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Social networking sites (SNS) continue to rise in popularity, solidifying their ongoing presence and influence for the foreseeable future. Sites such as Twitter, YouTube, and Facebook provide outlets for user-created content with global connection and implications. Facebook is currently the number one ranked SNS in terms of active monthly users (Smith, 2013). According to Smith (2013), Facebook has over 1.15 billion active monthly users, who access the site at least once a month to manage personal profile content or view the profiles of others. Studies have shown that the primary motivations for using Facebook, as reported by its users, were for social surveillance and investigation, perpetual contact with others, and creating shared content (Joinson, 2008). As a primary motivation for use, reported social surveillance demonstrates user awareness of Facebook’s pivotal role in establishing and maintaining individual and group impressions. Users understand that they are creating shared content, and just as they use Facebook to monitor friends, so too do they realize their friends are using Facebook to monitor them.

Impressions can be managed a number of ways through Facebook, including photo sharing, writing public wall posts, or merely by assigning “likes” to certain artifacts. Facebook walls are the public message boards that each user has within his/her profile where the user and his/her friends may freely post messages for all those connected to the network to see. Facebook is not the only site to allow such online public sharing, and as a result of these abundant platforms, it is becoming increasingly difficult for individuals to strategically manage impressions online (Rui & Stefanone, 2013).

Interestingly, of the millions of Facebook messages that are posted daily, 20% enact some form of humor (Carr, Schrock, & Dauterman, 2012). This is a conscious choice of individuals to incorporate humor within one in five messages online as a part of their strategic impression management. This raises the question of why this choice is made. What perceived outcome exists when people choose a message that caters to the funny bones of the audience? What perception do users have of others when they choose to enact humor on Facebook? More importantly, are these perceptions accurate?

Past studies have looked at the effects humor has on credibility (Wrench & Booth-Butterfield, 2013) and social attractiveness of the messenger (Wanzer, Booth-Butterfield, & Booth-Butterfield, 1996) in face-to-face (FtF) communication. However, studies have not sought to draw connections between humor use online and its effect on credibility and attractiveness. This is a critical gap in the available research, because FtF interactions provide a very different medium for communication immediacy than computer-mediated communication (CMC) contexts. SNS may not generate the same findings as studies focused on FtF interactions because of the different ways humor might be interpreted from reading it online versus listening to oral delivery. Using impression management (Goffman, 1959) as a theoretical frame, the purpose of this study is to examine the influence that humor enactment on Facebook has on messenger credibility and social attractiveness. This paper will first present a discussion of the relevant literature on (a) social information processing (SIP) theory and impression management on SNS, (b) humor enactment, and (c) individual perceptions of
credibility and social attractiveness. Following a review of the literature is a discussion of the proposed hypotheses followed by the conducted experiment and corresponding results.

Impression Management & Social Information Processing

Erving Goffman initially developed the concept of impression management in his theory of the presentational self in 1959. According to Goffman, impression management includes the efforts of a person to effectively create and manage certain impressions in the minds of others (Goffman, 1959). An individual will enact certain behaviors or performances in order to achieve this goal. Impression management was the keystone of Goffman’s presentational self, because it provided the motivation for people to craft communication to achieve a particular impression objective. These concepts are commonly referred to as part of the dramaturgical approach, which cites the use of performances as a key part of impression management. These performances are enacted for a target audience in what Goffman calls the front-stage. Communication that occurs outside the perception of the target audience is known as the backstage.

Since its conceptualization, Goffman’s theory of impression management has been applied across a variety of contexts. These include healthcare settings (Lewin & Reeves, 2011), public relations (Johansson, 2007), within the family (Gillespie, 1980), and numerous others. Impression management is highly applicable across contexts because of its simplicity and generalizability. So too may it be applied to social networking sites such as Facebook. Contextually, Facebook provides a clear conceptualization of how an individual’s “performance” is structured. All of the content that a user intentionally posts to one’s Facebook account is a part of the front-stage. Offline, the user engages in backstage preparation for future online performances.

