

**MOTIVATIONS AND IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT:
PREDICTORS OF SOCIAL NETWORKING SITE
USE AND USER BEHAVIOR**

A Thesis presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

Kara Krisanic

Dr. Shelly Rodgers, Thesis Supervisor

DECEMBER 2008

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

MOTIVATIONS AND IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT:
PREDICTORS OF SOCIAL NETWORKING SITE
USE AND USER BEHAVIOR

presented by Kara Krisanic, a candidate for the degree of Master of Arts in Journalism and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Shelly Rodgers, Committee Chair

Dr. Margaret Duffy, Committee Member and Advisor

Dr. Paul Bolls, Committee Member

Dr. Jennifer Aubrey, Outside Committee Member

DEDICATION

I dedicate the following thesis to my parents, Rita and Julius, without whom nothing in my life would be possible. Your love, encouragement, support and guidance have always served as the driving force behind my motivation to achieve my highest goals. Words cannot express the overwhelming gratitude I have for the life you have provided me. I will forever carry with me, the lessons you have instilled in my heart. Thank you and I love you, yesterday, today and always.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my entire thesis committee for their gentle guidance, continuous mentoring, and undying support throughout the completion of my thesis and graduate degree. Each of your unique contributions encouraged me to reach further and to dig deeper than I ever thought myself capable. Professor Duffy, it was you who first encouraged me to pursue a graduate degree. Thank you for seeing my potential and for nurturing my professional development. Professor Aubrey, I could not have asked for a committee member more dedicated to helping her students succeed. Thank you for all of your quick responses to my persistent questioning. Professor Bolls, thank you for encouraging me to use the time I was given in graduate school to “make myself smarter.” Adhering to this advice has made me feel like the true scholar I have become today. Professor Rodgers, I cannot begin to express how thankful I am for your support and guidance throughout my thesis process. You are a truly brilliant and talented professional, from whom I have learned more than I could have ever imagined.

"One's mind, once stretched by a new idea never regains its original dimensions." ~

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of Study	
Rationale	
Research Questions	
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
Uses and Gratifications	
A Brief History of the Theoretical Framework	
Assumptions and Audience Activity	
Motivations	
Defining Motivations and Motivation Measures	
New Media Studies on Motivation	
Impression Management as a Motivation for Use	
Online Social Networking Sites	
Defining Social Networking Sites	
User Behaviors Towards Ads on Social Networking Sites	
Facebook	
3. METHODS.....	37
Materials	
Sampling	
Research Instrument	
Methods: Survey Items	
Facebook Use	
Motivations	
Behavior Towards Facebook Ads	
Measurements	
Usage scale	
Motivations scales	
Predictors of Facebook Use	
Avoidance and Approach Behavior	

Predictors of Behavior Towards Facebook Ads
Statistical Assumptions

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	46
Results	
Participant Demographics	
Facebook Use	
Motivations and Impression Management	
Predictors of Facebook Use	
Avoidance and Approach Behavior	
Predictors of Behavior Towards Facebook Ads	
Discussion	
Theoretical Implications	
Methodological Implications	
Practical Implications	
Limitations and Directions for Future Research	
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	78
Overview	
Final Conclusions	
REFERENCES.....	81
APPENDIX	
A. Consent Form.....	86
B. Code Book.....	87
C. Facebook Intensity Scale.....	95
D. Motivations Scale.....	97
E. Impression Management Scale.....	102
F. Behaviors Towards Facebook Ads.....	104

G. Deleted Scale Items.....	105
H. Recruitment Script.....	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Rotated factor pattern from principal component analysis of Facebook intensity scale.....	47
2. Descriptive statistics for Facebook use variable.....	48
3. Rotated factor pattern from principal component analysis of Facebook motives.....	50
4. Correlation matrix between motivations.....	52
5. Correlation matrix between motivations and Facebook use.....	54
6. Summary of multiple regression analysis for motivations predicting Facebook use.....	55
7. Descriptive Statistics for approach and avoidance behavior variables towards Facebook ads.....	56
8. Correlation matrix between motivations and approach and avoidance behavior towards Facebook ads.....	57
9. Summary of multiple regression analysis for motivations predicting approach behavior towards Facebook ads.....	58
10. Summary of multiple regression analysis for motivations predicting avoidance behavior towards Facebook ads.....	59

ABSTRACT

This paper applied the uses and gratifications theory to the social networking site, Facebook, in an effort to examine the predictive power of consumers' motivations with regards to site use and behaviors towards advertisements on the site. Consumers' online impression management behaviors are discussed in detail, and are considered a possible motivation for site use. An online survey measured study participants' (N=288) intensity of Facebook use, their motivations for using the site, and their behavioral intentions toward approaching and avoiding advertisements on the site.

A total of nine consumer motivations for using Facebook were extracted from a principal components factor analysis and were labeled information, entertainment, discussion, connect, shop, game, update, product inquiry, and impression management. The Facebook use variable was regressed on the nine motivation variables in a multiple regression analysis, which revealed that the motivations labeled connect and entertainment were predictors of Facebook use. Both the approach and avoidance behavioral intention variables were also regressed on the nine motivation variables. The motivations labeled shop and product inquiry were both positive predictors of approach behavior, and both negative predictors of avoidance behaviors towards advertisements on Facebook. The motivation labeled impression management was not a significant predictor of Facebook use or behavior intentions towards advertisements on the site as literature suggested. Additional research on consumer impression management behavior on social networking sites is suggested. Implications of study findings for online advertisers and Web site managers are discussed.

Ch. 1 Introduction

A. Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to understand how audiences use online social networking sites to gratify their social and psychological needs. The uses and gratifications theory was applied to social networking sites in an effort to better understand which social and psychological motivations are the strongest predictors of social networking site use. Specifically, the motivation to practice impression management was investigated as a predictor of social networking site use, as the literature points out that a computer-mediated communication environment allows for greater self-presentation opportunities than face-to-face communication. Finally, this study investigated how motivations for using social networking sites related to and predicted criterion variables related to behavior toward advertisements on social networking sites.

B. Rationale

As a strategic communication graduate student, I believe the social networking site phenomenon is one of the most interesting topics when considering new media. Social networking sites are changing the way people, young and old, interact with one another online. Although recent studies on social networking sites focus on the social interactions that occur between users, Beer (2008) suggests, "It is important that we do not perpetuate any amnesia about the functioning of capitalism in our analysis of SNS (social networking sites)- fuelled by the free to access and user-generated nature of such sites," (p. 524). In other words, the author suggests that future research on social

networking sites should focus not only on the interactions between users, but on the capitalistic nature of the sites and how user-generated content on profiles can be beneficial to marketers.

As noted by Klassen (2007): “Marketers can't afford not to advertise on social networks because they account for larger and larger chunks of the time kids spend online,” (cited in Advertising Age). According to Grunwald Associates, 96% of online teens and tweens report using social networks. However, Rodgers et al. (2007) stated that such marketing decisions must be justified in light of advertising effectiveness online (p. 448). In other words, achieving ad effectiveness on social networking sites means that marketers must be able to demonstrate a strong understanding of users on the sites. In Bryne's (2008) article that discusses the necessity of such an understanding, John Dunne of Captivate Digital was quoted in the article as saying, “Simply running standard advertising on social networking sites does not connect with users. Early signs indicate that many brands don't have the kind of passionate or committed relationship with their customers to justify a stand-alone social networking venture” (Bryne, 2008, para. 3).

One of the most important things to understand about audiences of social networking sites is what motivates their use of the sites. In the push for ad expenditure justification and accountability, Rodgers and Thorson, (2000) explain that, “Consumer motives for Internet use have been identified as one key to understanding the effectiveness of interactive advertising strategies” (as cited in Rodgers et al., 2007, p. 448). Additionally, Ruggiero (2000) suggested that when studying new media, motivation becomes a central concept since interactivity is present to one degree or another and audiences have extensive choices. Ruggiero (2000) argues that scholars

should conduct research to determine whether new media provides undefined motivations or needs, and whether previous motivation typologies can be applied to newer media, such as social networking sites. It is with this argument in mind that the present study was conceptualized in an effort to gain a better understanding of the “uses and gratifications” of social networking sites and how these U&G are able to make predictions about ad attitudes and behaviors.

To understand what motivates audiences’ use of social networking sites, one must first define the audience itself. Social networking sites are a home to a media savvy generation, commonly referred to as the “millennials.” In fact, approximately 70 percent of Facebook members alone are in either high school or college. According to Jayson’s (2006) article on millennials, this generation is full of highly educated, altruistic, digitally trained multi-taskers. Millennials apparently understand when advertisers are targeting them, suggesting that traditional methods of advertising to this group online (such as banner ads or pop-ups) probably will not have the intended effect and may in fact turn off this technology savvy segment. The article also explains that due to millennials’ time spent communicating online, members of this generation have shown a “decline in their face-to-face social skills in a tech-dominated world” (Civic Engagement section, para. 8). According to Ellison, Steinfield and Lampe (2007), this may be due to the fact that computer-mediated communication, such as communication through social networking sites, “emphasizes verbal and linguistic cues over less controllable nonverbal communication cues,” (p. 2). So as younger generations spend more time communicating online, they may develop communication skills that are not as applicable to face-to-face communication. The emphasis on verbal and linguistic cues also enables

social networking site users to better strategically manage the impressions they give off to others when compared to communicating face-to-face. The appeal of such strategic impression management through social networking sites is the user's total and premeditated control over the impressions they give off. Therefore it is believed that for some audiences, the ability to manage the impressions they give off to others on social networking sites may be so appealing in fact, it could be the motivating factor driving their site use. The current study will then seek to determine, in addition to various other motivations for site use, whether impression management motivates the use of social networking sites.

In fact, Boyd and Ellison (2007) suggested that when researching impression management and self-presentation strategies, social networking sites are important outlets to consider. The interactive nature of social networking sites allows users the ability to negotiate self-presentations through their online profiles by managing the impressions of themselves they give off to others through the site. When audiences practice impression management on social networking sites, they strategically manage what is included in their profiles. The profile information may or may not be the most accurate depiction of what that person is like in real life, which is important for marketers to understand when considering whether or not to advertise on the site.

Offering 'hyper targeting' services enables social networking sites such as Facebook and Myspace to help marketers improve their understanding of consumers using the sites. When a person joins a social networking site, they fill out a profile, which includes personal demographic, geographic, and psychographic information. This information can be viewed publicly unless otherwise specified by privacy settings

controlled by that user. According to Richards (2007), Myspace “will divide its users into more than 100 categories with names like 'movies', 'travel' and 'auto', based on information in their profiles. Advertisers can target their campaigns towards audiences who are more likely to be interested in seeing them” (Richards, 2007, para. 6). Facebook on the other hand, allows hyper targeting only to those members who agree to allow the tracking of their profile information by advertisers. In an effort to generate greater advertising effectiveness on social networking sites, marketers use such hyper-targeting services to more specifically focus advertising efforts on those audience members most likely to take an interest in their products or services, as defined by the information provided by each individual user on their profile. However, simply categorizing audience members into groups based on profile information will not adequately enable marketers to make predictions about how audiences will behave towards their advertisements, because these categories do not fully explain the audiences’ motivations for using the sites. This is best understood through the motivation theory that is situated in the functionalist school of thought. Motivation theory asserts that motives give rise to behavior, so are key to understanding behaviors (Cooper, Shapiro, & Powers, 1998). For this reason, this study will assess the relationship between motivations for using social networking sites and several behavioral variables related to Internet advertisements. However prior to evaluating the relationship between user motivations and such behaviors, this study will seek to determine the what motivates audiences’ overall use of the site.

The question of how and why consumers use social networking sites is based in uses and gratifications (U&G) theory. Application of U&G is found throughout research

of traditional forms of media such as television (Grant, Guthrie, & Ball-Rokeach, 1991) and newspapers (Loges & Ball-Rokeach, 1993). When new media technology emerges in a society, it is important to apply the pre-existing theory to the newer media in an effort to understand how it differs from traditional media. With new media developments such as social networking sites, modern uses and gratification scholars seek to understand how the theory can explain audience's use of the sites.

This study attempt to explore and answer several research questions pertaining to computer-mediated communication media referred to here as social networking sites. First, it will expand on uses and gratifications research in its application to a new media in an attempt to add to existing knowledge on possible new motivations that drive media use online. Additionally, the research will attempt to determine whether impression management is a motivation that predicts the use of social networking sites. Finally, the study will determine how usage motivations relate to and predict behaviors toward Internet advertisements.

C. Research Questions

Again, the purpose of this study is to understand which motivations, including impression management, are the strongest predictors of social networking sites use. Additionally, this study seeks to understand how the motivations for using social networking sites predict criterion variables related to participant's behaviors towards advertisements on Facebook. Rodgers and Thorson, (2000) explain that, "consumer motives for Internet use have been identified as a key to understanding the effectiveness of interactive advertising strategies." As a step toward furthering this understanding for social networking sites, this study first asks:

RQ1: What motivations are the strongest predictors of Facebook use?

Cooper et al. (1998) explained through the functionalist theory that motivations are the key to understanding behaviors, as they are what give rise to the behavior. Therefore it is assumed that by studying participants' motivations, this study can better understand use behavior in regards to Facebook. Additionally, in Rodgers et al. (2007), the authors explain that, "internet advertising practitioners and scholars can consider additional external factors with the goal of building a more comprehensive model of how internet motives influence individuals' psychological and behavioral responses to internet ads" (p. 470). Therefore, this study seeks to also ask in reference to Facebook motives:

RQ2: What motivations are the strongest predictors of approach behavior toward advertisements on Facebook?

RQ3: What motivations are the strongest predictors of avoidance behavior toward advertisements on Facebook?

Ch. 2 Literature Review

A. Uses and Gratifications

I. A Brief History of the Theoretical Framework

Early mass communication scholars considered media to be an all-powerful outlet for persuading audiences. McQuail (2005) explained that this was a result of the popularity and power of media when used for propaganda during the early twentieth century. Audiences were considered passive, consuming, and processing all media messages to which they were exposed. Elihu Katz (1959) was a major contributor to the shift in focus of uses and gratifications (U&G), from how media affects audiences, to how audiences use media to gratify their social and psychological needs. In adhering to this shift in focus of U&G theory, the purpose of the current research will focus on how audiences' social and psychological needs are gratified through their use of social networking sites, rather than how their use of the site affects them as audience members.

It was during the 1950s and 1960s that social and psychological motivation variables were identified and operationalized, and were assumed to be the driving purpose for audience media consumptions and gratifications (Wimmer & Dominick, 1997). It was during these decades that a shift from an assumed passive audience to an active audience was gaining acceptance throughout the mass communication discipline (Ruggiero, 2000). No longer were audiences thought to passively consume media messages they were exposed to; rather, the theoretical assumption was strongly accepted that audiences actively sought out media to gratify some need. Audience activity will be

furthered discussed, however it is important to note that current findings show that audience activity varies depending not only on the individual, but the amount of choice and interactivity a medium offers (Cowles, 1989; Levy & Windhal, 1984). The interactive nature of social networking sites offers audiences a great deal of choice, enabling them to actively contribute to the content of the sites and interact in the communication process as message receivers and senders. Such contributions and interactions can be studied in terms of behaviors, or rather how audience members behave when receiving and sending the messages during the interactive communication process. In accordance with the functionalist theory, motivations are what give rise to behaviors. Therefore, the interactive nature of social networking sites provide rich opportunities for understanding what motivates site use, as users can behave and contribute more actively when compared to traditional media.

