive; as high self-monitors would be more likely to be rated negatively as opposed to low self-monitors.

There is little information addressing the implications of impression formation based on Facebook profiles. Traditional studies of impression formation have looked at areas such as friendliness and warmth; however, the presentation of self via social network sites may not follow the same “rules of engagement” of face-to-face interactions. Some studies have looked into impression formation based on specific aspects of Facebook profiles.

EFFECTS OF FACEBOOK ON SOCIAL INTERACTIONS

Facebook is an important area of study in order to increase our understanding of social interaction and how it can be improved by Facebook usage. As social beings, one consideration that needs to be made is whether or not social networks are taking over communication by replacing face-to-face interpersonal connections. According to a study done by Kujath (2011), it is not yet replacing face-to-face interactions; however the amount of interaction done online is a great amount. The study found that 40% of Facebook users had no friends online that they had not met in person. One hundred of the participants responded that they did have friends online that they had not met in person, which averaged to 7.2 “friends” per participant. When reporting what they used Facebook for, 14 of the participants reported that they frequently use social networking to meet new people while the majority of participants ($n = 132$) reported that they only use it to keep in contact with people they know personally. Only 11.5 percent ($n = 21$) out of all the participants ($n = 178$) responded that they never communicate with friends online more than in person; the remaining participants responded that they communicated via Facebook more often than in person either “seldom” ($n = 60$), “sometimes” ($n = 64$), or “frequently” ($n = 33$). Considering that many of the participants do use Facebook for increased communication may indicate a trend in overall network-based communication. Because Facebook is used so frequently as a form of communication, it is essential that social investigators begin to look at the implications it has on relationships and whether those online interactions have consequences outside of the online world.

Individuals use Facebook not only to provide information about themselves, but also to collect information about others, which is similar to the way humans interact in face-to-face. Wise, et al, (2010) found it to be less pleasurable to spend time “social browsing” than “social

searching” on Facebook among the participants. Social browsing was the term used for the behavior of looking at Facebook *feeds*, or the area of Facebook which displays other’s updates, likes, and statuses, while social searching was direct communication with other individual and impression management (editing personal information and profiles). In the study, Wise, et al., (2010) coded, or identified and categorized, the activity of 29 participants’ Facebook interactions within a 5 minute periods of online activity. As a distracter, participants also spent 5 minutes on Amazon.com and CNN.com. The on-screen activity of Facebook was recorded and coded to find the amount of time spent on each of the following activities: social browsing, social searching, communication, and impression management. Intercoder reliability was at 86.5% between the two coders. Researchers found that of the screens coded ($N=312$), 116 screens were social searching, 114 screens were social browsing, 28 screens were log-in related, 37 screens were communication and impression management. The amount of time per page was also collected, as was skin conductance and facial EMG during their time on each page. According to the research, it was less pleasurable, as indicated by skin conductance and facial electromyography (EMG), to spend time social browsing than social searching on Facebook among the participants. The facial EMG recorded muscle movements, such as those associated with smiling or frowning, in order to determine mood while looking at the internet pages. Theoretically, if individuals find it pleasurable to edit their profile information, which is essentially self-monitoring, then they are more likely to engage in this behavior often.

Gonzales and Hancock (2011) looked to find the relationship between Facebook usage and self-esteem. An experiment done by Gonzales and Hancock (2011) looked to find the relationship between Facebook usage and self-esteem. The study had a total of 63 participants divided into three conditions: exposure to a mirror, exposure to Facebook, and a control in which

no exposure was used. All participants completed the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale after spending three minutes in their assigned condition. A linear contrast analysis, where the mirror condition was given a weight of negative 1, 0 was given to the control, and positive 1 was given to Facebook, it was found that the Facebook condition did have a significant effect on self-esteem ($F(1, 59) = 8.60, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.13$). Viewing one's own Facebook profile increases self-esteem. Even more so, editing one's profile also increases self-esteem. However, visiting another person's profile lowers self-esteem. If these statements can be generalized, it may be found that editing, or monitoring, self-presentation via social networks may lead to positive emotions about the self. This may lead to the increased behavior of self-monitoring when using a Facebook profile, as opposed to face-to-face interactions because of the combination of ease of editing self-presentation and the positive, self-esteem boosting effects it has on individuals.

