Fame, Facebook, and Twitter: How Attitudes About Fame Predict Frequency and Nature of Social Media Use

Dara N. Greenwood
Vassar College

Social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter) offers the opportunity to both enact and respond to public performances of self, as well as to follow and interact with actual public figures. However, to date, we know little about how users' attitudes about fame intersect with their social media behaviors. The present survey study (Mturk; $n = 371$) investigated links between fame appeal and participants' Facebook and Twitter use. Fame attitudes were measured via a scale tapping the appeal of Visibility (e.g., being on the cover of a magazine), Status (e.g., traveling first class), and Prosocial (e.g., being able to financially support friends and family) aspects of fame, as well as time spent fantasizing about fame and the perceived realism of becoming famous one day. Visibility was the most robustly and consistently predictive of active and celebrity-oriented social media behaviors (posting and responding vs. reading; increased number of media figures followed, more frequent responses to media figure posts). Fame Fantasy and Fame Realism showed similar, although less robust, patterns. Individuals with active Facebook and Twitter accounts showed increased fame affinity relative to those with only one or none. Findings showcase the fame-relevant function of social media and the common motivational threads that may tie fame interest to social media use.

Keywords: Social Media, fame, celebrity, Facebook, Twitter

All the world is not, of course, a stage, but the crucial ways in which it isn't are not easy to specify (Goffman, 1959, p. 72).

The dual human needs to be seen and valued have been conceptualized as fundamental to human social life and, their fulfillment, to emotional well-being (James, 1890; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In today's media and technology-saturated culture, these needs may manifest in two potentially related phenomena: widespread use of social media, and an interest in fame. Despite intuitive, anecdotal, and indirect evidence linking the two, limited, if any, research has directly investigated whether individuals' attitudes about fame are related to how they use social media platforms such as Facebook (FB) and Twitter. The present study attempts to fill that gap.

Fame and Social Media: Common Motivational Threads?

Psychologists have noted that in addition to a growth in entertainment media content that focuses on personal achievement and competition (e.g., reality TV shows), the ubiquitous invitation to post, tweet, and broadcast the self en masse via personalized new technologies may both reflect and fuel a societal shift toward individualistic values and a quest for fame (Konrath, O'Brien, & Hsing, 2011; Twenge & Campbell, 2009; Uhls & Greenfield, 2012). For example, Uhls and Greenfield's (2012) focus group investigation of 20 American middle school children revealed that the phenomenon of friends becoming social media *audiences* may render the concept of fame salient (p. 324). Further, Konrath et al. (2011) have speculated

that superficial and self-oriented social media use may explain, in part, an observed decline in self-reported empathy among college students over the past several decades. Twenge and Campbell (2009) applied the same reasoning to an apparent rise in narcissism over time. Indeed, narcissistic tendencies have been associated with both a desire for fame (Greenwood, Long, & Dal Cin, 2013; Maltby, 2010) as well as self-promotional social media behaviors such as posting photos and curating one's profile (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008; Carpenter, 2012). Thus, both fame and social media use may be particularly appealing to those with self-aggrandizing motives.

There is more to the fame and social media story than superficial values and self-involvement, however. Research suggests that both may also be fueled by basic, even existential anxieties about the self. Prior analyses by the author found that individuals with heightened inclusion anxiety (i.e., higher need to belong) showed increased interest in diverse appeals of fame, in addition to increased time spent engaged in fame fantasies (Greenwood et al., 2013). Further, recent work in terror management theory finds that situationally activated anxiety about death (the ultimate form of social exclusion) also increases an affinity for fame. The authors propose that fame ostensibly assuages mortality fears by conferring a symbolic form of immortality (Greenberg, Kosloff, Solomon, Cohen, & Landau, 2010). (Worth noting, perhaps, is that wealth and status often confer literal mortality buffers—from access to high-quality health care to living conditions that are less vulnerable to environmental hazards.) This notion fits with earlier work (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Braudy, 1986) in which fame is characterized as the ultimate promise of social inclusion. The special social status and value that often accompany fame may assure individuals that they are safe and loved (being famously reviled is another story for another paper).

An interesting parallel to psychological motivations for fame emerges in the research on social media use. For example, Toma and Hancock (2013) found that FB use offers a form of self-affirmation on par with a reassertion of personal values in the face of ego threat. Specifically, having the opportunity to look at one's own FB profile (vs. a stranger's) helped reduce defensive responding in the face of an academic failure. Their second study showed that priming people with threatening feedback (vs. neutral feedback) increased their self-reported interest in spending time on FB. Toma and Hancock (2013) conclude, "The extraordinary amount of time people spend on FB may be a reflection of its ability to satisfy ego needs that are fundamental to the human condition . . . [that] pertain to how people wish to see themselves-socially attractive and embedded in a network of meaningful relationships" (p. 328). The ability for FB to satisfy ego needs may also be due to a skew identified by Pew data; apparently, thanks to a concentrated number of "power users," the average FB user receives more friend requests, likes, messages, and photo tags than they themselves give (Hampton, Goulet, Marlow, & Rainie, 2012). Online profiles may function as a reassuring social mirror that confirms existential presence and value.

