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ABSTRACT

I employ the uses and gratifications approach and goals-planning-action model to forward hypotheses and research questions about the motives, self-presentation strategies, and audience perceptions associated with adolescent and young adult use of Facebook and Twitter. I offer conclusions regarding my hypotheses and research questions using data from a cross-sectional online survey of 202 adolescents and young adults. Results suggest that participants are more likely to use Facebook to fulfill social and content gratifications than Twitter, which provides partial support for my predictions (H1a & H1b). Additionally, participants are more likely to use Twitter to fulfill process and technology gratifications than Facebook (RQ1). Furthermore, the only self-presentation concern about which participants reported a significant difference was that of supplication, which was contrary to my predictions (H2a & H2b), but provided some clarity in terms of the differences between self-presentation concerns on Facebook and Twitter (RQ2). As expected, participants expressed significantly greater familiarity with their audience on Facebook than on Twitter (H3). Contrary to my predictions, however, participants reported significantly greater concern for impression management on Facebook than on Twitter (H4). I discuss how these findings provide directions for future research on motives and self-presentation strategies on Facebook and Twitter.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Most adolescents and young adults cannot remember a time before the existence of the Internet. Their identities and social development have largely been influenced by Internet communication technology, including social networking sites (SNSs) such as Facebook and Twitter. In recent years, as many as 80% of teens (Lenhart et al., 2011) and 89% of young adults (Brenner & Smith, 2013) report using SNSs. These SNSs provide a new, dynamic channel for users to construct identities, represent themselves, and interact with others (boyd & Ellison, 2007; Donath, 2007; Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Livingstone, 2008). The features of SNSs allow individuals the ability to present themselves more strategically to their audiences (Walther, 2007), giving way to potentially hyperpersonal interactions—interpersonal interactions that are more intimate and satisfying than are typical in comparable offline settings (Walther, 1996).

Understanding how users present themselves on SNSs is essential for researchers who are interested in exploring the dynamics of modern interpersonal relationships, as extant literature indicates that different people may engage in different self-presentation strategies online (Livingstone, 2008; Tong, Van Der Heide, Langwell, & Walther, 2008; Zywica & Danowski, 2008). In an attempt to develop a more comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon, the current study examines how adolescents use SNSs—their motives for using particular sites as well as their self-presentation strategies on these sites.

In recent years, media scholars have insisted that focusing the study of SNS use solely on Facebook is a limitation (e.g., Brandtzæg, 2012; Brandtzæg & Heim, 2011; Valenzuela, Park, & Kee, 2009). These scholars advocate for research exploring how
people use different SNSs, citing the possibility that dissimilar patterns of usage might have different social implications (Brandtzæg & Heim, 2011; Valenzuela et al., 2009). Despite this expressed need for the study of other SNSs, most studies continue to focus only on Facebook use. Very few studies examine the use of Twitter, according to Chen (2011), who indicates, “Even among social networks, Twitter has received less study so far than larger and older applications, such as Facebook” (p. 755). Much of the extant research on Twitter focuses largely on mass communication (e.g., Greer & Ferguson, 2011; Lee & Oh, 2013) or political communication (e.g., Himelboim, 2014; Vergeer, Hermans, & Sams; 2013) applications of the medium, and very few studies examine the personal uses of Twitter (Chen, 2011; Johnson & Yang, 2009; Marwick & boyd, 2011).

Media scholars concerned about the social implications of adolescent SNS use are making progress in illuminating individual use patterns on various SNSs. The present study seeks to develop a better understanding of adolescent use of two SNSs—Facebook and Twitter—and the relationship among different motives for use, different audience perceptions, and concerns for impression management. I will use both the uses and gratifications approach and the goals-planning-action model to guide my thinking about how motives and audience characteristics of each site may impact individual users’ self-presentation behaviors and concerns.

I will begin by explicating the assumptions consistent with the uses and gratifications approach, and how this theoretical paradigm has been applied to both Facebook and Twitter use. Next, I will provide background on the goals-planning-action model, particularly the secondary goals of self-presentation that are salient to this study. I will continue by advancing hypotheses and research questions regarding motives for
Facebook and Twitter use and how audience characteristics impact the degree to which individuals engage in impression management. Details regarding methods of recruitment, the sample for this study, and study procedures will provide the necessary background information to better understand the results of data analysis. Finally, I will discuss significant results of the study, their implications, and directions for future research.

A better understanding of this topic would be beneficial in three ways. First, this study will provide better discernment between the motives and behaviors associated with Facebook and Twitter use. As stated previously, many researchers have called for the study of more than just Facebook. This study will determine if and how the uses of Facebook and Twitter converge and diverge. Second, it will provide a better understanding of Jones and Pittman’s (1982) taxonomy of self-presentation strategies in the context of online environments. Much of the research on self-presentation strategies is limited to face-to-face contexts or Facebook. This study will open up possibilities to explore this taxonomy in new and different contexts. Finally, and most practically, this study is of particular importance considering the influence that SNSs can have on the identity development of adolescents (Subrahmanyam, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008; Gemmill & Peterson, 2006; Lenhart & Madden 2007; Subrahmanyam & Greenfield, 2008).
CHAPTER TWO: SURVEY OF LITERATURE

Uses and Gratifications

The emergence of computer-mediated communication in the late 20th century facilitated the revival of uses and gratifications research (Ruggiero, 2000). The uses and gratifications approach (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974; Rubin, 1994) posits that individuals select what media to use and how to use them based on the gratifications sought and obtained from that particular medium. Media use is motivated, goal-directed, purposive behavior (Rubin, 1994), and understanding individuals’ motives and goals for using specific media will help uncover the differential patterns of individual behavior enacted through different media. Early work examining the motives and communication behaviors of Internet users solidified the uses and gratifications approach as a useful framework for Internet research, and the approach has been successfully used in recent research on various online applications, including SNSs such as Twitter (Johnson & Yang, 2009), Facebook (Bumgarner, 2007; Joinson, 2008), and MySpace (Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008).

The uses and gratifications approach allows technology and media researchers to explicate users’ various motives when engaging with media, allowing for a better understanding of differing behaviors, outcomes, and perceptions related to specific media use. Because the Internet is a platform for multiple mass media (Johnson & Yang, 2009), meaning individuals are offered many media choices through the Internet, it is necessary to take a more granular approach to the exploration of Internet uses and gratifications, one that acknowledges that individuals attend to specific types of content within the larger media framework of the Internet (Smock, Ellison, Lampe, & Wohn, 2011). Social
networking sites, for instance, may be the specific type of content to which people attend online. Simultaneously, SNSs, in themselves, offer various functions within one medium, which creates the need for even more precise analysis of specific media that are part of an umbrella medium of SNSs within the larger medium of the Internet.

Extant research on SNSs has identified potential limitations for this area of investigation that should be avoided in the future: Many scholars attest that lumping SNSs together in an analysis of their uses and gratifications is unwise (Brandtzæg, 2012; Brandtzæg & Heim, 2011; Smock et al., 2011; Valenzuela et al., 2009). They urge future SNS research to take into consideration that SNS use is not homogenous: Different SNSs can be used for different purposes (Smock et al., 2011; Valenzuela et al., 2009); dissimilar patterns of usage from person to person may give way to different social implications (Brandtzæg, 2012); and by simply looking at one SNS at a time, we might miss the important fact that SNS usage involves systematic patterns in which the same SNS can be used for different purposes and different SNSs can be used for the same purpose (Brandtzæg & Heim, 2011).

It is important to understand the similarities and differences in the gratifications sought and obtained through Facebook and Twitter use, as they are two of the most popular SNSs for teens (Edwards, 2013). McKinney, Kelly, and Duran (2012) have published some of the only research to compare Facebook and Twitter use, and they focus on the motivation for sharing information on the two SNSs: Is information-sharing driven by narcissistic tendencies or driven by the desire to maintain connections within one’s social network? Further studies comparing the distinct motives for using the two sites are absent from the literature. Independent studies of each of the two SNSs have
been performed which indicate individuals’ motives for using the two sites share some similarities and also represent some differences. For instance, Johnson and Yang (2009) attest that Twitter use fulfills both information and social motives, which is supported by Chen (2011) who emphasizes that Twitter use fulfills the need to connect with others. In studies of the motives for Facebook use, scholars contend that Facebook, too, fulfills information and social needs (Cheung, Chiu, & Lee, 2011; Nadkarni & Hofmann, 2012; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011; Rui & Stefanone, 2013; Smock et al., 2011). The need for research comparing the uses of these two SNSs remains unmet. The diversity of users and uses of SNSs necessitates careful examination of the motives of use for individual sites as well as a comparison of popular SNSs to one another in order to uncover distinct yet intersecting patterns of use, which leads to my first research question:

RQ1: How do the motives for using Facebook and Twitter differ?

The literature indicates that Facebook can support a wide range of social activities. Smock et al. (2011) posit that different users come to Facebook for different reasons. Various scholars have explored the motives for Facebook use, and the medium has been demonstrated to fulfill needs such as relaxation or entertainment (Cheung & Lee, 2009; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011; Smock et al., 2011), expression and information sharing (Cheung & Lee, 2009; Lampe, Wash, Velasquez, & Ozkaya, 2010; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011; Smock et al., 2011), self-presentation or social enhancement (Cheung & Lee, 2009; Nadkarni & Hofmann, 2012), professional advancement (Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011), and a sense of belonging or social interaction (Cheung & Lee, 2009; Ellison et al., 2007; Joinson, 2008; Lampe et al., 2010; Nadkarni & Hofmann, 2012; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011; Smock et al., 2011).
Primarily, Facebook is used to fulfill social gratifications, in which users typically engage with familiar others.

Similarly, individuals are motivated to use Twitter for a variety of reasons, the most salient of which are information motives. Scholars contend that Twitter gratifies similar needs as Facebook such as connections to other people (Chen, 2011) and information (Johnson & Yang, 2009). Because Twitter has received less study so far than larger and older social networking applications, such as Facebook (Chen, 2011), studies exploring the uses and gratifications of Twitter have produced mixed results. For instance, Johnson and Yang (2009) contend that information motives—learning and sharing information—are positively related to Twitter use while social motives—having fun, being entertained, expressing oneself, and keeping in touch with friends and family—are not significantly related to Twitter use. At the same time, Chen (2011) asserts that frequency of Twitter use is positively associated with gratifying a need for informal connection or camaraderie with others. These seemingly contradictory propositions about the motives for Twitter use require additional investigation. However, because studies of Facebook consistently report that this medium is used to gratify social needs, and because the information motives for using Twitter are consistent, I hypothesize that:

H1a: Users will be more greatly motivated to use Twitter when seeking information, or content, gratifications as compared to Facebook.