Since these social interactions via Facebook do not require actual face-to-face time, it helps those who are shy facilitate social relationships. Orr, Sisic, Ross, Simmering, Aresenault, and Orr (2009), found that those who were shyer tended to spend more time on Facebook. It is also stated that those who were shyer tended to feel more positively towards Facebook. The study correlated the amount of self-reported time spent on Facebook for participants ($n=103$) with self-esteem as reported on the Revised Check and Buss Shyness Scale. The study found that on average participants used Facebook for an average of 30 minutes a day. A correlation matrix was used to compare shyness with the time spent on Facebook, the number of friends on Facebook, and attitudes towards Facebook. A positive correlation was found between shyness and Facebook use ($r = 0.24$); those who were shyer tended to spend more time on Facebook. There was also a positive relationship between shyness and positive attitudes towards Facebook ($r = .27$); those who were shyer tended to feel more positively towards Facebook ($r =$

.12). However, those who were shy tended to have a lower number of friends. It may then be assumed that Facebook is a preferred means of communication for those that are less socially inclined. Those that are shy, or have difficulty feeling comfortable in social situations, may use Facebook in order to communicate as opposed to face-to-face interactions. Theoretically, this means that those who do not normally have the chance to self-monitor during face-to-face interactions can now do so online via Facebook.

During face-to-face interactions, when a person is viewed as similar to the self, that person is more likely to be evaluated positively. A study done by Milyavskaya, Reoch, Koestner and Losier (2010) found a correlation between interdependence and impressions of individuals based on their profile picture. One hundred and sixty three college students were asked to view a profile of a professor and evaluate the professor on a survey. The participants viewed a paper based profile, similar to a resume, where all information about the professor was the same; the only difference in the conditions was that the professor was picture either alone, with a spouse, or with a child. Participants were also asked to complete a 24-item scale on themselves, which scored their levels of interdependence. A standardized regression coefficient and t-tests revealed that those who rated themselves as more interdependent were more likely to rate the professor more positively when their profile picture featured the person with others ($\beta = .19, p < .05$). It was also found that the perceiver with lower interdependence levels was more likely to rate the individual pictured alone in their profile picture more positively. If someone is likely to rate a person based on their profile picture on a resume, it is likely that the same concept would apply to an online profile. Facebook pages has profile pictures much like a resume or portfolio. This may suggests that Facebook users judge others based solely on the information they gather about the person by viewing their profile picture. The impression that perceivers form of the individual

is consistent with the way impressions are formed in face-to-face interactions.

The information found in the previously mentioned study does help support the fact that others do create judgments based on Facebook profiles; however it answers little of the extent of judgment made and whether that judgment is positive or negative. In social interactions, often the more alike two people are, the more positively they would rate each other. Many of the previously mentioned researchers relied on their own observations of sample Facebook profiles in order to come to their conclusions; they did not include any outside observation. Outside observation can help create a controlled environment that theoretically mimics the actual use of Facebook to a greater extent than having a limited number of researchers doing the same observations. It should also be taken into consideration that when the researcher is doing the observations, they have a certain agenda in mind. Allowing participants, who are unaware of the research goals, to make observations based on Facebook profiles can help to create more valid results. The current study is interested in outside perceiver ratings, which allows for an unbiased rating of Facebook profiles.

THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study looks at how accurately a person's self-monitoring tendencies are perceived by others, based solely on information provided by the person's social network profile (specifically Facebook profiles). Although previous research on personality has been done on personality based on investigators' coding of profile pages or self-reports relating to social networking, research is lacking in the area of perceiver evaluation based on social network profiles (Kujath, 2001; Wise, et al., 2010). Past research has looked at aspects of personality, such as narcissism, shyness, and self-esteem, based on Facebook profile content, however research on self-monitoring among Facebook users has been limited (Mehdizadeh, 2010; Orr, et al., 2009; Gonzales & Hancock, 2011). Facebook offers an opportunity for users to strategically and continually edit profile information in order to present a desired image, something characteristic of high self-monitors in their everyday life. In addition to information on self-monitoring among Facebook users, data from this study will shed light on the relationship between perceived levels of self-monitoring and likability.

H1: Perceivers will not accurately discern self-monitoring tendencies in target individuals. Whether or not a person is a high or low self-monitor will not be recognized by a perceiver based solely on the information gathered on their Facebook page.

H2: Likability ratings will differ significantly between perceived low and high self-monitors. Those that are seen as low self-monitors will be rated more likable than those seen as high self-monitors.

H3: Likability ratings by perceivers will differ significantly between self-rated low and high self-monitors. Those that rate themselves as low self-monitors will be seen as more likable than those who rate themselves as high self-monitors.