Leaving aside the complex question of whether social media activity reliably assuages social or emotional distress (recent research suggests that Facebook use may, in fact, decrease emotional well-being; Kross et al., 2013), a craving for positive feedback and validation may be a common thread that links a desire for fame with social media use. A "uses and gratifications" framework (cf. Rubin, 2002), developed by communication scholars to capture diverse motivations for and perceived benefits of media use, may be relevant here. Specifically, individuals may use social media in the service of ostensibly gratifying specific psychological needs—the need to feel seen and valued, and to feel meaningfully embedded in social networks. These needs may also manifest in individuals' attitudes about the appeal of fame, from being literally seen and admired, to having elite access to resources, to having the power and ability to help others. Whereas previous work has connected some critical dots between psychological needs and fame appeal, and between psychological needs and social media use, the present study endeavors to connect the dots between fame appeal and social media use.

Social Media and the Practices of Fame

Although arguably all of social life might be conceptualized as some kind of performance—

even our most intimate relationships can activate different kinds of relational "scripts" (Schlenker, 2003)—the diversity and magnitude of audiences afforded by social media platforms like FB and Twitter vastly outrank the number of interaction partners most of us encounter in daily life. According to a recent Pew Research report, the average FB user has 229 friends (Hampton et al., 2011), and various Internet sources report the average Twitter user has anywhere from 126 to 208 followers. Thus, social media sites offer a unique social spotlight: an auditorium-sized group of friends/followers for whom various versions of self might be performed.

Social media use continues to rise in popularity; two-thirds of adult Internet users are on FB—a frequency that jumps to 86% when sampling users between 18 and 29 years old (Duggan & Brenner, 2013). Twitter is reportedly used by only 16% of adult Internet users, but this number once again obscures increased adoption among 18–24-year-olds (using at a rate of 27%, Duggan & Brenner, 2013) as well as a trend over the past 2 years in which individuals aged from 25 to 44 have doubled their usage (Smith & Brenner, 2012). Both sites enable brief personal broadcasts, biographical information, private messaging, public commenting, and photo-sharing. However, there are some important differences. FB predated Twitter by 2 years (2004 launch vs. 2006) and was originally a "gated" Internet community that required a college e-mail to join. It is also a more friend-oriented network than Twitter, which does not require mutual following. Rather, Twitter is premised on a potentially asymmetric system in which one can have one's posts (or tweets) followed by someone who one does not, in turn, follow. For this reason and others described later in the text, Twitter may be a more "fame-friendly" platform than FB.

Twitter has been described as encouraging the enactment of "microcelebrity" (Marwick & boyd, 2011a) among noncelebrity users. The authors point out that Twitter users gain status and followers by marketing themselves/their thoughts as a type of likable personal brand, designed to appeal to diverse and loyal audiences (p. 127). The social media presence of *actual* celebrities may contribute to these practices. Indeed, Twitter explicitly markets itself as a vehicle to "Follow your friends, experts, fa-

vorite celebrities, and breaking news." Not surprisingly, research suggests that one major motivation for Twitter adoption is interest in and perceived access to celebrities (Hargittai & Litt, 2011). As a case in point, musicians appear to top both Twitter and FB charts. At the time of writing, Rihanna and Eminem had respectively received 72 and 71 million "likes" on FB, and Justin Bieber and Lady Gaga respectively boasted 40 and 38 million followers on Twitter.

Users of both FB and Twitter may now embed famous media figures within their actual social networks, visually and conceptually leveling the fame-playing fields on walls and feeds, as if celebrities are just another peer or friend. Users also have the opportunity to ostensibly "interact" with these individuals by posting comments, liking photos, or responding to celebrity tweets. In some cases, individuals may get an alleged response or "retweet" from a favorite media figure (debates continue as to which celebrities are tending to their Twitter feeds themselves vs. outsourcing this job to a staff member), which may understandably fuel perceptions that media figures are actual versus imagined friends. Moreover, public figures themselves often encourage and reward fan/follower interactions online, a practice that may amplify experiences of vicarious fame. Celebrity mayor Cory Booker, for example, who has 1.4 million Twitter followers, often responds directly to and/or "retweets" follower comments, a strategy that has garnered both admiration and a bit of political backlash.

Just as fame, or thoughts about fame, may confer feelings of heightened social value, so may electronically engaging with actual famous others. Parasocial interaction, or the illusion of intimacy that a one-sided imaginative social rapport with a media figure enables (Horton & Wohl, 1956; Giles, 2002), has been theorized to provide a sense of self-worth, via a type of social transitive property. Caughey (1984) notes that imagining being singled out by an idealized media figure may be alluring because it "makes *you* somebody" (p. 50). Indeed, individuals with an inflated sense of self-worth (e.g., narcissists) or those concerned with the extent to which they are valued by others (e.g., those with high belonging needs) both report greater parasocial engagement with media figures (Ashe, Maltby, & McCutcheon, 2005; Greenwood & Long, 2011, respectively). Following and/or interact-

ing with famous others on social media sites may provide a concrete opportunity to bask in their social media spotlight. The term "parasocial" may, in fact, be inaccurate in this particular context: social media now enables the potential for a two-sided social rapport. The mere possibility that a favorite media figure will read and perhaps respond to one's posts may be particularly alluring for those who find fame and its perks appealing.