H1b: Users will be more greatly motivated to use Facebook when seeking social gratifications as compared to Twitter.
The myriad needs that Facebook and Twitter could potentially gratify for users highlight the unique nature of online applications such as SNSs: They are “masspersonal.” Facebook and Twitter have been described as masspersonal media (Marwick & boyd, 2011), or media that combine elements of broadcast media and face-to-face, interpersonal communication (Dicken-Garcia, 1998; O’Sullivan, 2005). In dissecting the uses and gratifications of new media, the traditional audience concept that is central to the uses and gratifications approach must be modified because of the interpersonal potential of the Internet (Ruggiero, 2000). New technologies such as SNSs provide “new or previously rare contexts for information expression and engagement” (Yzer & Southwell, 2008, p. 8) that allow users to share personal content with a wide range of people, merging interpersonal and mass communication functions into one (O’Sullivan, 2005). The unique nature of masspersonal media and the new contexts they create for communication provides a ripe ground for research. Accordingly, scholars such as Carr et al. (2008) call for “a deeper understanding of the use and influence of these sources” through “a renewed focus on the interpersonal goals that drive users’ information seeking and processing” behaviors online (p. 1). Thus, we turn our attention to interpersonal goals as part of the larger set of motives for using these media.

**Interpersonal Goals**

Pinpointing the motives for individuals’ use of Facebook and Twitter could shed light on the variation in individuals’ goals in interacting with others on the two sites. Goals help to explain an individual’s actions prior to and during interpersonal interactions (Dillard, Segrin, & Harden, 1989), and they vary based on hierarchy, importance, and temporality (Dillard, 1990; Smith, Cody, Lovette, & Canary, 1990). In terms of
hierarchy, motives exist at the top; motives are “broad and deep-seated determinants of behavior” (Dillard, 1990, p. 71). Thus, within the masspersonal medium of SNSs, the motives for using those sites may serve as the broad determinants of the behaviors individuals enact on those sites. The goals for particular interactions on those sites, then, are derived from these broader motives; goals “occupy the next tier in the hierarchy” and define the interaction, according to Dillard (1990, pp. 71-72). At the lowest level of the hierarchy are subgoals, which are governed by and also serve to shape goals (Dillard, 1990; Dillard et al., 1989). Goals and subgoals are also termed primary and secondary goals, respectively, and will be identified as such for the purposes of this paper.

Secondary goals are of particular interest to the present study. They complement primary goals by shaping the interaction. Secondary goals comprise the other concerns that arise in the course of pursuing or planning to pursue a primary goal (Schrader & Dillard, 1998). The categories of secondary goals are widely accepted, although sometimes labeled in slightly different ways, and include identity goals, interaction goals, resource goals, and arousal management goals (Schrader & Dillard, 1998). Identity goals are objectives related to self-concept, which are derived from one’s moral standards and expectations for personal conduct. Interaction goals—sometimes referred to as conversation management goals—are concerned with social appropriateness, which can include concerns for impression management. Resource goals are focused on increasing or maintaining relational, material, and/or physical assets. Arousal management goals typify attempts to diminish the apprehension experienced leading up to and/or during an interaction. Schrader and Dillard (1998) report, “Together, the primary and secondary goals comprise the (intrapersonal) goal structure of the communication episode. And,
because both sets of goals shape interaction, knowledge of the associations among them can contribute to our understanding of the motivations of the social actor” (pp. 279-280). It is precisely these associations between motives and secondary goals that this study explores.

**Impression Management**

Extant research indicates that users pursue various goals through their actions on SNSs. Of all the secondary goals that shape these primary goals, interaction goals are likely of vast importance to SNS users. Studies suggest that most SNS users are motivated by the need to be socially accepted and, therefore, carefully manage the impressions they make online (Binder, Howes, & Sutcliffe, 2009). Indeed, computer-mediated contexts such as SNSs provide a unique context in which to engage in strategic self-presentation. Secondary goals involving self-presentation and impression management are vastly important to achieving users’ goals because research suggests that unsuccessful self-presentation can lead to rejection and criticism (Binder et al., 2009). Similarly, Marwick and boyd (2011) assert that because diverse social contexts are collapsed into one through masspersonal media, it is difficult for people to engage in the complex negotiations needed to vary their self-presentation, manage impressions, and save face. It is these self-presentation, or impression management, goals on which we will focus for the purpose of this study.

For the purpose of this study, the terms impression management and self-presentation will be used interchangeably, as others have done in the past (e.g., Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Lee, Quigley, Nesler, Corbett, & Tedeschi, 1999; Schlenker, 1980). Self-presentation is a process by which individuals engage in impression management.
and information control in everyday life (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker & Pontari, 2000); through this process, individuals attempt to control how others perceive them (Leary, 1995). Self-presentation involves an individual’s conscious effort to present a certain image and to express a specific identity through verbal and nonverbal communication to others (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker & Britt, 1999, 2001). Scholars contend that the Internet has opened up a new venue for self-presentation and that people may practice different self-presentation strategies online (Livingstone, 2008; Tong et al., 2008; Zywica & Danowski, 2008). Therefore, it is important to explore the self-presentation strategies enacted online.

In order to capture the wide array of impression management strategies that individuals commonly use, Jones and Pittman (1982) developed a taxonomy aimed at categorizing and describing this wide array of impression management behaviors. Their taxonomy includes: ingratiation, in which individuals use statements of modesty, familiarity or humor to elicit an attribution of likability from others; self-promotion, in which individuals highlight their talents or accomplishments in order to be seen as competent; exemplification, in which people self-sacrifice or show self-discipline in order to gain the attribution of dedication from others; intimidation, in which people display their power or potential to punish in order to be seen as dangerous; and supplication, where individuals attempt to appear helpless or self-deprecatory in order to elicit an attribution of being needy from observers.

In early studies of online self-presentation behaviors using Jones and Pittman’s taxonomy, Dominick (1999) found that ingratiation was the strategy most frequently used on personal homepages. As the Internet evolved to offer SNSs, this program of research,
too, expanded to explore the self-presentation strategies used on SNSs. Four self-presentation strategies are often used on SNSs: competence (i.e., self-promotion), supplication, exemplification, and ingratiation (Jung, Youn, & McClung, 2007). Additionally, studies comparing Chinese and American youth use of SNSs have confirmed that American youth use more ingratiation strategies while Chinese users engage in more competence and supplication (Chu & Choi, 2010). However, many of these studies focus on a singular SNS—Facebook—to garner these results. Because the motives and primary goals for using different SNSs may vary, the use of different self-presentation strategies may vary as well, which leads me to ask:

RQ2: How do self-presentation strategies on Facebook and Twitter differ?

The motives for using each of the SNSs, and the distinct usage patterns of each SNS, should give way to distinct self-presentation concerns and strategies on each SNS. If individuals are motivated to use Facebook for social reasons (e.g., social enhancement, the need to belong, or social interaction), ingratiation could be one of the most frequently used self-presentation strategies used to achieve these ends. Ingratiation is considered a ubiquitous form of social behavior and an integral component of social interactions (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker, 1980; Schlenker & Weigold, 1992). This self-presentation strategy involves attempts to appear friendly and likeable and often results in attributions of attraction and liking (Baxter & Philpott, 1982; Jones, 1964; Jones & Wortman, 1974). These attributions of attraction and liking are central to social enhancement, the need to belong, and social interaction. It is this confluence of gratifying needs for social enhancement and acceptance along with the attributions associated with the self-presentation strategy of ingratiation that lead me to hypothesize:
H2a: Facebook users will be more greatly concerned with the specific self-presentation strategy of ingratiation than Twitter users will be.

In terms of Twitter use, if information motives—the need to receive or disseminate information—drive individuals’ use of this particular SNS, the most salient self-presentation strategies used when individuals are posting information on this SNS should relate, in some way, to a need to be seen as a credible source of information. Individuals who primarily use Twitter to receive information may be posting in order to gather information; however, they may simply be lurking to gather information. Because sharing information on Twitter requires posting and because the present study is focused on individuals’ posts on Twitter, it is the self-presentation concerns associated with sharing information in which I am interested. Based on this information, I hypothesize:

H2b: Twitter users will be more greatly concerned with the specific self-presentation strategy of self-promotion than Facebook users will be.

Audience Characteristics

Various factors can influence how individuals determine and express their self-presentation strategies. Baumeister and Jones (1978) posit that an audience’s prior knowledge about an individual impacts one’s self-presentation strategy, as individuals attempt to construct a credible image and personal identity that is consistent with what that particular audience expects of the individual. Additionally, Leary et al. (1994) uncovered relationships between the familiarity of one’s target, the target’s gender similarity to the source, and one’s self-presentation motives: Individuals' self-presentation motives are lower when interacting with highly familiar people of their own sex than when interacting with less familiar people of their own sex.
This relationship between source and audience familiarity has been studied online, as Chu and Choi (2010) report that self-presentation strategies differ when interacting with close friends versus strangers. Chu and Choi (2010) continue, explaining that the adaptation of self-presentation strategies when interacting with strangers suggests that people habitually focus on self-enhancement when communicating with strangers but show modesty when interacting with friends. In the context of Facebook and Twitter, these audience characteristics are further complicated. The masspersonal nature of Facebook and Twitter allow users to disseminate information to a wide audience. Not only is the audience for one’s Facebook updates and Tweets wide, but this wide audience is composed of multiple, overlapping and collapsing audiences (Krämer & Haferkamp, 2011; Marwick & boyd, 2011). The structure of SNSs like Facebook and Twitter facilitates an overlap in social networks in which the resulting audience is composed of diverse and sometimes conflicting members of various social circles. While the wide reach and potential diffusion of information on these networks creates opportunities for acquisition of social connections and resources (Ellison, Vitak, Steinfield, Gray, & Lampe, 2011), it also poses challenges for one’s impression management strategies.

Although Facebook and Twitter share some similar functionality, the two sites vary in terms of the reciprocity of connections between users. On Facebook, “friendship” requires reciprocity: One cannot add a friend on Facebook who is not simultaneously agreeing to add the other as a friend. Twitter changes this model; although Twitter, too, requires users to choose the accounts they will “follow,” there is no technical requirement of reciprocity, and often, according to Marwick and boyd (2011), no social expectation of reciprocity either. There is, then, a disconnect between one’s followers and the accounts
that they follow. It is common social practice on Twitter to follow celebrities or other individuals whom the user does not know. Based on the nature of the audiences and social norms of these two SNSs, as well as what we know about audience familiarity and self-presentation strategies, I predict:

H3: The audience on Twitter will be less familiar than the audience on Facebook.

H4: Based on degree of audience familiarity, individuals will engage in a greater degree of impression management on Twitter than on Facebook.
Participants

Two hundred fifty-seven adolescents and young adults were recruited to participate in this exploratory study using a snowball sampling method. Of those subjects who accessed the survey link, 202 individuals were eligible participants, assented or consented to participate, and completed the survey. The targeted sample for this study was adolescent and young adult Facebook and/or Twitter users. In order to participate, individuals had to be between 13 and 22 years old, use Facebook and/or Twitter, and have access to the Internet. The sample was predominantly female (n = 131, 64.9%) with 33.7% males (n = 68) and .5% transgender respondents (n = 1). Additionally, the sample reported their race/ethnicity as primarily White (n = 152, 75.2%) followed by multi-racial (n = 21, 10.4%), Hispanic/Latino (n = 12, 5.9%), Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 8, 4.0%), Black/African-American (n = 7, 3.5%), and other (n = 2, 1.0%). The average age of participants was 17.85 years; 27.7% of the sample were middle adolescents, age 13-16 years (n = 56); 44.6% of the sample were late adolescents, age 17-19 years (n = 90); 27.7% of the sample were young adults, age 20-22 years (n = 56). In terms of Facebook and Twitter use, these two SNSs were reported as two of the three most popular SNSs within this sample. Most of the participants used both Facebook and Twitter (n = 117, 57.9%), while smaller constituencies used Facebook but not Twitter (n = 69, 34.2%), and very few participants reported using Twitter but not Facebook (n = 14, 6.9%).