Research of the 1970s further constructed U&G theory by collaborating with developments in the fields of sociology and psychology. Ruggiero (2000) argues that the concentration shifted to include research on not only gratifications sought by the audience, but also a comparison to the actual gratifications obtained. To better understand gratifications, development of the various typologies of social and psychological needs as well as audience motivations became a major part of both mass communication and social and psychological research. This study will further contribute to such motivation typologies by adapting a scale used for measuring Internet motivations. The scale will then be used to determine what motivations are the strongest predictors of social networking site use, and behavior toward advertisements on the sites. It was also during this time that Katz, Blumer and Gurevitch (1974) defined what studies of U&G are

concerned with:

(1) the social and psychological origins of (2) needs, which generate (3) expectations of (4) the mass media or other sources, which lead to (5) differential patterns of media exposure (or engagement in other activities), resulting in (6) need gratifications and (7) other consequences, perhaps most unintended ones (p. 20).

Thus, the present study builds on the assumption that social and psychological motivations drive audiences to seek out social networking sites, based on expectations, in order to gratify needs. Galloway and Meek (1981) posit that expectations of gratifications can be explained through the simultaneous study of U&G and expectancy value theory. Galloway et al. (1981) explains that expectancy theory examines a concept of expectancy or “The likelihood that certain behavior will lead to an outcome (i.e. gratification in what follows)--and a concept of valence--that is, the value or attractiveness of the outcome” (p. 438). Rayburn and Palgreen (1984) added that another important concept related to expectancy is evaluation or “the degree or affect, positive or negative, toward an attribute or behavioral outcome” (p. 539). The authors found in their study on television news that when there are discrepancies between gratifications sought and obtained, the audience may be motivated to make behavioral changes to reduce such differences.

Criticisms of U&G were prevalent in the 1970s. According to Severin and Tankard (1997), criticism included issues with data collection, relying too heavily on self-reporting by study participants, lack of operational definitions and unclear concepts, non-theoretical ideas and, defining audiences as purely active. One relevant criticism by Elliott (1974) suggested that U&G focuses too heavily on the individual and lacked a necessary focus on social structure. He stated that the tradition is individualistic, dealing

only with intra-individual processes. Elliot believed, “These can then be generalized to aggregates of individuals, but they cannot be converted in any meaningful way into social structure and processes” (p. 252). Ruggiero (2000) asserts that U&G scholars should consider the criticisms and make the changes in their research approaches. Social networking sites offer a unique environment in which to try and overcome some of the inherent limitations of past U&G studies in that the focus is more on social structure rather than the individual. This focus may help to offer further conceptualization of the concept of motivation while attempting to overcome some of the criticisms associated with the U&G tradition.

Moving onto the 1980s to the present, U&G research focuses on applying theory to new media such as the Internet and Web sites (Boyd et al., 2007; Dwyer, 2007; Larose, Mastro & Eastin, 2001; Ellison et al., 2007; Papacharissi & Rubin, 2000). Perhaps not too surprising, research in any new area tends to evolve from what can be termed as a U&G approach, by determining the uses of a particular medium, followed by an examination of additional studies that test the effects of those uses. The Internet has seen a similar trend in that new studies in this area focused heavily on identifying the various uses and gratifications of the Internet, dating back to nearly the genesis of the Internet in 1994. However, the Internet, unlike traditional media, is constantly changing to include new technologies and platforms, many of which are interactive in nature. Therefore, it is important that as new platforms arise, uses and gratifications are examined to determine whether “old” U&G apply and/or whether new U&G are needed to explain social and psychological motivations for using new technology online. It is hoped that the present study on social networking sites will make an important contribution to U&G studies by

focusing not only on the communication process occurring between users, but also the processes between users and advertising messages on the sites themselves. This angle helps to establish the legitimacy of this research, from both a theoretical and practical understanding, by tying the U&G tradition to the broader discipline of advertising and the specific subset or field of online advertising. This is an important distinction since U&G studies have historically situated in traditional media and most have focused on U&G of news within those media. A focus on advertising provides a unique opportunity to examine whether or not U&G is robust enough to identify uses of social networking sites and the extent to which those uses are predictive of advertising behaviors. In this sense, the present study extends existing literature in two ways with a focus on new media but a unique twist that includes advertising online.

II. Assumptions and Audience Activity

Katz et al. (1974) outline five basic assumptions about U&G: (1) an active audience, (2) the audience member is the initiator in linking needs gratification and media choice, (3) that media competes with other external factors in satisfying needs, (4) that audiences are self-sufficient in reporting their interests and motives for satisfying needs, and (5) that researcher's value judgments concerning the importance of mass media to an individual must be suspended in uses and gratifications research.

The assumption of an active audience was criticized for not considering the possibility that levels of audience activity could vary. Rubin et al. (1984) suggested that audience activity is variable, not absolute. A completely passive audience is no longer widely accepted, and levels of audience activity are believed to vary depending on external factors. According to Ruggiero (2000), study findings on TV (Grant, Guthrie &

Ball-Rokeach, 1991), newspapers (Lodges & Ball-Rokeach, 1993), and communication technologies (Ferguson & Perse, 1994) show that levels of audience activity and individual media use patterns can lead to media dependency for some individuals. Levy and Windahl (1984) also attempted to make clear the notion of audience activity arguing that audience activity involves a range of orientations in the communication process by testing a model of audience orientations that linked activity to uses and gratifications. As noted earlier, the present study assumes that, as with traditional media, the online user is an active participant in the uses and gratifications sought online. This is a commonly accepted proposition among Internet scholars in both news and advertising fields. In relation to the current study, audiences actively contribute to social networking sites through user-generated content and actively consume information on the site by browsing profile content. Again, these contribution and consumption behaviors by social networking site audiences can be used to infer motivations for site use. It is assumed that the social networking site audience members are active participants in their need gratification and therefore, their behaviors reflect their motivations to use the sites. For example, the current study seeks to determine whether the ability to practice impression management on social networking sites motivates their use of the sites. By questioning study participants about their impression management activity on social networking sites, it can be determined whether impression management behaviors motivate site use.

B. Motivations

I. Defining Motivations and Motivation Measures

Papacharissi and Rubin (2000) define motivations as “general dispositions that influence people’s actions taken to fulfill a need or want” (p. 179). The conceptualization

of motivation has been somewhat unclear in scholarly research between various disciplines including the research of U&G, sociology, psychology, and mass communication. The confusion rests in the fact that when measuring how audiences “use” a media to fulfill a need, audience motivations are evaluated in the media use, and scholars infer motivations from behaviors. Defining and measuring motivations through behavior is supported through the motivation theory referred to as “functionalism.” In discussing functionalism, Cooper et al. (1998) explained that, “Behavior is best understood in terms of the goals or needs it serves” (p. 1528). The authors posit that motivations are the key to understanding behaviors, as they are what give rise to the behavior, as noted before. However, they also found in their study on sexual behavior in adolescents, that behaviors serve different needs for different people.

Functionalism also assumes that motivations increase when greater need gratification opportunities are presented. Rodgers and Sheldon (2002) explain that a person will be most motivated to act when situational opportunities match the needs of the individual. For example, if an audience member’s motivation to use a social networking site is to connect with their friends, according to functionalism, the person’s motivation will be increased when the site provides situational opportunities for gratifying such needs. According to Rodgers and Sheldon’s (2002) assertion, when advertisements on social networking sites provide situational opportunities or “match” the needs of the audience member, that person may be more motivated to behave favorably or attend to the advertiser’s message.

Many scholars have developed typologies of motivations that drive audience use of media. According to Katz et al. (1959), one of the first attempts at forming a

motivation typology was proposed by Laswell (1948) who posited that audiences are motivated to use media for surveillance, correlation, entertainment, and cultural transmission. McQuail, Blumler, and Brown (1972) revised this initial motivation typology to include diversion, personal relationships, personal identity, and surveillance. From developments in motivation theory, McQuire (1974) formed a matrix model of human motivations. The author organized his human motivation typology by cognitive versus affective motivations, self-preservation versus self-growth motivations, and active versus passive audiences. McQuire (1974) explained that, “By way of clarifying this distinction, this cognitive-affective polarity might be contrasted as stressing the directive aspects of motives versus their dynamic aspects, that is, forces that orient, as contrasted with those that energize, the individual” (p. 173).

Orientation forces help the individual confirm who they are now and who they always have believed themselves to be through self-preserving techniques. Hence, by filling out interests, activities, and personal information for public consumption, individuals on social networking sites are assumed to use self-preserving techniques that highlight strengths and perhaps downplay weaknesses of the individual. On the other hand, energizing forces help to build individual’s self-efficacy through self-growth techniques. In the same way, users of social networking sites can practice self-growth by expanding friendships outside of their networks or by learning new information about themselves or others when surveying other profiles and interests. This may serve as an appropriate model for comparing, for example, communications on the Internet versus TV, where audiences are arguably more active with the Internet than TV. The Internet may also offer greater self-growth opportunities than TV because, unlike TV, the Internet

allows audiences to interact and contribute to the communication process. The increased opportunities for audience interaction when using new media such as social networking use sites, calls for a reevaluation of traditionally defined media motivations. Media specific, or for example Web specific motivations, will differ from motivations for using traditional media such as TV due to the increased opportunities for audience interaction with the media.

II. New Media Studies on Motivation

Recent scholars have applied U&G to new media including the Internet and social networking sites. One recent example involves a survey conducted by Ebersole (2000), which sought to understand the uses and gratifications of the Web specific to college students. Through a factor analysis, the authors defined a new typology of motivations that drive Web use. A total of eight factors were extracted from the analysis and labeled research and learning, easy access to entertainment, communication and social interaction, something to do when bored, access to material otherwise unavailable, product information and technical support, games and sexually explicit sites, and consumer transactions. Although some of these Web motivations may be applied to social networking sites, many social networking sites do not allow sexually explicit content, and it is doubtful that the kind of research done on Web search engines is the same kind of research done on social networking sites, such as researching a friend's favorite music for example. Therefore, it is argued that the prior factors identified by general Internet use may not apply directly to social networking sites, suggesting a need to examine social networking sites as a unique interactive platform that differs from general Internet use.

A more recent Internet usage study by Stafford, Stafford, and Schkade (2007) defined broader Internet use motivations. Using a survey, the authors conducted a factor analysis extracting three factors related to Internet browsing and processing, to content gratifications, and social dimensions implying that the Internet is used for socializing with others. Stafford et al. (2007) believe that “the newly described Internet social gratification can serve as an important construct in models of Internet use, along with Internet-specific process and content gratifications” (p. 10). These three factors seem relevant to social networking sites; however, the social dimension is too broad to be of much help in making specific predictions about ad behavior and does not consider specific motivations regarding self-growth or self-preservation, which research shows represent a major part of the socialization processes occurring on social networking sites (Ellison et al., 2007). So again, we see that existing U&G scales may not necessarily apply to social networking sites because they do not consider the interactive and social function of such sites (nor would we expect that the scales would take these functions into account since this particular platform is a recent technology, implemented after the prior studies were conducted).

Papacharissi and Rubin’s (2000) study on computer-mediated communication (CMC) successfully uses previous typologies in constructing an Internet motivation measurement scale by combining interpersonal, media, and new technology motives. The interpersonal motivations were created by combining factors of affection, inclusion/companionship, and control. The media motivations included entertainment, habit, information, social interaction, escape, surveillance, pastime, and relaxation. The Internet motivations included time control, convenience, economy, and expressive need.

By combining various factors found in previous research into the three broad motivation categories labeled interpersonal, media, and Internet, the author's Internet motivation measurement scale is much more complete and comprehensive than prior scales. The authors conducted a factor analysis from the measurement scale and yielded five interpretable factors including interpersonal utility, pass time, information seeking, convenience, and entertainment. The extracted factors leads to the question of whether motivations for the Internet are similar to the motivations for using social networking sites. Likely, there are some similarities but also differences. Namely, the purpose and goals of social networking sites are more specific and defined when compared to the entirety of the Internet. For this reason, it can also be expected that some of the motivation factors relevant to the Internet overall, may not necessarily apply to a specific Internet site, such as a social networking site.

In Clark, Lee, and Boyer's (2007) study on audience's uses of Facebook, several of the scale items of Papcharrisi's et al. (2000) Internet motivation scale were adapted to apply to Facebook in an attempt to understand what motivates the use of Facebook. Similar to Papcharrisi's et al. (2000) study, five factors emerged but were weighted differently. The factor analysis found that audiences are primarily motivated to use Facebook in gathering information about their friends in a more purposeful manner than when using the entire Internet as a whole. Two factors maintained the integrity of the original scale and included pass time and entertainment. However, the authors concluded that overall motives for using the Internet and for using Facebook were nearly identical, again suggesting some perhaps universal motives for Internet use as a whole (Rodgers & Sheldon, 1999).

In deciding among the various scales created for measuring motivations, Rodgers, Wang, Rettie, and Alpert's (2007) extension of the Web Motivation Inventory (WMI) that included new Internet motivations (since the original WMI was created in 1999), is applicable to new media studies. According to Rodgers and her colleagues (2007), the original WMI was developed from a synthesis of over 100 Internet motives drawn from literature and qualitative interviews. Four main motives for using the Internet emerged from the initial research and are labeled research, communicate, surf, and shop. The WMI emerged as a logical choice for this study over other scales because it has been tested and re-tested on both student and non-student samples, on US and non-US samples, and was replicated over periods of time (Rodgers and Sheldon, 2002). According to Rodgers et al. (2007), the testing and re-testing of the WMI across different times and samples helps to demonstrate the scale's validity and reliability. So unlike earlier scales, the WMI appears to be robust across a variety of situations, settings, and samples, which makes it a good candidate for the present study. Additionally, the WMI has been applied to Internet advertising research so should not need a lot of changes in wording or the actual instrument in applying the scale to social networking sites and behaviors exhibited toward ads found in those sites.

In this sense, the updated version of the WMI (2007) provides Internet researchers a useful and robust measure of Internet motives that, presumably, would transfer to other Internet advertising contexts as well. In order to extend the scale to reflect current Internet motives, the authors conducted two studies. Study 1 replicated the WMI with student samples of Internet users in the US, UK and Australia to determine whether the original four factors were reliable across samples. The study also involved qualitative

research, as participants were asked to list additional Internet uses not found in the original WMI, which would be applied later in Study 2. Study 1 reported high-reliability alpha for each motive across the samples of the three countries, demonstrating that the WMI scale displayed good internal consistency.

The Rodgers' et al. (2007) WMI scale was further investigated to determine how applicable the scale is to Internet advertising. The nomological validity of the WMI scale was assessed by testing the relationship between the motivations and two criterion variables related to advertising on the Internet. The variables measured participant approach behavior and avoidance behavior in regards to Internet ads using the items, "I tend to click on Internet ads," and "I typically try to avoid Internet ads," for measurement. Regression was used to determine which motivations increase or decrease the intention to click on an Internet ad. The current study will draw upon Rodgers' et al. (2007) WMI scale and the authors' various measures of Internet advertisement behaviors in determining relationships between audience motivations and behaviors towards ads on social networking sites.