The Present Study

Despite theoretical and intuitive overlap between social media use and fame motivation, and despite more than a hundred articles published to date on FB alone (cf. Anderson, Fagan, Woodnutt, & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2012), it seems no one has systematically investigated individuals' specific fame motivations in the context of their social media use. The present study investigates how attitudes about fame are related to the frequency and nature of individuals' FB and Twitter use.

Fame attitudes are operationalized via a new scale (first reported in Greenwood et al., 2013) that taps Visibility (e.g., being asked for one's autograph, being on the cover of a magazine), Status (e.g., living in a penthouse or mansion, having VIP access to the best restaurants), and Prosocial (e.g., financially supporting family/friends, using fame to advance a cause) aspects of fame appeal. Additional fame attitudes are broadly assessed with items capturing frequency of time spent fantasizing about becoming famous and the extent to which individuals believe that future fame is a realistic possibility. Those who believe they are destined for fame may use social media in different ways than those for whom fame aspirations are confined to fantasy, if at all.

Social media affords myriad opportunities to feel seen and admired; it is not surprising that scholars have identified both self-presentation and belonging needs as primary motivations for using FB (Nadkarni & Hofmann, 2012). Individuals who show greater interest Visibility, as well as those who spend more time fantasizing about fame or thinking fame is a realistic future possibility, may engage more frequently in attention-getting social media behaviors. The following hypotheses are advanced:

H1: Individuals who find Visibility aspects of fame more appealing, those who spend more time fantasizing about being famous, and/or believing that fame is a realistic future possibility will: (a) *use social media more frequently*, and (b) engage more frequently in *active social media behaviors* (e.g., posting on FB or Twitter, commenting in response to posts).

The chance to make actual contact with a famous other may help individuals with heightened interest in Visibility aspects of fame, as well as fame fantasy and realism, feel seen and admired by proxy. Thus:

H2: Individuals who find Visibility aspects of fame more appealing, those who spend more time fantasizing about being famous, and/or believing that fame is a realistic future possibility will: (a) *follow more media figures* on FB and Twitter, and (b) *respond to media figure posts* more frequently.

The Status aspect of fame measures the appeal of an elite, wealthy lifestyle; it is not entirely clear how or whether it will be linked to the frequency of specific social media behaviors, which are not inherently materially relevant. However, there is evidence of increased materialistic tendencies among young girls who idealize male celebrities, presumably because of the consumer culture in which media figures are embedded (Engle & Kasser, 2005).

Thus:

RQ1: Will individuals who find Status aspects of fame more appealing (a) *use social media more frequently*, and (b) engage more frequently in *active social media behaviors* (e.g., posting on FB or Twitter, commenting in response to posts)?

Following and/or interacting with famous others may enable Status-oriented individuals to think of famous others as members of their in-group, which may facilitate vicarious elite status. Moreover, responses to posts by media figures may not only be read/reacted to by the media figure themselves but by anyone else who follows them. Conferred elite status may be elevated by the presence of a wide audience.

H3: Individuals who find Status aspects of fame more appealing will (a) *follow more media figures* on FB and Twitter and, (b) respond more frequently to *media figure posts*.

Greater interest in the Prosocial aspects of fame may reflect greater affiliative or other-oriented (vs. self-oriented) tendencies and motives. Because FB is more explicitly designed for keeping connected with actual friends and building "social capital" (Ellison, Steinfeld & Lampe, 2007) than Twitter, which is more explicitly designed for keeping up with celebrities and cultivating a "fan base," it is expected that:

H4: Individuals who find Prosocial aspects of fame more appealing will also use FB more frequently.

But,

RQ2: Will individuals who find Prosocial aspects of fame more appealing also use Twitter more frequently?

Next, because individuals endorsing Prosocial aspects of fame may be motivated to use social media for the purposes of keeping up with and interacting with others:

H5: Individuals who find Prosocial aspects of fame more appealing will engage in more frequent (a) *reading* of others' social media posts, and (b). more frequent *responding* to others' social media posts.

However, those who find Prosocial aspects of fame appealing may not necessarily be more likely to broadcast their own status updates:

RQ3: Will individuals who find Prosocial aspects of fame more appealing engage in more frequent *posting behaviors* on social media?

The other-orientation that is implied in finding Prosocial aspects of fame more appealing may well include a desire to feel some kind of parasocial engagement with media figures.