I called for qualified, interested participants through posts on my Facebook page, through posts in Facebook groups of a youth leadership organization with which I am associated, and through contacts at a youth group. Participants also were recruited from
communication courses at a small, private, university in the Southeastern United States. Participants were encouraged to refer friends to the study. Participation was incentivized through a drawing offering ten $10 iTunes gift cards to randomly selected participants who completed the study and entered the drawing. Because the sample for this study includes minors, great care was taken in securing the privacy of participants. All adult participants consented to participate, and all minor participants provided their assent. These identification, recruitment, and consent/assent processes were approved by the Institutional Review Board.

After providing assent or consent, participants responded to a maximum of 75 items through an online questionnaire distributed via Qualtrics online survey software. The number of items participants responded to depended on their SNS use: If participants used only Facebook, they responded to 39 questions; if they used only Twitter, they responded to 40 questions; and if they used both sites, they responded to 75 questions.

**Procedure**

The target sample size was about 150 participants, based on similar studies with sample sizes ranging from 94 to 208 participants (Bolino & Turnley, 1999; Cheung et al., 2011; Marwick & boyd, 2011; Chu & Choi, 2010), as well as a power analysis indicating that about 134 participants is necessary to detect small effect sizes. Because the Institutional Review Board approved waiver of parental permission for this study, all participants accessed the online survey in the same way: A survey link was either emailed, private messaged via Facebook, or accessed through Facebook recruitment messages. All participants provided assent or consent electronically after accessing the
survey link. No participants were permitted to progress with the study without providing assent or consent.

**Measures**

The questionnaire consisted of eight scales: intensity of Facebook use, intensity of Twitter use, motives for Facebook use, motives for Twitter use, self-presentation concerns on Facebook, self-presentation concerns on Twitter, Facebook audience familiarity, and Twitter audience familiarity. In addition to these eight scales, participants were asked to indicate whether they used the following selected SNSs—Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Myspace, YouTube, Pinterest, Tumblr, and Google+—as research from the Pew Internet & American Life Project suggests that these are the most popular sites on which teens have social media profiles (Madden, 2013). Finally, participants were asked to provide the following demographic information: age, sex, and race/ethnicity.

**Intensity of Facebook use.** The intensity of Facebook use questions were intended to measure the extent to which participants are actively engaged in Facebook activities. The items used to measure intensity of Facebook use were selected from Ellison et al.’s (2007) Facebook intensity scale and have been used in comparable studies of Facebook self-presentation strategies (Bazarova, Taft, Choi, & Cosley, 2013). Participants responded to two items measuring the intensity of their Facebook use. Participants responded to the question, “About how many total Facebook friends do you have?” by selecting one of nine options (1 = less than 10, 2 = 10-49, 3 = 50-99, 4 = 100-149, 5 = 150-199, 6 = 200-249, 7 = 250-299, 8 = 300-399, 9 = 400 or more). Participants responded to the question, “On a typical day, about how much time do you spend on
Facebook?” by selecting one of seven items (1 = no time at all, 2 = less than 10 minutes, 3 = 10 to 30 minutes, 4 = more than 30 minutes, up to 1 hour, 5 = more than 1 hour, up to 2 hours, 6 = more than 2 hours, up to 3 hours, 7 = more than 3 hours). The two items were averaged to create an intensity of Facebook use measure. On average, participants scored moderately high ($M = 5.73$, $SD = 1.27$) on the intensity of Facebook use measure, which demonstrated weak reliability ($\alpha = .23$).

**Intensity of Twitter use.** The intensity of Twitter use questions were intended to measure the extent to which participants are actively engaged in Twitter activities. The items used to measure intensity of Twitter use were adapted from Ellison et al.’s (2007) Facebook intensity scale; however, it is important to note that the intensity of Facebook use and intensity of Twitter use scales were not comprised of the same number of items. The items measuring intensity of Twitter use were designed to be relevant to the use of this particular technology; these items include the two items used in the intensity of Facebook use scale as well as two items intended to measure activity specific to Twitter use. Participants responded to four items related to the intensity of their Twitter use. Participants responded to the question, “About how many total Twitter followers do you have?” by selecting one of nine options (1 = less than 10, 2 = 10-49, 3 = 50-99, 4 = 100-149, 5 = 150-199, 6 = 200-249, 7 = 250-299, 8 = 300-399, 9 = 400 or more). Similarly, participants responded to the question, “About how many total Twitter users are you following” by selecting one of nine options (1 = less than 10, 2 = 10-49, 3 = 50-99, 4 = 100-149, 5 = 150-199, 6 = 200-249, 7 = 250-299, 8 = 300-399, 9 = 400 or more). Additionally, participants responded to the question, “On a typical day, about how much time do you spend on Twitter?” by selecting one of seven possible responses (1 = no time
at all, 2 = less than 10 minutes, 3 = 10 to 30 minutes, 4 = more than 30 minutes, up to 1 hour, 5 = more than 1 hour, up to 2 hours, 6 = more than 2 hours, up to 3 hours, 7 = more than 3 hours). Finally, participants were asked to indicate, “On a typical day, how often do you tweet?” using a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = very frequently). These four items were averaged to create an intensity of Twitter use measure. On average, participants’ scores on this measure were moderate (M = 4.25, SD = 1.57). The scale demonstrated reliability (α = .79).

**Motives for Facebook use.** The motives for Facebook use scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants were motivated to use Facebook to fulfill four types of gratifications: content, social, process, and technology gratifications. The four types of gratifications and the items in this scale were adapted from a measure used by Liu, Cheung, and Lee (2010) in their study of the motives for using Twitter. The four motives for Twitter use that Liu et al. (2010) use in this scale are comparable to motives for Facebook use provided in other studies (Cheung et al., 2011; Dholakia & Kshetri, 2004; Joinson, 2008; Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011); thus the scale was adapted to be relevant to Facebook use. The original 22 item scale from Liu et al. (2010) was adapted for use in the present study by retaining the most reliable items for each type of gratification, which yielded 11 items—three items measuring content gratifications, three items measuring social gratifications, four items measuring process gratifications, and one item measuring technology gratifications.

**Facebook content gratifications.** Content gratification is derived from the purposeful, instrumental use of media (Cutler & Danowski, 1980). Individuals who use media for their direct, substantive intrinsic value seek to fulfill content gratifications
(Cutler & Danowski, 1980). To determine participants’ motives to use Facebook to fulfill content gratifications, participants responded to three items. Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = very frequently) to indicate how frequently they use Facebook for reasons such as, “To provide information” (see Appendix A for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create the Facebook content gratifications measure. On average, participants’ scores on this measure were moderate ($M = 3.27, SD = 1.24$), and the measure exhibited satisfactory reliability ($\alpha = .75$).

**Facebook social gratifications.** Social gratification is obtained through interactivity with other people through media use (Liu et al., 2010). Media fulfill social gratifications when they allow users to interact and maintain connections with each other (Liu et al., 2010). To measure participants’ motives to use Facebook to fulfill social gratifications, participants were asked to respond to three items. Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = very frequently) to indicate how frequently they use Facebook for reasons such as, “To connect with people who share some of my values” (see Appendix A for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create the Facebook social gratifications measure. On average, participants scored moderately high on the measure ($M = 4.23, SD = 1.27$), and the measure demonstrated marginal reliability ($\alpha = .64$).

**Facebook process gratifications.** Process gratifications arise primarily from being involved in the process of behavior, rather than from message content (Cutler & Danowski, 1980). Unlike content gratifications, individuals derive process gratifications from the extrinsic value of media (e.g., the process of searching for something or passing time online) (Liu et al., 2010). To measure participants’ motives to use Facebook to
fulfill process gratifications, participants were asked to respond to four items. Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = very frequently) to indicate how frequently they use Facebook for reasons such as, “For enjoyment and/or entertainment” (see Appendix A for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create the Facebook process gratifications measure. On average, participants’ scores on this measure were moderate ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.21$), and the measure demonstrated satisfactory reliability ($\alpha = .79$).

**Facebook technology gratifications.** Technology gratifications are derived from “the suitable and convenient environment provided by a system (Liu et al., 2010, p. 933). Because the inclusion of technology gratifications in SNS uses and gratifications research has only recently emerged, only one item measuring this motive was included as an exploratory investigation of this particular motive for the use of Facebook. Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = very frequently) to indicate how frequently they use Facebook “To have a place where I can post things I want to say immediately.” On average, participants’ scores were moderately low and widely dispersed on this measure ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.61$).

**Level of Facebook motivation.** This measure was used to assess participants’ overall level of motivation to use Facebook. All 11 of the items that were included in the measures of each individual gratification were averaged to create the measure of level of Facebook motivation. On average, participants’ scores on the measure were moderate ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.12$), and the measure demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .85$).

**Motives for Twitter use.** The motives for Twitter use scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants were motivated to use Twitter to fulfill four
types of gratifications: content, social, process, and technology gratifications. The four types of gratifications and the items in this scale were adapted from a measure used by Liu, Cheung, and Lee (2010) in their study of the motives for using Twitter. The original 22 item scale from Liu et al. (2010) was adapted for use in the present study by retaining the most reliable items for each type of gratification, which yielded 11 items—three items measuring content gratifications, three items measuring social gratifications, four items measuring process gratifications, and one item measuring technology gratifications.

**Twitter content gratifications.** Content gratification is derived from the purposeful, instrumental use of media (Cutler & Danowski, 1980). Individuals who use media for their direct, substantive intrinsic value seek to fulfill content gratifications (Cutler & Danowski, 1980). To determine participants’ motives to use Twitter to fulfill content gratifications, participants responded to three items. Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = very frequently) to indicate how frequently they use Twitter for reasons such as, “To provide information” (see Appendix B for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create the Twitter content gratifications measure. On average, participants scored moderately low on this measure ($M = 2.84, SD = 1.45$), and the measure exhibited satisfactory reliability ($\alpha = .83$).

**Twitter social gratifications.** Social gratification is obtained through interactivity with other people through media use (Liu et al., 2010). Media fulfill social gratifications when they allow users to interact and maintain connections with each other (Liu et al., 2010). To measure participants’ motives to use Twitter to fulfill social gratifications, participants were asked to respond to three items. Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = very frequently) to indicate how frequently they use Twitter for
reasons such as, “To connect with people who share some of my values” (see Appendix B for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create the Twitter content gratifications measure. On average, participants’ scores on this measure were moderate ($M = 3.25, SD = 1.19$), and the measure demonstrated marginal reliability ($\alpha = .60$).

**Twitter process gratifications.** Process gratifications arise primarily from being involved in the process of behavior, rather than from message content (Cutler & Danowski, 1980). Unlike content gratifications, individuals derive process gratifications from the extrinsic value of media (e.g., the process of searching for something or passing time online) (Liu et al., 2010). To measure participants’ motives to use Twitter to fulfill process gratifications, participants were asked to respond to four items. Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = very frequently) to indicate how frequently they use Twitter for reasons such as, “For enjoyment and/or entertainment” (see Appendix B for full list of items and item wording). On average, participants scored moderately high on this measure ($M = 4.36, SD = 1.28$), and the measure demonstrated satisfactory reliability ($\alpha = .85$).

