

# **Virtually Perfect: Impression Management and Identity Manipulation on Facebook**

Kelcey Lerner  
Undergraduate  
Saint Mary's College  
[Klerne01@saintmarys.edu](mailto:Klerne01@saintmarys.edu)  
December 15, 2010  
Carrie Erlin  
[Cerlin@saintmarys.edu](mailto:Cerlin@saintmarys.edu)

# **Virtually Perfect: Impression Management and Identity Manipulation on Facebook**

## *ABSTRACT*

*After Facebook was invented on February 4, 2004, the popularity of the social networking site rapidly flourished creating a forum where individuals were able to manage their virtual impressions. Before social networking, the only way one could represent their image was through face-to-face interactions. Facebook provided the means for individuals to manage their impressions through the ability to manipulate their photos and information. After surveying 53 Saint Mary's College women about their identity constructions and manipulations, this paper will use Ervin Goffman's impression management theory to analyze the motivations behind their impression management on Facebook. The results of this study indicate that the participants were mainly from the Midwest. Of the majority, Saint Mary's College women screen the information that is posted to their profiles and do enhance their photos to appear more desirable to the opposite sex.*

The impression one makes on others determines how they will be perceived amongst the members in their community. “Impression management” is a concept introduced by Erving Goffman. It highlights the ways in which people in the company of others strive to present an image of themselves in particular ways. The importance of being recognized in a positive light does not only comply with human nature, but has become crucial in social circles. Outside pressures people face to fit in serves as the incentive to adjust their presentations in efforts to abide by the norms of their desired groups. The invention of Facebook has facilitated identity construction through the abilities to shape or tweak the information and photos posted on an individual’s profile in attempts to control how others will perceive them.

Facebook provides users with the ability to strategize how to virtually convey who they are, as well as being able to craft their impressions to ensure they appeal to their desired audiences. Since the profile owner carefully creates a certain impression through the screening of information or through the enhancement of photos, outside information without the consent of the owner may hinder the “face” (Erving Goffman 1955) the profile owner is trying to project. The unscreened information that is posted on an owner’s profile may be ambiguous, which inevitably could jeopardize their carefully constructed identities.

How do Saint Mary’s College students use impression management on their Facebook profiles and what are their motivations for the manipulations? “Impression management” is defined as the process through which people try to control the impressions other people form of them. The women at Saint Mary’s College spend their time on Facebook to monitor their profiles in efforts to stabilize their images and others perceptions. Through impression management and identity manipulation, the culture of

Facebook use is demonstrated by college-aged women living in residence halls at Saintmary's College.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Identity*

Facebook is a social networking site that allows users to put information about themselves and others. People commonly shape their behaviors and manipulate their appearance in attempts to control how others view them. Facebook also functions as a tool that allows users to pick and choose their most desirable characteristics and incorporate them into their profiles (Rosenbloom 2008). Angwin (2009) found that online identities allow users to thrive socially by constructing themselves to whomever they wish to be. Walther, Heide, Kim, Westerman, and Tong (2008) explored how cues deposited by social partners onto one's Facebook profile affect observers' impressions of the profile owner. They found that verbal statements posted on a profile owner's wall conflicts with the user's impression management by unwanted or unscreened information. Their data indicated that the verbal comments left on a user's wall created different impressions based on the profile owner's sex. Walther et al. (2008) found that the more positive remarks left about users who were female, the more the user was considered credible to their "friends" on Facebook. On the contrary, the negative comments and undesirable photos left about users who were males raised their desirability. Thus, impression management is less costly for a profile owner to distort than to have other users interfere. The ability for users to post unwanted information that has not been screened by the profile owner may cause the owner to feel uneasy about their virtual image.

The photos and information on a profile owner's profile allows them to manage their identities on a daily basis. Siibak (2009) found that 56% of women believed that looking good in the photos posted on Facebook are one of the main elements to their profiles. Siibak (2009) found that women usually choose photos of themselves that reflect their personalities and that females are more conscious about their appearance in these photos than are males. Additionally, Siibak's data indicated that more women than men admitted to enhance their appearance to gain popularity. Similarly, Sheldon (2010), also points out that women disclose more information on their Facebook profiles than men. Sheldon (2010) examined the relationship between social attraction and self- disclosure, finding that there is a significant relationship between the two. Sheldon's (2010) results concluded that relationship development and maintenance, are similar in both Facebook and in face- to- face relationships. In compliance, Lampe, Ellison, and Steirnfield (2006) mentioned that their participants also reported a high level of confidence that Facebook portrays their identities accurately. Thus, online and offline identities are shown to mirror each other.