Building off Goffman’s definition, impression management on social networking sites describes the conscious behaviors that individuals enact to create certain impressions for online target audiences. However, reworking the definition to include online contexts does not adequately determine whether the outcomes of impression management on SNS will mirror face-to-face findings. In order to address this concern, Social Information Processing Theory (SIPT; Walther, 1992) provides additional understanding of how these two broad contexts are related. Social Information Processing Theory argues that, within a computer-mediated context and in the absence of nonverbal cues, individuals rely on other available social cues to shape perceptions of the message and its messenger (Walther, 1992). Additionally, despite this attention to other social cues, individuals tend to achieve similar degrees of relational certainty and impression formations within a CMC context as within FtF interactions. Walther even argues that CMC may in some instances provide for increased “hyperpersonal interaction” in which communicators more quickly and more effectively manage and form desired impressions through self-disclosure (Walther, 1996). This is thought to be a result of reduced inhibition caused by distance and varying degrees of anonymity between communicators. Therefore, it is reasonable to predict that interactions and humor use on Facebook will elicit similar results as observed in FtF contexts.

With the continued growth of SNS, such as Facebook with over 1.15 billion users and Twitter with over 240 million users worldwide (Smith, 2013), the importance of being able to manage individual and organizational impressions online becomes ever more apparent. Despite the increasing importance of understanding how people manage impressions online, there is limited research on self-presentation and impression management on sites such as Facebook. Recent studies have focused on issues of gender impressions (Rose et al., 2012) and comparisons of impression management across platforms such as Facebook and LinkedIn (van Dijck, 2013). For example, individuals will manage personal information differently on
Facebook, a site dominated by profiles centered on personal lives, than on LinkedIn, a site dedicated to professional networks and career connections (van Dijck, 2013).

Humor Enactment

Outside of SNS, humor has been studied to understand its ability to manage individual and organizational impressions. For example, Wrench and Booth-Butterfield (2003) examined the ways that physicians managed impressions of credibility with patients. Credibility is strongly associated with patient compliance and adherence to prescribed treatment plans. Findings demonstrate that physicians enact humor with patients in order to manage impressions of credibility. Physicians who enacted humor were more likely to be perceived as credible, and as a result, patients were more likely to adhere to prescribed treatments.

Hall and Pennington (2012, pp 254) link humor to impression management on Facebook when discussing humor orientation, the ability to produce humor, on social networking sites. They found that individuals were highly competent in creating humor that will be interpreted as such by audiences when they desire to manage an impression of humor. This highlights a crucial component of humor enactment in impression management, intentionality. A precise definition of humor is difficult to provide due to its highly interpretive nature (Wanzer, Frymier, & Irwin, 2010). Despite the subjectivity of humor, Hall and Pennington demonstrate through their research that individuals are able to successfully enact humor for a given audience on Facebook. Additionally, this highlights that 20% of all Facebook messages, the humor-oriented ones (Carr, Schrock, & Dauterman, 2012), are not created unintentionally, but as a deliberate impression management strategy.

Ultimately, people choose to enact humor to achieve certain goals. Those goals are for (a) identification with the target audience, (b) the clarification of ideas or opinions in memorable stories or phrases, (c) the enforcement of norms without appearing overly negative or critical, and (d) the differentiation of oneself from perceived opposition (Meyer, 2000). These goals are informed by certain psychological and sociological motivations of an individual (Lynch, 2002), such as impression management. Booth-Butterfield and Booth-Butterfield (1991) determined that individuals tend to have a particular orientation to which they ascribe regarding general humor use and appreciation, which affects the way that they use and interpret forms of humor. Those that rate themselves high in humor orientation tend to incorporate humor more often in communication, be rated as more humorous by others, and find humor more appropriate in most situations (Wanzer, Booth-Butterfield, & Booth-Butterfield, 1995). Additionally, the literature identifies four styles of humor enactment. These styles are (a) affiliative, (b) aggressive, (c) self-enhancing, and (d) self-defeating (Cann, Zapata, & Davis, 2009). Despite their distinctions and potential comparison for effectiveness, all four styles may be used to manage individual impressions. Variances may exist depending on the individual and his/her humor orientation. For example, self-enhancing humor may be used to manage impressions of individual superiority, and self-defeating may impress humility.

Overall, research has taken multiple views on discerning how to best classify and describe humor (Lynch, 2002). Additionally, literature has examined how humor effects credibility (Gruner, 1967; Mazer, Murphy, & Simonds, 2009) and attractiveness (Walther, Van Der Heide, Hamel, & Shulman, 2009) in varying contexts. The next section delves into further discussion of these variables.