**Twitter technology gratifications.** Technology gratifications are derived from “the suitable and convenient environment provided by a system (Liu et al., 2010, p. 933). Because the inclusion of technology gratifications in SNS uses and gratifications research has only recently emerged, only one item measuring this motive was included as an exploratory investigation of this particular motive for the use of Twitter. Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = very frequently) to indicate how frequently they use Twitter “To have a place where I can post things I want to say immediately.” On
average, participants’ scores were moderately high and widely dispersed on this measure ($M = 3.93, SD = 1.79$).

**Level of Twitter motivation.** This measure was used to assess participants’ overall level of motivation to use Twitter. All 11 of the items that were included in the measures of each individual gratification were averaged to create the measure of level of Twitter motivation. On average, participants’ scores on the measure were moderate ($M = 3.59, SD = 1.19$), and the measure demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .82$).

**Self-presentation concerns on Facebook.** This scale was used to measure participants’ degree of concern for impression management on Facebook. Participants answered questions about the degree to which they engaged in particular self-presentation strategies as well as their degree of public self-awareness, which has been used as a measure of concern for self-presentation in comparable studies (Bazarova et al., 2013), in their most recent posts on Facebook. These items were adapted from scales from two previous studies, including Prentice-Dunn and Rogers’ (1982) scale of public self-awareness and Bolino and Turnley’s (1999) scale measuring impression management in organizations. Overall, this scale included 14 items: two items measuring public self-awareness, and three items measuring each of the four specific self-presentation strategies—ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification, and supplication.

**Public self-awareness on Facebook.** Prentice-Dunn and Roger’s (1982) scale of public self-awareness was adapted by Bazarova et al. (2013) to measure degree of concern for self-presentation on Facebook. Participants responded to two items measuring overall self-presentation concern on Facebook. Participants used seven-point Likert-type scales ($1 = \text{disagree very strongly}, 7 = \text{very strongly agree}$) to indicate how
strongly they agreed that their most recent posts on Facebook were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I was concerned about the way I presented myself” (see Appendix C for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create the Facebook public self-awareness measure. On average, participants’ scores on the measure were moderate and widely dispersed ($M = 3.32, SD = 1.82$), and the measure demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .89$).

**Ingratiation on Facebook.** Ingratiation is one of the self-presentation strategies from Jones and Pittman’s (1982) taxonomy that is noted as being salient to SNS use (Chu & Choi, 2010; Jung, Youn, & McClung, 2007). This scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants’ most recent posts on Facebook were related to a concern for ingratiation (i.e., appearing likeable and friendly). Participants were asked to respond to three items measuring concern for ingratiation on Facebook. The three items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree very strongly, 7 = very strongly agree) to indicate how strongly they agreed that their most recent posts on Facebook were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I wanted others to see me as likeable, friendly, and socially desirable” (see Appendix C for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create a measure of ingratiation on Facebook. On average, participants scored moderately low on the measure ($M = 2.78, SD = 1.64$), and the measure exhibited satisfactory reliability ($\alpha = .81$).

**Self-promotion on Facebook.** Self-promotion is another self-presentation strategy from Jones and Pittman’s (1982) taxonomy that has been noted as one of the strategies salient to SNS use (Chu & Choi, 2010; Jung, Youn, & McClung, 2007). This scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants’ most recent posts on Facebook were
related to a concern for self-promotion (i.e., highlighting one’s talents and accomplishments in order to be seen as competent). Participants were asked to respond to three items measuring concern for self-promotion strategies. The three items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree very strongly, 7 = very strongly agree) to indicate how strongly they agreed that their most recent posts on Facebook were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I wanted others to see me as competent, skilled, and intelligent” (see Appendix C for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create a self-promotion on Facebook measure. On average, participants’ scores on this measure were moderate and widely dispersed ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.83$), and the measure demonstrated satisfactory reliability ($\alpha = .90$).

**Exemplification on Facebook.** Exemplification is the third self-presentation strategy from Jones and Pittman’s (1982) taxonomy that has been noted as salient to SNS use (Chu & Choi, 2010; Jung, Youn, & McClung, 2007). This scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants’ most recent posts on Facebook were related to a concern for exemplification (i.e., the desire to appear ethical, moral, and/or principled). Participants responded to three items measuring concern for exemplification strategies on Facebook. The three items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree very strongly, 7 = very strongly agree) to indicate how strongly they agree that their most recent posts on Facebook were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I wanted others to see me as ethical, moral, and principled” (see Appendix C for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create a measure of exemplification on Facebook. On average, participants’ scores on the measure were moderate ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.76$), and the measure demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .86$).
Supplication on Facebook. Supplication is the final self-presentation strategy from Jones and Pittman’s (1982) taxonomy that has been noted as salient to SNS use (Chu & Choi, 2010; Jung, Youn, & McClung, 2007). This scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants’ most recent posts on Facebook were related to a concern for supplication (i.e., making others feel obligated to help, nurture, or assist the individual in some way). Participants responded to three items measuring concern for supplication strategies on Facebook. The three items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree very strongly, 7 = very strongly agree) to indicate how strongly they agree that their most recent posts on Facebook were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I wanted people to feel obligated to help, nurture, or assist me” (see Appendix C for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create a measure of supplication on Facebook. On average, participants scored low on the supplication measure (M = 1.75, SD = 1.08), and the measure demonstrated reliability (α = .89).

Overall concern for impression management on Facebook. This measure was used to assess participants’ overall degree of concern for impression management on Facebook. All 14 of the items that were included in the measures of public self-awareness, ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification, and supplication were averaged to create the measure of overall concern for impression management on Facebook. On average, participants’ scores on the measure were moderate (M = 2.90, SD = 1.18), and the measure demonstrated reliability (α = .90).

Self-presentation concerns on Twitter. This scale was used to measure participants’ degree of concern for impression management on Twitter. This scale mirrors the scale used to measure self-presentation concerns on Facebook. Participants answered
questions about the degree to which they engaged in particular self-presentation strategies as well as their degree of public self-awareness, which has been used as a measure of concern for self-presentation in comparable studies (Bazarova et al., 2013), in their most recent posts on Twitter. As previously discussed, these items were adapted from scales from two previous studies (Bolino & Turnley, 1999; Prentice-Dunn & Rogers, 1982). Overall, this scale included 14 items: two items measuring public self-awareness, and three items measuring each of the four specific self-presentation strategies—ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification, and supplication.

**Public self-awareness on Twitter.** Prentice-Dunn and Roger’s (1982) scale of public self-awareness was adapted by Bazarova et al. (2013) to measure degree of concern for self-presentation on Facebook. The items were adapted to measure concern for self-presentation on Twitter. Participants responded to two items measuring overall self-presentation concern on Twitter. Participants used seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree very strongly, 7 = very strongly agree) to indicate how strongly they agreed that their most recent posts on Twitter were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I was concerned about the way I presented myself” (see Appendix D for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create the Twitter public self-awareness measure. On average, participants’ scores on the measure were moderate ($M = 2.99, SD = 1.67$), and the measure demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .78$).

**Ingratiation on Twitter.** This scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants’ most recent posts on Twitter were related to a concern for ingratiation (i.e., appearing likeable and friendly). Participants were asked to respond to three items measuring concern for ingratiation on Twitter. The three items asked participants to use
seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree very strongly, 7 = very strongly agree) to indicate how strongly they agreed that their most recent posts on Twitter were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I wanted others to see me as likeable, friendly, and socially desirable” (see Appendix D for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create a measure of ingratiation on Twitter. On average, participants’ scores on this measure were moderate (M = 2.86, SD = 1.55), and the measure exhibited marginal reliability (α = .63).

**Self-promotion on Twitter.** This scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants’ most recent posts on Twitter were related to a concern for self-promotion (i.e., highlighting one’s talents and accomplishments in order to be seen as competent). Participants were asked to respond to three items measuring concern for self-promotion strategies on Twitter. The three items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree very strongly, 7 = very strongly agree) to indicate how strongly they agreed that their most recent posts on Twitter were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I wanted others to see me as competent, skilled, and intelligent” (see Appendix D for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create a self-promotion on Twitter measure. On average, participants’ scores on this measure were moderate (M = 3.07, SD = 1.66), and the measure demonstrated satisfactory reliability (α = .93).

**Exemplification on Twitter.** This scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants’ most recent posts on Twitter were related to a concern for exemplification (i.e., the desire to appear ethical, moral, and/or principled). Participants responded to three items measuring concern for exemplification strategies on Twitter.
The three items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree very strongly, 7 = very strongly agree) to indicate how strongly they agree that their most recent posts on Twitter were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I wanted others to see me as ethical, moral, and principled” (see Appendix D for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create a measure of exemplification on Twitter. On average, participants’ scores on the measure were moderate (\(M = 3.04, SD = 1.41\)), and the measure demonstrated reliability (\(\alpha = .80\)).

**Supplication on Twitter.** This scale was intended to measure the extent to which participants’ most recent posts on Twitter were related to a concern for supplication (i.e., making others feel obligated to help, nurture, or assist the individual in some way). Participants responded to three items measuring concern for supplication strategies on Twitter. The three items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree very strongly, 7 = very strongly agree) to indicate how strongly they agree that their most recent posts on Twitter were related to statements such as, “When I posted, I wanted people to feel obligated to help, nurture, or assist me” (see Appendix D for full list of items and item wording). Items were averaged to create a measure of supplication on Twitter. On average, participants scored low on the supplication measure (\(M = 1.92, SD = 1.22\)), and the measure demonstrated reliability (\(\alpha = .90\)).

**Overall concern for impression management on Twitter.** This measure was used to assess participants’ overall degree of concern for impression management on Twitter. All 14 of the items that were included in the measures of public self-awareness, ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification, and supplication were averaged to create the measure of overall concern for impression management on Twitter. On average,
participants’ scores on the measure were moderate ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.12$), and the measure demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .89$).

**Facebook audience familiarity.** Participants responded to items assessing their familiarity with both their global audience on Facebook (i.e., considering all of their Facebook friends, how well individuals know their overall audience) as well as the targeted audience of their most recent Facebook post (i.e., how well individuals know specific individuals or groups of individuals with whom they interact on Facebook). Responses to these items were averaged to create an overall audience familiarity measure.

**Global audience familiarity on Facebook.** This measure was intended to assess how well participants know their Facebook friends. This scale was used to measure audience familiarity in a comparable study of self-presentation strategies on Facebook (Bazarova et al., 2013). Participants responded to two items regarding their familiarity with their global audience on Facebook. These items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = *I do not know them*, 7 = *I know them extremely well*) to indicate their familiarity with their global Facebook audience. Example items included, “Considering all of your Facebook friends, in general, how well do you know them?” (see Appendix E for full list of items and item wording). The two items were averaged to create a measure of global audience familiarity on Facebook. On average, participants scored moderately high ($M = 4.63$, $SD = .91$), and the measure demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .74$).