METHODS

Participants

Two hundred forty two undergraduate university students attending Texas A&M International University (TAMIU) in Laredo, Texas served as participants. TAMIU is located on the United States-Mexico border with a predominately Hispanic population. Students were recruited from upper-level undergraduate Psychology courses, where various academic majors were represented. 25 graduate students enrolled in one of two Master-level Psychology programs were recruited to provide self-ratings of self-monitoring tendencies and were asked to provide a screenshot of their Facebook profile.

Materials/Apparatus and Measures

For this study, participants worked individually at a computer station located in a cubicle to ensure privacy. Each computer station was equipped with a computer, a monitor, a mouse, and a keyboard, along with access to the Internet.

Facebook Profiles

Screenshots of four Facebook profiles were used for this study. The profiles were collected from four participants. Two separate screen shots were collected from each participant. Each participant opened their Facebook profile and the researcher used the screen shot function on the computer in order to take a picture of the screen. Everything that could be seen on the computer screen was captured in this screen shot. The first screen shot included the participant's main Facebook profile page. The Facebook profile page includes the following: a cover photo, which is one photo chosen by the user which spans across the entire top section of the page; a profile picture, which is also chosen by the user and is located at the left side of the profile page; hyperlinked tabs labeled "timeline," "About," "Photos," "Friends," and "More" are located to the

right of the profile pictures (the number of photos and the number of friends are displayed next to their corresponding link; the user's Facebook "wall" covers the rest of the page below the profile picture and hyperlinks which is filled with updates, pictures, and/or information of their choice. The second screen shot includes whatever pictures appear when the "Photos" hyperlink was followed. This includes any pictures the user chooses to be displayed. For the four profiles used, the number of pictures ranges from one to eleven pictures and featured the Facebook user, other individuals, and quotes. Each screenshot was approximately 1600x1000 pixels and saved as a .jpeg file.

MediaLab

MediaLab version 2012.4.131 was used for the study. MediaLab is a computer-based program which allows researchers to create surveys and electronically collect the responses. It has multi-media capabilities and can present different stimuli and measures to participants. MediaLab can be used on a variety of PC systems with any current version of Windows. MediaLab was used to collect the responses to the surveys used in this study.

Stimuli

Participants were exposed to one individual's screenshots of his or her existing profile page and main photo page from his or her Facebook account. To obtain these screenshots, 25 participants who were not part of the sample for the main study were recruited to complete a self-monitoring scale (Snyder, 1974; see Appendix A). Participants were given a consent form that described only the completion of the scale, and they provided their self-monitoring information only after signing that consent form. This scale was completed using MediaLab version 2012.4.131.

Once the self-monitoring scale was completed, participants were given a second

consent form that provided them with information concerning the collection and use of their Facebook profile and photo pages during the next phase of the study. The reason there were two consent forms was to ensure that reminders of their use of Facebook would not influence participants' thought processes while completing the self-monitoring scale. This second consent form notified them that their Facebook profile pages and photo pages would not remain anonymous, that a second pool of participants would view them, and that it was possible that they would be recognized. They were informed also that they had the right to refuse to provide screenshots of their profile pages and photo pages without fear of penalty. Therefore, screenshots were collected on a volunteer basis. Of the twenty-five participants, two participants refused to provide screenshots of their profile page and photo page, eight claimed they did not have a Facebook account, and fifteen consented to providing screenshots.

Those who consented were asked to use the computer and Internet service available in their cubicles to login to their Facebook account. Then, the researcher captured an electronic screenshot of their Facebook profile page and main photo page (which contains single photos that function as "album covers"). Once the screenshots were saved on the desktop of the computer in use, participants were asked to log out of their Facebook accounts.

Self-monitoring ratings

Self-monitoring scores were calculated for the fifteen consenting participants. Snyder's (1974) *Self-Monitoring Scale* was used to assess both perceiver ratings and self-ratings of self-monitoring (see Appendix A and B). The scale consists of 25 statements which respondents must determine as characteristic of them or not, and responses follow a forced choice scale of *True* or *False*. Each time a respondent endorsed a statement as true of their disposition, they are assigned a point to indicate endorsement of a high self-monitoring tendency. Points assigned to

each item are summed, so that total scores for this scale range from 0 to 25. A score that falls between 0 and 12 indicates that the respondent is a relatively low self-monitor, while a score that falls between 13-25 indicates that the respondent is a relatively high self-monitor. Sample items from the *Self-Monitoring Scale* include: “I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.” and “My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.” The Facebook profile screen shots of the individuals with the two highest (labeled Hi1 and Hi2) and two lowest (labeled Lo1 and Lo2) self-monitoring scores served as the stimuli for the main study (Table 1).