DiMicco and Millen (2007) examined how college students craft their identities to socially fit in within other college students. Their data showed that college students want to disclose information about their hobbies and activities, and also display photos that project themselves in a playful manner. Lampe et al. (2006) found that Facebook profiles are constructed by students for an audience they feel are seeking them. Similarly, Joinson (2008) found that Facebook is used for social searching and surveillance. Social searching is a way to search for friends on Facebook and surveillance allows users to keep up to date with what their friends are doing. Thus, the hobbies and activities one

displays on their Facebook profile are used to attract other users who share the same identities and interest. Joinson (2008) also examined the gratifications through the use of photos displayed on a profile and found that Facebook is used as a tool for virtual “people watching” to look for specific types of people.

Zhao, Grasmuck, and Martin (2008) found correlations in appearance presentation and self narratives of profile owners on Facebook. They found that users projected themselves on Facebook to be socially desirable by manipulating their photos and information. The “block” feature on Facebook enables users to block whomever they wish from their account to create their own desired audiences. Ginger (2008) researched this blocking feature, finding that in 2006, 53% altered their privacy settings. Whereas in 2007, 86% limited their information. He argues that this find demonstrates that profile owners have become increasingly concerned with their digital images, yet still remain comfortable within their desired groups. Although Internet users attempt to control their social identities, other Internet users have the ability to disrupt this constructed identity and, hence, relationship conflicts can occur.

#### *Privacy and Relationship Conflicts*

“Friends” on Facebook have the power to interfere with a user’s profile based on the information they choose to post. A profile owner chooses to display information about themselves on their own personal page, but when “friends” choose to post ambiguous information or pictures on the another user’s wall, this may be grounds for arguments within relationships. Muise, Christofides, and Desmarais (2008) explored the role of Facebook in the experience of jealousy and to determine if increased Facebook exposure predicts jealousy above and beyond personal and relationship factors. Their

findings showed that 19.1% of their participants said accessibility of information was part of their jealousy cues. Jealousy cues may be prompted by negative information or pictures a user may find about another user. They also found that 16.2% of the participants' jealousy stemmed from relationship jealousy of past partners. Also, 10.3% their participants had a difficult time limiting their use of Facebook because of the time they felt they needed to monitor their partners. Muise, et al. (2008) said that 74.6% of the participants were "friends" on Facebook with their past romantic/sexual partners, and 78.9% of their participants reported that their partners were "friends" with their past romantic/sexual partners as well. Muise, et al. (2008) concluded that jealousy cues on Facebook related to the amount of time their participants spent monitoring their partners Facebook profiles. Similar to the Muise, et al. (2008) findings, Murgittroyd, Whiteside, Yee, Gross, and Kaczmarek (2006) found that people use Facebook as a tool to purposefully spark jealousy with past partners. Murgittroyd et al. (2006) participants noted that a Facebook relationship status does not necessarily reflect a person's offline relationship. In contrast, their participants also indicated that they would be upset if their partner did not list that they were in a relationship which makes it evident there is a clear contradiction between what the participants said their feelings were on the meaning of being in a relationship on Facebook, and their actual feelings. This relates to Muise, et al. (2008) findings in the sense that the information posted may be considered ambiguous, and may result in conflict or prompt jealousy.

## THEORY

### *Impression Management*

Throughout the twentieth century, social theorists, particularly Erving Goffman (1955), developed ideas about human identity and impression management. Goffman seeks to understand why people may alter their appearance to make a positive impression on other people. Goffman's theory of impression management and the construction of identities are pertinent to understanding why people alter their identities on Facebook. Essentially, Goffman provides insight as to why people put on a front when projecting themselves to a particular audience, and why they will conform to social expectations.