**Target audience familiarity on Facebook.** This measure was intended to assess how well participants know the Facebook friends with whom they have interacted most
recently on the platform. This scale mirrors the measure of global audience familiarity; however, items were adapted to inquire about participants’ intended recipients of their most recent posts on Facebook. Participants responded to two items regarding their familiarity with the intended recipient(s) of their most recent Facebook posts. The items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = I do not know them, 7 = I know them extremely well) to respond to questions such as, “How well do you know the receiver of the message?” (see Appendix E for full list of items and item wording). The two items were averaged to create a measure of target audience familiarity on Facebook. On average, participants scored high ($M = 5.90$, $SD = 1.56$), and the measure demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .96$).

**Overall Facebook audience familiarity.** This measure was used to assess participants’ overall degree of familiarity with their audience on Facebook. All four of the items that were included in the measures of global audience familiarity and target audience familiarity on Facebook were averaged to create the measure of overall Facebook audience familiarity. On average, participants scored moderately high ($M = 5.17$, $SD = 1.06$), and the measure demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .78$).

**Twitter audience familiarity.** Participants responded to items assessing their familiarity with both their global audience on Twitter (i.e., considering all of the Twitter users they follow and the Twitter users who are following them, how well individuals know their overall audience on Twitter) as well as the targeted audience of their most recent Twitter activity (i.e., how well individuals know specific individuals or groups of individuals with whom they interact on Twitter). Responses to these items were averaged to create an overall Twitter audience familiarity measure.
Global audience familiarity on Twitter. This measure was intended to assess how well participants know their Twitter followers and following. This scale mirrors the measure of global audience familiarity on Facebook; the items were adapted to be relevant to Twitter use. Participants responded to two items regarding their familiarity with their global audience on Twitter. These items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = I do not know them, 7 = I know them extremely well) to indicate their familiarity with their global Twitter audience. Example items included, “Considering all of the people who follow you and who you follow on Twitter, how well do you know them?” (see Appendix F for full list of items and item wording). The two items were averaged to create a measure of global audience familiarity on Twitter. On average, participants’ scores were moderate (M = 4.31, SD = 1.16), and the measure demonstrated reliability (α = .90).

Target audience familiarity on Twitter. This measure was intended to assess how well participants know the other Twitter user(s) with whom they have interacted most recently on the platform. This scale mirrors the measure of global audience familiarity; however, items were adapted to inquire about participants’ intended recipients of their most recent posts on Twitter. Participants responded to two items regarding their familiarity with the intended recipient(s) of their most recent Twitter posts. The items asked participants to use seven-point Likert-type scales (1 = I do not know them, 7 = I know them extremely well) to respond to questions such as, “How well do you know the receiver of the message?” (see Appendix F for full list of items and item wording). The two items were averaged to create a measure of target audience familiarity on Twitter. On
average, participants scored high \((M = 5.81, SD = 1.77)\), and the measure demonstrated reliability \((\alpha = .96)\).

**Overall Twitter audience familiarity.** This measure was used to assess participants’ overall degree of familiarity with their audience on Twitter. All four of the items that were included in the measures of global audience familiarity and target audience familiarity on Twitter were averaged to create the measure of overall Twitter audience familiarity. On average, participants scored high \((M = 5.81, SD = 1.77)\), and the measure demonstrated reliability \((\alpha = .79)\).
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Descriptive Analyses

As a preliminary step, I conducted exploratory analyses of the sample itself, to better understand the SNS usage of the participants in this study. First, I compared the frequencies of users within each age group (middle adolescents, late adolescents, and young adults) who reported using various SNSs: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, MySpace, YouTube, Pinterest, Tumblr, and Google+. Two of the most popular SNSs participants reported using were Facebook (n = 194, 96.0%) and Twitter (n = 133, 65.8%), in comparison to other options. The second most popular site was YouTube (n = 157, 77.7%), followed by Instagram (n = 110, 54.5%), Pinterest (n = 96, 47.5%), Google+ (n = 44, 20.8%), Tumblr (n = 41, 20.3%), and MySpace (n = 14, 6.9%). Every participant in the young adult group reported using Facebook, which represents the age group with the highest percentage of Facebook users. The late adolescent group represents the age group with the highest percentage of Twitter users. See Table I for more information.

Next, I ran bivariate correlations of all the variables in the model to determine which, if any, variables were related. In the interest of space, I will report only selected significant findings. Additional results of the bivariate correlations are reported in Tables II and III; however, the number of variables in this study limits the ability to report all significant correlations. A number of demographic variables were associated with key variables in the model. First, the correlation matrix indicated significant associations between age and other variables in the model. Age was significantly correlated with the amount of time spent on both SNSs: Age was negatively associated with time spent on Twitter (r = -.28, p < .005), but positively associated with time spent on Facebook (r
Table I

Demographic Characteristics and SNS Use as a Percentage of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle adolescents (n = 56)</th>
<th>Late adolescents (n = 90)</th>
<th>Young adults (n = 56)</th>
<th>All (N = 202)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>33.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.10</td>
<td>64.40</td>
<td>73.20</td>
<td>64.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>66.10</td>
<td>75.60</td>
<td>83.90</td>
<td>75.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facebook</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>97.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twitter</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>69.60</td>
<td>82.20</td>
<td>78.60</td>
<td>77.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>57.10</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>60.70</td>
<td>54.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinterest</td>
<td>33.90</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>64.30</td>
<td>47.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumblr</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google+</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myspace</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II

Summary of Correlations for Selected Variables Associated with Facebook Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>V3</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>V5</th>
<th>V6</th>
<th>V7</th>
<th>V8</th>
<th>V9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1: age</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2: content</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3: social</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4: process</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5: tech.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6: global AF</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7: target AF</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8: CIM</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9: intensity</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. AF = audience familiarity, CIM = concern for impression management
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
Table III

Summary of Correlations for Selected Variables Associated with Twitter Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>V3</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>V5</th>
<th>V6</th>
<th>V7</th>
<th>V8</th>
<th>V9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1: age</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2: content</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3: social</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4: process</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5: tech.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6: global AF</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7: target AF</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8: CIM</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9: intensity</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AF = audience familiarity, CIM = concern for impression management
* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
=.28 \ p < .001). Age was also positively associated with number of Facebook friends \( (r = .35, p < .001) \) and global familiarity with one’s Twitter audience \( (r = .19, p < .05) \).

These results suggest that older participants spend less time on Twitter than their younger counterparts, but report a sense that they know their audience better. Additionally, older participants spend more time on Facebook than their younger counterparts and have amassed more friends. Based on these results, age was retained as a possible covariate for future analyses involving intensity of Twitter use, intensity of Facebook use, and Twitter audience familiarity.

Another demographic variable of interest is participant sex. Using independent-samples \( t \)-tests, I compared the sample means of female participants to the sample means of male participants on all variables in the model. Results of these analyses indicated some significant differences in the ways male and female participants use Facebook. On average, female Facebook users spend more time on Facebook \( (M = 3.95, SD = 1.41) \) than male users \( (M = 3.39, SD = 1.30) \). This difference was significant \( t(188) = 2.70, p < .01 \). Also, female participants expressed less familiarity with their global audience on Facebook \( (M = 4.56, SD = .78) \) than male participants \( (M = 4.83, SD = 1.00) \). This difference was nearing significance \( t(188) = -1.93, p < .06 \). Female participants also expressed greater motivation to use Facebook for content gratifications \( (M = 3.41, SD = 1.20) \), social gratifications \( (M = 4.41, SD = 1.14) \), and process gratifications \( (M = 3.90, SD = 1.12) \) than did male participants \( (M = 3.02, SD = 1.22; M = 3.97, SD = 1.34; M = 3.52, SD = 1.29) \). These differences were all significant: content gratifications—\( t(188) = 2.14, p < .05 \), social gratifications—\( t(188) = 2.39, p < .05 \), process gratifications—\( t(188) = 2.11, p < .05 \). Again, these results reinforce the decision to retain participant sex as a
possible covariate in subsequent analyses involving intensity of Facebook use, Facebook audience familiarity, and motives for Facebook use.

Results of the independent-samples $t$-tests also indicated that there were significant differences in the ways male and female participants use Twitter. On average, female Twitter users follow more individuals on Twitter ($M = 5.55, SD = 2.33$) than male users follow ($M = 4.53, SD = 2.44$). This difference was significant $t(118) = 2.17, p < .05$. Female users also tweet more frequently ($M = 3.51, SD = 1.20$) than male users ($M = 2.92, SD = 1.36$). This difference was significant $t(119) = 2.37, p < .05$. Female participants also expressed greater motivation to use Twitter for content gratifications ($M = 3.15, SD = 1.42$), process gratifications ($M = 4.54, SD = 1.24$), and technology gratifications ($M = 4.21, SD = 1.74$) than did male participants ($M = 2.13, SD = 1.26; M = 3.96, SD = 1.26; M = 3.20, SD = 1.73$). These differences were all significant: content gratifications—$t(117) = 3.63, p < .001$, process gratifications—$t(118) = 2.35, p < .05$, technology gratifications—$t(118) = 2.90, p < .005$. These results indicate that participant sex should be retained as a possible covariate in subsequent analyses involving intensity of Twitter use and motives for Twitter use.

In addition to participant age and sex, the intensity of use variables were significantly associated with other variables in the model. Intensity of Facebook use was positively associated with all of the motives for using Facebook—content gratifications ($r = .34, p < .001$), social gratifications ($r = .26, p < .001$), process gratifications ($r = .30, p < .001$), and technology gratifications ($r = .19, p < .01$). Intensity of Facebook use was also negatively associated with global audience familiarity on Facebook ($r = -.17, p$
< .05). These results suggest that intensity of Facebook use should be retained as a possible covariate for subsequent analyses.

Much like the intensity of Facebook use variable, the intensity of Twitter use variable was significantly associated with all of the motives for using Twitter—content gratifications \( (r = .42, p < .001) \), social gratifications \( (r = .49, p < .001) \), process gratifications \( (r = .62, p < .001) \), and technology gratifications \( (r = .54, p < .001) \). Table III provides more information regarding the significant correlations of intensity of Twitter use and other key variables in the model. Results suggest that this variable should be retained in subsequent analyses as a possible covariate.

**Hypothesis Testing**

The first research question queried the potential differences between motives for Facebook use and motives for Twitter use. More specifically, I also hypothesized that users would be more greatly motivated to use Twitter when seeking content gratifications as compared to Facebook (H1a), and users would be more greatly motivated to use Facebook when seeking social gratifications as compared to Twitter (H1b). In order to compare the means of each of the four motives for Facebook and Twitter use within the group of subjects who use both SNSs, I selected only those cases who reported using both sites in order to compare means within-subjects using a repeated-measures analysis of covariance (RM-ANCOVA). Additionally, because the results of the bivariate correlations suggested that age, sex, intensity of Facebook use, and intensity of Twitter use are significantly correlated with some of the motives for using the two SNSs (see Tables II and III), these variables were included as possible covariates in the RM-ANCOVA to test the potential differences between the motives for use on the two SNSs.
Results of the RM-ANCOVA indicated that there was a significant difference between motives for Facebook and Twitter use. In order to test sphericity, I first checked Mauchly’s test. The test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, $\chi^2(27) = 178.86, p = .000$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .67$).