H6: Individuals who find Prosocial aspects of fame more appealing will also follow *more media figures on FB or Twitter.*

It is not clear whether striving for *actual* interaction with media figures, via liking or responding to their social media posts, will be associated with increased appeal of the Prosocial aspects of fame. Individuals who find altruistic aspects of fame appealing may not need to call attention to themselves in this public way. Thus:

RQ4: Will individuals who find Prosocial aspects of fame more appealing respond more frequently to *media figure posts*?

Finally, because social media provides opportunities for social performance, whether as an actor or audience member or both, merely having an active FB or Twitter account vs. not may be associated with an increased endorsement of all fame constructs. Having a Twitter account, in particular, may be associated with increased fame affinity due to its increased celebrity-oriented focus and functionality.

Further, having *both* FB and Twitter accounts compared with just one or the other might speak to an interest in doubling the benefits of social media use vis-à-vis fame interest. Individuals who use both kinds of social media are opting to participate, whether actively or passively, in two potentially different performance platforms and in front of two different audiences (although there is functionality that allows individuals to duplicate their posts on each site, the assumption is that there are different, if partly overlapping, audiences involved). To date, research has typically focused on either FB *or* Twitter use; the present research is positioned to examine associations with the use of both.

H7: Individuals with active FB and Twitter accounts will show greater interest in all aspects of fame than individuals just using Twitter, who will show greater interest in fame than those just using FB; and, all three will show greater interest in fame than those not using either FB or Twitter (i.e., FB and Twitter > Twitter > FB > none).

Recent Pew research reports show that more women than men use social media (71% of women vs. 62% of men; Duggan & Brenner, 2013). This may reflect socialization practices that encourage women to forge and maintain social bonds (Eagly, 1987). Additionally, research suggests that both fame and social media are more appealing among younger individuals

(Uhls & Greenfield, 2012). Links among key study variables as a function of gender and age will be examined before pursuing primary hypotheses and research questions.

Methods

Participants and Procedure

Participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk to participate in a study entitled, "Self and culture survey," which they were told would take approximately 20 minutes to complete and be worth $0.65 for their time. Originally, 408 individuals completed the survey. However, after various exclusions (e.g., technical difficulties, unreasonably short response times, missing responses to key demographic items), the final sample was $n = 371$. The sample was about evenly split between men and women (52% vs. 48%). The mean age of the sample was 31 (range of 18–73; 75% of the sample was 35 or younger). Self-identified ethnicity labels showed that 78% of the sample identified as White/Caucasian, 8% identified as Asian (broadly defined), 5% identified as Black or African American, 5% as Latino/a, 3% as biracial, 0.5% as Native American, and 0.5% did not offer specific ethnic labels (e.g., "American").

Questions about fame and social media use were embedded in a larger survey (a portion of which focused on links between the self-concept and fame appeal, Greenwood et al., 2013). Participants were probed for comments/suspicions at the end and provided with a debriefing page.

Measures

General fame attitudes. As noted earlier, fame attitudes were assessed via a scale that tapped three factors: Visibility, Status, and Prosocial aspects of fame appeal. Details of scale development are presented in Greenwood et al. (2013); for descriptive purposes, factor loadings are reprinted in Table 1. Factor scores are used in the present analyses.[1]

Two additional items asked how often participants imagined being famous (never, rarely, sometimes, often) and how realistic they believed it might be that they would one day become famous (*Not at all* to *Extremely*, 1–7

scale). These variables are henceforth referred to as Fame Fantasy and Fame Realism, respectively. Fame Realism scores were positively skewed; however, normalizing the distribution via square root transformation did not change the results, so the raw scores are used.

Social media use. To measure the nature and frequency of FB use, a modified a scale devised by Junco (2012) was used. Specifically, participants reported how much they used FB (from never to multiple times/day; 1–8 scale), as well as what percentage of their time on FB was spent doing various activities (e.g., reading status updates, posting status updates, posting photos, looking at others' photos; 0%–100% of the time). Inspection of data for specific behaviors showed that a majority of participants did not keep in mind a total of 100% across items (e.g., sometimes they were below and sometimes above). This variable is thus treated as an index of frequency (0–10 pt scale) versus a proportion. In support of this approach, the correlation between the total frequencies aggregated across specific FB behaviors and frequency of time spent more generally on FB is significant, $r(301) = .28, p < .001$.

For conceptual and statistical parsimony, the two FB behaviors relevant to posting were averaged into one variable (FB-posting: posting status updates, posting photos, $\alpha = .81$). The two FB behaviors relevant to "lurking" (a term that describes passive, observational internet participation, McKenna & Bargh, 1998) were also averaged into one variable (FB-lurking: reading status updates, looking at photos, $\alpha = .69$). Finally, the three FB behaviors relevant to responding were combined into a third variable (FB-responding: commenting on or liking posts/photos, responding to comments on own posts/photos, $\alpha = .92$).

Additional items asked how many media figures, if any, participants liked or were "friends" with on FB (*N*/A, none, 1–2, 3–4, 5 or more) and how often, if ever, they "liked" or commented on media figures' posts (*N*/A, never, rarely, sometimes often).