In the article "On Face-Work," (Goffman 1955) explains why people constantly take into consideration the impression they present to others. For Goffman, the "face" is defined as a positive social value a person effectively claims for himself. Goffman says that when people meet or see others for the first time, it immediately prompts an emotional reaction. The community in which people appear and present themselves needs to be consistent with the community they encounter. For example, on Facebook, people care about the impressions they make on others in their friendship network. Their "face" is a product of the people they interact with on Facebook. The people in their friendship network can immediately make judgments about the Facebook owner's profile picture or any other personal data presented on an individual's Facebook site, which results in an emotional reaction by the Facebook owner. Based on this emotional reaction, the owner can modify their appearance to appear more socially acceptable to their intended audience.



Goffman further explains that when a person has an encounter with another person, he is placed in a social relationship. Each person has a responsibility to maintain their “face” to gain support from others within a group. In order to maintain relationships, individuals must be careful not to destroy other peoples “face.” Goffman says that in all social relationships, each side needs to trust their own face to keep intact the desired impressions of others. For example, when a Facebook user “friends” another user, they are automatically categorized into a relationship. This relationship means that the users’ have initiated contact with one another already forming their own personal judgments. Users attempt to maintain their image in order to gain the approval of their friends within the network. When users “post” a comment on another users wall, this could cause a disturbance in the relationship between the users, depending upon what is being discussed in the “post.” The information posted may be grounds for a distortion in the “face” of the owner, which in turn may destroy others’ perceptions of the owner’s image.

Despite all the steps people take to maintain a positive image on Facebook, certain disruptions, intended or unintended, can occur that threaten their “face.” Goffman identifies common disruptions as “unmeant gestures, inopportune intrusions, faux pas, and scenes.” Unmeant gestures are inappropriate actions that do not coincide with the desired impression. Inopportune intrusions occur when someone interjects themselves within another’s boundaries unannounced. Faux pas occur when someone goes against social norms which, in turn, could potentially jeopardize their self image, or that of another. Unmeant gestures, inopportune intrusions, and faux pas may occur without intention or knowledge of the person responsible. By contrast “scenes,” are a purposeful attempt to discredit the people you associate with, yourself, or outsiders. For example, on

Facebook, a user may become so angry with another user they may post inappropriate or embarrassing comments on another's wall. The user could also reveal secret or private information about another user, which would create a "scene," and would inevitably harm the "face" of another user. When Facebook owners become embarrassed by these disruptions, it alters the user's identity and may deteriorate their self- image.

Goffman (1956) indicates that people create certain impressions, purposefully, to avoid embarrassment. On Facebook, people change or "un-tag," their photos to regulate how others perceive them. If a person is tagged in a photo that they feel portrays an identity they do not want others to see, they will either alter or remove the photo to alleviate shame. Goffman indicates that when someone feels embarrassed, they are seen throughout society as weak, inferior and defeated, and are thus motivated to reduce shame.

Goffman explains that in every social relationship people take into consideration the norms of society around them and attempt to construct themselves in a way they will be accepted. My study will apply Goffman's concepts associated with impression management to determine if, and how, they apply to Facebook users.

## METHODOLOGY

### *Participants*

Fifty-three female students at Saint Mary's College participated in this study. All students were allowed to participate as long as they were eligible to live in a dorm. The ages of the participants were our generation, college-aged women. There may have been students older or younger than the average age range, but, the majority of the students fit within the college-age range. The researcher did not have any contact with the

participants, so the exact ages of the students were not recorded. The participants had to attend Saint Mary's and they also had to live in the Saint Mary's residence halls.

### *The Survey*

The survey was broken down into three sections. The first section contained questions regarding the participant's demographics, their Facebook use, and how the participants may have manipulated their identities through the information and photos posted to their profiles. The second section asked questions about the participant's personal relationships and how jealousy within those relationships has impacted the way the participants screen their information. Also, the second section also contains information about their motivations behind screening their information. The third section allowed the participant's to voice their opinions on how Facebook will be in the future. A copy of the survey is attached in the Appendix.

### *Research Methods*

Surveys were distributed around the dorms on the Saint Mary's College campus. To avoid biases, the surveys were distributed by an alternate person to prevent any face-to-face interactions between the participants and the researcher. Since the distributor chose which floors to distribute the surveys to, this is a selective sample. The distributor told the participants she would be back to collect their surveys by a specific time and also to place their surveys outside their door after their surveys were completed. Once the distributor had collected the surveys, they were given to the researcher. .