Table IV summarizes the results of the RM-ANCOVA. Overall, there was a significant effect of the motives for using Facebook and Twitter, Wilks’ Lambda = .76, $F(7, 100) = 4.65, p < .001$, suggesting that the motives for using the two SNSs are significantly different. Additionally, there was no significant overall effect of the levels of motivation for using the two sites, suggesting that participants’ level of motivation to use Facebook ($M = 3.61, SD = 1.12$) is not significantly different from their level of motivation to use Twitter ($M = 3.59, SD = 1.19$). In other words, the type of SNS does not impact the level of motivation to use either of the sites. Taken together, these results suggest that participants are motivated to use the two sites to relatively the same degree while their motives to use the sites for specific reasons vary significantly.

### Table IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motives</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives x age</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives x sex</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives x FB intensity</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives x Twitter intensity</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover, results indicate significant main effects for two of the four variables entered as possible covariates on the motives for using Facebook and Twitter: age and intensity of Twitter use. The main effects of age and intensity of Twitter use were significant, $F(4.67, 494.98) = 2.87, p < .05$, $F(4.67, 494.98) = 36.19, p < .001$, respectively. These results suggest that age and intensity of Twitter use contribute to a significant portion of the variance in motives for using the two SNSs; therefore, estimated means will be reported based on adjustments made for these covariates. The main effects of sex and intensity of Facebook use were not significant, $F(4.67, 494.98) = 2.10, p = .07$, $F(4.67, 494.98) = 1.09, p = .36$, suggesting that sex and intensity of Facebook use do not contribute to a significant portion of the variance in motives for using the two SNSs.

In order to more fully investigate the significant differences between motives for Facebook and Twitter use, after controlling for age and intensity of Twitter use, appropriate follow-up contrasts were examined. Pairwise comparisons producing significant results are reported in Table V. The results of the pairwise comparisons indicate that participants were significantly more motivated to use Facebook for content gratifications ($M = 3.41, SD = 1.24$) and social gratifications ($M = 4.39, SD = 1.25$) than Twitter ($M = 2.87, SD = 1.47; M = 3.24, SD = 1.22$). Participants were significantly less motivated to use Facebook for technology gratifications ($M = 2.79, SD = 1.63$) than Twitter ($M = 3.91, SD = 1.84$).

Overall, the results of the RM-ANCOVA on motives for using Facebook and Twitter provide support for H1b: After controlling for age and intensity of Twitter use, users report greater motivation to use Facebook to meet social gratifications than Twitter. Additionally, the results of the RM-ANCOVA on motives for using Facebook and
### Table V

**Mean Differences between Motives for Using Facebook and Twitter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>3.41$^a$</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4.39$^b$</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2.79$^c$</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Corresponding superscript letters indicate significant differences: $^b,c$ $p < .001$, $^a$ $p < .01$. 

Twitter render H1a unsupported—after controlling for age and intensity of Twitter use, users are not more greatly motivated to use Twitter to fulfill content gratifications than Facebook. Additionally, the results of the RM-ANCOVA provide some indication of the differences between motives for using Facebook and Twitter (RQ1). The results suggest that participants were more greatly motivated to use Facebook to fulfill content and social gratifications than Twitter, and participants were more greatly motivated to use Twitter to fulfill technology gratifications than Facebook—even after controlling for age and intensity of Twitter use.

Next, RQ2 proposed an investigation of the differences between degrees of concern for specific self-presentation strategies on Facebook and Twitter. More specifically, I also hypothesized that Facebook users would be more concerned with the self-presentation strategy of ingratiation than Twitter users and that Twitter users would be more concerned with the self-presentation strategy of self-promotion than Facebook users. First, it is important to note that descriptive statistics indicated that participants who use Facebook are most concerned with the specific self-presentation strategies of self-promotion \((M = 3.55, SD = 1.80)\) and exemplification \((M = 3.23, SD = 1.70)\). In terms of Twitter use and concern for specific self-presentation strategies, descriptive statistics indicated that participants who use Twitter are most concerned with the specific self-presentation strategies of self-promotion \((M = 3.08, SD = 1.69)\) and exemplification \((M = 3.04, SD = 1.42)\), as well.

Next, in order to explore the differences between degrees of concern for each self-presentation strategy on Facebook compared to Twitter, I selected only those participants who reported using both sites in order to conduct within-subjects comparisons using a
RM-ANCOVA. Additionally, it is important to recall that the results of the bivariate correlations suggested that age, intensity of Facebook use, and intensity of Twitter use were significantly associated with some of the self-presentation strategies. Therefore, these variables were included as possible covariates in a RM-ANCOVA to investigate the potential differences between concerns for self-presentation strategies on the two sites.

The RM-ANCOVA indicated that there was a significant difference between the self-presentation strategies used on Facebook and Twitter. In order to test the assumption of sphericity, I first checked Mauchly’s test. The test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, $\chi^2(44) = 234.96, p = .000$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .68$).

**Table VI**

Repeated-Measures Analysis of Covariance of Self-Presentation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-presentation</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-pres x age</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-pres x FIU</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-pres x TIU</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* FIU = Facebook intensity of use, TIU = Twitter intensity of use

Table VI summarizes the results of the RM-ANCOVA. There was a significant overall effect of the self-presentation strategies used on Facebook and Twitter, Wilks’ Lambda = .79, $F(9, 98) = 2.89, p < .01$. In order to further examine the significant differences between specific self-presentation strategies used on the two SNSs, follow-up contrasts were investigated. Two within-subjects contrasts produced significant results. The comparison between ingratiation on Facebook ($M = 2.85, SD = 1.23$) and
supplication on Twitter ($M = 1.87, SD = 1.23$) was significant, $F(1, 106) = 7.30, p < .01$. Additionally, the contrast between self-promotion on Twitter ($M = 3.08, SD = 1.63$) and supplication on Twitter ($M = 1.87, SD = 1.70$) was significant, $F(1, 106) = 5.46, p < .05$. Contrary to the results suggested by the bivariate correlations, results indicate that none of the three suspected main effects were significant. In other words, age, $F(6.11, 647.85) = 1.52, p = .17$, intensity of Facebook use, $F(6.11, 647.85) = 1.08, p = .38$, and intensity of Twitter use $F(6.11, 647.85) = .43, p = .86$, did not account for a significant portion of the variance in self-presentation strategies used on the two SNSs.

In order to more fully investigate the significant differences between self-presentation strategies on Facebook and Twitter, appropriate follow-up comparisons also were examined. Pairwise comparisons producing significant results are reported in Table VII. Of note, no significant difference was detected between participants’ concerns for ingratiation on Facebook ($M = 2.85, SD = 1.64$) and ingratiation on Twitter ($M = 2.81, SD = 1.57$), which does not support my predictions (H2a). Additionally, no significant difference was found between participants’ concerns for self-promotion on Facebook ($M = 3.52, SD = 1.80$) and self-promotion on Twitter ($M = 3.08, SD = 1.69$), which does not support my predictions (H2b). The only self-presentation strategy that was significantly different between the two sites was supplication; results indicate that participants were significantly less concerned with supplication on Facebook ($M = 1.83, SD = 1.18$) than on Twitter ($M = 1.87, SD = 1.21$). Overall, the results of the RM-ANCOVA investigating RQ2, H2a, and H2b suggest that the concerns for specific self-presentation strategies are significantly different; however, these differences were not between the concerns for
### Table VII

*Mean Differences between Self-Presentation Strategies on Facebook and Twitter*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplication</td>
<td>1.83&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.87&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* PSA = public self-awareness. Corresponding superscript letters indicate significant differences: <sup>a</sup> p < .001.
ingratiation on the two SNSs nor between the concerns for self-promotion on the two SNSs.

The last two hypotheses addressed suspected differences in degrees of audience familiarity on the two sites and, subsequently, differences in degrees of concern for impression management on the two sites. First, H3 predicted that the audience on Facebook would be more familiar than the audience on Twitter. Because participants indicated their degree of familiarity with their global audience on each site as well as I used a RM-ANCOVA to explore the potential differences between degrees of audience familiarity on the two sites while controlling for potential covariates. As previously discussed (see Tables II and III), sex, intensity of Facebook use, and intensity of Twitter use were associated with audience familiarity outcomes; therefore, these variables were included as possible covariates in a RM-ANCOVA. Age was not significantly correlated with the dependent variable in this model; therefore, it was not included as a possible covariate.

The results of the RM-ANCOVA suggested that there was a significant difference in participants’ degree of familiarity with their global audiences on Facebook and Twitter, but no significant difference in participants’ degree of familiarity with their target audiences on Facebook and Twitter. Because there were only two factors in the model, there is no need to test the assumption of sphericity using Mauchly’s test.

Table VIII summarizes the results of the RM-ANCOVA for both global audience familiarity and target audience familiarity on Facebook and Twitter. Results suggest no significant overall effect of target audience familiarity on Facebook and Twitter, Wilks’ Lambda = .91, \( F(1, 98) = .01, p = .91 \). There was, however, a significant overall effect of
Table VIII

Repeated-Measures Analysis of Covariance of Audience Familiarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Global Audience Familiarity</th>
<th>Target Audience Familiarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity x sex</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity x FIU</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity x TIU</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* FIU = Facebook intensity of use, TIU = Twitter intensity of use
global audience familiarity on Facebook and Twitter, Wilks’ Lambda = .91, \( F(1, 109) = 10.29, p < .01 \). These results suggest that although participants did not perceive a significant difference in the familiarity of the target audiences of their most recent posts on the two sites, they did perceive that their global audiences on Facebook were significantly more familiar than their global audiences on Twitter.

Moreover, results suggest that the main effect of intensity of Facebook use was significant, \( F(1, 109) = 6.22, p < .05 \), suggesting that intensity of Facebook use contributes to a significant portion of the variance in differences in global audience familiarity on Facebook and Twitter. Results suggest that the main effects of sex \( F(1, 109) = .43, p = .51 \), and intensity of Twitter use \( F(1, 109) = .001, p = .98 \), did not account for a significant portion of the variance in global audience familiarity on the two SNSs. In summary, the results of the RM-ANCOVA provide support for H3: participants perceive their global audience on Facebook to be significantly more familiar than their global audience on Twitter. Thus, these results provide support for H3.

In order to more fully investigate the significant differences between degrees of audience familiarity on Facebook and Twitter, appropriate follow-up comparisons also were examined. Pairwise comparisons producing significant results are reported in Table IX. Of note, the pairwise comparisons indicated that participants’ familiarity with their global audience on Facebook (\( M = 4.71, SD = .87 \)) is significantly different from their global audience on Twitter (\( M = 4.34, SD = 1.15 \)), suggesting that participants’ global audience on Facebook is more familiar than the global audience on Twitter. Overall, the results of the RM-ANCOVA investigating H3 suggest that the global audiences on
Table IX

*Mean Differences between Reports of Audience Familiarity on Facebook and Twitter*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>4.71(^a)</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.34(^a)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Corresponding superscript letters indicate significant differences: \(^a\) \(p < .05\).
Facebook and Twitter are significantly different such that participants reported knowing their audience on Facebook better than on Twitter. Thus, these results support the hypothesized relationship in H3.