III. Impression Management as a Motivation for Use

According to Dwyer (2007), "Impression management has been defined as the goal-directed conscious or unconscious attempt to influence other's perceptions about a person, object or event by controlling or managing the exchange of information in social interaction" (p. 2). Erving Goffman helped to develop the groundwork for scholarly research in the area of impression management with his 1959 book on self-presentation. Goffman explained impression management in terms of motivations. He believed human interaction was much like a performance in a play. Lui (2007) used this performance

analogy to explain impression management and quoted Goffman in saying, ‘Successful performers are ‘aware of the impression they foster.’ Thus, the impressions managed by these performers, or in other words audience members, need to be crafted so as to stand up to the scrutiny of an audience that is able to ‘glean unofficially by close observation,’” (as quoted from Goffman, 1959, p.144). Jones and Pittman (1982) helped to further impression management research by developing an initial taxonomy of impression management behaviors based on previous research. These behaviors included self-promotion (promoting accomplishments to be viewed as competent by others), ingratiation (using flattery or favors to win other’s approval), exemplification (self-sacrifices or doing more than expected to win other’s approval), intimidation (promoting one’s power over another to win approval) and supplication (advertising personal weaknesses to elicit the feeling that the other is needed).

The current study focuses on the impression management behaviors performed by the users of social networking sites. Impression management behaviors are practiced on social networking sites when users fill out their online profiles. Users have total control over what information about themselves they wish to include or censor when filling out their profiles. It can be argued that users of social networking sites even have the ability to fabricate or exaggerate certain claims they make about themselves on their profiles, more so when compared to face-to-face communication. It is useful to examine such behaviors because some users may find the ability to manage such online impressions very appealing. So appealing in fact, it could motivate their very use of the sites. This will be examined in the current study by determining whether impression management is a motivation predicting audience’s use of the sites. Although the current study focuses

on impression management behaviors online through social networking sites, impression management has been a focus in business organizational research. Bolino and Turnley, (1999) used the Jones et al. (1982) impression management taxonomy to create a scale for measuring employee impression management behaviors in the work place. The initial scale of 44 items was reduced after pre-testing to contain 25 total items, five of the items designated to measuring each of the five impression management behaviors outlined in the Jones et al. (1982) taxonomy. Although the items in the scale are focused on employee behaviors, it provides impression management researchers a strong example of how the impression management behaviors typology can be used to develop a scale for measuring impression management behaviors in other settings, such as in online social networking sites.

At times, audiences practice impression management in a purposeful manner, while other times not. Ellison, Heino and Gibbs (2006) explain intentional and unintentional strategies for practicing impression management in terms of, “expressions given (communication in the traditional sense, e.g., spoken communication) and expressions *given off* (presumably unintentional communication, such as nonverbal communication cues),” (p. 2). According to scholarly research, the unintentional expressions of self’s may occur more frequently on social networking sites because online communication lacks the social cues involved with face-to-face interactions such as facial expressions or attractiveness. According to Ellison et al. (2007):

These same self-presentational behaviors exist online, although online self-presentation is more malleable and subject to self-censorship than face-to-face self-presentation due to the asynchronous nature of computer-mediated

communications (CMC) and the fact that CMC emphasizes verbal and linguistic cues over less controllable nonverbal cues (2).

Ellison et al. (2007) argue that belonging to and communicating on social networking sites is important for building social capital. Users of social networking sites build social capital in two ways, primarily by, “communicating with people who are already a part of their extended social network,” (boyd et al., 2007, p. 2) and by making new friends, ultimately expanding their social networks. Impression management is one strategy for gaining social capital because individuals believe that presenting themselves to others in certain ways will increase the likelihood for communicating and interacting with others.

According to Ellison et al. (2006), “the greater control over self-presentational behavior in CMC allows individuals to manage their online interactions more strategically,” (p.2). The self-presentation strategy of impression management allows social networking site users to disclose and/or censor information about themselves on their profiles. Profiles of social networking sites can be considered vicarious projections of self, however impression management may contribute to a vicarious projection of “non-objective or bias self.” For example, users may choose a profile picture based on how attractive they believe it makes them appear to others. Users may even go so far as to augment their original photos with a photo editing software. At the risk of social networking sites appearing negative, it is important to reiterate that impression management can be both a conscious or unconscious act, however it is still a goal directed action.

Nonetheless, the ability for users to censor this information representing who they

are online raises the concern for deception, or being misled about another user based on the information they provide on their profiles. Ellison et al. (2007) conducted an experiment on Facebook user profiles, which involved measuring how many fields were filled out on each profile. Participant's use of the fields in their profiles was then correlated with the number of links or relationships they had between other users. The results indicated that populating the fields in profiles was positively related to the number of friends a user has. The authors suggest that by filling out profile fields, such as what high school a user attended or contact information; a user can reduce the perceived deception and increase the ease of connecting with people of similar backgrounds or interest. In a broad sense, the authors conclude that the more information provided by users on their profiles, the less others will feel they are being deceived by them, and the more likely they are to make new online relationships.

Similarly, in Lui's (2007) study on social networking site profiles, the author described user's profile entries as list of interests often functioning as the user's taste preferences. The study findings revealed that these "lists of interests" created by users in their profiles revealed markers of motifs like "irony, alienation, utopia and satire." Lui (2007) believes these motifs may reveal that, "the social network profile's list of interest might actually be more useful as an indication of one's aesthetics than as a factual declaration of interests." However, these findings do not necessarily mean that the impression management behaviors on social networking site users should be considered as attempts at deception, but an idealized projection of oneself.

Rosenbloom (2008) explains that most scholars agree that impression management behaviors are not acts of deception. "It is more like social lubrication

without a drink in your hand. Those studying it online have found that when people misrepresent themselves, it is often because they are attempting to express an idealized or future version of themselves” (p. 1). In Dwyer’s (2007) qualitative study on privacy and impression management, participants shared their thoughts regarding how other users present themselves in social networking sites versus how they are in real life. The author found that users often spend hours changing pictures and information about oneself on social networking sites in order to project to others their most appealing self. Some participants made clear that they felt betrayed when other users profiles projected false expectations of what the user is like in real life. However, most participants expressed that they enjoyed using their profile to add profile elements, such as applications and content, that made them feel unique and allowed them to express their emotions to the public, to get things off their minds by writing down their thoughts, and by sharing them with others. Bargh, McKenna and Fitzsimons (2002) found that Internet interactions better allowed individuals to express the aspects of their true selves they found difficult expressing in face-to-face interaction.

In a study on self-presentation motives of everyday social encounters, Nezlek & Leary (2002) explain that most research on impression management falls into one of three categories, studying either the individual differences in impression motivations, self-evaluations or self-presentational goals. Nezlek and Leary’s (2000) study focused on individual’s unique factors that affect self-presentational strategies, the strength of self-presentational motivations, and concerns for others’ evaluations of the individual. Important for this study is Nezlek and Leary’s (2000) construction of a scale entitled “Measures of Self-Presentational Styles.” The items on the scale measured participant

motivation to practice impression management. The measurement of impression management on the scale was based on what degree participants wanted others to perceive them as likeable, friendly, socially desirable, competent, skilled, intelligent, ethical, moral, principled, physically attractive, handsome and pretty. Two additional items measured how much participants thought about how other people were evaluating them throughout communication, and also how nervous or tense they felt in communicating. This study will consider impression management as a motivation, and will determine whether the concept predicts social networking site use.

Similar to the current study, a recent study on blog use conceptualized impression management as a motivation, questioning whether impression management predicted blog use. In this study, Younbo, Vordererm & Song (2007) adapted Nezelek and Leary's (2000) impression management scale to apply to impression management behaviors on Cyworld.com, a popular Internet blog. In Younbo's et al. (2007) study, respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement to eight statements, such as, "I want the other users in the Cyworld.com to perceive me as likeable." The 7-point response scales were anchored by "Not at all (1)" to "Very much (7)." The study found that impression management positively predicted both posting content and browsing content. This scale is appropriate for adaptation in the current study, applying the scale to social networking site use as opposed to blog use.

C. Online Social Networking Sites

I. Defining Social Networking Sites

According to boyd et al. (2007), social networking sites are defined as "web based services that allow individuals to (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a

bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and transverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system” (2). Today, there are thousands of online social networking sites differing in functions, features and users. For example, Sylvers (2008), “there are sites for travelers to get in touch with people in the places they visit (couchsurfing.com), services that provide user-generated information about entertainment (dontstayin.com) and communities for people interested in knitting and crocheting (ravelry.com),” (Sylvers, 2008, para. 15.) Ellison et al. (2007) discuss a common objective of most social networking sites in saying:

Online communities have different goals, but a common and important enterprise is forming connections between users. This is especially true for online communities that focus on articulating social networks, such as Facebook, Myspace, Friendster and Orkut, where the number of friends a user lists may act as a simple proxy for their connectedness in the network. (p. 1)

Popular examples of social networking sites include Facebook and Myspace. Common to most social networking sites are user profiles. The profile often consists of information fields for the purpose of projecting characteristics of the individual, “which typically include descriptors such as age, location, interests, and an “about me” section” (boyd et al., 2007, p. 3). Individuals can upload a profile photo to appear on their profile along side the demographic and psychographic information they also provided. Users have total control over filling in all, some or none of the optional profile fields, depending on what they wish to display to the public. Sights also contain various other virtual profile application options such as photo albums, videos, streaming music players

and applications such as games or friend rankers, to name a few.

In addition to defining what a social networking site is, it is important to define the best way to measure audience's use of the sites. In Younbo's et al. (2007) study on blog use, the authors discussed measurement of a media's use in stating that, "Although time spent on media (e.g., number of hours watching TV) is still widely used as a measure of media exposure, simple exposure time cannot capture different levels of attention or effort oriented to media usage," (p. 6). This operational definition of usage makes sense for measuring the use of social networking sites, as there is a great difference between simply searching the site versus contributing content in the form of user-generated content. Ellison's et al. (2007) Facebook Intensity Scale is a good example of measuring use beyond frequency and duration measures. Ellison's et al. (2007) Facebook intensity scale assesses audience behavior in terms of time spent on Facebook, and the participant's number of Facebook friends. It also asks attitudinal questions measuring how emotionally connected the user is with Facebook. The authors then use the average standardized item responses to create a Facebook Intensity variable. This variable represents study participants' average overall use of Facebook in terms of time spent, levels of attention, and content contribution.

Another aspect of social networking sites are their interactive nature. Interactivity is a multi-dimensional concept that differentiates two-way communication media, such as social networking sites, from traditional one-way media such as TV. Hanjun, Chang-Hoan, & Roberts (2005) explain the multi dimensions of interactivity occurring most frequently in literature are the human-message interaction, which as discussed later as important for Internet advertisers, and human-human interaction. Hanjun et al.'s (2005)

study findings showed that consumers who engage in more of these interactions evaluated the Web site more positively, leading to positive attitudes toward the brand and increased purchase intent. Hanjun et al. (2005) describes that consumers using traditional media have many message choices, but have little control over the messages or when they are exposed to them. In contrast, interactive media gives consumers both choice and control over the messages. “Users can manipulate and customize the messages by alternating colors, shapes, graphics, sounds and order of message contents,” (p. 59). In this sense, interactive media allow marketers to deliver messages to consumers, allow consumers to provide feedback, and allow consumers to interact with the messages more than ever before possible in a two-way communication environment.

McMillan (2004) further conceptualized the multi-dimensionality of interactivity. The author explains interactivity of a media as the degree to which a media contains each the following dimensions; (1) “complexity of choice,” or amount of content of available to users for selection, (2) “effort users exert,” or the user-to-system activity, (3) “responsiveness,” or degree to which communication resembles actual human discourse, (4) “monitoring of information use,” or how many individuals visit the site, (5) “ease of adding information,” the opportunities available to contribute content, and finally (6) “interpersonal communication,” or the capacity to enable communication between individuals. In assessing the interactivity of a media in such terms, social networking sites are highly interactive, offering users varying levels of these interactive dimensions.

The concept interactivity informs the current study in several ways. For example in relation to McMillan’s (2004) “ease of adding information” dimension of interactivity, the interactive nature of social networking sites enable users to manage their online

impressions when filling out their profiles. The ability for users to do so through the sites interactive features may encourage certain behaviors, from which motivations can be inferred. Another example may include site features, such as Facebook's online chat, where users can interact with one another in real time, which relates to the "interpersonal communication" dimension of interactivity. The availability of this interactive feature may then contribute to a user's motivations to connect with others through social networking sites. Although the current study will not measure the interactivity of a specific social networking site, it is important to understand that the interactivity of a site can contribute to how a user ultimately interacts with and behaves towards a site. Users of sites with less interactive features may be motivated to behave on the site differently than when compared to sites that are more interactive.

II. User Behaviors toward Ads on Social Networking Sites

Understanding Younbo's et al. (2007) human-message dimension of interactivity can help Internet marketers better understand why consumers may or may not choose to interact with their advertisement. Cho and Cheon (2004) explain that one reason a consumer may avoid an advertisement is if they believe it impedes on their perceived goal or motivation. An assumption of the uses and gratification theory is that consumers are goal-directed when using the Internet. Therefore, "when Internet ads are a significant sources of noise or nuisance, hindering consumers efforts to browse Web content, they can disrupt consumer Web page viewing, distract viewers from the Web page's editorial integrity, and intrude on their search for desired information" (p. 90). As previously discussed, the main idea of the motivation theory "functionalism" is that motivations are the key to understanding behaviors, as they are what give rise to the behavior. Rodgers

and Sheldon (2002) used this functionalist perspective in hypothesizing that Internet banner ads promoting a message that matches a user's motivation for using the Web, should be more persuasive than banners that do not. The authors measured such consumer motivations through what the authors titled the Web Motivation Inventory (WMI), measuring the ad's persuasiveness by asking participants to indicate the likelihood they would click on the ad. The authors found that for all but one of the Web motivations, consumers were more likely to interact or "click" on a banner ad whose message was related to the user's motivation. For example, "high scores on the surfing motive predicted stronger intent to click on surfing banners" (p. 90).

In a more recent WMI scale study including new Internet motivations undefined by past WMI studies, Rodgers et al. (2007) assessed the nomological validity of the WMI scale by determining how avoidance behavior, "I typically try to avoid Internet ads," and approach behavior, "I tend to click on Internet ads" towards Internet advertisements were related to and predicted by motivations. Bagozzi (1980), Cronbach & Mehl (1955) and Reise et al. (1993) explain that, "Nomological validity assesses whether the construct of interest behaves as it should with regard to its external relationship with other concepts," (as quoted in Rodgers et al., 2007, p. 460). The study found that the WMI extracted motivations "surf" and "shop" were significantly associated with approach behavior, whereas the motivations "communication," "research" and "shop" were significantly associated with avoidance behavior. Additionally, the "research" motive significantly predicted a decrease in approach behavior, "surf," and "shop" significantly predicted an increase in approach behavior, and none of the motives significantly predicted avoidance behavior. Internet advertisers can benefit from the understanding that tailoring their

advertising messages to match consumer's motivations for using the Internet can affect the likelihood of consumer interaction with the message, or intent to click on the advertisement, as motivations give rise to behaviors according to the functionalist theory.