---

[1] Factor scores were utilized in lieu of mean scores because data were collected as part of a larger study that incorporated the original scale items. Visibility (Eigenvalue = 6.95, 38.6% of variance), Status (Eigenvalue = 2.67, 14.8% of variance) and Prosocial (Eigenvalue = 1.55, 8.6% of variance) aspects of fame.

Table 1
Factor Loadings for Fame Appeal Items

Item	Factor 1 (Visibility)	Factor 2 (Status)	Factor 3 (Prosocial)
Being on the cover of a magazine	**.845**	.026	−.023
Having your picture taken	**.834**	−.060	.017
Being recognized in public	**.812**	−.052	−.062
Doing press interviews	**.774**	−.172	.053
Being asked for your autograph	**.730**	.034	−.023
Have a lot of followers on Twitter or other social media	**.701**	.097	−.070
Attending awards shows	**.647**	.169	.028
Being a spokesperson for favorite products or brands	**.621**	.044	.134
Having the ability to travel in first class and stay at exclusive resorts	−.126	**.864**	.032
Receiving free gifts of luxury items	.070	**.781**	−.055
Living in a mansion or penthouse apartment	.050	**.767**	−.036
Having VIP access to the best restaurants	.042	**.757**	.056
Having an expensive/fashionable wardrobe	.276	**.571**	−.051
Being financially secure	−.215	**.454**	.220
Being able to financially support family and friends	−.192	.073	**.660**
Making family/friends proud	.068	.030	**.634**
Being able to use your fame for important causes	.032	.081	**.617**
Being a role model to others	.263	−.122	**.606**

Note. Bolded numbers represent highest loading items on each factor (items reordered by factor).
Reprinted from Greenwood et al. (2013).

To ascertain frequency of Twitter use and specific Twitter behaviors, individuals were asked how much time they spent on Twitter (from never to multiple times/day; 1–8 scale), how much of their time on Twitter (if they had an active account) they spent posting tweets, reading tweets, and responding to tweets (0%–100% of the time). As with the FB responses, a substantial minority did not tally their responses to total 100%. Percentage of time spent performing specific Twitter behaviors is also treated as a general index of frequency versus a proportion. Also, as mentioned earlier, this approach is supported by a significant correlation between total frequency of behaviors reported and reported general frequency of Twitter use:

$r(153) = .48$, $p < .001$. Finally, we asked how many media figures they followed on Twitter (N/A, none, 1–2, 3–4, 5 or more) and how often they comment on media figures' tweets (N/A, never, rarely, sometimes, often).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Fame variables. Means and intercorrelations among fame variables are shown in Table 2. Scores for fame variables were, not surprisingly, moderately correlated with each other, with the exception of the Status fame factor and Fame Realism.

Table 2
Means and Intercorrelations Among Fame Variables (Controlling for Age and Gender)

Variables	M (SD)	Visibility	Status	Prosocial	Fame fantasy	Fame realism
Visibility	—		.48**	.42**	.55**	.37**
Status	—			.57**	.28**	.05
Prosocial	—				.26*	.17*
Fame fantasy	2.18 (0.84)					.37**
Fame realism	1.87 (1.89)					

Note. Mean scores for Fame factors are each 0 (*SD*s = 0.96, 0.95, 0.88, respectively).
* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Gender differences. *T*-tests were performed to determine whether attitudes about fame differed as a function of participant gender. Results showed that women scored higher than men on the Prosocial fame factor, $t(359) = -2.85$, $p < .01$ (Ms $= .14 > -.13$), and marginally higher than men on the Status fame factor, $t(359) = -1.96$, $p < .06$ (Ms $= .10 > -.09$). Men scored higher than women on frequency of Fame Fantasy, $t(366) = 2.17$, $p < .05$ (Ms $= 2.27 > 2.08$).

Women were more marginally more likely than men to have an active FB account, $\chi^2(371) = 3.38$, $p < .07$ (88% vs. 81%). Among those reporting an active FB account ($n = 312$), t-tests were conducted on the five FB variables (overall FB use, FB-posting, FB-responding, FB-lurking, number of media friends) as a function of gender. Results show that women were more likely to use FB overall, $t(310) = -2.69$, $p < .01$ (Ms $= 6.69 > 6.14$), and were more likely to comment/like posts, $t(305) = -2.27$, $p < .05$ (Ms $= 2.67 > 2.06$), compared to men.

No gender differences emerged with respect to having a Twitter account or not. Among those with an active Twitter account ($n = 148$, 40% of the sample), a *t*-test revealed that men spend more time reading tweets than women, $t(146) = 2.34$, $p < .05$ (Ms $= 6.74 > 5.49$).