### *Reasons for Methodology*

Surveys were used because the information requested was of a personal nature.

The survey allowed the participants to share their honest opinions and answers without feeling a sense of judgment or pressure through the anonymity of the survey process. If the researcher had chosen to collect their data through face-to-face interviews, the data may not have been the participant's true feelings on the topic of Facebook. The interview process may have caused the participants to suppress their answers by the fear of judgment or possible biases. Due to the personal nature of the topic, the uncomfortable environment may have inevitably caused the participants to rush through the interview causing them to leave out needed information.

#### *Advantages and Drawbacks*

An advantage of the hard copy survey method was that it provided the researcher with rich information because the participants were allowed to manage their own time to complete the survey instead of rushing through a structured time frame. This allowed the participants to take their time and not rush through the survey process.

Some of the disadvantages to this study were that the participants needed to have a Facebook in order to participate which eliminated the students who did not have a Facebook. Also, there was no incentive to take the survey such as extra credit, which reduced the intended sample size. The participants were limited to the residence halls which eliminated any of the students who lived off campus. Lastly, if this study was repeated, more demographical variables are necessary such as: race and ethnicity, specific age, and class. More demographical variables will provide the next researcher with more detailed findings.

## FINDINGS

The data collected pays attention to a few important dimensions of impression management and identity manipulation on Facebook. The first of these dimensions will analyze the ways in which Saint Mary's students manage their impressions and the second will show how Facebook "friends" may interfere with a profile owner's impression management and identity construction on Facebook.

The five demographical regions of the participants were: the North East, South East, Midwest, South West, and the West. The majority of the participants were from the Midwest (62.3%), followed by the South East, South West, North East, and lastly the West.

Question	North East	South East	Midwest	South West	West	Total
Region	5 (9.4%)	7 (13.2%)	33 (62.3%)	6 (11.3%)	2 (3.8%)	N= 53

Noting that the majority of the participants of this study were from the Midwest, the results may reflect Midwestern views of impression management through Facebook. If this study was conducted at a different university, the results may have varied due to cultural or regional differences.

The results showed that participants used impression management on their Facebook profiles. Table 2, explains exactly how the participants managed their impressions.

Table 2: Impression Management				
Question	Always	Sometimes	Never	Total
Alter or enhance photos	7 (13.2%)	20 (37.7%)	26 (49.1%)	N=53
27 (50.9%)				
Manipulate or screen information	14 (26.4%)	32 (60.4%)	7 (13.2%)	N=53
46 (86.8%)				

As seen in Table 2, 49.1 percent of the participants never altered or enhanced their photos, but 37.7 percent of them indicated they sometimes did. The participants who said they always altered or enhanced their photos combined with the participants who said they sometimes did, totals 50.9 percent. Thus, almost half of the participants admitted to enhancing their photos. Only 13.2 percent of the participants said they never manipulated or screened their information on Facebook. Roughly 60.4 percent the participants said they sometimes manipulated or screened their information, and 26.4 percent said they always did. Again, combining the participants who answered always and sometimes manipulated or screened their information totals 86.8 percent, indicating that a significant portion of the participants manipulated or screened the information posted on their Facebooks. In sum, the majority of the participants managed their impressions through manipulating or screening their information and also by altering or enhancing their photos.

Table 3: Motivation (1)				
Question	Always	Sometimes	Never	Total
Considers what opposite sex will think when posting photos/information on profile	33 (62.3%)	17 (32.1%)	3 (5.7%)	N= 53
	53 (94.3%)			
Nervous of what “friends” post based on what others may think	27 (50.9%)	20 (37.7%)	6 (11.3%)	N=53
	47 (88.6%)			

In Table 3, the participants made a clear depiction of their motivations behind impression management. The results show that 62.3 percent of the participants said that they considered what the opposite sex would think of their impressions when choosing what photos and information to add. Combining the participants who answered always and sometimes, 94.3 percent said they considered the opposite sex’s opinion and only 5.7 percent said they never did. Some of the participants wrote explanations for embellishing their information with the most common reason to “attract the opposite sex.” It is likely there is a relationship between participants who took the opposite sex into consideration when altering their information and participants who indicated they get nervous about what their “friends” may post on their profiles. Combining the participants who answered always and sometimes, 88.6 percent of the participants said they have been nervous of what others may post, while only 11.3 percent said they never had been nervous. Thus, it may be that participants worry about what their “friends” posted on their profiles because

of what their desired viewing group (the opposite sex) would think. Since most of the participants constructed their identities by manipulating their photos and information, any outside information posted on their profiles could ruin their impressions of how the opposite sex may perceive them as well as anyone else viewing their profiles.