Credibility and Social Attractiveness

Based upon prior research that has sought to draw connections between humor and credibility and attractiveness, the next logical step is to look at how these variables are influenced in a
social media context. Credibility is defined by McCroskey (1998) as the attitude of a receiver, which refers to the degree to which a source is seen as believable. For a Facebook messenger, there may be significant benefits for being perceived as a credible source. Those with increased credibility may be viewed as influential leaders in their particular networks. Additionally, as this image of an influential leader increases, the content of that leader’s page may be shared more, garner greater online traffic, and expand that individual’s network. Those with a larger network of friends tend to perceive a stronger support system and identify as having greater life satisfaction (Manago, Taylor, & Greenfield, 2012).

Although the link between humor and messenger credibility has not been studied in a SNS context, researchers have been examining the link elsewhere. For instance, Gruner (1967) examined the connection between humor and speaker credibility. Findings from Gruner’s study again indicate the subjectivity of humor and note that humor is effective in increasing the perceived credibility of the speaker only in instances where the intention of humor is understood and accepted. As discussed earlier, this is equally true in other examples such as healthcare (Wrench & Booth-Butterfield, 2003). The credibility of the physician is only increased if the humor used is understood and identified as appropriate to the situation.

Additional contexts of study include the classroom and other lecture opportunities. Teachers that include aspects of humor in their self-disclosure with the class are perceived to have increased credibility (Mazer, Murphy, & Simonds, 2009). Shalski, Tamborini, Glazer, and Smith (2009) also determined that the use of humor increased the level of speaker and instructor credibility in front of an audience. In addition, audience members were determined to have greater presence during the message. This prior research demonstrates a clear link between effective humor use and its ability to increase perceived credibility of a user. This is true not only in offline contexts but as well within the current and future application to online environments.

Where the literature diverges from this notion of humor leading to increased source credibility is in crises, and rightly so. Crises are instances of increased uncertainty. People are seeking information that will provide appropriate answers to the uncertainty, and therefore, audiences are less likely to deem humor as credible (Austin, Lui, & Jin, 2012). Instead, audiences seek sources that deliver clear and accurate information in a serious manner. Although this demonstrates a divergence in the literature, it may not be wholly applicable to individual Facebook profiles unless that individual uses humor that is overly crass or insensitive during a crisis that is highly salient within the social network.

In addition to humor being linked to credibility, the literature offers insights into perceptions associated with humor and attractiveness. According to McCroskey and McCain (1974), attractiveness occurs when we enjoy interacting with and want to spend time with someone. Linked to social networking sites such as Facebook, attractiveness is a perception established by the content created by the messenger. Humor has been positively related to attractiveness (Wanzer, Booth-Butterfield, & Booth-Butterfield, 1996) but not yet in the SNS context. The goal of humor enactment and managing impressions of attractiveness is similar to that of credibility in that people with more friends on Facebook identify as having stronger support systems and greater life satisfaction (Manago et al., 2012). By being perceived as more socially attractive, individuals attract more friend requests, thus expanding their social network in a cyclical fashion.

Attractiveness has been studied in a variety of contexts, especially since its operationalization by McCroskey and McCain in 1974 (McCroskey, McCroskey, & Richmond, 2006). In a study conducted by Wanzer, Booth-Butterfield, and Booth-Butterfield (1996), researchers determined that individuals with higher humor orientations, individuals that enact humor more often and perceive humor as more appropriate in communication, are identified as more socially attractive. Of note, there is research that implies that social attraction is largely influenced by the messages that others post on a friend’s wall rather than
the friend’s wall itself. Walther, Van Der Heide, Hamel, and Shulman (2009) determined that other-generated comments in social media tend to take precedence over self-generated comments when individuals are forming impressions of attractiveness related to an individual’s page. Additionally, the type of communication enacted by friends had varying effects on the impressions of the user depending on whether the friend was male or female (Walther, Van Der Heide, Kim, Westerman, & Tong, 2008). This creates an interesting implication for study if other-generated content is more persuasive than self-generated when establishing impressions. Studies seeking to mitigate this factor should be mindful of what content is incorporated in the study. For example, researchers may need to control for other-generated content by not making it visible to participants. By doing so, researchers can more accurately assure that participants are basing their rating of credibility and attractiveness on the self-generated message.

Critique of the Literature

Overall, the literature provides substantial background in creating a framework focused on impression management and how humor may be used to manage impressions. Additionally, there is substantial evidence linking humor enactment in a variety of contexts related to credibility and social attractiveness. However, the literature is weak in providing a clear argument of how humor is incorporated on social networking sites. Further, there are some divergences in the literature that create ambiguity behind what effect humor has on credibility and attractiveness. The goal of this study is to address this gap in the literature.