Rodgers et al. (2007) operationally defined approach and avoidance behaviors towards Internet advertisements as the "intention to click on Internet ads." This operational definition is congruent with Cho's (1999) study on Web advertising, in which the author explained the action of clicking banner ads through the elaboration likelihood model (ELM). According to the author, when consumers come across persuasive communication they follow one of two different routes through the ELM, the central or peripheral route. In the central route, consumers are highly involved and highly motivated to process and exert cognitive processing effort towards the message. In regards to Internet advertisements, "As long as consumers voluntarily perform an action (i.e., clicking banners) to see the content of advertising messages, information processing is more active and intensive than passive exposure without voluntary action," (34). This ties back into the active audience assumption, as audiences vary in their level of activity when consuming media. Cho (1999) argues that exposure to advertisements on the Internet is more voluntary than exposure through traditional media because it requires more commitment through voluntary action. The author explains that voluntary exposure to advertising messages is dependent on the level of involvement the consumer has with the message. "In high-involvement situations, consumers have high motivation to process advertising messages due to high personal relevance" (p. 38). Cho's study employed a measure of intentional action towards a banner ad in measuring advertising effectiveness. This can once again be used in applying the "matching hypothesis" of the functionalism

theory of motivation when comparing motivations of Internet users with the effectiveness of Internet advertising messages. Again, functionalism assumes that motivations increase when greater need gratification opportunities are presented. Therefore, when advertising messages match consumer motivations, the messages present greater need gratification, and the consumer will be more motivated to “exert cognitive processing effort towards the message.” In other words, the likelihood that the consumer will click on an ad is increased when messages offer some sort of need gratification to the consumer.

In a sense, understanding what motivates the use of using social networking sites can help advertisers better tailor their messages to offer need gratification opportunities matching user motivations for using the site. In assessing how well Rodgers et al.’s (2007) WMI scale related to Internet advertising constructs, the authors assessed the relationship between Web motivations and approach-avoidance behaviors towards Web advertisements. Similarly, social networking site scholars can infer which motivations predict approach behavior towards ads on the sites, (tendency to click on ads) and which motivations predict avoidance behaviors, (tendency to avoid clicking on ads). This information can in turn inform marketers wishing to create more effective ads on networking sites, of the importance in tailoring messages to “match” the user’s motivations that will best predict an intention to click on an ad, or an approach behavior.

III. Facebook

Due to the large amount of social networking sites available on the Internet today, each varying in their networking goals, there is a need for this study to define what kind of social networking site will be researched and why. This study will focus only on the motivations for using Facebook.com, one of the most popular social networking sites on

the web today. Facebook was chosen for this study because of its college-aged audience and its unique niche for creating networks for which audiences to belong to within the site. According to Facebook's timeline, Harvard student Mark Zuckerberg first launched Facebook in February of 2004 for his fellow Harvard colleagues. By December of the first year, Facebook reached nearly 1 million users. Unlike other social networking sites running at the time, Facebook was specifically designed for college students and required an active college e-mail address to become a member. Although Facebook started as a college-only networking site, today over half of the current users are outside of college. In fact, according to Zuckerberg (n.d.) users who are 25 years old and older are the fastest growing demographic. Nonetheless, the college student demographic accounts for some of the heaviest traffic on Facebook to date.

According to boyd et al. (2007) "Unlike previous SNSs (social networking sites), Facebook was designed to support distinct college networks only," and although Facebook has since opened membership up to any audience, "the change to open signup did not mean that new users could easily access users in closed networks" (p. 10). Facebook's organization of networks within networks contributes to the ease of achieving a main goal of networking because according to boyd et al. (2007), "What makes social network sites unique is that they allow individuals to meet strangers, but rather that they enable users to articulate and make visible their social networks" (p. 2). Facebook provides users the opportunity to belong to unique networks within the entire site. For these reasons, Facebook can serve as an important tool in the researching social networking sites as applied to the theoretical uses and gratifications framework.

Again, uses and gratifications research assumes an active audience. User activity

on Facebook occurs in two ways; by consuming existing content, or by contributing new content. Content consumption can involve for instance, the reading and searching of content added by other users. Contributing content however, often referred to as user-generated content, involves higher levels of audience activity as the audience is not simply consuming existing content, but creating new content. Contribution may include posting comments, sending messages, tagging pictures, uploading content, adding applications or filling out profiles.

This review of literature has informed this study in several ways. First, it is understood that the uses and gratifications theory can be applied to new media, such as social networking sites, to understand how audiences use the media in gratifying their social and psychological needs. Motivations drive needs, and therefore the study of audience motivations will help explain the strongest predictors of usage. Typologies of media motivations exist for many traditional media. However, the best motivation scales to use for studying new media such as social networking sites will measure motivations through scales including interpersonal, media and new technology motives. Additional and undefined motivations may also exist for new media such as social networking sites, motivations including communication goals such as networking and socializing. The literature points out that impression management is a major practice by users of social networking sites. However, it is unknown whether impression management is a motivation that predicts the use of social networking sites. For these reasons, this study will utilize a social networking site motivation measurement scale in predicting which motivations are the strongest predictors of social networking site use, and for the first time, will include and consider impression management among motives for site use.

Finally, the literature has pointed out the importance for validating the scale against criterion variables related to the construct. For that reason, it is important to include research pertaining to the effectiveness of advertisements on social networking sites.

Ch. 3 Method

A. Materials

I. Sampling

In determining the appropriate sample size for the current study, Wimmer and Dominick (1997) stated that, “multivariate studies always require larger samples than do univariate studies because they involve the analysis of multiple response data (several measurements on the same subject)” (p. 73). The appropriate sample size depends on several factors, but often most important is the amount of error that the researcher will tolerate. However, because sampling error cannot be calculated in non-probability samples such as the sample in the current study (Wimmer & Dominick, 1997, p. 74), it is important to determine an appropriate sample size through alternative criteria. Wimmer and Dominick, (1997) stated that, “one guideline recommended for multivariate studies is as follows: 50= very poor; 100= poor; 200= fair; 300= good; 500= very good; 1000=excellent” (p. 73).

All factors considered including the purpose of the current research, the time and financial constraints, as well as Wimmer and Dominick et al.’s (1997) suggestion for determining multivariate sample sizes, 350 participants was deemed a “good” to “very good” sample size by the current study. Therefore, a convenience sample of 350 students enrolled at a large Midwest university was recruited to voluntarily participate in an online survey (See Appendix H for recruitment script). This survey measured the intensity of their Facebook use, their motivations for using the site including the motivation

impression management, and their behavioral intentions toward advertisements on the site. Initial survey items also collected demographic data, including participants' gender measured by (1) male and (2) female, as well as their year in school measured by (1) college freshman, (2) college sophomore, (3) college junior, (4) college senior, and (5) graduate/ professional student. Participation in the study was voluntary, and participants were recruited through a student e-mail list serve.

II. Research Instrument

The survey used in this study was executed through freeonlinesurveys.com. This online survey generator assisted the researcher in creating the survey in an online forum, and allowed for mass distribution as well as data collection and exportation. Participants were directed to the online survey's URL through a recruitment e-mail sent through a student list-serve. When participants clicked on the link, they were directed to an informed consent statement (See Appendix A), which they were required to read and agree to its terms prior to entering the survey. Participants who did not consent were thanked for their time and asked to exit the survey at that time. Participants who consented were directed to the online survey (see Appendix B).

B. Methods: Survey Items

I. Facebook Use

In this study, the concept "social networking site use" is defined as the use of Facebook, one of the most frequented networking sites currently in the market. Facebook was selected for its heavy use by the "millenials" (Zuckerberg, N.D.), or college-aged audience, which strategically fit the convenience sample of college student participants used in this study. In regards to determining how to measure the use of a media, Younbo

et al. (2007) stated that, “although time spent on media (e.g., number of hours watching TV) is still widely used as a measure of media exposure, simple exposure time cannot capture different levels of attention or effort oriented to media usage” (p. 6).

In an effort to combat this criticism and obtain a more complete measure of Facebook use, the current study utilized Ellison’s et al. (2007) Facebook Intensity Scale (See Appendix C), which the authors explain, was created to determine participants’ use of Facebook beyond measurements including only frequency and duration of use. Ellison et al.’s (2007) Facebook Intensity Scale (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .83$) also includes two assessments of behavior. The first behavior dimension asks participants to indicate on an eight-point likert scale, the number of Facebook friends they have. The scale ranges from (1) “10 or less friends” to (8) “more than 400.” The second behavior measure asks participants to indicate on a five-point likert scale, the amount of time in minutes spent on Facebook in a typical day. The scale ranges from (0) “less than ten minutes” to (5) “more than three hours.” The scale also includes several five-point Likert scale items regarding attitudinal questions, which are designed to assess how emotionally connected a participant is to Facebook. These scale items ask participants indicate their level of agreement with statements regarding reasons for using Facebook, ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (5) “strongly agree.”

II. Motivations

The next set of survey questions measures participant’s motivations for using Facebook. According to Papacharissi and Rubin (2000), the concept of motivation can be defined as “general dispositions that influence people’s actions taken to fulfill a need or want” (p. 179). Scholars have created many scales in previous research that measure the

motivations driving media use (McQuail et al., 1972; McQuire, 1974; Ebersole, 2000; Stafford et al., 2007). However, Rodgers and her colleagues' (2007) Web Motivation Inventory (WMI) with new Internet motivations was considered the best choice for the current study due to its comprehensive nature, specificity to the Internet and adaptability to Facebook. The WMI scale is a logical choice for this study as it has been tested and re-tested on both student and non-student samples, US and non-US samples, and replicated over a period of time (Rodgers and Sheldon, 2002). According to Rodgers et al. (2007), the testing and re-testing of the WMI across different times and samples help to affirm the scale's construct validity and reliability. Additionally, the WMI has been applied in Internet advertising research, which is important for this study on Facebook and the effectiveness of advertisements on the site. The adapted WMI scale asks participants to indicate on several five-point Likert scales, their level of agreement with statements regarding reasons for using Facebook. The scales range from (1) "strongly disagree" to (5) "strongly agree." Higher scores indicate that the item more strongly motivated the participant's use of Facebook. Six items were deleted from the original scale that did not apply to Facebook use motivations. These items included, "create a wish list on a website," "cast my vote," "find a website someone recommended to me," "try on the latest fashions," "experience a product" and "buy a gift card for a family member or friend." Other items were adapted to apply more specifically to Facebook as opposed to the Web in the original study. For example, the item, "I use the Internet to e-mail friends," was adapted to read, "I use Facebook to message friends."

From the review of literature, it is believed that the ability to practice impression management should also be considered a motivation for using social networking sites.

Impression management can be described as the personal goal of managing one's image through self-presentation strategies, and research has concluded that impression management is a common practice among users of social networking sites (Dwyer, 2007; Ellison et al., 2006; Ellison et al., 2007; Rosenbloom, 2008.) Ellison et al. (2007) stated that a major benefit of social networking sites is building types of social capital, or staying in touch with friends while gaining new ones. Findings in boyd's (2004) study revealed that practicing impression management on social networking sites enabled users to negotiate their presentation of self in order to better connect with other users. Younbo et al.'s (2007) scale for measuring impression management (Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$) was adapted and used in addition to Rodgers et al.'s (2007) WMI scale, as the WMI scale does not include measures of the motivation to practice impression management (see Appendix E). The scale will be used in determining whether impression management is also a motivation predicting the use of Facebook, a motivation that may not be as obvious when studying the breadth of the Internet as a whole. This five-point Likert scale asks participants to indicate their level of agreement with statements regarding reasons for using Facebook, such as for example, "I use Facebook to add profile information that will make other users on Facebook perceive me as likeable." This scale ranges from (1) "strongly disagree" to (5) "strongly agree." Higher scores indicate the item more strongly motivated the participant's use of Facebook.

III. Behavior Towards Facebook Ads

Rodgers et al.'s (2007) study extended the WMI scale to include new Internet motives and tested the scale's nomological validity by investigating the relationship between Web motivations and two criterion variables, measuring approach and avoidance

behavior towards Internet advertisements. Items measuring approach and avoidance behaviors in this study were adapted from Rodgers et al.'s (2007) original items by replacing the phrase "Internet ads" with the phrase, "Facebook ads" (see Appendix F). This study defines approach and avoidance behaviors towards Facebook ads as, "intentions towards clicking on Facebook ads." Participants will be asked to indicate on two, five-point Likert scales, their level of agreement with statements regarding behaviors towards Facebook ads. The item "I tend to click on Facebook advertisements" will measure participant approach behavior in regards to Facebook advertisements. In contrast the item, "I typically try to avoid Facebook advertisements," will measure participant avoidance behavior towards Facebook ads. Each scale ranges from (1) "strongly disagree," to (5) "strongly agree."

C. Measurements

I. Usage scale

Ellison's et al. (2007) Facebook Intensity scale was chosen for measuring usage. Participant responses to scale items will first undergo a principle components factor analysis with Varimax rotation. This will determine whether the items all load on the same factor and are measuring the same concept. A Facebook Intensity variable will then be calculated using the retained items. This variable will represent the average intensity of participant's Facebook use. Individual items were standardized before calculating an average to create the intensity variable, due to differing item scale ranges.

II. Motivations scales

Data collected from participant responses to the items measuring their motivations for using Facebook, (Rodgers' et al. (2007) adapted WMI scale (Appendix

D), and the Younbo et al.'s (2007) adapted impression management scale (Appendix E)) will be subjected to a principal-components factor analysis with Varimax rotation. Factors with eigenvalues greater than +/- 1.0 will be retained for further analysis. Additionally, strongly loaded items for each factor will undergo a reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha in determining whether the items used in creating each variable, are reliable. The closer alpha is to 1.0, the more reliable the coefficient will be considered. Reliable items will be averaged and used to create new variables, each representing a motivation acting as a predictor variable. A correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the extracted motivations. Pearson Correlation coefficients and the significance of the correlations are reported.

III. Predictors of Facebook Use

In answering RQ1, multiple standard regression analysis was used to determine which motivation variables are the strongest predictors of Facebook use. First, a bivariate correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the predictor motivation variables, and the dependent variable measuring Facebook use. Next, the Facebook Intensity variable was regressed on each motivation variable. This determined how strongly individual motivations predict Facebook use. Significance of t-tests was reported.

IV. Avoidance and Approach Behavior

Total participant responses to the items measuring approach and avoidance behavior towards Facebook ads were used as DVs in the regression analysis towards answering the second and third research questions. The mean and standard deviation of the approach and avoidance behavior variables were reported. The approach and

avoidance variables were then used to assess the predictive power of each motivation variable previously defined by the factor analysis conducted for the motivation survey items.

V. Predictors of Behavior Towards Facebook Ads

In answering RQ2 and RQ3, multiple standard regression was used to understand which of the motivations factors were the strongest predictors of approach behavior and avoidance behavior. First, a bivariate correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the predictor motivation variables, and the dependent criterion variables measuring approach and avoidance behavior towards ads on Facebook. The approach and avoidance behavior variables were then each regressed on the motivation predictor variables. This determined how strongly each motivation predicted participant behavior towards ads on Facebook. Significance of t-tests were reported.

D. Statistical Assumptions

The assumed significance level was set at $p < .05$. This level of significance has been accepted and used in many research studies since the development of significance testing (Wimmer & Dominick, 1997, p. 232). Findings resulting in a significance level of $p < .01$ were acknowledged with a symbol noted in the tables illustrating the study findings. Additionally, because little was known about what outcomes the study would produce, and because two-tailed tests do not predict direction, two-tailed tests were appropriate to use for the study (Wimmer & Dominick, 1997, p. 232).