Age. Age was inversely related to Visibility, $r(361) = -.14$, $p < .01$, Status, $r(361) = -.14$, $p < .01$, Fame Fantasy, $r(368) = -.17$, $p < = .001$, and Fame Realism, $r(368) = -.18$, $p < .001$. Younger participants were also significantly more likely to have an active FB account, $t(369) = -2.68$, $p < .01$ (Ms $= 30.4 < 34.7$). Somewhat surprisingly, no significant age difference emerged as a function of having an active Twitter account.

Due to the aforementioned differences, age and gender are included as covariates in the analyses mentioned further. However, it is worth noting that results are virtually analogous, with a few minor exceptions, when these covariates are not included.

Primary Analyses

Because specific predictions were made for some, but not all, of the analyses mentioned further, the *p* value is set conservatively at $< .01$, with $p < .05$ considered marginal.

FB use. The majority of the sample ($n = 312$) reported having an active FB account.[2] The majority (64%) of those who reported having an active FB account reported using FB at least once/day; and about one-third of the sample reported using FB multiple times a day. Participants reported spending the most amount of FB time engaged in FB-lurking ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 2.39$), followed by FB-responding ($M = 2.37$, $SD = 2.35$) and FB-posting ($M = 1.40$, $SD = 1.57$).

More than half of the sample (56%) reported having at least one media figure friend/like on FB, and more than one-third of the sample (35%) reported having three or more media friends/likes.

About one-third of those with media friends/likes on FB reported never liking/responding to media figure posts, 40% reported responding rarely, 21% reported responding sometimes, and 5% reported responding often. Because the latter group was too small to make meaningful comparisons, it was collapsed with the "sometimes" group, yielding three categories for this variable: never ($n = 60$), rarely ($n = 70$), and sometimes/often ($n = 44$).

Fame affinity and FB use. To assess the independent relationships between general fame attitudes and specific FB behaviors, partial correlations between the FB variables and the general fame variables were conducted (controlling for age and gender). As shown in Table 3, Visibility and Fame Fantasy were positively related to all social media behavior, except for FB-lurking, which was not significantly related to any fame variables. All fame variables were positively and significantly related to the number of media friends/likes on FB, and all fame variables, except for Fame Realism, were positively and significantly associated with overall frequency of FB use.

To clarify the relative contributions of the general fame attitudes to specific FB behaviors that emerged as significant in the correlational analyses, four hierarchical regressions were next conducted on Frequency of FB use, FB-posting, FB-responding, and number of media figure friends/likes, respectively. In each regression, age and gender were entered in Step 1,

---

[2] Three people were excluded for reporting an active FB account but then scoring 0 on all behavioral indices.

Table 3
*Partial Correlations Among Fame Variables and FB Use (*n *= 281; Controlling for Age and Gender)*

Measure	Visibility	Status	Prosocial	F. Fantasy	F. Realism
1. Frequency of FB use	.18*	.19*	.19*	.19*	.07
2. Percentage of time FB-posting	.35**	.14+	.12+	.20*	.25**
3. Percentage of time FB-responding	.28**	.07	.04	.18*	.10
4. Percentage of time FB-lurking	.13+	.11	.06	.12+	.03
5. Number of media friends/likes	.27**	.15*	.21**	.26**	.18*

Note. The sample for this analysis is lower due to missing data.
+ $p < .05$.   * $p < .01$.   ** $p < .001$.

followed by the three Fame Appeal factors in Step 2, and Fame Fantasy and Fame Realism in Step 3.

When considering predictors for overall frequency of FB use, each step in the model was significant but only the second step improved predictive utility; *F-change*(3, 293) = 4.86, $R^2 = .08$, $p < .01$. Although adding the fame appeal variables improved the model in Step 2 (the effect of Visibility in Step 2 was marginal; $p < .10$), gender (being female) was the only significant predictor in all three steps.

For FB-posting, the second and third step in the model were significant but, again, only Step 2 increased the predictive utility, *F-change*(3, 289) = 15.72, $R^2 = .15$, $p < .001$. Specifically, Visibility was the lone significant predictor in both Step 2 and Step 3 ($\beta = .39$, $p < .001$; $\beta = .35$, $p < .001$, respectively).

Similarly, for FB-responding, all three models were significant and only Step 2 significantly improved the predictive utility of the model, *F-change*(3, 288) = 9.16, $R^2 = .11$, $p < .001$. In this case, both gender (female) and Visibility positively predicted frequency of FB-responding in Step 2 ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$; $\beta = .33$, $p < .001$, respectively), and remained significant in Step 3 ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$; $\beta = .31$, $p < .001$, respectively).

For the regression predicting number of media figure friends/likes, all steps were significant and Steps 2 and 3 improved the utility of the model, *F-change*(3, 293) = 6.56, $R^2 = .09$, $p < .001$; *F-change*(2, 291) = 3.33, $R^2 = .11$, $p < .05$. Visibility was significant in Step 2 ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$) but became nonsignificant in Step 3 when Fame Fantasy and Fame Realism were added; Fame Fantasy was predictive of media friends/likes, $\beta = .15$, $p < .05$ (marginal by imposed conservative criterion).