Table 1

*Self-Monitor (SM)
Self-Rating Scores*

<u>Target</u>	<u>SM</u>
Hi1	18
Hi2	13
Lo1	4
Lo2	5

Note: Hi1 = high self-monitor 1; Hi2 = high self-monitor 2; Lo1 = low self-monitor 1; Lo2 = low self-monitor 2

In its original form, Snyder’s *Self-Monitoring Scale* served to gather self-ratings of self-monitoring. To gather perceiver ratings of self-monitoring in each target individual, items on the *Self-Monitoring Scale* were adapted to reflect a third-person point of view. Respondents simply decided whether each statement described each target person (i.e., “The person finds it hard to imitate the behavior of other people” and “The person’s behavior is usually an expression of his/her true inner feelings, attitudes and beliefs.”). This version was scored the same way as the original.

Likability

Reysen's (2005) *Likability scale* (See Appendix C) was administered to determine if perceivers' perceptions of self-monitoring tendencies in the target individuals influenced how positively they rated those individuals, as previous research has shown (Leone & Hawkins, 2006; Milyavskaya, 2010; Norris, 1999). This is an eleven-item survey that uses a 7-point Likert-type scale (1- *strongly disagree*, 2- *strongly disagree*, 3-*disagree*, 4-*neutral*, 5-*agree*, 6-*strongly agree*, 7-*very strongly agree*). Sample items include: "This person is friendly." and "This person is likeable." Average score was calculated for each participant, and higher mean scores indicate more liking of each target individual.

Facebook Usage

Participants responded to a survey on Facebook usage (see Appendix D). This survey first collected information regarding demographics, such as age, gender, and ethnicity, and then the participants answered an additional six questions to determine how often they used Facebook and edited their profile information.

Procedure

For the main study, participants were given a consent form that explained the basic procedure for the study and assured them that they were free to withdraw from the study without penalty, if at any time they felt they could not continue. Twenty-five students were recruited and asked to complete Snyder's *Self-Monitoring Scale*. According to their self-ratings on the *Self-Monitoring Scale*, two targets were high self-monitors (scores of 18 and 13; labeled Hi1 and Hi2 respectively) and two were low self-monitors (scores of 4 and 5; labeled Lo1 and Lo2 respectively). A new pool of participants which were not included in the main part of the study were then asked to complete the adapted *Self-Monitoring Scale* and Reysen's *Likability scale* in

reference to the randomly presented target individual, and the Facebook usage survey to assess their personal use. Participants viewed the Facebook screenshots from one of four target individuals, which were presented to participants in random order. 51 individuals rated Hi1, 61 participants rated Hi2, 48 individuals rated Lo1, and 48 individuals rated Lo2.

Results

Responses from participants who had missing data were excluded from further analysis. Any “problem” participants who answered “yes” to being familiar with, knowing, or being Facebook friends with the participant were also excluded. This was done to ensure that the observations were made solely on the information gathered from the screenshots and not from previous face-to-face interaction with the target individuals. In total, thirty-eight participants were excluded. Total scores were calculated for the adapted *Self-Monitoring Scale* and average scores were determined for the *Likability scale*.

The first hypothesis predicted that there would be a difference between self-rated and perceiver-rated self-monitoring. A one sample t-test was used to be the most appropriate statistical analysis since the one sample t-test is used to compare a single score (the self-rated score) to the mean score of a population (the perceivers’ self-monitoring scores) to determine if there are any significant differences between the two. A one-sample t-test was conducted on each of the self-rated self-monitoring to perceiver-rated self-monitoring. All one sample t-test were found to be statistically significant (see Table 2).

To test for H2 and H3, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was determined to be the most appropriate statistical analysis. The ANOVA is used to test the differences between the two means. In order to test for H2 and H3, the mean perceiver rated likability score was found (Table 3).

The second hypothesis of interest stated that likability ratings would differ significantly between perceived low and high self-monitors. To test for H2, a one-way between groups ANOVA was conducted to look at the differences in likability based on perceiver self-monitoring (Table 4). The ANOVA revealed that there were differences in likability based on perceiver self-monitoring ($F(1, 184) = 4.309, p = .039$).