Hypotheses

Based upon the research relevant to impression management, humor enactment, and perception of credibility and attractiveness, the following two hypotheses have been identified for this study.

**H1: Humor enactment on Facebook results in an increased perception of messenger credibility.**

**H2: Humor enactment on Facebook results in an increased perception of messenger social attractiveness.**

Although the majority of the literature does not focus on the variables being applied on social networking sites, the research provides significant evidence that in face-to-face interactions, these variables are positively related. Translated to Facebook, the expectation of results is similar.

Method

**Participants**

The convenience sample was composed of 283 undergraduate students enrolled in a large, Midwestern university. Of the participants, 74.91% \((n = 212)\) were female, while 24.73% \((n = 70)\) were male. Additionally, only one participant chose not to disclose sex. The majority (74.20%, \(n = 210\)) identified as Caucasian, followed by African-American (15.55%, \(n = 44\)), Other (4.95%, \(n = 14\)), Hispanic (3.89%, \(n = 11\)), Asian American (1.06%, \(n = 3\)), and Native American (.35%, \(n = 1\)). Participant ages ranged from 18 to 59 years, with a mean of 20.83 (SD = 3.22) and a median of 20 years. When asked questions regarding individual familiarity and exposure to Facebook, 93.99% \((n = 266)\) reported having a Facebook profile. Of those individuals who reported having a Facebook profile, 96.24% \((n = 256)\) have had one for over a year, and 76.32% \((n = 203)\) reported spending over one hour per week using Facebook.
Procedures
In order to test the hypotheses proposed for this study, an experimental design consisting of four treatment groups (male control, male humorous, female control, and female humorous) was utilized. Conditions were separated into male and female profiles, because previous research has indicated that messenger sex has a significant effect on how humor is used and perceived (Zippin, 1996). Sex was manipulated by changing the profile photos. The name of the user, Taylor Johnson, remained the same.

At the discretion of the instructors of each class, students had the potential to earn class assignment credit as compensation for participation. In addition, alternative forms of extra credit were provided to students who chose not to participate in the study. Participants were provided with a secure link through which they could access the study. Prior to accessing the survey, individuals were directed to a web page where informed consent was obtained. Upon accessing the study portion of the website, participants were initially exposed to one of four mock Facebook profiles (see Appendix B). The four profiles were identical in every way with the exception of the manipulated conditions. Some participants viewed a profile containing five non-humorous message posts (e.g. “I just finally purchased the last of my books for the semester. The prices just keep going up.”), while others viewed a profile with five message posts that had been altered to incorporate humor (e.g. “I just finally purchased the last of my books for the semester. Will work for food”). Given the subjectivity of humor, a variety of messages were piloted prior to incorporation to ensure that a high percentage of participants would perceive them as intended. Pilot participants were asked to rate the pool of messages along a scale of 1 (Not Funny) to 100 (Very Funny).

Instruments
Following exposure, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire that measured the perceived credibility and attractiveness they would assign to the messenger. Lastly, participants were asked to respond to a brief demographic section.

Source Credibility
Credibility was measured using a modified version of Teven and McCroskey’s 18-measures of credibility (McCroskey & Teven, 1999) measuring for three distinct factors of credibility including competence, character, and caring. Participants responded to these measures using 7-point semantic differential scales. The alpha reliabilities for these measures have previously ranged from .80 and .94. For this study, the reliability coefficients of .74 for competence ($M = 4.48, SD = .28$), .82 for caring ($M = 4.23, SD = .31$), and .78 for character ($M = 4.53, SD = .29$) were obtained (see Appendix A for complete instrument).

Social Attractiveness
Social attractiveness was measured using a modified version of McCroskey’s measure of interpersonal attraction (McCroskey, McCroskey, & Richmond, 2006). The tool instructs participants to respond to questions related to social attractiveness (e.g., This person seems pleasant to be with.) along a 5-point Likert scale. The alpha reliability for the social attraction measure has previously ranged from .91 to .94. For this study, the reliability coefficient obtained for the social attractiveness measure was .92 ($M = 4.64, SD = .26$) (see Appendix A for the complete instrument measuring social attraction).