Finally, H4 asserted that based on the audience familiarity prediction supported in H3, individuals would engage in a greater degree of impression management on Twitter than on Facebook. In order to compare the means of overall degrees of concern for impression management between Facebook and Twitter users within the group of subjects who use both SNSs, I selected only those cases who reported using both sites in order to perform within-subjects comparisons. A RM-ANCOVA was used to investigate the potential differences in concern for impression management on the two sites. As noted in Tables II and III, the motives for using Facebook and Twitter and familiarity of target audience on Twitter are significantly correlated with overall concern for impression management on Facebook and Twitter. Therefore, these variables were entered in a RM-ANCOVA as possible covariates.

The results of the RM-ANCOVA suggested that there is no significant difference in participants’ concern for impression management on Facebook and Twitter. Because there are only two factors in the model, there is no need to test the assumption of sphericity using Mauchly’s test; sphericity is assumed. Results suggest no significant overall effect of concern for impression management on Facebook and Twitter, Wilks’ Lambda = .98, $F(1, 101) = 1.95, p = .17$. Moreover, results indicate that the potential main effects of the motives for use and target familiarity were not significant; results suggest that these variables did not account for a significant portion of the variance in concerns for impression management on the two SNSs.
Although the overall effect of concern for impression management on Facebook and Twitter was non-significant, the pairwise comparisons based on estimated marginal means suggest that concern for impression management on Facebook ($M = 2.98, SD = 1.20$) is significantly different from concern for impression management on Twitter ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.14$). These results suggest that individuals who use both SNSs are more concerned with impression management on Facebook than on Twitter, which is diametrically opposed to the proposed relationship between the two variables (H4).
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The goal of this study was to develop a better understanding of adolescent and young adult use of two SNSs—Facebook and Twitter—and the relationship among different motives for use, different audiences, and concerns for impression management and specific self-presentation strategies. As such, participants were asked to respond to questions regarding their motives for using each SNS, concerns for self-presentation in their most recent posts on these SNSs, and familiarity with their audiences—both global and targeted audiences of their most recent posts. Self-reported data from these participants were used to draw conclusions about how these variables may be related to one another. Results suggest that there are significant differences in individuals’ motives, self-presentation strategies, concerns for impression management, and familiarity with audiences on the two SNSs.

First, I explored how the motives for using Facebook and Twitter differ, hypothesizing that users would be more greatly motivated to use Twitter to fulfill content gratifications and more greatly motivated to use Facebook to fulfill social gratifications. Results suggest that individuals in this sample are more likely to use Facebook to fulfill social and content gratifications than they are to use Twitter to fulfill the same gratifications. Additionally, the participants in this sample are more likely to use Twitter to fulfill technology gratifications than they are to use Facebook to fulfill the same gratifications. These results provide partial support for my hypotheses regarding motives for use specific to each SNS and provide some clarity in addressing how the motives for using the two SNSs may differ.
With regards to self-presentation strategies, I investigated how these strategies might differ on Facebook and Twitter, proposing that Facebook use would be associated with concerns for ingratiation strategies and Twitter use would be associated with concerns for self-promotion strategies. Neither of these hypotheses was supported; however, results suggested that participants expressed a greater degree of concern for public self-awareness and a greater degree of overall concern for impression management on Facebook than on Twitter. Furthermore, after controlling for covariates, the specific self-presentation strategy of supplication was the only specific strategy about which participants indicated significantly different degrees of concern on Facebook and Twitter: Participants were significantly more concerned with supplication on Twitter than on Facebook. In comparing all of the other specific self-presentation strategies, significant differences between the degrees of concern for these strategies on the two different SNSs were not found.

Finally, I hypothesized that the audience on Facebook would be more familiar than the audience on Twitter; furthermore, this increased degree of audience familiarity on Facebook would be associated with users’ decreased concern for self-presentation on Facebook as compared to Twitter. Indeed, participants expressed that their global audience on Facebook was significantly more familiar than their audience on Twitter. Surprisingly, though, the final hypothesis regarding degree of concern for impression management based on audience familiarity was not supported. As mentioned, there is evidence to suggest that participants reported a greater degree concern for impression management on Facebook than on Twitter, which is contrary to my hypothesis.
The unsupported hypothesis associated with concern for self-presentation based on audience familiarity warrants further discussion. The reported results are contradictory not only to my predictions but to Leary et al.’s (1994) proposition that self-presentation concerns are negatively related to target familiarity in an interaction. Although participants reported greater familiarity with their audience on Facebook, they also reported greater concern for self-presentation on Facebook. Lack of support for this hypothesis warranted more investigation. I provide the following possible explanations for this particular finding.

As predicted, participants’ audiences on Facebook were more familiar than their audiences on Twitter. According to Baumeister and Jones (1978), the audience’s prior knowledge about an individual contributes to the individual’s self-presentation concerns: Individuals will try to present an image that is credible and consistent (emphasis added) with the audience’s expectations. Consistency, a norm of self-presentation, dictates that people should exhibit a reasonable degree of consistency in their behavior across different situations (Goffman, 1959; Leary, 1995). In the case of Facebook, maintaining consistency from the offline to the online context becomes a concern because the audience is not only more familiar, but the audience is also typically comprised of individuals whom the user has met offline first (Ellison et al., 2007; Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2006). Therefore, a user’s audience on Facebook has some expectation of the way the user typically presents him or herself and, thus, expects consistency. Twitter audiences, on the other hand, can often include individuals that the user has never met before, and therefore has no conception of the user’s typical behavior. Because Facebook users are likely to know their audiences more intimately and in offline contexts, they are
likely more motivated to present an image consistent with their audience’s existing perception. Twitter, however, may allow for an audience that is so unfamiliar that the user does not assume that the audience has any preconceived notion of the user’s personal identity or behavior. Therefore, Twitter users may exhibit less concern for self-presentation because there is no consistent image or personal identity to uphold with their audience. This potential explanation underscores the significance of SNSs to individuals’ personal identity.

The potential differences in motivation to present a consistent image of oneself on Facebook and Twitter is further complicated by the make-up of the audiences on these two SNSs: Audiences on SNSs are made up of various, distinct social groups to which users present themselves, which may compound the issue of presenting consistent and appropriate images to one’s audience, particularly on Facebook. DiMicco and Millen (2007) attest that SNSs now allow users to maintain many social networks and diverse social relationships, which can be both beneficial and detrimental to one’s relationships: The ability to maintain a multitude of heterogeneous social connections through a singular platform may serve various social functions. On the other hand, the members comprising each of these social networks may have a slightly distinct conception of the user’s personal identity based on the way that individual typically chooses to present him or herself to each network (e.g., the image one portrays to his or her youth group leader is likely different from the image that same individual presents to his or her closest friends). Again, because the audiences on Facebook are more familiar than those on Twitter, the degree of impression management required to present and maintain consistent images to these various audiences is likely more intense on Facebook than on Twitter.
To further explicate the phenomenon associated with presenting oneself consistently to disparate, unique audiences on SNSs, Marwick and boyd (2011) coined the term *context collapse*: SNSs collapse multiple contexts into one and bring together typically disparate and distinct audiences. Context collapse complicates the need to vary one’s self-presentation among these typically distinct audiences (Marwick & boyd, 2011); on SNSs, users must attempt to present a singular personal identity that is consistent and appropriate to the many images that each distinct group expects of that individual. Again, Facebook poses more of a concern in maintaining the image that others have of us. The phenomenon of context collapse is certainly present on Twitter. As Marwick and boyd (2011) contend, “The potential diversity of readership on Twitter ruptures the ability to vary self-presentation based on audience, and thus manage discrete impressions” (p. 116). However, this issue likely presents less of a concern for Twitter users because of the previously noted audience characteristics: The audience on Twitter can include complete strangers who are not offline acquaintances of the Twitter use and who have no expectations regarding the image the individual typically presents.

**Theoretical Implications**

In continuing to explore the distinctions between the ways individuals use SNSs like Facebook and Twitter, various theoretical implications should be noted. First, this study responds to the need to explore an SNS other than Facebook and provides some clarity in potential differences between Facebook and Twitter. Although the present study does not answer all of the questions regarding motives for use on the two sites, audience perceptions on Facebook and Twitter, and their impact on self-presentation concerns, the present study does reveal a bit of the mystery behind a rather under-studied area: The
personal uses of Twitter. Research on the personal uses of Twitter is still in its infancy, and the present study may provide some direction for further exploration of individuals’ motives, goals, and self-presentation strategies on this particular SNS. Results indicate that the Twitter users in this sample are attracted to this particular social networking platform more so than Facebook because it fulfills process and technology gratifications—participants report using this medium because it provides entertainment and enjoyment, allows users to show their personalities, and is a place where they can say what they want to say immediately. Overall, there was little difference in the self-presentation strategies that users enacted on Facebook and Twitter. Although generalizable results regarding the differences between Facebook and Twitter from the present study are limited, they provide a starting point from which to conduct future research.

An additional theoretical contribution of the present study is its extension of Jones and Pittman’s (1982) taxonomy of self-presentation strategies to the context of online environments. Results of the present study indicate that participants were most concerned with the self-presentation strategies of self-promotion and exemplification on both Facebook and Twitter, which is contrary to studies indicating that ingratiation is the self-presentation strategy that American youth most often use online and on SNSs, specifically (Chu & Choi, 2010; Dominick, 1998). Participants reported significantly greater concern for the specific strategy of supplication on Twitter than on Facebook. The evolution of the self-presentation strategies that are most used on SNSs may serve as an additional indicator of the evolution of the uses of SNSs and reinforces the necessity for
more precise conceptualization and operationalization of the motives for using the two sites.

Finally, the present study provides an exploratory, theoretical basis from which to begin developing better scales for measuring the gratifications sought through Facebook and Twitter use, particularly the items measuring social gratifications. The present study reveals a necessity for better conceptualization and operationalization of the social motives for using Facebook and Twitter. The scale used in this study to measure the fulfillment of social gratifications on Facebook and Twitter was not reliable (α = .64, .60, respectively); the lack of a reliable measure merited further investigation, and I offer the following possible explanation:

First, I considered how other scholars have conceptualized the social motives of SNS use. Indeed, individuals often use SNSs to connect with others and to maintain and increase their social networks (Chen, 2011; Ellison et al., 2007; Joinson, 2008). Alternatively, other scholars suggest that SNS use provides a medium to strategically seek and compete for attention (Stefanone, Lackaff, & Rosen, 2008; Stefanone & Lackaff, 2009), as SNS users are motivated by a desire to be seen as socially desirable and, therefore, be socially accepted (Binder et al., 2009; Tokunaga, 2011). Discriminating between those two motives for use is quite nuanced but also crucial to understanding individuals’ social motives for using the sites. The results of the present study beg the question: Do SNSs fulfill the need to be social or the need to be socially validated by others? Future research should continue to uncover what users consider to be the social gratifications sought and obtained from both Facebook and Twitter use. This information
can be used to create more valid and reliable scales to measures the social motives for using these particular SNSs.