When predictor variables are highly correlated, multicollinearity can be a problem. According to Shannon and Davenport (2001), multicollinearity means that a large amount of overlap exists between predictor variables, leaving little variance

available for unique predictors to contribute to the dependent variable. In assuring that multicollinearity was not a problem in the current study, collinearity tests including tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) were conducted. According to Shannon and Davenport (2001), “Higher tolerance values indicate little overlap with the other predictors” whereas, “as the VIF becomes larger, greater overlap exists among predictors” (p. 321). Therefore, multicollinearity should not be a problem when the collinearity tests produce higher tolerance values and lower VIF values (close to 1). Upon completion of these tests in the current study, multicollinearity was not an issue.

Ch. 4 Results and Discussion

A. Results

I. Participant Demographics

A total of 350 participants responded to the online survey. Of those 350 responses, 62 participants dropped out of the study prior to answering survey items, leaving a total of 288 total study participants. According to Wimmer and Dominick (1997), this sample size is considered “good” for a multivariate study (p. 73). Of the 288 total participants, 213 were female (74% of the total respondents), and 75 were male (26% of the total respondents).

Three total college freshman (1% of total respondents), 60 college sophomores (20.8% of total respondents), 55 college juniors (19.1% of total respondents), 100 college seniors (34.7% of total respondents), and 70 professional/graduate students (24.3% of total respondents) responded to the survey.

II. Facebook Use

A Facebook intensity variable was calculated to represent the average intensity of participants’ Facebook use. Ellison’s et al. (2007) original Facebook intensity scale contained eight items. To ensure all items loaded on a single factor in this study, participant responses to the eight items were subjected to a principle component factor analysis with Varimax rotation. Initially, two factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than +/- 1.0, and were labeled “behavioral use” and “attitudinal use” of Facebook. Only the factor labeled “attitudinal use” however, met the criteria for factor retention.

According to Stacks (2002), the criteria for a factor to be considered for further statistical analysis is, “(1) each factor has at least two items that ‘load’ at +/- .60 and (2) each item does not ‘load’ on other factors greater than +/- .40 (p. 140). Table 1 summarizes the Facebook intensity variable created from participant responses to the current study.

Table 1: Rotated factor pattern from principal component analysis of Facebook intensity scale (N = 288)				
Factor	Items	Factor Loading	α	Variance Explained
(Eigenvalue)				
Attitudinal Use (3.466)			.734	32.237
	1. I am proud to tell people I'm on Facebook	.835		
	2. I feel I am part of the Facebook Community	.760		
	3. I would be sorry if Facebook shut down	.726		
Behavioral Use (1.122)				57.360
	1. In the past week, on average, approximately how many minutes per day have you spent on Facebook?	.720		
Deleted Items		Loadings		
		Emotional Use	Temporal Use	
	1. About how many total Facebook friends do you have?	-.045	.575	
	2. Facebook is part of my everyday activity	.436	.696	
	3. Facebook has become part of my daily routine	.464	.599	
	4. I feel out of touch when I haven't logged onto Facebook for a while	.599	.400	

From the factor analysis solution, items loaded on the factor labeled “attitudinal use” were used to create the Facebook intensity variable, representing the intensity of participants’ Facebook use. To create this variable, each item was first standardized to compensate for the differing item scale ranges. The standardized items were then averaged to create the Facebook intensity variable ($M = .0000$; $SD = .64671$). A

reliability analysis was conducted to determine the internal consistency of the Facebook use variable ($\alpha = .734$). According to Stacks (2002), “In general, good reliability estimates are coefficients of .70 or higher. Great reliability estimates are coefficients of .80 or higher. Excellent reliability estimates are coefficients of .90 or higher” (p. 132). Therefore, this study considers the reliability coefficient representing the Facebook intensity variable ($\alpha = .734$) a “good” estimate of internal consistency. Table 2 summarizes the Facebook intensity variable.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for Facebook use variable (N = 288)		
Variable and individual scale items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Facebook intensity variable¹ (Cronbach's alpha= .734)	.0000	.81
I am proud to tell people I'm on Facebook <i>1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree</i>	3.49	.883
I feel I am part of the Facebook community <i>1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree</i>	3.58	.887
I would be sorry if Facebook shut down <i>1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree</i>	4.11	1.005
<i>Notes: ¹ Individual items were first standardized before taking an average to create scale due to differing item scale ranges. The individual item's mean and standard deviation reported are prior to standardization.</i>		

III. Motivations and Impression Management

Items from both Rodgers' et al. (2007) adapted WMI scale (Appendix D) and Younbo et al.'s (2007) adapted impression management scale (Appendix E), were individually subjected to a principal-components factor analysis with Varimax rotation. A total of twelve factors with eigenvalues greater than +/- 1.0 emerged from the factor analysis conducted on the Rodgers' et al. (2007) adapted WMI scale. One factor with an

eigenvalue greater than +/- 1.0 emerged from the factor analysis conducted on the Younbo et al. (2007) adapted impression management scale.

In further determining which factors would be retained and which items were considered to load strongly on each factor, a criterion for factor and item retention was necessary. Stacks (2002) stated that, "like reliability, 'good' factors are produced by (1) at least two items that 'load' at +/- .60 and (2) do not 'load' on other factors greater than +/- .40, thus producing a clean dimension," (p. 140). Therefore, only those factors and items adhering to Stack's (2002) aforementioned criteria were retained. From Rodgers' et al. (2007) adapted WMI scale, three total factors and 15 total items did not adhere the criteria and were dropped from further analysis. From Younbo et al.'s (2007) adapted impression management scale, one item did not adhere to the criteria and was dropped from further analysis.

Finally, the items contributing to each retained factor were subjected to a reliability analysis. Referring back to Stack's (2002) description of acceptable reliability coefficients, good reliability estimates are coefficients of .70 or higher, great estimates are .80 or higher, and excellent reliability estimates are coefficients of .90 or higher (p. 132). One factor did not adhere to any of Stack's (2002) acceptable ranges for reliability coefficients. Therefore, that factor and its respective items were also dropped from further analysis. (see appendix G for a full listing of all deleted items).

Once all the items and factors that did not adhere to the retention criteria were deleted, a total of eight factors from Rodgers et al.'s (2007) original adapted WMI scale, and one factor from Younbo et al.'s (2007) original adapted impression management scale were retained for further statistical analysis. The factors retained from the adapted

WMI scale were labeled: information ($\alpha = .858$), entertainment ($\alpha = .824$), discussion ($\alpha = .894$), connect ($\alpha = .851$), shop ($\alpha = .858$), game ($\alpha = .870$), update ($\alpha = .753$) and product inquiry ($\alpha = .729$). The item retained from the impression management scale was labeled: impression management ($\alpha = .910$). These items representing these factors were used to create the predictor variables later used in a regression analysis in predicting both Facebook use, and participant behavior towards advertisements on Facebook. Table 3 summarizes the nine total motivation factors representing these predictor variables.

Table 3: Rotated factor pattern from principal component analysis of Facebook motives (N = 288)				
Motive (Eigenvalue)	Items	Loading	α	Variance Explained
Information (11.392)	1. I use Facebook to search for information I need	.784	.858	8.018
	2. I use Facebook to get information I need	.823		
	3. I use Facebook to find out things I need to know	.771		
	4. I use Facebook to get answers to specific questions	.614		
Entertainment (4.687)	1. I use Facebook to surf for fun	.724	.824	7.998
	2. I use Facebook to find information to entertain myself	.718		
	3. I use Facebook to amuse myself	.730		
	4. I use Facebook to entertain myself	.763		
Discussion (2.786)	1. I use Facebook to discuss topics I care about	.726	.894	7.657
	2. I use Facebook to participate in a group discussion	.731		
	3. I use Facebook to give my on a topic of discussion	.781		
	4. I use Facebook to respond to others discussion on topics of interest to me	.772		
Connect (2.321)	1. I use Facebook to Facebook chat live with other users	.850	.851	6.045
	2. I use Facebook to chat with others online	.794		

3. I use Facebook to talk to a live person	.726		
Shop (2.018)		.858	5.510
1. I use Facebook to shop for products listed on Facebook's marketplace	.871		
2. I use Facebook to sell products through Facebook's marketplace	.844		
3. I use Facebook to buy things	.798		
Game (1.809)		.870	5.416
1. I use Facebook to play games	.868		
2. I use Facebook to entertain myself with games	.837		
3. I use Facebook to play games with other users	.839		
Update (1.809)		.753	5.165
1. I use Facebook to read updates about other's on the news feed	.687		
2. I use Facebook to read friend's status updates	.673		
3. I use Facebook to read specific friend's mini-feeds	.712		
Product Inquiry (1.379)		.729	4.139
1. I use Facebook to discuss products with other users	.689		
2. I use Facebook to learn about products from friends	.661		
Impression Management ¹ (1.115)		.910	59.333
1. I add profile information on Facebook that will make others perceive me as likeable	.867		
2. I add profile information on Facebook that will make others perceive me as friendly	.863		
3. I add profile information on Facebook that will make others perceive me as socially desirable	.847		
4. I add profile information on Facebook that will make others perceive me as competent	.843		
5. I add profile information on Facebook that will make others perceive me as skilled	.795		
6. I add profile information on Facebook that will make others perceive me as intelligent	.827		
7. I think about how the other people on Facebook are evaluating my profile	.607		
Notes: ¹ Items summarized under the factor labeled "impression management" resulted from a factor analysis conducted separate from all other items, as the items originated from two separate scales measuring different concepts.			

A correlation analysis was conducted to determine the whether significant

relationships exist between the motivations extracted from the factor analysis. Table 4 illustrates the correlation analysis, reporting the Pearson Correlation and significance (2-tailed) of the correlation between the motivations.

	Information	Entertainment	Discussion	Connect	Shop
Information	1.000	.385** (.000)	.508** (.000)	.152** (.010)	.173** (.003)
Entertainment	.358** (.000)	1.000	.273** (.000)	.169** (.004)	.093 (.116)
Discussion	.508** (.000)	.273** (.000)	1.000	.283** (.000)	.282** (.000)
Connect	.152** (.010)	.169** (.004)	.283** (.000)	1.000	.145* (.013)
Shop	.173** (.000)	.093 (.116)	.282** (.000)	.145* (.013)	1.000
Game	.140* (.017)	.142* (.016)	.304** (.000)	.232** (.000)	.286** (.000)
Impression Management	.249** (.000)	.252* (.000)	.159* (.007)	.131* (.026)	.114 (.054)
Update	.258** (.000)	.482** (.000)	.298** (.000)	.279** (.000)	.041 (.491)
Product Inquiry	.241** (.000)	.140* (.018)	.438** (.000)	.185** (.002)	.414** (.000)

Table 4 (Cont.)				
	Game	Impression Management	Update	Product Inquiry
Information	.140* (.017)	.249** (.000)	.258** (.000)	.241** (.000)
Entertainment	.142** (.016)	.252** (.000)	.482** (.000)	.140* (.018)
Discussion	.304** (.000)	.159** (.007)	.298** (.000)	.438** (.000)
Connect	.232** (.000)	.131* (.026)	.131* (.026)	.279** (.000)
Shop	.286** .000	.114 .054	.041 .491	.414** .000
Game	1.000	.039 .505	.139* .018	.289** .000
Impression Management	.039 .505	1.000	.232** .000	.075 .204
Update	.139** .018	.232** .000	1.000	.075 .204
Product Inquiry	.289** .000	.086 .144	.075 .204	1.000
Pearson Correlation (Sig. 2-tailed) ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level				

The correlation analysis revealed six insignificant relationships between motivations. The motivations insignificantly related to each other included the following: Shop and Entertainment ($r = .093$, $p = .116$); Shop and Impression Management ($r = .114$, $p = .054$); Shop and Update ($r = .041$, $p = .491$); Impression Management and Game ($r = .039$, $p = .505$); Impression Management and Product Inquiry ($r = .086$, $p = .144$);

Product Inquiry and Update ($r = .075, p = .204$).

IV. Predictors of Facebook Use

Table 4 describes the bivariate correlations between the nine Facebook motive variables, and the Facebook use variable. The findings show that the information ($r = .314, p < .01$), entertainment ($r = .474, p < .01$), discussion ($r = .242, p < .01$), connect ($r = .346, p < .01$), game ($r = .135, p < .05$), update ($r = .372, p < .01$) and impression management ($r = .239, p < .01$) motives significantly correlate with Facebook use. In contrast, the motives shop and product inquiry were not significantly correlated with Facebook use.

Table 5: Correlation matrix between motivations and Facebook use (N = 288)		
Motivation	Facebook Use	
	<i>r</i>	<i>P</i>
Information	.314 **	.000
Entertainment	.474 **	.000
Discussion	.242 **	.000
Connect	.346 **	.000
Shop	.104	.077
Game	.135 *	.022
Update	.372 **	.000
Product Inquiry	.103	.082
Impression Management	.239 **	.000
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed) ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)		

Research question one asked, “What motivations are the strongest predictors of social networking site use?” In answering this question, the Facebook use variable was regressed on the nine motivation predictor variables. Table 5 summarizes this regression analysis. Results from the multiple regression analysis show that the nine-factor model significantly predicted Facebook use ($R^2 = .327$; adjusted $R^2 = .305$; $p < .01$). The entertainment ($\beta = .323$, $p = .000$) and connect ($\beta = .239$, $p = .000$) motives were significant predictors of Facebook use. Both the entertainment and connect motives increased participants’ use of Facebook.

Table 6: Summary of multiple regression analysis for motivations predicting Facebook use (N = 288)			
Dependent Variable: Facebook Use			
Predictors	β	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
Information	.115	1.900	.058
Entertainment	.323 **	5.430	.000
Discussion	-.008	-.116	.908
Connect	.239 **	4.478	.000
Shop	.022	.401	.680
Game	.006	.111	.912
Impression Management	.075	1.427	.155
Update	.106	1.793	.074
Product Inquiry	-.036	-.620	.536
R^2 (Adj. R^2)	.327 (.305)		
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)			
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)			

V. Avoidance and Approach Behavior

Table 6 summarizes descriptive statistics for the two criterion variables, related to

advertisements on social networking sites, which represent study participants' behavior towards advertisements on Facebook. Total responses to the items were used to create the two dependent criterion variables labeled approach and avoidance behavior. The approach behavior variable represents participant responses to the survey item, "I tend to click on advertisements on Facebook." The avoidance behavior variable represents participant responses to the survey item, "I typically try to avoid advertisements on Facebook."

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for approach and avoidance behavior variables towards Facebook ads (N = 288)		
Individual items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
I tend to click on advertisements on Facebook. <i>1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree</i>	1.66	.872
I typically try to avoid advertisements on Facebook. <i>1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree</i>	4.16	.955

VI. Predictors of Behaviors Towards Facebook Ads

Table 7 describes the bivariate correlations between the nine Facebook motivation variables and the two criterion variables, representing either approach or avoidance behavior towards advertisements on Facebook. The findings show that the information ($r = .120, p < .05$), entertainment ($r = .168, p < .01$), discussion ($r = .139, p < .05$), shop ($r = .252, p < .01$), game ($r = .175, p < .01$) and product inquiry ($r = .268, p < .01$) motives significantly and positively correlate with approach behavior. The motives, labeled connect and update, did not significantly correlate with approach behavior.