Results
A one-way K-group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the effects of the manipulated Facebook profile (male control, male humor, female control, or female humor) on the dependent variables of the competence, character, and caring dimensions of credibility and the social attraction variable. A
MANOVA was chosen because the dependent variables were related. Table 1 presents the correlations among the dependent variables. Levene’s test for equality of variance was not significant for the dependent variables social attractiveness, caring, competence, and character (respectively $F = .621, p = .602$, $F = 1.010, p = .389$, $F = .1.007, p = .390$, $F = .1.247, p = .293$), indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was tenable. Significant differences were found among the four treatments (male control, female control, male humorous, female humorous) on the dependent measures, Wilks’s $\lambda = .86$, $F(12, 646) = 3.04$, $p < .05$. The multivariate $\eta^2$ based on Wilks’s lambda was small, .047. Table 2 details the item means and standard deviations on the dependent variables for the four treatments. As a follow up to the MANOVA, four ANOVAs were conducted. The ANOVAs were significant for social attraction $[F(3, 247) = 4.19, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05]$ and caring $[F(3, 247) = 2.64, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03]$. The ANOVAs were not significant for competence $[F(3, 247) = 1.38, p > .05, \eta^2 = .02]$, or character $[F(3, 247) = 1.29, p > .05, \eta^2 = .02]$. Despite the significance of these subscale dimensions, neither $H_1$ nor $H_2$ was supported.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Caring</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Attraction</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations Among the Dependent Variables.

*p<.01

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male Control</th>
<th>Female Control</th>
<th>Male Humor</th>
<th>Female Humor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soc Attr</td>
<td>57.27a</td>
<td>52.96ab</td>
<td>59.11bc</td>
<td>54.05c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>26.67a</td>
<td>24.25ab</td>
<td>24.52bc</td>
<td>25.76bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>27.57a</td>
<td>25.87a</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Char</td>
<td>27.98</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>27.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means and Standard Deviations for the Four Conditions on the Dependent Variables.

Note: Means in a row that share a subscript letter are significantly different at $p<.05$ in the Fisher’s least significant difference test.

In a post hoc analysis, Fisher’s LSD was conducted to examine multiple comparisons between exposure type and the dependent variables of social attraction and caring. Tests indicated that the male control was reported as significantly more socially attractive than the female control and that the male humor condition was reported as significantly more socially attractive than either the female control or the female humor condition. Additionally, the male control was reported as more caring than the male humor and female control conditions. Despite the lack of significance found between exposure type and competence when tested in...
the ANOVA, the multiple comparisons test indicates that the male control was reported as significantly more competent than the female control.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to evaluate whether an individual incorporating humor within Facebook messages is perceived differently regarding credibility and attraction than an individual who does not incorporate humor. Predictions of findings were constructed based on prior literature related to humor and impression management. Actual results from the data analysis did not support the proposed hypotheses that humor would increase perceptions of source credibility and social attractiveness. Rather, there was no significance between the manipulated variable of humor and the dependent variables. This is not consistent with previous research, which has found a significant effect of humor incorporation on the two dependent variables. Biological sex was found to be a significant indicator of social attractiveness and a single dimension of credibility, caring.

Furthermore, results demonstrated that participants rated the male control (non-humorous) as more socially attractive than the female control and more caring than either the male humorous or female control conditions. Male humor was rated as more socially attractive than either of the female conditions. In no instances were either of the female conditions found to be significantly more credible or socially attractive than a male condition. This may be due to actual significance in how men and women are perceived online or a potential bias in the generated comments that favor the male messenger over the female. Future research should look further at the way attractiveness and source credibility, among other variables, are assigned to men and women online when sharing different message designs.

Of interest in the results is the finding that the male control was rated as more caring than the female control. Typically, relational dynamics such as caring and concern for others is considered a feminine trait that is associated more with women (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). This may function as a result of perceived humor of males and females. Research has shown that both men and women tend to expect men to be more humor-oriented and in general rate men as being funnier than women, even going so far as to misattribute humorous comments constructed by a woman as having been constructed by a man (Mickes, Walker, Parris, Mankoff, & Christenfeld, 2012). As a result, the female condition may be viewed as acting differently than predicted, violating feminine expectations and the associated attributes.