Table 3: Motivations (2)			
Question	Yes	No	Total
Participants feel profile is accurate to who they are in person	42 (79.2%)	11 (20.8%)	N=53
Social Pressures at Saint Mary's College to have a certain image	22 (41.5%)	31 (58.5%)	N=53

Table 3 will show the second set of motivations for impression management. Most of the participants said they felt their Facebook profiles were completely accurate and reflect who they are in person. Since 79.2 percent of the participants felt their identities on Facebook matched their true life identities, that percentage may indicate why 86.8 percent from Table 2 manipulated or screened the information their “friends” posted on their profiles. Without the participants screening the photos and information posted on their profiles, the outside information could give a false representation to who they really are.

The percentages show that 58 percent of the participants did not feel Saint Mary's College had social pressures to have a certain image, and 41.5% of them did. The close division may provide another reason as to why the participants managed their impressions on Facebook. The 41.5 percent of the participants who said that Saint Mary's



College did have social pressures to have certain images may also alter or monitor their profiles to ensure they fit in within the Saint Mary’s community. Some of the participants said that the Saint Mary’s image was: to be “fun,” “classy,” “popular,” “skinny,” “beautiful,” “socially accepted,” and “well-rounded.” The participants who indicated they did not feel there were certain images, may modify their profiles for other various reasons.

Table 4: Effects of disturbance in impression management			
Question	Yes	No	Total
Partners displaying jealousy of participants profile from ambiguous information	32 (60.4%)	21 (39.6%)	N= 53
Participants displaying jealousy of partners profile from ambiguous information	43 (79.2%)	10 (18.9%)	N=53

The effects of the disturbances in impression management may be directly related to jealousy within relationships. More than half of the participants (60.4%) said their partners had experienced jealousy due to ambiguous information being posted to their profiles. To coincide, 79.2% of the participants admitted to displaying jealousy of their partners profiles due to ambiguous information that was posted. Issues relating to jealousy within their personal relationships may provide another explanation as to why the majority of the participants said they have felt nervous of what others may post knowing their partners, or personal friends are able to view their profiles.

## DISCUSSION

The findings in this study show that Saint Mary's College students use impression management on their Facebook profiles in efforts to be perceived in a positive light. They manage their impressions through the information and photos they choose to include on their profiles. Most of the participants constructed their identities through manipulating and screening the information they chose to put on their profiles, as well as screening or manipulating what others are able to post. A little more than half of the participants said they either sometimes or always altered or enhanced their photos, but even more participants admitted to manipulating or screening their Facebook information than altering or enhancing their photos. This may indicate that the written information on their profiles is more reflective of their character or true life identities than what photos may depict.

The participants' motivations behind impression management were: their nervousness of other's posts, maintaining the accuracy of their true identities, the opposite sex, and maintaining the Saint Mary's image. The results in this study regarding the participant's attitudes towards what others post on their Facebook pages confirms Walther et al. (2008) conclusions about the effects of unscreened verbal statements posted to their participants walls. Their participants indicated that the unscreened verbal statements made by others caused stress since the statements could have conflicted with their identity constructs. Participants in this study carefully constructed their profiles in a way they felt was accurate to their true identities. As Facebook permits "friends" to post whatever information they choose, whenever they choose, friends' postings may interfere with their constructed impressions the profile owner is trying to convey. Most of the

participants agreed that friends' ability to post on their Facebook page created a sense of nervousness as the posts could potentially disrupt not only their online impressions, but also their accuracy to who they are in person. This finding supports Erving Goffman's (1955) notion that all people constantly take into consideration the impression they present to others. Thus, despite all the steps people take to maintain their image on Facebook, certain disruptions, whether intended or unintended, can threaten their "face."