Additionally, findings show that the entertainment ($r = -.160, p < .01$), discussion ($r = -.144, p < .05$), shop ($r = -.262, p < .01$), product inquiry ($r = -.298, p < .01$) and

game ($r = -.136, p < .05$) motives all significantly and negatively correlate with avoidance behavior. The motives labeled information, connect, update, and impression management, did not significantly correlate with avoidance behavior.

Table 8: Correlation matrix between motivations and approach and avoidance behavior towards Facebook ads (N = 288)				
Predictors	I tend to click on Facebook ads (Approach Behavior)		I typically try to avoid Facebook ads (Avoidance Behavior)	
	<i>r</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>P</i>
Motivation				
Information	.120 *	.042	-.109	.065
Entertainment	.168 **	.004	-.160 **	.006
Discussion	.139 *	.018	-.144 *	.014
Connect	.115	.051	-.093	.115
Shop	.252 **	.000	-.262 **	.000
Game	.175 **	.003	-.136 *	.021
Update	.098	.097	-.068	.250
Product Inquiry	.268 **	.000	-.298 **	.000
Impression Management	.066	.262	-.089	.130

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)
 ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

The second and third research questions in this study sought to understand, “What motivations are the strongest predictors of approach behavior towards advertisements on Facebook, and what motivations are the strongest predictors of avoidance behavior towards advertisements on Facebook?”

In answering these questions, the approach and avoidance behavior variables were individually regressed on the nine motivation predictor variables. Table 8 summarizes the

regression analysis for the motivations predicting approach behavior, while table 9 summarizes the regression analysis for the motivations predicting avoidance behavior.

Table 9: Summary of multiple regression analysis for motivations predicting approach behavior towards Facebook ads (N = 288)			
Dependent Variable: Approach behavior			
Predictors	β	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
Information	.016	.235	.815
Entertainment	.115	1.685	.093
Discussion	-.059	-.791	.430
Connect	.033	.545	.586
Shop	.155 *	2.430	.016
Game	.067	1.082	.280
Impression Management	-.002	-.032	.975
Update	.018	.261	.794
Product Inquiry	.183 **	2.726	.007
R² (Adj. R²)	.118 (.090)		
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)			
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)			

Table 10: Summary of multiple regression analysis for motivations predicting avoidance behavior towards Facebook ads (N = 288)			
Dependent Variable: Avoidance behavior			
Predictors	β	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
Information	.009	.129	.898
Entertainment	-.122	-1.800	.073
Discussion	.039	.523	.602
Connect	-.016	-.258	.797
Shop	-.160 *	-2.536	.012
Game	-.019	-.303	.762
Impression Management	-.030	-.504	.615
Update	.014	.212	.832
Product Inquiry	-.224 **	-3.345	.001
R² (Adj. R²)	.128 (.099)		
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed)			
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)			

Results from the multiple regression analysis show that the nine-factor model predicted approach behavior ($R^2 = .118$; adjusted $R^2 = .090$; $p < .01$). The shop ($\beta = .155$, $p = .016$) and product inquiry ($\beta = .183$, $p = .007$) motives were significant predictors of approach behavior towards advertisements on Facebook. The motives labeled shop and product inquiry increased participants' intention to click on the advertisements on Facebook.

Additionally, the nine-factor model predicted avoidance behavior ($R^2 = .128$; adjusted $R^2 = .099$; $p < .01$). The shop ($\beta = -.160$, $p = .012$) and product inquiry ($\beta = -.224$, $p = .001$) motives were significant predictors of avoidance behavior towards

advertisements on Facebook. Both the shop and product inquiry motives decreased participants' avoidance of the advertisements on Facebook.

B. Discussion

I. Theoretical Implications

In regards to the first research question, findings revealed that seven of the nine total Facebook motives were positively related to Facebook use. The shop and product inquiry motivations were not significantly related to the use of Facebook. Although it could be argued that the advertisements and marketplace application on Facebook do provide users outlets for gratifying their shop and product inquiry motives, the goal of interaction between users on Facebook is not specific to product discussions or shopping. In an attempt to understand why these motives did not have a significant relationship with Facebook use, Ellison et al. (2007) stated that the common goal of all social networking sites is, "forming connections between users," (p. 1). Facebook continues to be an outlet for "forming connections between users" and those connections are vast and unique to each user. Therefore, an argument for why the shop and product inquiry motives were not significantly related to Facebook use could be the fact that they have less to do with forming connections with others, and more to do with online purchases when compared to the motivations that were significantly correlated with Facebook use. These motivations significantly correlated with the use of Facebook include information, entertainment, discussion, connect, game, impression management, and update. The motivation labeled game was the least significant of these relationships which again, could be explained by the fact that Facebook is not a gaming site by nature, such those networking sites like SecondLife.com, where the site is more focused on the gaming

aspects. Although users can play games on Facebook, these games became available only recently in May of 2007 when Facebook first started to allow outside developers to create Facebook applications. Therefore, it is possible that the significance of a relationship between user's motivations and site use depends on the overall goal or purpose of that site, as defined by the way it is used by the majority of its audience. For example, in a research study focused on a social networking site where most of the interaction between users is specific to shopping for example, a shop motive may be highly correlated with the site usage.

Of the seven motives significantly related to Facebook use, only the motivations labeled connect and entertainment were significant predictors of Facebook use. In reference to the review of literature, the uses and gratifications theory asks how audiences use media in fulfillment of their needs. In studying need gratification, an audience's social and psychological motivations are used to measure their media use. Scholars infer motivations from behaviors, and this is supported through functionalist theory which assumes that people are most motivated to use a media when it media provides gratification opportunities matching the user's needs, (Rodgers and Sheldon, 2002, p. 85). Therefore, one reason the connect and entertainment motives are significant predictors of Facebook may be due to the fact that study participants strongly believe Facebook provides them over all other motives, the opportunity to connect with others and to entertain themselves through the use of the site. To clarify, it is not to say that Facebook does not provide opportunities for gratifying needs related to other motivations. It is obvious that the nature of Facebook's features provide opportunities for users to gratify needs related the other motivations, such as discussing topics with others or searching for

information for example. However while seven of the nine total motivations defined by this study were significantly related to Facebook use, only the motivations connect and entertainment can be said to significantly predict participants' Facebook use.

The survey items defining the motivations connect and entertainment were originally defined by the motivations communication, research and surf in the Rodgers' et al. (2007) study. At first glance, it does not seem logical that some of the same survey items defining connect and entertainment motives in the current study, could also define the motives labeled research and surf in Rodgers' et al. (2007) WMI study. When taking a closer look however, it makes sense that the item "I use Facebook to surf for fun," (as adapted from the item, "I use the Internet to surf for fun" from the WMI scale), falls under both entertainment motive in the current study, and the surf motive in Rodgers et al.'s (2007) study.

In Rodgers et al.'s (2007), the original four motives from the author's previous study were further divided into sub-motives. In the current study, the items defining the motivations connect and entertainment originally fell under the sub-motives labeled community, interaction, entertainment and exploration. The division of the original motives into sub-motives further clarifies why items defining the motivations connect and entertainment in the current study, were originally defined by the surf or research motives from Rodgers et al.'s (2007) study. For instance in the WMI study, one of the sub-motives under the research motive was labeled interaction, and the items defining the interaction sub-motive also defines the connect motive in the current study. It is more obvious that items defining the connect motive in the current study could also define the

sub-motive interaction in the Rodgers et al. (2007) study, especially more obvious when compared to the research motive from which the sub-motive interaction was developed.

Moving forward from research question one, the second and third research questions attempted to understand how motivations are related to, and predict, criterion variables measuring participants' approach and avoidance behaviors towards advertisements on Facebook. Similarly, Rodgers et al. (2007) assessed the nomological validity of the WMI scale using such criterion variables, which was adapted and used in the current study. In making this assessment, Rodgers et al. (2007) validated the extended WMI scale by determining whether the construct of interest, motivations for using the Web, behaved as it should with regard to its external relationship with other concepts, specifically banner ads on the Web. It was necessary to repeat this assessment in the current study, as the assessment of the nomological validity of the Rodgers et al.'s (2007) WMI scale related to Internet motivations and advertisements, whereas the current study relates to Facebook motivations and advertisements on Facebook. In addition, when the nomological validity of the WMI scale was assessed in the Rodgers et al.'s (2007) study, the motivation impression management was not included in the analysis.

The relationships between the criterion variables and the motivation variables were first assessed through a bivariate correlation analysis. The motivations significantly related to approach behavior included information, entertainment, discussion, shop, game, and product inquiry. The correlation analysis showed that these significant relationships were positive, meaning that as a participant's motivation increases, the more likely they are to approach an advertisement on Facebook. Likewise, as a participant's motivation decreases, the less likely they are to approach an advertisement on Facebook,

however only for those motivations that were significantly related to approach behavior. In contrast, the motivations significantly related to avoidance behavior include entertainment, discussion, shop, product inquiry and game. All of the significant relationships found between the avoidance variables and motivations were negative, meaning that as one of these motivations increases for participants, the likelihood that the participants will avoid an advertisement on Facebook will decrease. Likewise, as one of these motivations decreases for participants, the likelihood that the participant will avoid an advertisement on Facebook will increase.

Despite these correlations, only the shop and product inquiry motives were significant predictors of the approach and avoidance variables behavior towards advertisements on Facebook. The shop and product inquiry motives significantly predicted an increase in approach behavior, or in other words an increase in participants' intentions to click on advertisements on Facebook. Likewise, the shop and product inquiry motives significantly predicted a decrease in avoidance behavior, or rather a decrease in participants' avoidance of Facebook advertisements. This makes sense both logically, and in accordance with Cooper et al.'s (1998) explanation of the functionalist theory. The author explained how motivations are the key to understanding behaviors, as they are what give rise to the behavior. In relation to the current study, the shop and product inquiry motivations are what give rise to approach and avoidance behaviors towards Facebook advertisement. It can be argued that a major goal of advertising is to persuade audiences to attend to the advertisement's message. Therefore, it makes sense that the shop and product inquiry motives significantly predicted approach and avoidance behaviors towards advertisements on Facebook, because the survey items defining the

these motivations logically relate to participants' desires to purchase and/or learn about products or services offered by the advertisers.

Perhaps this also explains why, although correlated with the approach and avoidance behavior variables, none of the other seven motivations (information, entertainment, discussion, connect, game, update, and impression management) were significant predictors of behaviors towards Facebook advertisements. A major assumption of the uses and gratification theory is that consumers are goal-directed in their use of media. When Internet advertisements produce a significant source of noise or nuisance, they can hinder, disrupt, distract or intrude on the goals of the users (Cho and Cheon, 2004, p. 90). This could be an explanation for why motivations such as information and connect, may not have significantly predicted approach behavior towards Facebook advertisements. Such advertisements could be considered disruptive in nature for participants motivated to use Facebook for reasons other than those opportunities provided by the advertising messages. In contrast, those participant's motivated to use the site to shop or inquire about products may view the advertisements as an opportunity for need gratification provided through their Facebook use.

However, in making this assertion it would also then seem as though a significant and positive predictive relationship would exist between the seven motivations mentioned above and the avoidance behavior variable, meaning that for example as participants' motivations for connecting with friends increased, so to would their avoidance of advertisements on Facebook. However this predictive relationship did not reveal itself in the current study. Perhaps then, the only interpretation that can be made is that participants behave indifferently towards advertisements on Facebook, neither

approaching nor avoiding the advertisements, when motivated by any of the seven insignificant predictor motivation variables. This means that unless advertisers tailor their messages to reflect either a shop or product inquiry motivation, the effectiveness of their message will be based on a gamble or educated guess, rather than a predictive relationship. However there may be one other explanation for the lack of predictive relationships, positive or negative, between the motivation and the approach and avoidance variables. Rodgers and Sheldon (2002) stated in reference to the functionalist theory that, Internet banner advertisements promoting a message that matches a user's motivation for using the Web, should be more persuasive than banners that do not. Findings from the Rodgers and Sheldon (2002) study revealed the author's hypothesis was accurate, and that for all but one, messages matching participant's motivation was a positive predictor of participant interaction with the advertisement.

In applying these findings, one explanation for the lack of significant predictive relationships between user motivations and approach and avoidance behavior variables on Facebook, is the possibility that the majority of advertisements currently on Facebook promote messages appealing only to the shop and product inquiry motivations. This would imply a need for Facebook advertisers to create messages appealing not only to the shop and product inquiry motivations, but also to the other seven motivations that were not significant predictors of approach or avoidance behavior. It is unknown whether the findings of Rodgers and Sheldon (2002) study would prove to be equally effective for increasing audience interaction with Facebook advertisements as motivations for using the sites may differ slightly from those of the Web as a whole. However, the current study revealed that only the shop and product inquiry motivations predict participant

interaction with advertisements on Facebook, and if it is true that only shop and product inquiry motivations are the focus of advertising messages on Facebook, advertisers may be doing themselves a disservice by ignoring what really motivates audiences to use Facebook. In this study, only the motivations connect and entertain significantly predicted Facebook use. Perhaps if advertisers tailored their messages to match these motivations, audiences would be more likely to view the ads as an outlet for their need gratification, and in turn the desired approach behavior towards their advertisements would ensue.

One last goal of the current study was to determine whether participant's motivation to practice impression management was a significant predictor of Facebook use as suggested by literature. Current studies have shown that impression management is an important concept to consider when studying social networking sites because online communication lacks the social cues involved with face-to-face interactions, (Ellison, 2007; Lui, 2007; Rosenbloom, 2008; Bargh et al., 2008). There is no question that the interactive features of Facebook provide users the opportunity to practice impression management, and participants in qualitative studies (Dwyer, 2007) have admitted enjoying the act of managing the impression they give off to others online through their profiles. However, the impression management motivation in the current study did not significantly predict participants' Facebook use. However, the impression management motive was significantly correlated with Facebook use, meaning that although the motivation did not predict participant use of Facebook, a positive relationship exists between the concepts. Theoretically, this may imply that managing one's impression online is not the sole driving force encouraging participants use Facebook. It was

interesting to find however, that the impression management motivation was significantly correlated with both the motivations connect and entertainment, the only two motivations significantly predicting Facebook use. This may imply that although not predicting the use of Facebook, impression management may play an interesting role in the use of Facebook.

II. Methodological Implications

The first methodological implication relevant to this study relates to Ellison's et al. (2007) "Facebook Intensity Scale" which was adapted for this study in order to measure study participants' use of Facebook. As previously mentioned, this scale was chosen for its inclusion of measurements other than traditional measures of frequency and duration of Facebook use, including additional behavioral and attitudinal questions regarding site use as well. In total, Ellison's et al. (2007) Facebook intensity scale was originally comprised of eight items. In the original Ellison et al. (2007) study, all eight items were used to create the Facebook intensity variable by standardizing the mean of each items and then taking an average of those scores. However, in the current study, a principal component factor analysis with Varimax rotation was performed prior to creating the intensity of use variable to ensure the items all measured Facebook use. Surprisingly, the factor analysis revealed that only three attitudinal use items met this study's criteria for retention, as defined in the results section by Stacks (2002). This means that the original scale items pertaining to behavioral Facebook use including (1) how many friends a user has, and (2) average time spent weekly on Facebook, were not included in the measurement scale used to define participant's Facebook use in this study. In other words, participant's use of Facebook in this study was defined only by attitudinal

usage questions, which according to Ellison (2002), were designed to measure “the extent to which the participant was emotionally connected to Facebook and the extent to which Facebook was integrated into her daily activities” (Measures of Facebook Usage section, para.1).