The third hypothesis stated that likability ratings would differ significantly between self-rated low and high self-monitors. To test for H3, a one-way between groups ANOVA was conducted to look at the differences in likability based on self-rated self-monitoring (Table 5). ANOVA revealed no significant differences between groups ($F(1, 200) = .093, p = .761$).

Table 2

Self-Rated Self-Monitoring (SM) by Perceiver-Rated SM and Standard Deviations (SD), t-scores (t) and Probability Values (p)

Target	Self SM	N	Perceiver SM	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Hi1	18	51	12.69	3.49	-10.87	.00
Hi2	13	61	13.95	3.39	2.18	.03
Lo1	4	48	12.90	3.04	20.27	.00
Lo2	5	48	14.96	3.22	21.41	.00

Table 3

*Perceivers' Likability Ratings
of Target Individuals Number
(N), Mean, and Standard
Deviation (SD)*

Target	N	Mean	SD
Hi1	45	4.22	.86
Hi2	57	4.29	.82
Lo1	49	4.48	.82
Lo2	51	3.98	.86
Total	202	4.24	.85

Table 4

*Likability Based on Perceiver
Self-monitoring*

<u>Targets</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
High SM	116	3.99	.57
Low SM	70	4.17	.58
Total	186	4.06	.58

Note: High SM = Hi1 and Hi2; Low SM = Lo1 and Lo2

Table 5

*Likability Based on Self-rated
Self-monitoring*

<u>Targets</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
High SM	100	4.06	.58
Low SM	97	4.06	.59
Total	197	4.06	.58

DISCUSSION

The present study examined how accurately people rate another as a high or low self-monitor based solely on the information that can be gathered from Facebook profiles. The t-tests which looked at the possible differences between self-rated and perceiver rated self-monitoring were found to be significant. This means that the perceivers' ratings did not "match" the self-ratings; perceivers could not tell if a Facebook user was a high or low self-monitor. Previous research has found that perceivers can predict certain personality traits, such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, extroversion, neuroticism, and shyness (Mehdizadeh, 2010; Orr, et al. 2009; Qiu, et al., 2012), however the previously mentioned studies did not use perceivers to rate Facebook users. This study is unique in the fact that it used perceivers' ratings, in an attempt to mimic the actual use of Facebook as a platform for social interaction, and unlike the other studies, this study found that self-monitoring cannot be predicted. Speculating from the results of the study, it may be assumed that there are other implications. One implication is perhaps that people behave differently online than they do in person. According to Qiu, et al., (2012) the activity seen on Facebook profiles may not reflect real life behavior. It may be that the subjects rated themselves accurately on the self-monitoring scale, but that behavior is only present in face-to-face interactions and not reflected on their Facebook profile. Although a variation of Snyder's Self-Monitoring Scale has been used for research on online behavior before (Lin, 2008), the scale was created for real-life scenarios and was not designed to measure online activity. This may create some limitations as each item on the scale was created with real-life scenarios in mind. Should a scale be created to measure self-monitoring in online activity, the

results of this study may have differed. At the time that this study was conducted, no such scale existed.

Furthermore, the nature of online presentation and communication may allow individuals to self-monitor from behind a keyboard which may make self-monitoring a simpler task. If this is the case, then the data would result as it did in this study; all individuals would be, indeed, higher self-monitors online than they are in actual social situations. Another possibility is that all individuals are seen to be relatively high self-monitors from an outside perspective, regardless of their actual level of self-monitoring. It may be that Facebook has become so ubiquitous that the persona/profile created automatically seems inflated to the perceiver. Furthermore, in order for a person to be interested in creating a Facebook profile, they first must be interested in presenting themselves in a social manner- as is the nature of “social networks.” It is possible that those who use social networking sites somehow differ from the rest of the population who are not interested in this form of communication.

Based on the literature available on self-monitoring, the second and third hypothesis stated that those who were perceived to be high self-monitors would be rated as less likable while those who were perceived to be low self-monitors would be rated as more likable, based on perceiver and self-rated self-monitoring scores. It has been found that those who are low self-monitors are more likely to engage behaviors that enhance relationships and thus may be viewed more positively (Leone & Hawkins, 2006). Also, self-presentation which focuses on one individual may be construed as a negative trait (Milyavskaya, Reoch, & Koestner, 2010). When compared to self-rated self-monitoring scores, there was no relationship to likability scores. An ANOVA comparing perceiver self-monitoring scores and likability was found to be significant in support of the second hypothesis. Those that were rated high self-monitors by perceivers were

seen as less likable. In Milyavskaya, Reoch, and Koestner's (2010) study, those pictured with others on their Facebook profile were rated more positively. This trend seemed to occur the profile coded Lo2 of the present study. The profile of the second low self-monitor, labeled Lo2 in the results, was the only profile of the four used in this study that solely pictured the subject on the profile page; all other conditions featured pictures of other people and/or pictures of the subject with other people. Lo2 was rated the least likable and was rated as the highest self-monitor.