**Practical Implications**

The practical implications of the present study rest heavily within personal identity construction, presentation, and validation concerns. Identity concerns are salient to adolescents and young adults, as adolescence and young adulthood is the time at which individuals begin developing a cohesive identity (Erikson, 1968). Social networking sites provide a platform through which to express one’s identity and facilitate the fulfillment of crucial needs such as personal identity construction and presentation, as well as provide the venue to validate the identities of others (boyd & Ellison, 2007; Donath, 2007; Ellison et al., 2007; Livingstone, 2008). Uncovering nuances of perceived audience characteristics and self-presentation concerns can aid in understanding how individuals, especially adolescents and young adults, meet these crucial personal identity needs. Furthermore, because the development of personal identity is tied to self-worth and self-esteem, the outcomes associated with the ability to construct one’s personal identity and to have that identity validated could be monumental to young people’s overall well-being.

Additionally, the present study provides some practical knowledge of the percentage of adolescents and young adults who use Facebook and Twitter. A large number of the participants in the present study report using these two SNSs, which is contrary to recent reports suggesting that adolescents and young adults are abandoning Facebook for other, more preferred SNSs. In late 2013, for instance, Edwards reported that Twitter was overtaking Facebook as the most popular SNS for teens. Data from the
present study suggest, however, that Facebook is still the most SNS to which adolescents and young adults subscribe the most. The picture of Facebook use painted by my data is supported by national survey data from the Pew Internet & American Life Project: Facebook is still the SNS that teens subscribe to and use the most (Madden, 2013). According to survey data from the Pew Internet & American Life Project, 94% of teen social media users reported having a Facebook profile, and 81% indicate that Facebook is the profile they use the most often (Madden, 2013). Only 26% of teen social media users reported having a Twitter account, and 7% of those Twitter users indicated that it was their main social media profile (Madden, 2013). This most recent focus group data suggests that while teens’ sentiments toward Facebook are changing, they continue to use the platform; their relationship with Facebook is complicated and evolving (Madden, 2013). Information provided by participants in the present study reflect the notion that Facebook is still being used by adolescents and young adults; however, other social networking platforms such as Twitter and Instagram are gaining in popularity and could provide rich contexts for future research.

**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

Before closing, I should acknowledge some of the limitations of the present study. First, there are concerns regarding the sample’s representativeness and generalizability. Because participants were recruited through a snowball sampling method, the results are not generalizable to the larger population. Because of the exploratory nature of the present study, however, the results may provide some direction for future research. Additionally, the sample is fairly evenly distributed across the targeted age range;
however, future research would benefit from a sample that more evenly represented the youngest participants in the targeted sample.

The exploratory nature of this study has provided increased clarity regarding the specifications for measures to better capture the phenomena under investigation. In order to reduce potential participant attrition due to boredom, many of the scales used were adapted to include the fewest and most reliable items necessary to capture the phenomenon at hand. However, this attempt to minimize participant attrition resulted in a few marginally reliable or unreliable measures. For instance, more items could have been retained from the original measure of intensity of Facebook use, as intensity of use could be a key variable to understanding self-presentation behavior on SNSs. Hinkin (1998) indicates that approximately four to six items should be used to adequately measure a construct; thus, additional items should be included in future research to insure construct validity. Additionally, the scales measuring the motives for using Facebook and Twitter included one marginally reliable measure—the social gratifications measure—and one single-item measure that could be expanded in future studies—the technology gratifications measure. Improving the reliability of these key measures will be crucial to future investigation of adolescents’ motives for using these two SNSs. Additionally, because SNSs and the ways individuals use them evolve so rapidly, the items included in all of the motives for use measures should be periodically re-evaluated and carefully scrutinized; the scales used in the present study are only four years old, but, again, should be re-evaluated periodically for relevance to the current uses of SNSs. The face validity of each of the items in these measures should be of utmost concern. Future research
should focus on developing a new, valid, and reliable measure of adolescent motives for Facebook and Twitter use.

Future research could explore the technology gratifications fulfilled by Twitter use, and how these specific motives for using the SNS may be related to a decreased concern for self-presentation on Twitter compared to other SNSs.

**Conclusion**

The results of this exploratory study begin to delineate the distinct uses of Facebook and Twitter in an adolescent and young adult sample. Considering motives for use, concerns for impression management, and audience familiarity, this study begins to identify nuanced distinctions between the ways adolescents and young adults use two of the most popular SNSs—Facebook and Twitter. As surmised, the motives for using the two SNSs are unique; arguably, the distinct motives for using the two sites may be the impetus for other differences in the ways adolescents and young adults use the two SNSs such as their concerns for specific self-presentation strategies and overall impression management on the two sites. The significant differences in degrees of audience familiarity and concern for impression management on the two SNSs underscore the notion that the two sites are used in different ways and provide rich, new avenues to explore how audience characteristics impact self-presentation strategies online.
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### APPENDIX A

*Motives for Facebook Use Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content gratifications:</strong> <em>How often do you use Facebook in each of the following ways?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To keep track of what I am doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To document my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social gratifications:</strong> <em>How often do you use Facebook in each of the following ways?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To connect with people who share some of my values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet new people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain a daily, personal connection with family and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process gratifications:</strong> <em>How often do you use Facebook in each of the following ways?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For enjoyment and/or entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pass the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To show my personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To tell others about myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology gratifications:</strong> <em>How often do you use Facebook in each of the following ways?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a place where I can post things I want to say immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unless otherwise noted, response categories ranged from 1 = *never* to 6 = *very frequently.*
APPENDIX B

Motives for Twitter Use Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content gratifications:</strong> <em>How often do you use Twitter in each of the following ways?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To keep track of what I am doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To document my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social gratifications:</strong> <em>How often do you use Twitter in each of the following ways?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To connect with people who share some of my values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet new people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain a daily, personal connection with family and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process gratifications:</strong> <em>How often do you use Twitter in each of the following ways?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For enjoyment and/or entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pass the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To show my personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To tell others about myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology gratifications:</strong> <em>How often do you use Twitter in each of the following ways?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a place where I can post things I want to say immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unless otherwise noted, response categories ranged from 1 = *never* to 6 = *very frequently.*
## APPENDIX C

### Facebook Self-Presentation Concerns Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public self-awareness:</strong> How much do you agree that your last post on Facebook was related to each of the following statements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I was concerned about the way I presented myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I was concerned about what other people would think of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ingratiation:</strong> How much do you agree that your last post on Facebook was related to each of the following statements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I wanted others to see me as likeable, friendly, and socially desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I complimented someone on their dress or appearance in a photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I praised someone for their accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-promotion:</strong> How much do you agree that your last post on Facebook was related to each of the following statements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I wanted others to see me as competent, skilled, and intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I wanted to make people aware of my accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I wanted to make my talents public to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplification:</strong> How much do you agree that your last post on Facebook was related to each of the following statements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I wanted others to see me as ethical, moral, and principled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I wanted people to see how busy I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I wanted people to see I’m involved in lots of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplication:</strong> How much do you agree that your last post on Facebook was related to each of the following statements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I wanted people to feel obligated to help, nurture, or assist me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I asked for help that I really didn’t need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I posted, I talked about how bad I am in a particular area or how little I know about a certain topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Unless otherwise noted, response categories ranged from 1 = disagree very strongly to 7 = very strongly agree)*
APPENDIX D

Twitter Self-Presentation Concerns Scale

Individual Items

**Public self-awareness:** How much do you agree that your last post on Twitter was related to each of the following statements?
- When I posted, I was concerned about the way I presented myself
- When I posted, I was concerned about what other people would think of me

**Ingratiation:** How much do you agree that your last post on Twitter was related to each of the following statements?
- When I posted, I wanted others to see me as likeable, friendly, and socially desirable
- When I posted, I complimented someone on their dress or appearance in a photo
- When I posted, I praised someone for their accomplishments

**Self-promotion:** How much do you agree that your last post on Twitter was related to each of the following statements?
- When I posted, I wanted others to see me as competent, skilled, and intelligent
- When I posted, I wanted to make people aware of my accomplishments
- When I posted, I wanted to make my talents public to others

**Exemplification:** How much do you agree that your last post on Twitter was related to each of the following statements?
- When I posted, I wanted others to see me as ethical, moral, and principled
- When I posted, I wanted people to see how busy I am
- When I posted, I wanted people to see I’m involved in lots of activities

**Supplication:** How much do you agree that your last post on Twitter was related to each of the following statements?
- When I posted, I wanted people to feel obligated to help, nurture, or assist me
- When I posted, I asked for help that I really didn’t need
- When I posted, I talked about how bad I am in a particular area or how little I know about a certain topic

*Note.* Unless otherwise noted, response categories ranged from 1 = disagree very strongly to 7 = very strongly agree)
APPENDIX E

Facebook Audience Familiarity Scale

Individual Items

**Global audience familiarity:**
Considering all of your Facebook friends, in general, how well do you know them?

1 = I do not know them, 2 = I do not know them very well, 3 = I do not know them well, 4 = I know them, 5 = I know them well, 6 = I know them very well, 7 = I know them extremely well

Considering all of your Facebook friends, in general, how familiar are you with them?

1 = They are extremely unfamiliar to me, 2 = They are very unfamiliar to me, 3 = They are unfamiliar to me, 4 = They are somewhat familiar to me, 5 = They are familiar to me, 6 = They are very familiar to me, 7 = They are extremely familiar to me

**Target audience familiarity:**
How well do you know the receiver of the message?

1 = I do not know him/her, 2 = I do not know him/her very well, 3 = I do not know him/her well, 4 = I know him/her, 5 = I know him/her well, 6 = I know him/her very well, 7 = I know him/her extremely well

How familiar are you with the receiver of the message?

1 = He/she is extremely unfamiliar to me, 2 = He/she is very unfamiliar to me, 3 = He/she is unfamiliar to me, 4 = He/she is somewhat familiar to me, 5 = He/she is familiar to me, 6 = He/she is very familiar to me, 7 = He/she is extremely familiar to me
APPENDIX F

Twitter Audience Familiarity Scale

Individual Items

Global audience familiarity:
Considering all the people who follow you and who you follow on Twitter, how well do you know them?
1 = I do not know them, 2 = I do not know them very well, 3 = I do not know them well, 4 = I know them, 5 = I know them well, 6 = I know them very well, 7 = I know them extremely well

Considering all the people who follow you and who you follow on Twitter, how familiar are you with them?
1 = They are extremely unfamiliar to me, 2 = They are very unfamiliar to me, 3 = They are unfamiliar to me, 4 = They are somewhat familiar to me, 5 = They are familiar to me, 6 = They are very familiar to me, 7 = They are extremely familiar to me

Target audience familiarity:
How well do you know the receiver of the message?
1 = I do not know him/her, 2 = I do not know him/her very well, 3 = I do not know him/her well, 4 = I know him/her, 5 = I know him/her well, 6 = I know him/her very well, 7 = I know him/her extremely well

How familiar are you with the receiver of the message?
1 = He/she is extremely unfamiliar to me, 2 = He/she is very unfamiliar to me, 3 = He/she is unfamiliar to me, 4 = He/she is somewhat familiar to me, 5 = He/she is familiar to me, 6 = He/she is very familiar to me, 7 = He/she is extremely familiar to me
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