The reliability coefficient of the Facebook intensity variable in the current study (Cronbach's alpha= .734) was slightly lower when compared with the reliability coefficient of Ellison’s (2007) scale that included all eight items (Cronbach's alpha= .83). However, the reliability of the scale in this study, consisting only of attitudinal items, fell in the range of what is considered a “good” reliability coefficient (Stacks, 2002, p. 132). It is believed however, that by adhering to this strict retention criteria and by deleting those items and factors not adhering to the criteria, the Facebook intensity variable is the purest representation of the participants’ use of Facebook attainable by this study. With the behavioral items completely excluded from the scale, it is important to reevaluate what the scale is measuring. The purpose of the original scale was to measure the intensity of study participants’ use of Facebook. However, after deleting the unreliable scale items, remaining items used to create the Facebook use variable consisted only of, “I am proud to tell people I am on Facebook,” “I feel I am part of the Facebook community,” and “I would be sorry if Facebook shut down.” Without the inclusion of both attitudinal and behavioral items, it would be difficult to argue that the variable is still measuring participants’ overall “intensity of Facebook use.” It could however be argued that these items are measuring participants’ use of Facebook in terms of their, “commitment to Facebook.” In re-conceptualizing the Facebook use variable from “participants’ intensity of Facebook use,” to read “participants’ commitment to Facebook

use,” both current and future studies are able to make more clear, what the use variable is measuring and how it interacts with other variables such the motivations.

Recent studies have similarly differentiated between types of media use, dependent upon the items used in forming the scales. For example, Larose, Lin and Easton (2003) measured participants’ use of the Internet using three separate scales. One scale measured Internet use behaviorally, utilizing items similar to the behavioral items deleted from the “commitment of use” scale in the current study such. The remaining two use scales measured participants’ use of the Internet in terms of self-regulation in relation to Internet addiction, and the other in terms of habit strength as related how much using the Internet is habit for the participant. Differentiating between types of media use is important both conceptually and theoretically. Newer media like the Internet and social networking sites allow for various types of use, and can differ dependent upon individual users. In the current study, because only the attitudinal items were reliable and used in forming the Facebook use variable, it is important to elaborate on what the variable measured. Therefore, the Facebook use variable in the current study can be said to describe participants’ “commitment to use Facebook” more than their intensity of Facebook use.

The second methodological implication stems from the differences between the two scales used to measure participants’ motivations. These two scales again include Rodgers’ et al. (2007) adapted WMI scale and Younbo et al.’s (2007) adapted scale for measuring impression management. Rodgers et al.’s (2007) adapted WMI scale is an extended version of the original WMI scale, including 42 new motive items in addition to the 12 existing items. These items measured various motives for using the Internet

compiled from other motive scales as well as qualitative data. The purpose of Rodgers et al.'s (2007) study, which extended the original WMI scale, was confirmatory in nature and assisted in further validation of a proven Web motivation measurement scale. In contrast, the Younbo et al.'s (2007) adapted impression management scale includes a total of eight items, all measuring participant's motivation to practice impression management on specific Web site. This contrasts to the WMI, which measures not one, but various motivations for using the entire Web, as opposed to a unique Web site.

It was originally thought that items comprising the impression management scale would be added to the WMI scale items in the current study, as the WMI did not include items measuring participants' motivation for practicing impression management. First, an initial principle components factor analysis with Varimax rotation was performed, combining both WMI and impression management scale items into one scale. By combining these two scales, a total of 62 items were entered for a data reduction analysis. With this large amount of items, a total of 13 factors emerged with eigenvalues over +/- 1.0. This raised the question of whether combining the items from the two different scales produced impure results. To determine whether a cleaner data reduction was possible, the two scales were separated for individual factor analyses. From these individual factor analyses, factors were then extracted and defined separately. Then, new variables were created to represent each motivation by averaging the items representing each factor. These motivation variables, created by extracting factors from items originally adapted from the WMI and impression management scales, were finally reunited as predictor variables in the multiple regression analyses which were later used to answer the study's research questions.

One reason the first factor analysis could have produced an unclear reduction of data could have to do with the fact that the scales were measuring motivations in slightly different ways. According to the functionalist theory, motivations are often measured through behaviors is because motivations give rise to behaviors (Cooper et al., 1998, p. 1528). Items from Rodgers et al.'s (2007) WMI scale support this functionalist theory by measuring motivations through participants' self-reported agreement or disagreement with statements regarding certain behaviors. For example, the survey item, "I use the Web to search for information I need," uses the behavior, "search for information" to define the underlying motive, "information." The original impression management scale measured motivations more through participant desires, rather than behaviors. For example, the original scale item, "I want other users in the Cyworld.com to perceive me as friendly," reflects a participant's desire to be viewed a certain way, however the behavior associated with achieving that desire is undefined in by item. For this reason, scale items such as the one mentioned above were adapted in the current study to more strongly reflect participants' behaviors related to managing their impression on Facebook, as opposed to their desired results from practicing impression management. For example, the above item was adapted to read, "I use Facebook to add profile information that will make others perceive me as likeable," in order to measure behaviors similar to the WMI scale.

III. Practical Implications

Many of the theoretical implications discussed have applied considerably to the marketers on Facebook, and how they might tailor their advertising messages to better serve the needs of their consumers. However, current study findings may have practical

implications for the Web site managers working for social networking sites such as Facebook. According to Verbyla (1997):

Many guidelines on building Web sites re-iterate the theme that the user must win for the Web site to win. In the initial stages this involves designing the character of the Web site to attract the intended audience of consumers. Thereafter there must be in place mechanisms to ensure that the Web site enables the desired relationships to be built up with that audience, (Synergize section).

In other words, it is not only important for Facebook marketers to tailor their advertising messages to meet audience's motivations for using the site, but is equally important for Web site managers too, to understand what drives audiences to the sites for several reasons. First and foremost, the job of the site manager should be providing a user-focused and user-friendly site for the purposes of ensuring that site traffic will persist, marketers interest in the site will remain, and site profitability will ensue. By understanding what motivates consumers to use the site, which according to study findings is to connect and entertain, Web site managers can make the necessary changes to the site to ensure such needs are being gratified. Verbyla (1997) suggests that effectiveness of Web site management does not only rest in understanding the needs of site users, but also the needs of site sponsors to effectively target site users. "This means that the processes and supporting tools for Web-site management must not speak only one language. Indeed the processes and tools can be enriched by drawing from those already in the various areas such as graphical design, statistics, flow analysis and sales psychology" (Verbyla, 1997, Synergize section). Using current research findings in addition to such Web site management tools, site managers can better provide online marketers the abilities to gratify user motives for site use.

For example, the introduction of Facebook applications allowed for outside developers to create applications, often times that were product or service specific, for users to interact with on Facebook. Web site managers could benefit from gaining further understanding of what motivates audiences to use their sites. In turn, these managers could further develop new, or fine tune existing Facebook opportunities, both enabling site sponsors to better gratify user needs and increasing overall user satisfaction with the site in general. In relation to the current study, participants reported that a major motivation for using Facebook was for entertainment. Using this knowledge, Web site managers could use Verbyla's (1997) aforementioned management tools (including graphical design, statistics, flow analysis and sales psychology) to investigate new ways to entertain users through the modification and advancement of site features. Such modifications may call for increasing the opportunities for interaction between users and marketing messages beyond banner ads, in such a way that users will be provided more entertained by the messages.

C. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Follow-up studies should consider either creating a new, or adapting an existing impression management scale, different from the Younbo et al.'s (2007) impression management scale used in the current study. One reason for this suggestion already briefly discussed, is the fact that the original wording of scale items from the Younbo et al. (2007) scale reflected participants' desires to be perceived in a certain way by others, rather than their specific impression management behaviors on the site. Additionally, because the original impression management scale items were adapted to measure behaviors rather than desires in the current study, participants may have been unclear as

to what the questions were asking. For instance, interpretation of responses to the scale item, “I add profile information on Facebook that that will make others perceive me as likeable” may not be very representative of impression management behaviors occurring on Facebook. It would be hard to imagine many Facebook users would be adding information “to appear un-likeable or unappealing to others,” as this would be inconsistent with the overall goal of networking and connecting with other users on social networking sites (Ellison et al., 2007, p. 1).

Future scale items should be more specific to the impression management behaviors occurring online through Facebook, perhaps even including items regarding the interactive features enabling users to execute such self-regulating behaviors online. For example, a hypothetical scale item asking participants to indicate their level of agreement with a statement such as, “When tagged in a Facebook album, I sometimes delete pictures of myself I believe others will find unattractive,” may more accurately measure the kind of impression management behaviors carried out specifically by users of Facebook.

Future studies can also attempt to further validate and extend Rodgers’ et al. (2007) WMI proven scale for measuring Web use motivations. For example, adapting the scale to measure participant motivations for using specific Web sites such as Facebook or a similar social networking site, as opposed to the entirety of the Web. Such studies should explore whether new motivations specific to the unique goals of the site in question should be considered. For example, the current study treated impression management as a possible motivation driving participant use of Facebook, as networking with other users is a major goal on social networking sites and users have the ability to control the impressions they give off through their online profiles. When initially creating

the WMI scale items, Rodgers and Sheldon (2002) conducted qualitative interviews and synthesized existing motivation scales to categorize Web use motivations into four categories. This method could prove affective for defining motivations and scale items unique to specific Web sites, as opposed to adapting only a single existing scale as done in the current study with the impression management scale.

Another limitation of the current study to address is the fact that this study utilized data collected from a non-probability convenience sample, comprised completely of college students from a single mid-western university. This means that all significant findings in the current study were based on responses from a non-representative sample. Therefore, participant responses in the current study may differ greatly when compared to a probability sample comprised of participants varying in age and geographic location, especially when considering the possibility of a similar study conducted on an international level. According to Stacks (2002), because sampling error cannot be calculated when using non-probability samples such as the sample used in this study, any significant results should not be generalized to the population, which in this case would be all Facebook users (p. 62). It is also important to note that only three total college freshman (1% of total respondents) participated in the current study. This is a low representation of an age group that could arguably be heavy Facebook users. Although certain research constraints prevented the current study from obtaining a more representative sample, future studies utilizing a non-probability sample should consider using a quota sampling method to ensure all age groups are more equally represented.

Lastly, it is interesting that only the shop and product inquiry motivations were significant predictors of behavior towards Facebook advertisements. This may have had

to due with the fact that shopping and product inquiry are inherently related to some of the major goals of advertisements, including selling products or services, and having consumers notice and attend to messages. However, it is also possible that current advertisements on Facebook have failed to provide users with messages reflecting their motivations for Facebook use, thus failing to provide users an outlet for need gratification. Future research should investigate current advertising content and messages on Facebook or similar social networking sites, in an effort to determine how message strategies relate to or deviate from audiences' motivations for using the site. In extending current study findings, future research could seek to determine whether any advertisements on Facebook are reflective of the motivations found to significantly predict Facebook use in the current study, specifically the connect and entertainment motives. If the majority of advertisements fail to acknowledge Facebook audiences' motivations for using the site in their messages, such findings could further validate this study's assertion that perhaps current Facebook advertisements are only reflective of the shop and product inquiry motivations, and that more messages should attempt to gratify audiences' motivations to connect with others and to entertain themselves.

Ch. 5 Conclusion

A. Overview

The purpose of this research was to determine what motivations are the strongest predictors of Facebook use, as well as which are the strongest predictors of approach and avoidance behaviors towards the advertisements on Facebook. Past studies have similarly attempted to define what motivates audiences to use Facebook or other social networking sites. However, unique to the current study is the inclusion of scale items measuring participant's motivation to practice impression management, which research suggests may be a behavior commonly practiced by users of social networking sites. Rodgers et al.'s (2007) WMI scale is a renowned scale for measuring Web motivations, and its validation and reliability across various industry studies is appealing for use in Web research. In the current study, Rodgers et al.'s (2007) WMI scale was used for the first time in measuring participant motivations for using a specific Web site, as opposed the Web in general. It was previously posited that, as new media technologies such as social networking sites emerge in society, it is important to apply pre-existing theory to the new media in determining how audiences may react differently. Therefore, this research has attempted to further the application of a proven scale for measuring Web motivations, by applying it specifically to a specific site, Facebook, just one of infinite Web sites found on the Internet today.

Results from the current study showed that the participant motivations to connect with others and to be entertained were significant predictors of Facebook use. Although

the motivation to practice impression management did not significantly predict participant's use of Facebook as originally hypothesized, a significant positive relationship was found between the two variables as literature and research suggested. Additionally, the study participants' motivations to shop and to inquiry about products on Facebook were significant positive predictors of approach behavior, and were significant negative predictors of avoidance behaviors towards advertisements on Facebook. Although the findings of the current study cannot be generalized to the Facebook population, they can serve as stepping-stones for directing future researchers studying motivations, social networking sites, impression management, audience behaviors towards online advertisements, and modern uses and gratifications theory development.

B. Final Conclusions

In today's noisy and cluttered media environment, it is increasingly important for advertisers to be able to justify their media purchases with research supporting such decisions. In an effort to increase the likelihood that audiences' will behave predictably and desirably towards their advertising messages, current and future Facebook advertisers can benefit from understanding what motivates audiences to use the site. By tailoring advertising messages to reflect audiences' motivations for using the site, advertisers can more effectively provide site users an outlet for need gratification. Although the results of this study are not generalizeable, the results suggest that advertisers should take into consideration that fact that Facebook audiences use the site to connect with others and to entertain themselves. Results also suggest however, that audiences' behaviors towards advertisements on Facebook can only be predicted by Facebook user's motivations to shop or to inquire about a product while using the site. Further research is necessary to

determine whether tailoring Facebook advertisements to reflect motivations predicting site use, such as connect and entertainment, would increase desirable approach behavior towards Facebook advertisements. It is believed that the concept impression management should be further explored in relation to both Facebook use and audience behaviors towards Facebook advertisements, as both previous research and the current study show that impression management is related to Facebook use.

REFERENCES

- Bargh, J. A., McKenna, K. Y., & Fitzsimons, G. M. (2002). Can you see the real me? Activation and expression of the "true self" on the Internet. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58 (1), pp. 33-48.
- Beer, D. (2008). Social network(ing) sites...revisiting the story so far: A response to danah boyd & Nicole Ellison. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, pp. 516-529.
- Bolino, M.C., & Turnley, W.H. (1999). Impression management in organizations: A scale development based on the Pittman taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2(2), pp. 187-206.
- boyd, d. (2004). Friendster and publicly articulated social networks. *Proceedings of ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1279-1282.) New York: ACM Press.
- boyd, d., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), article 11.
- Bryne, N. (2008). Online advertising 'must adapt to social networks.' Retrieved March 20, 2008, from <http://www.siliconrepublic.com/news/news.nv?storyid=single10657>
- Cho, C. (1999). How advertising works on the WWW: Modified Elaboration Likelihood Model. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 21(1), p. 32-50.
- Cho, C., & Hongsik, J.C. (2004). Why do people avoid advertising on the Internet? *Journal of Advertising*, 33(4), pp. 89-97.
- Clark, N., Lee, S. & Boyer, L. (2007). A place of their own: An Exploratory Study of College Students' Uses of Facebook. Proceedings from the *International Communication Association Annual Meeting*. Washington District of Columbia.
- Clary, G.E., Snyder, M., Ridge, D.R., Copeland, J., Stukas, A.A., Haugen, J. & Miene, P. (1998). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), pp. 1516-1530.
- Cooper, M., Shapiro, C. & Powers, A. (1998). Motivations for sex and risky behavior among adolescents and young adults: A functionalist perspective. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 75(6), pp. 1528-1558.
- Cowles, D. (1989). Consumer perceptions of interactive media. *Journal of Broadcasting*

& *Electronic Media*, 33(1), pp. 83-89.