However, there was no support for the third hypothesis which stated that those that rated themselves as high self-monitors would be rated as less likable than low self-monitors. Those that rated themselves as low self-monitors were not more likable than those were rated themselves as high self-monitors. However, when perceiver-rated self-monitoring was looked at, two things were seen. First of all, there were more perceived high self-monitors than low self-monitors. Many of those who considered themselves low self-monitors were rated as high self-monitors. When perceiver self-monitoring ratings related to likability, it was seen that those who were high self-monitors were less likable. It seems that likeability was based on the perceiver's judgment of the Facebook user, as evident from the perceiver self-monitoring scores, and not based on the Facebook user's actual level of self-monitoring.

Another limitation of this study is that the information presented to the perceivers on the snapshots of the Facebook pages was limited; it does not compare to online engagement and interaction. Perceivers may have a better indication of whether someone is a high or low self-monitor with more information given, such as the amount of information seen when "friending" a person on Facebook. Facebook friends are able to see daily information and may have a more

detailed idea of how often a person attempts to alter their online behavior for the sake of self-presentation.

Future Directions

Overall, this study gives an initial starting point for further investigations on self-monitoring and Facebook. At the time this study was conducted, it was the first study to the author's knowledge that was concerned with the relationship between self-monitoring and Facebook usage. Additionally, research in the area of social networking is currently limited. Although not all hypotheses were supported, it may be possible to continue research in the area of outside observations and reactions to social networking profiles, specifically researching dealing with Facebook and its social implications. A more extensive use of Facebook profiles as stimuli for perceiver ratings may allow for different results.

It is essential to continue Facebook research in the area of social psychology as Facebook has practical implications in our everyday lives. It is important to understand the effect Facebook has on social interactions and what potential consequences may come from online social engagements. As social networks become more engrained in our society, the more influence it has on the social expectations of society.

REFERENCES

- Asch, S. (1943). Forming impressions of personality. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 41*(3), 258-290.
- Back, M. (2011). PERSOC: A unified framework for understanding the dynamic interplay of personality and social relationships. *European Journal of Personality, 25*(2), 90-107.
- Brambilla, M., Sacchi, S., Rusconi, P., Cherubini, P., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2012). You want to give a good impression? Be honest! Moral traits dominate group impression formation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 51*, 149-166.
- Cooley, C. (1995). *On self and social organization*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Darvell, M., Walsh, S., & White, K. (2011). Facebook tells me so: Applying the theory of planned behavior to understand partner-monitoring behavior on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior & Social Networking, 14*(12), 717-722.
- DeAndrea, D., & Walther, J. (2011). Attributions for inconsistencies between online and offline presentations. *Communications Research, 20*(10), 1-21.
- Elphinston, R., & Noller, P. (2011). Time to face it! Facebook intrusion and the implications for romantic jealousy and relationship satisfaction. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior & Social Networking, 14*(11), 631-635.
- Gershon, I. (2011). Un-friend my heart: Facebook, promiscuity, and heartbreak in a neoliberal age. *Anthropological Quarterly, 84*(4), 865-894.
- Gonzales, A., & Hancock, J. (2011). Mirror, mirror on my Facebook wall: Effects of exposure to Facebook on self-esteem. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior & Social Networking, 14*(1/2), 79-83.