Another motivation the participants indicated behind impression management was what the opposite sex would think of them upon viewing their profiles. The participants' sense of nervousness of what others post on their profiles may be due to their knowledge of knowing their partners were able to view all their photos and information, whether the information was screened or unscreened. The unscreened ambiguous information, posted by their friends could potentially ruin the "face" they were trying to present to their partners. Muise et al. (2008) found that their participants partner's jealousy cues stemmed from incorrect information posted by their "friends" on Facebook. Again, this may indicate that outside information disclosed by others can hinder the way a Facebook profile owner tries to project themselves to their desired audiences.

For the future, if this study was conducted in a different region or at another university, different conclusions may be drawn due to the various cultures of Facebook. A larger sample may supply more qualitative results providing more insight behind impression management strategies on Facebook. Also, in a larger community, more data could be collected on the participants' motivations behind impression management such as who the participants are "friends" with, their family histories, and a broader age range.

This study showed the culture of Saint Mary's College women living in residence halls online Facebook use and also how they used impression management on Facebook through their manipulations and screening of information and photos on their profile pages. The data collected may be an essential contribution to larger studies to show that our society has made Facebook an social expectation amongst the college-aged generation.

## APPENDIX

### *Survey*

The purpose of this study is to better understand how Saint Mary's College students monitor their Facebook profiles through impression management and how they manipulate their Facebook identities to fit in within their community.

#### Part One: Demographics and Identity manipulation

1. Where are you from?
  
2. How many hours a day approximately do you spend on Facebook?
  
3. In what ways do you use Facebook? (circle all that apply)]
  - A) Social purposes
  - B) Job related purposes
  - C) Keep in contact with family members
  - D) To stay posted on friends lives
  - E) To make sure others know what I am doing
  - F) Keep tabs on exclusive relationships or friendships
  - G) Other
  
4. Do you enhance your photos on Facebook?
  - A) Always
  - B) Sometimes
  - C) Never
  
5. Do you manipulate or screen the information you write on your personal profile.
  - A) Always
  - B) Sometimes
  - C) Never
  
6. If you answered "Always, or Sometimes," to question 5, do you manipulate your information in efforts to make sure people do not perceive you in a negative light? If you answered "Never" please circle, "C."
  - A) Yes
  - B) No
  - C) C
  
7. Do you feel that the pictures and information you post on your Facebook is completely accurate to whom you really are? (If no, please explain in the space provided)
  - A) Yes
  - B) No

8. Have you ever purposefully embellished your pictures or information on your Facebook in hopes to attract certain people or a particular group? (If you answer yes, please explain your motives in the space provided)
  - A) Yes
  - B) No
  
9. Do you feel that there are any social pressures within the Saint Mary's community to have a certain image? (If yes, please explain in the space provided)
  - A) Yes
  - B) No
  
10. When you consider what pictures and information to post on your Facebook profile, do you ever consider what the opposite sex will think?
  - A) Always
  - B) Sometimes
  - C) Never
  
11. Have you ever created a false Facebook identity under a different name?
  - A) Yes
  - B) No
  
12. My definition of the word "popularity" is: the quality of being widely admired or accepted by a particular group of people. How important is popularity to you?
  - A) Very Important
  - B) Somewhat Important
  - C) Undecided
  - D) Not Very Important
  - E) Not Important At All

#### Part Two: Personal Relationships

13. Are you in an exclusive sexual relationship?
  - A) Yes
  - B) Somewhat
  - C) No
  
14. If you answered yes, are you friends with your partner on Facebook? (If you answered "No," please circle "B.")
  - A) Yes
  - B) B
  
15. Are you ever nervous of what someone may post on your wall or what picture someone may tag of you based on other people being able to view your profile?