Finally, to determine whether frequency of responding to media figure posts (coded categorically: never, rarely, sometimes/often) was associated with attitudes about fame, a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA; controlling for age and gender) was conducted for the subsample having at least one media figure friend/like on FB (*n* = 174). The overall effect of frequency of responding was marginally significant, *F*(10, 314) = 1.94, $p < .05$ ($\lambda = .89$); inspection of univariate analyses reveals a marginal difference for Visibility only; *F*(2, 161) = 4.51, $p < .05$. Pairwise comparisons reveal that participants responding sometimes/often to media figure posts scored significantly higher on the Visibility fame factor than those reporting responding rarely or never (*ps* < .01; *M*s = .58 > .10, .08, respectively).[3]

In sum: when fame variables were considered simultaneously, increased appeal of the Visibility fame factor was most robustly predictive of FB-posting, responding, the number of media figures likes/friends on FB, and the frequency of responding to those media figures. Fame Fantasy was additionally predictive of the number of media friends/likes on FB.

Twitter.   Less than half of the sample reported an active Twitter account (*n* = 148).[4] Forty-six percent of the sample with an active Twitter account reported using it at least once/week, whereas 30% reported using it at least once/day. Participants reported reading others' tweets with the highest frequency, followed by

---

[3] Findings remain virtually analogous when frequency of responding to friends' posts is included as an additional covariate, suggesting that responding to celebrity posts is distinct from habitual social media patterns.

[4] Five people were excluded for reporting an active Twitter account but then scoring 0 on all behavioral indices.

posting tweets, followed by responding to others' tweets. A majority of individuals with Twitter accounts (85%) reported following at least one media figure on Twitter and half (50%) reported following five or more media figures. More than half (55%) of those who followed media figures reported ever responding to media figure tweets, and a smaller group (11%) reported responding sometimes or often. Because such a small group of people ($n = 14$) fell into the latter group, for the purposes of analyses, response frequency was dichotomized as never ($n = 57$) or ever ($n = 69$).

Fame affinity and Twitter use. To assess the independent associations among Twitter use and fame attitudes, partial correlations (controlling for age and gender) between the fame variables and five Twitter variables (overall frequency, posting tweets, reading tweets, responding to tweets, and the number of media figures followed on Twitter) were computed. The Visibility aspect of fame appeal was positively correlated with frequency of posting tweets, $r(138) = .22, p < .01$, and responding to tweets, $r(138) = .21, p < .05$ (marginal), and negatively correlated with frequency of reading tweets, $r(138) = -.22, p < .01$. A similar pattern emerged for Fame Realism, which was positively correlated with posting tweets, $r(138) = .21, p < .05$ (marginal), and negatively correlated with reading tweets, $r(138) = -.22, p < .01$. No other significant associations emerged.

To probe whether frequency of responding to media figure tweets (never vs. ever) was associated with fame attitudes (limited to those who follow one or more media figure on Twitter, $n = 126$), another MANCOVA (controlling for age and gender) was performed. Results showed a significant overall effect of frequency of responding to media figure tweets, $F(5, 112) = 4.58, p < .01$ ($\lambda = .83$). Inspection of univariate analyses showed that those responding *ever* to media figure tweets scored significantly higher than those who never respond on Visibility, $F(1, 116) = 10.06, p < .01$ ($Ms = .54 > -.03$), and Fame Realism, $F(1, 116) = 16.23, p < .001$ ($Ms = 2.48 > 1.54$). Similar marginal findings were obtained for: Status, $F(1, 116) = 4.98, p < .05$ ($Ms = .37 > .02$), and Prosocial fame factors, $F(1, 116) = 6.89, p < .05$ ($Ms = .40 > .07$), as well as for Fame Fantasy, $F(1, 116) = 6.42, p < .05$ ($Ms = 2.59 > 2.19$).[5]

In sum, appeal of the Visibility aspects of fame as well as perceived Fame Realism emerged as the most consistent predictors of performative and celebrity-oriented Twitter use.

Cumulative social media use. The majority of the sample reported using FB only ($n = 181$), followed by those who used both FB and Twitter ($n = 131$), followed by no social media ($n = 42$), and, finally, Twitter use only ($n = 17$). Due to the small sample of participants using only Twitter, social media use was collapsed into those using both sites ($n = 131$), those using one or the other ($n = 198$), and those using neither ($n = 42$).

To test whether having two social media accounts will be associated with increased affinity for all aspects of fame than having one or none, a final MANCOVA (controlling for age and gender) was performed. An overall effect of social media use emerged, $F(10, 696) = 3.01, p < .01$ ($\lambda = .92$). Inspection of univariate analyses showed significant effects for the Visibility, $F(2, 352) = 7.28, p < .01$, and Prosocial aspects of fame, $F(2, 352) = 8.66, p < .001$, as well as Fame Fantasy, $F(2, 352) = 6.39, p < .01$. Marginal effects emerged for Status, $F(2, 352) = 4.25, p < .05$, and Fame Realism, $F(3, 352) = 3.02, p = .05$. Pairwise comparisons showed that participants using both FB and Twitter scored significantly higher on Visibility, Prosocial, and Fame Fantasy than those without active social media accounts. Those using both FB and Twitter also scored higher on the Prosocial fame factor compared with those using only FB or Twitter. Marginal distinctions for Visibility, Status, and Fame Fantasy emerged between those using both and those using only one or the other social media site (Table 4).