- Hall, J. A., & Pennington, N. (2013). Self-monitoring, honesty, and cue use on Facebook: The relationship with user extraversion and conscientiousness. *Computers In Human Behavior, 29*(4), 1556-1564.
- Klein, O. W. (2004). Prejudice on the stage: Self-monitoring and the public expression of group attitudes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(2), 299-314.
- Kujath, C. L. (2011). Facebook and MySpace: Complement or substitute for face-to-face interaction? *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking, 14*(1/2), 75-78.
- Kunda, Z., & Thagard, P. (1996). Forming impressions from stereotypes, traits, and behaviors: A parallel-constraint-satisfaction theory. *Psychological Review, 103*(2), 284-308.
- Leary, M. & Allen, A. (2011). Personality and persona: Personality processes in self-presentation. *Journal of Personality, 79*(6), 889-916.
- Leone, C. & Hawkins, L. (2006). Self-monitoring and close relationships. *Journal of Personality, 74*(3), 739-778.
- Lin, C. S. (2008). Exploring the personality trait of self-monitoring on technology usage of web portals. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 11*(2), 235-238.
- Mehdizadeh, S. (2010). Self-presentation 2.0: Narcissism and self-esteem on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior & Social Networking, 13*(4), 357-364.
- Mensh, I., & Wishner, J. (1947). Asch on "forming impressions of personality": Further evidence. *Journal of Personality 16*(2), 188-191.
- Milyavskaya, M., Reoch, J., Koestner, R., Losier, G. (2010). Seeking social connectedness: Interdependent self-construal and impression formation using photographic cues of social connectedness. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 150*(6), 689-702.

- Muise, A., Christofides, M., & Desmarais, S. (2009). More information than you ever wanted: Does Facebook bring out the green-eyed monster of jealousy? *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*(4), 441-444.
- Nisbett, R., & Wilson, T. (1977). The halo effect: Evidence for unconscious alteration of judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(4), 250-256.
- Norris, S. L. (1999). Self-monitoring, trust, and commitment in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social Psychology, 139*(2), 215-220.
- Orr, E., Sisic, M., Ross, C., Simmering, M., Arsenault, J., & Orr, R. (2009). The influence of shyness on the use of Facebook in an undergraduate sample. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 12*(3), 337-340.
- Reysen, S. (2005). Construction of a new scale: The Reysen likability scale. *Social Behavior and Personality, 33*(2), 201-208.
- Snyder, M. (1974) Self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*(4), 526-537.
- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986) On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(1), 125-139.
- Stopfer, J., Egloff, B., Nestler, S., & Back, M. (2014) Personality expression and impression formation in online social networks: An integrative approach to understanding the processes of accuracy, impression management, and meta-accuracy. *European Journal of Personality, 28*(1), 73-94.
- Qiu, L., Lin, H., Leung, A., & Tov, W. (2012). Putting their best foot forward: Emotional disclosure on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior & Social Networking, 15*(10), 569-572

Wise, K., Alhabash, S., & Park, H. (2010). Emotional responses during social information seeking on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior & Social Networking*, *13*(5), 555-562.

APPENDIX A

SELF-MONITORING SCALE

Developed by Mark Snyder (1974)

DIRECTIONS: The statements below concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. No two statements are exactly alike, so consider each statement carefully before answering. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, **circle the “T”** next to the question. If a statement is FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE as applied to you, **circle the “F”** next to the question.

- (T) (F) 1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.
- (T) (F) 2. My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.
- (T) (F) 3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.
- (T) (F) 4. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.
- (T) (F) 5. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.
- (T) (F) 6. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.
- (T) (F) 7. When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.
- (T) (F) 8. I would probably make a good actor.
- (T) (F) 9. I rarely seek the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.
- (T) (F) 10. I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.
- (T) (F) 11. I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.
- (T) (F) 12. In groups of people, I am rarely the center of attention.

(T) (F) 13. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.

(T) (F) 14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.

(T) (F) 15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.

(T) (F) 16. I'm not always the person I appear to be.

(T) (F) 17. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.

(T) (F) 18. I have considered being an entertainer.

(T) (F) 19. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.

(T) (F) 20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.

(T) (F) 21. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

(T) (F) 22. At a party, I let others keep the jokes and stories going.

(T) (F) 23. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should.

(T) (F) 24. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).

(T) (F) 25. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

APPENDIX B

OUTSIDE OBSERVER: SELF-MONITORING SCALE

Adapted from Mark Snyder's (1974) Self-Monitoring Scale

DIRECTIONS: The statements below concern your assumptions of the observed person's reactions to a number of different situations based solely on the information gathered from his or her Facebook profile. No two statements are exactly alike, so consider each statement carefully before answering. If you believe a statement is **TRUE** or **MOSTLY TRUE** as applied **TO THE PERSON WHOSE PROFILE YOU VIEWED**, circle the **"T"** next to the question. If you believe a statement is **FALSE** or **NOT USUALLY TRUE** as applied **TO THE PERSON WHOSE PROFILE YOU VIEWED**, circle the **"F"** next to the question. Since each response is based on assumptions, there are no incorrect answers; please do not leave any item blank.