- Dwyer, C. (2007). *Digital relationships in the 'MySpace' generation: Results from a qualitative study*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Ebersole, S. (2000). *Uses and gratifications of the web among students*. Retrieved December 6, 2007, from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue1/ebersole.html#reasonsfor>
- Elliott, P. (1974) Uses and gratifications: A critique and a sociological alternative. In J.G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratifications research* (pp. 249-268). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ellison, N., Heino, R., & Gibbs, J. (2006). Managing impressions online: Self-presentation processes in the online dating environment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(2), article 2.
- Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C. & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook "friends:" Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4), article 1.
- Ferguson, D.A., & Perse, E.M. (1994). *Viewing television without a remote: A deprivation study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Research Division, Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NV.
- Galloway, J. J., & Meek, F. L. (1981). Audience uses and gratifications: An expectancy model. *Communication Research*, 8, pp. 435-449. [mu journ]
- Grant, A.E., Guthrie, K.K., & Ball-Rokeach, S. (1991). Television shopping: A media dependency perspective. *Communication Research*, 18, pp. 773-798.
- Hanjun, K. Chang-Hoan, C., & Roberts, M. (2005). Internet uses and gratifications: A structural equation model of interactive advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 34(2), pp. 57-70.
- Jones, E.E., & Pittman, T.S. (1982). Towards a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In Suls (Ed.) *Psychological perspectives on the self* (pp. 231-261). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Katz, E. (1959). Mass communication research and the study of popular culture: An editorial notes on a possible future for this journal. *Studies in Public Communication* 2: 1-6.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Utilization of mass communication by the individual. In J. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communication:*

- Current perspectives on gratifications research* (pp. 19-34). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Katz, E., Gurevitch, M., & Haas, H. (1973). On the use of the mass media for important things. *American Sociological Review*, 38, pp. 164-181.
- Klassen, A. (2007). Advertisers can't afford to quit MySpace. *Advertising Age*, 78(30).
- Larose, R., Lin, C.A. & Eastin, M.S. (2003). Unregulated Internet usage: Addiction, habit, or deficient self-regulation? *Media Psychology*, 5, pp. 225-253.
- Larose, R., Mastro, D. & Eastin, M.S. (2001). Understanding internet usage: A social cognitive approach to uses and gratification. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19(4), pp. 395-413.
- Levy, M. R., & Windahl, S. (1984). Audience activity and gratifications: A conceptual clarification and exploration. *Communication Research*, 11, pp. 51-78.
- Loges, W.E., & Ball-Rokeach, S. (1993). Dependency relations and newspaper readership. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 42, pp. 95-112.
- Lui, H. (2007) Social network profiles as taste performances. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), article 13.
- McQuire, W.J. (1974). Psychological motives and communication gratification. In J. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratifications research* (pp. 167-196). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McQuail, D. (2005). *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory*. (5th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McQuail, D., Blumler, J., & Brown, J. (1972). The television audience: A revised perspective. In D. McQuail (Ed.), *Sociology of mass communications* (pp. 135-165). Middlesex, England: Penguin.
- Nezlek, J. B. & Leary, M. R. (2002). Individual differences in self-presentational motives in daily social interaction. *PSPB*, 28(2), pp. 211-223.
- Papacharissi, Z., & Rubin, A.M. (2000). Predictors of internet use. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 44(2), pp. 175-196.
- Rayburn, J. D., & Palmgreen, P. (1984). Merging uses and gratifications and expectancy-value theory. *Communication Research*, 11, pp. 537-562.

- Richards, J. (2007). Social networks get personal with 'hyper-targeting.' Received April 3, 2008 from http://technology.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/tech_and_web/article2810857.ece
- Rodgers, S. & Sheldon, K.M. (2002). An improved way to characterize Internet users. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 42(5), pp. 85-94.
- Rodgers, S. & Thorson, E. (2000) The interactive advertising model: how users perceive and process online ads. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 1(1), available online at <http://jiad.org/vol1/no1/rogers>.
- Rodgers, S., Wang, Y., Rettie, R., and Alpert, F. (2007). The Web Motivation Inventory: Replication, extension and application to Internet Advertising. *International Journal of Advertising*, 26(4), pp. 447-476.
- Rosenbloom, S. (2008). Putting your best cyberface forward. Retrieved March 3, 2008 from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/03/fashion/03impression.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print&oref=slogin.
- Rubin, A.M. (1984). Ritualized and instrumental television viewing. *Journal of Communication*, 34(3), pp. 67-77.
- Ruggiero, T. E. (2000). Uses and gratifications theory in the 21st century. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3(1), pp. 3-37.
- Severin, W. J., & Tankard, J. W. (1997). *Communication theories: Origins, methods, and uses in the mass media* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Shannon, D. M., & Davenport, M.A. (2001) *Using SPSS to solve statistical problems: A self-instruction guide*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Stacks, D. W. (2002). *Primer of Public Relations Research*. NY: The Guilford Press.
- Stafford, T. F., Stafford, M. R. & Schkade, L.L. (2007). Determining uses and gratifications for the internet. Retrieved November 10, 2007 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3713/is_200404/ai_n9398988
- Sylvers, E. (2008). Networking sites boom but ads slow to follow. *International Herald Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/06/01/business/networks.php>
- Verbyla, J. (1997). The seven habits of effective web managers. Proceedings from Third Australian World Wide Web Conference. Lismore, NSW: Southern Cross University.

Wimmer, R.D., & Dominick J. R. (1997). *Mass media research*. (5th ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Younbo, J., Vordererm P., & Song, H. (2007). Motivation and Consequences of Blogging in Social Life. Proceedings from the 2007 Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association.

Zuckerburg, M. (n.d.). Press Room. Retrieved November 10, 2007 from <http://missouri.facebook.com/press.php>

Appendix A

Consent Form

You have been invited to participate in a research study conducted by a candidate for the Masters of Arts in Journalism at the University of Missouri-Columbia. The aim of this study is to understand what motivates you to use Facebook. The results from this study will contribute to the completion of a master's thesis paper.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete an online survey. The entire study should take approximately 20 minutes. Your decision whether to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University of Missouri or the School of Journalism. Your participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

The data from this study will be kept confidential. Your participation is anonymous and all data you provide will not be connected to you in any way.

The principal researcher conducting this study is Kara Krisanic. If you have any questions, you may contact her at E-mail: kjkmq7@mizzou.edu or Phone: (314) 210-7605.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), contact MU Campus Institutional Review Board located in 483 McReynolds Hall, phone number (573) 882-9585.

I have read the above information. Any questions I may have raised have been answered. By signing this consent form I am stating that I am at least 18 years of age, and that I consent to participate in the study.

Signature of participant _____

Date _____

Appendix B

Code Book

In the following questions, please mark the answer that best describes you.

1. Consent Form (**consent**)

2. Please indicate your gender (**gend**)

Male	Female
(1)	(2)

3. Please indicate your current educational standing (**edu**)

College Freshman	College Sophomore	College Junior	College Senior	Graduate/Professional Student
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

4. About how many total Facebook friends do you have? (**F4**)

10 or less	(0)
11-50	(1)
51-100	(2)
101-150	(3)
151-200	(4)
201-250	(5)
251-300	(6)
301-400	(7)
more than 400	(8)

5. In the past week, on average, approximately how many minutes per day have you spent on Facebook? (**F5**)

Less than 10	(0)
10-30	(1)
31-60	(2)
1-2 hours	(3)
2-3 hours	(4)
More than 3 hours	(5)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

6. Facebook is part of my everyday activity (M6)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
7. I am proud to tell people I'm on Facebook (M7)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
8. Facebook has become part of my daily routine (M8)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
9. I feel out of touch when I haven't logged onto Facebook for a while (M9)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
10. I feel I am part of the Facebook community (M10)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
11. I would be sorry if Facebook shut down (M11)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

I use Facebook to...

12. Join groups (M12)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
13. Message other people (M13)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)

14. Surf for fun (M14)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
15. Play games (M15)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
16. Do research (M16)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
17. Discuss topics I care about (M17)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
18. Add applications (M18)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
19. Search for information I need (M19)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
20. Explore other user's profiles (M20)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
21. Read updates about other's on the news feed (M21)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
22. Discuss products with other users (M22)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
23. Purchase gifts for friends (M23)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
24. Participate in a group discussions (M24)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
25. Connect with my friends (M25)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

26. Watch online videos (M26)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
27. Get information I need (M27)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
28. Give my opinion on a topic of discussion (M28)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
29. Upload photos (M29)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
30. Find friends through the search feature (M30)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
31. Find interesting information (M31)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
32. Read friend's status updates (M32)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
33. Shop for products listed on Facebook's marketplace (M33)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
34. Get to know other people (M34)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
35. Facebook chat live with other users (M35)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
36. Find information to entertain myself (M36)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
37. Entertain myself	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

with games (M37)	disagree				agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
38. Find out things I need to know (M38)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
39. Respond to others discussions on topics of interest to me (M39)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
40. Upload videos (M40)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
41. Find information about someone else (M41)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
42. Find a group to join (M42)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
43. Read specific friend's mini-feeds (M43)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
44. Sell products through Facebook's marketplace (M44)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
45. Communicate with others (M45)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46. Listen to other people's problems (M46)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47. Amuse myself (M47)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48. Play games with other users (M48)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

49. Talk to a knowledgeable individual (M49)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
50. Create groups (M50)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
51. Get answers to specific questions (M51)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
52. Buy things (M52)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
53. Learn about products from friends (M53)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
54. Respond to wall posts (M54)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
55. Entertain myself (M55)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
56. Create events (M56)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
57. Chat with others online (M57)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
58. Visit entertaining Facebook pages (M58)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
59. Find information I can trust (M59)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
60. Talk to a live person (M60)	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

I add profile information on Facebook that that will make others perceive me as ...

61. likeable (F61)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
62. friendly (F62)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
63. socially desirable (F63)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
64. competent (F64)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
65. skilled (F65)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
66. intelligent (F66)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Please indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements.

67. I think about how the other people on Facebook are evaluating my profile (F67)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
68. I get nervous when editing the content of my Facebook profile (F68)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
69. I tend to click on advertisements on Facebook (ClickAds)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
70. I typically try to	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

avoid advertisements
on Facebook
(Noclickads)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

Appendix C

Facebook Intensity Scale

About how many total Facebook friends do you have?

10 or less	(0)
11-50	(1)
51-100	(2)
101-150	(3)
151-200	(4)
201-250	(5)
251-300	(6)
301-400	(7)
more than 400	(8)

In the past week, on average, approximately how many minutes per day have you spent on Facebook?

Less than 10	(0)
10-30	(1)
31-60	(2)
1-2 hours	(3)
2-3 hours	(4)
More than 3 hours	(5)

Facebook is part of my everyday activity

Strongly disagree	(1)
Disagree	(2)
Neutral	(3)
Agree	(4)
Strongly agree.	(5)

I am proud to tell people I'm on Facebook

Strongly disagree	(1)
Disagree	(2)
Neutral	(3)
Agree	(4)
Strongly agree.	(5)

Facebook has become part of my daily routine

Strongly disagree	(1)
-------------------	-----

- Disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly agree. (5)

I feel out of touch when I haven't logged onto Facebook for a while

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly agree. (5)

I feel I am part of the Facebook community

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly agree. (5)

I would be sorry if Facebook shut down

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly agree. (5)

Appendix D

Motivations Scale

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

I use Facebook to...

Join a group	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Message other people	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Surf for fun	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Play games	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Do research	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Discuss a topic I care about	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Add applications	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Search for information I need	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Explore other's profiles	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Read updates about other's on news feed	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Discuss products with others	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Purchase gifts for friends	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Participate in a group chat	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Connect with my friends	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Watch online videos	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Get information I need	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Give my opinion on a topic of discussion	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Upload photos	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Use a search engine to find friends	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Find interesting information	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree
Read friend's status updates	(1) Strongly disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly agree

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Shop for products listed on marketplace	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Get to know other people	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Facebook chat with others I know	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Find information to entertain myself	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Entertain myself with games	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Find out things I need to know	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Respond to others discussions on topics of interest to me	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Upload videos	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Find information about someone else	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Find a group to join	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Read specific friend's	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

mini-feeds	disagree				agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Sell products through marketplace	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Communicate with others	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Listen to other people's problems	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Amuse myself	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Play games with other individuals	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Talk to a knowledgeable individual	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Create a group	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Get answers to specific questions	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Buy things	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Learn about products from friends	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Respond to a wall post	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Entertain myself	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Create an event	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Chat with others online	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Visit entertaining Facebook pages	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Find information I can trust	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Talk to a live person	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Appendix E

Impression Management Scale

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

I use Facebook to...

Add profile information that will make others perceive me as likeable	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Add profile information that will make others perceive me as friendly	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Add profile information that will make others perceive me as socially desirable	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Add profile information that will make others perceive me as competent	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Add profile information that will make others perceive me as skilled	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
Add profile information that will make others perceive me as intelligent	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)

Please indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements.

I think about how the other people on	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
---------------------------------------	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Facebook are evaluating my profile	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I get nervous when editing the content of my profile	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Appendix F

Behavior Towards Facebook Ads

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

I tend to click on Facebook advertisements	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
I typically try to avoid Facebook advertisements	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)

Appendix G

Deleted Scale Items

1. I use Facebook to message other people
2. I use Facebook to do research
3. I use Facebook to add applications
4. I use Facebook to explore other user's profiles
5. I use Facebook to purchase gifts for friends
6. I use Facebook to watch online videos
7. I use Facebook to upload photos
8. I use Facebook to find interesting information
9. I use Facebook to get to know other people
10. I use Facebook to upload videos
11. I use Facebook to communicate with others
12. I use Facebook to listen to other people's problems
13. I use Facebook to create groups
14. I use Facebook to create events
15. I use Facebook to find information I can trust
16. I use Facebook to join groups
17. I use Facebook to talk to a knowledgeable individual
18. I use Facebook to find friends through the search feature
19. I use Facebook to connect with my friends
20. I use Facebook to respond to wall posts
21. I get nervous when editing the content of my Facebook profile

Appendix H

Recruitment Script

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by a Kara Krisanic, a graduate student in the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Responses to this study will help explain what motivates college students to use Facebook. Therefore, please only volunteer for this study if you are a current member of Facebook with an active Facebook account. The results from this study will contribute to a master's thesis.

Your participation is completely voluntary and your participation is anonymous. Your identity will be in no way connected to the data you provide. If you would like to volunteer your participation, please go to the following Internet link, which will take you to the online study for your completion.

<http://FreeOnlineSurveys.com/rendersurvey.asp?sid=kwv37viqmtcsr1447913>

Thank you for your consideration,

Kara Krisanic
314-210-7605
kjkmq7@mizzou.edu