- A) Always
  - B) Sometimes
  - C) Never
16. Have you ever experienced someone, either a sexual partner or friend, displaying a sense of jealousy or trust related issues pertaining to what is being posted on your wall or pictures that may have been tagged of you?
- A) Yes
  - B) No
17. Have you ever personally felt a sense of jealousy or mistrust from information you have read or pictures you have seen on your friends' or partners' profile?
- A) Yes
  - B) No
18. Does the Facebook "Relationship Status" make a relationship official, since it is "Facebook Official?"
- A) Always
  - B) Almost Always
  - C) Sometimes
  - D) Almost Never
  - E) Never

### Part 3: Communication and Social Skills

19. Have you ever "Facebook chatted" with someone who is a "friend" that you have never met before?
- A) Yes
  - B) No
  - C) Cannot Remember
20. Do you use Facebook to avoid face-to-face interactions?
- A) Always
  - B) Sometimes
  - C) Never
21. If you answered "Always," or "Sometimes," please provide an explanation or an example in the space provided. If you answered "No" circle the letter "A."
- A) A
22. Have you ever met anyone through Facebook prior to meeting them in person?
- A) Yes
  - B) No

23. Do you feel that Facebook has guided your ability to start a relationship with someone through the “chat” feature?
- A) Always
  - B) Sometimes
  - C) Undecided
  - D) Somewhat Never
  - E) Never
24. Please explain your opinion of what future generation’s social skills will transpire to be through the use of Facebook?

Thank you for your participation in this study.  
Kelcey Lerner  
480-452-3816  
[Klerne01@saintmarys.edu](mailto:Klerne01@saintmarys.edu)



## REFERENCES

Angwin, Julia..2009.” Putting Your Best Face Forward.” *The Wall Street Journal*, March 29. Retrieved November 21, 2010.

(<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123819495915561237.html?mod=article-outset-box>)

Barkuus, Louise., and Tashiro, Juliana. 2010. “Student Socialization in the Age of Facebook.” University of California, San Diego, CA. Unpublished Manuscript.

Boogart, Matthew Robert Vanden. 2006. “Uncovering the Social Impacts of Facebook on a College Campus.” Department of Education, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS. Unpublished Manuscript.

DiMicco, Joan Morris., Millen, David R. 2007. “Identity Management: Multiple Presentations of Self in Facebook” IBM T.J. Watson Research, Cambridge, MA, US. Unpublished Manuscript

Ginger, Jeff. 2008. “The Facebook Project: Performance and Construction of Digital Identity.” Department of Sociology, University of Illinois, IL. Unpublished Manuscript.

Joinson, Adam A. 2008. “ ‘Looking at’, ‘Looking up’ or ‘Keeping up with’ People?

Motives and Uses of Facebook” School of Management, University of Bath, Bath, UK. Unpublished Manuscript

Steve Jones.2002. “The Internet Goes to College” *Internet and American Life*. Retrieved November 21, 2010 (<http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2002/The-Internet-Goes-to-College.aspx>)

Lampe, Cliff., Ellison,Nicole., and Steinfield,Charles.2004. “A Face(book) in the Crowd: Social Searching vs. Social Browsing.” Department of Communications, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI. Unpublished Manuscript.

Amy Muise, M.Sc., Emily Christofides., and Serge Desmarais.2008. “More Information than you Ever Wanted: Does Facebook Bring Out the Green-Eyed Monster of Jealousy?” *CyberPsychology & Behavior*. Retrieved November 21, 2010. (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19366318>)

Murgittroyd, Elizabeth., Whiteside, Jennifer., Yee, William., Gross, Brian., and Kaczmarek, Tomasz.2006. “Facebook: What the Relationship Status is All About.” Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI. Unpublished Manuscript.

Shanyang Zhao., Sherri Grasmuch., and Jason Martin.2008. "Identity Construction on Facebook: Digital Empowerment in Anchored Relationships." *Elsevier*. Retrieved November 21, 2010. ([www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com))

Sheldon, Pavica.2010. "Similarities and Differences in Self-Disclosure and Friendship Development Between Face-to-Face Communication and Facebook." Department of Communications, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, LA. Unpublished Manuscript.

Andria Siibak.2009. "Constructing the Self Through the Photo Selection-Visual Impression Management on Social Networking Websites." *CyberPsychology*. Retrieved November 21, 2010. (<http://cyberpsychology.eu/view.php?cisloclanku=2009061501&article=1>)

Walther, Joseph B., Van Der Heide, Brandon., Kim, Sang-Yeon., Westerman, David., and Tom Tong, Stephanie. 2008. "The Role of Friends' Appearance and Behavior on Evaluations of Individuals on Facebook: Are We Known by the Company We Keep?" Department of Communications, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI. Unpublished Manuscript.