- (T) (F) 1. The person finds it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.
- (T) (F) 2. The person's behavior is usually an expression of his/her true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.
- (T) (F) 3. At parties and social gatherings, the person does not attempt to do or say things that others will like.
- (T) (F) 4. The person can only argue for ideas which he/she already believes.
- (T) (F) 5. The person can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which he/she has almost no information.
- (T) (F) 6. The person may put on a show to impress or entertain people.
- (T) (F) 7. When he/she is uncertain how to act in a social situation, he/she looks to the behavior of others for cues.
- (T) (F) 8. The person would probably make a good actor.

- (T) (F) 9. The person rarely seeks the advice of his/her friends to choose movies, books, or music.
- (T) (F) 10. The person sometimes appears to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than he/she actually is.
- (T) (F) 11. The person laughs more when he/she watch a comedy with others than when alone.
- (T) (F) 12. In groups of people, the person is rarely the center of attention.
- (T) (F) 13. In different situations and with different people, the person often acts like very different persons.
- (T) (F) 14. The person is not particularly good at making other people like his/her self.
- (T) (F) 15. Even if the person is not enjoying myself, he/she often pretends to be having a good time.
- (T) (F) 16. The person is not always the person he/she appears to be.
- (T) (F) 17. The person would not change his/her opinions (or the way he/she does things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.
- (T) (F) 18. He/she has considered being an entertainer.
- (T) (F) 19. In order to get along and be liked, the person tends to be what people expect him/her to be rather than anything else.
- (T) (F) 20. The person has never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.
- (T) (F) 21. The person has trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.
- (T) (F) 22. At a party, the person lets others keep the jokes and stories going.
- (T) (F) 23. The person feels a bit awkward in company and does not show up quite as well as he/she should.

(T) (F) 24. The person can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).

(T) (F) 25. The person may deceive people by being friendly when he/she really dislikes them.

APPENDIX C

LIKABILITY SCALE

Instructions: Circle how strongly you agree with each statement.

1. This person is friendly.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

2. This person is likeable.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

3. This person is warm.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

4. This person is approachable.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

5. I would ask this person for advice.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

6. I would like this person as a coworker.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

7. I would like this person as a roommate.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

8. I would like to be friends with this person.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

9. This person is physically attractive.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

10. This person is similar to me.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

11. This person is knowledgeable.

Very Strongly	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Very Strongly
Disagree	Disagree			Agree	Agree	

APPENDIX D

FACEBOOK USAGE SURVEY

Please complete this short questionnaire.

1. Descriptive Information

Age: _____ Gender: _____ Ethnicity: _____

2. What social network sites do you use? (Please check mark all that apply.)

Facebook Myspace Twitter Instagram Other (please specify) _____

3. How often do you check your social network sites?

Less than once a week

Once a week

Twice a week

Daily

Twice a day

More than twice daily

4. How often do you check Facebook?

Less than once a week

Once a week

Twice a week

Daily

Twice a day

More than twice daily

5. How often do you update your Facebook status?

Less than once a week

- Once a week
- Twice a week
- Daily
- Twice a day
- More than twice daily

6. How often do you change or edit your Facebook profile (Basic Information, About Me, Notes section, Timeline)?

- Less than once a week
- Once a week
- Twice a week
- Daily
- Twice a day
- More than twice daily

7. How often do you change, edit, or add your photos to Facebook (Profile Picture, My Photos, Wall Photos)?

- Less than once a week
- Once a week
- Twice a week
- Daily
- Twice a day
- More than twice daily

8. On average, how long do you spend on Facebook? (Please check mark only one choice)

- Less than 5 minutes
- 5 to 30 minutes
- 30 minutes to an hour
- More than one hour

VITA

Elizabeth Danielle Ramirez attended her hometown university after graduating from a local high school at the top of her class. She graduated Cum Laude from Texas A&M International University with a Bachelors of Arts in Psychology and a Minor in English in May 2011. The following semester, she was accepted into the Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology (MACP) program, where she will be receiving her degree in May 2014 with a 3.95 GPA. Because of the distinguished undergraduate career, Elizabeth was awarded the Graduate Retention Enhancement at TAMIU (GREAT) Graduate Fellowship for 2.5 years, for a total of approximately \$42,000.00. She also completed her counseling internship at the Children's Advocacy Center of Laredo. After graduating with her MACP, she plans on taking her National Counseling Exam in order to become a Licensed Professional Counselor and practice locally.

Ms. Ramirez may be reached at 3602 Brumoso Ct., Laredo, TX, 78046. Her email is lizdramirez@dusty.tamtu.edu.