The lack of significance between the humor condition and the dependent variables indicates that humor does not affect user perceptions of social attractiveness or credibility on Facebook. However, this finding contradicts findings from Wrench and Booth-Butterfield (2003) and Wanzer et al. (1996), which indicated that humor does in fact affect these perceived traits. This contradiction is especially evident in comparison to Walther’s Social Information Processing Theory (1992), which argues impression management across CMC often elicits similar results as in face-to-face interactions. Such unexpected results may stem from the commonality of humor on Facebook. Again, 20% of Facebook posts incorporate humor (Carr, Schrock, & Dauterman, 2012), perhaps negating its effect. It may stand to reason that if everyone is doing it, and doing it well, humor may lose its significant influence. Further research should be conducted to investigate the significance of humor in computer-mediated communication and, more specifically, social networking sites such as Facebook.
Limitations and Future Research

As in any social scientific experiment, this study is not without limitations. First, a preferred sample size of 400-450 may have increased observed effects and generalizability. Additionally, the mock Facebook profiles used were screenshots taken after manipulating the html code of an existing profile. Using screenshots may have decreased the ecological validity of the study, which may have benefitted from participants referencing “live” pages. However, it would be up to the researcher to determine how best to manage a live feed in which the messages are part of the manipulated condition. Ecological validity may also have been decreased by the lack of comments, “likes”, and other forms of interactions on the source’s Facebook page. These missing pieces may have exhibited a significant effect over the dependent variables. It stands to reason that a Facebook user with five comments that have received zero “likes” or comments may not be seen as socially attractive or credible. Further, more exhaustive pilot testing may have improved the execution of this study. Humorous messages could have been drafted with higher mean ratings of “funniness” and may have stressed greater significance for humor’s effect on the dependent variables as it appealed to broader audiences.

Future research would benefit from a modified replication of this study addressing the limitations and concerns listed above. Of particular interest is whether the heuristic cues on Facebook (e.g., likes, number of comments, additional postings) play a significant role in the overall perception of the Facebook user. In other words, would these small additions supersede the actual postings created by the user?

Conclusion

Overall, this study is one of the first to assess the role of humor on social networking sites such as Facebook. The findings demonstrate that humor does not significantly affect perceived source credibility and social attractiveness but that biological sex may. Future research should look for ways to adequately address the limitations of the current study and expound upon its premises. Humor proliferates a high degree of communication online and understanding its effects may help better explain how it is being used to manage impressions online on both a personal and practitioner level.
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Appendix A

Item 1
Teven and McCroskey’s 18-measures of credibility: Modified
Instructions: On the scales below, indicate your feelings about the individual whose Facebook page you have observed. Numbers 1 and 7 indicate a very strong feeling. Numbers 2 and 6 indicate a strong feeling. Numbers 3 and 5 indicate a fairly weak feeling. Number 4 indicates you are undecided.

1. Intelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unintelligent
2. Untrained 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Trained
3. Cares about others 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Doesn’t care about others
4. Honest 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Dishonest
5. Has others’ interests at heart 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Doesn’t have others’ interests at heart
6. Untrustworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Trustworthy
7. Inexpert 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Expert
8. Self-centered 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not self-centered
9. Concerned with others 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not concerned with others
10. Honorable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Dishonorable
11. Informed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Uninformed
12. Moral 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Immoral
13. Incompetent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Competent
14. Unethical 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Ethical
15. Insensitive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sensitive
16. Bright 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Stupid
17. Phony 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Genuine
18. Not understanding 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Understanding

Item 2
McCroskey’s Measure of Social Attractiveness: Modified
Instructions: For the statements below, respond to each on a scale ranging from 1 to 7, 1 signifying “strongly agree”, 7 signifying “strongly disagree”, and 3 signifying “I cannot determine”.

1. I think he/she could be a friend of mine.
2. I would like to have a friendly chat with him/her.
3. It would be difficult to meet and talk with him/her.
4. We could never establish a personal friendship with each other.
5. He/She just wouldn’t fit into my circle of friends.
6. He/She would be pleasant to be with.
7. He/She seems sociable to me.
8. I would not like to spend time socializing with this person.
9. I could become close friends with him/her.
10. He/She seems easy to get along with.
11. He/She seems unpleasant to be around.
12. This person does not seem very friendly.
Appendix B

Figure 1: Male Control
Figure 2: Female Control
Figure 3: Male Humor
Figure 4: Female Humor

My friends in Texas enjoyed a rare snow day this week. They were forced to brave harsh elements of 40 degrees.

My grandpa gave me $250 to help with extra expenses this semester, along with the usual sage advice not to spend it all at once... It was a Target gift card.

I found 20 dollars in my pocket today! Between that, the pocket lint, and a rogue paperclip, my possibilities are endless.

I just finally purchased the last of my textbooks for the semester. Will work for food.

I think it's time to upgrade my phone; the battery life is shorter than Kim Kardashian's first marriage.