Discussion

Despite indirect and anecdotal evidence suggesting links between fame motives and social media use, little, if any, empirical work has directly investigated these relationships. The present study examined how the appeal of fame—including the Visibility, Status, and

---

[5] Findings remain virtually analogous when frequency of responding to others' tweets is included as an additional covariate, suggesting, like FB findings, that responding to celebrity tweets is distinct from habitual social media patterns.

Table 4
Fame Attitudes as a Function of Cumulative Social Media Use

	FB and Twitter	FB or Twitter	No social media
Visibility factor	.22 (.08)$_a$	−.07 (.07)$_b$[+]	−.39 (.15)$_b$[*]
Status factor	.19 (.08)$_a$	−.11 (.07)$_b$[+]	−.13 (.15)$_{ab}$
Prosocial factor	.23 (.08)$_a$	−.08 (.06)$_b$[*]	−.36 (.14)$_b$[*]
Fame fantasy	2.37 (.07)$_a$	2.11 (.06)$_b$[+]	1.89 (.13)$_b$[*]
Fame realism	2.05 (.10)	1.76 (.08)	1.67 (.18)

Note. Means with different subscripts are significantly different, within rows. Parentheses reflect standard errors; means are adjusted for age and gender covariates.
[+] $p < .05$.　[*] $p < .01$.

Prosocial aspects of fame, as well as frequency of fame fantasizing and perceived realism of future fame—predicted the frequency and nature of individuals' FB and Twitter use. The Visibility fame factor, which captures the appeal of being recognized, asked for an autograph, featured on a magazine cover, among other indices of public admiration and attention, was the most consistently predictive of active (vs. passive) and celebrity-oriented social media behaviors. Fame fantasizing and Fame Realism showed similar, although less robust, connections. Further, using both FB and Twitter was associated with increased fame affinity compared with using one or none.

Usage patterns identified in the present study are largely in line with Pew reports of national trends, which indicate that a higher percentage of Internet users have FB than Twitter accounts, and that women and younger users are more likely to have FB accounts than their male and older counterparts (Duggan & Brenner, 2013). In line with previous work (Junco, 2012), participants spend more time lurking than posting their own updates. Providing support for the notion that Twitter is more clearly designed to facilitate keeping up with media figures than FB, a majority of those with Twitter accounts (84%) reported following at least one media figure, with half following five or more media figures, whereas only about half of FB users reported having "liked" or friended a media figure.

Links between social media use and fame affinities within each social media platform largely supported predictions. Namely, the appeal of Visibility aspects of fame, frequency of

time spent fantasizing about becoming famous, and perceived realism of becoming famous one day showed the most consistent and robust relationships with overall social media use, increased promotional social media use (e.g., posting updates/photos, responding to posts), and greater celebrity-oriented social media habits (e.g., following/friending more media figures and responding more often to their posts). No significant associations emerged between fame variables and FB-lurking (reading posts/looking at photos). Moreover, Visibility and Fame Realism were inversely related to reading tweets. It stands to reason that individuals who find the Visibility spoils of fame and fame *per se* particularly appealing would be less keen on passive (or invisible) social media behaviors that do not afford opportunities for self-expression or self-promotion. These findings contribute a new link to previous research examining psychological predictors of fame appeal and social media use; narcissism and belonging needs have been found to predict Visibility aspects of fame (Greenwood et al., 2013), and narcissism has also been shown to be associated with increased tendency to engage in exhibitionist postings on social media sites (Carpenter, 2012; Panek, Nardis, & Konrath, 2013).

Findings also contribute new insights regarding both parasocial and actual social interaction with media figures in a social media context. All fame indices were positively and significantly associated with an increased number of media "friends"/likes on FB. No such pattern emerged for number of media figures followed on Twitter, which may partly reflect the lower variability associated with following media figures on Twitter (recall that the vast majority of Twitter users followed at least one media figure compared with half of FB users). Keeping up with favorite media figures online and embedding them within one's known social network may both reflect and fuel a broader personal interest in fame and celebrity. Further, actually responding in some way (liking, commenting) to media figure posts, as those higher in Visibility and Fame Realism were more likely to do, may reflect and perpetuate an interest in fame in at least two ways. Not only may someone who responds to a media figures' post hope to be seen/appreciated by the celebrity in question, but they may hope for and receive a response or "retweet" in which this high status attentional

focus is made public. In short, such individuals may seek out and possibly achieve their "fifteen minutes of fame."

The potential effects of such celebrity engagement require further investigation. Although some research shows that individuals may derive boosts to self-worth and belonging from the "social surrogacy" that imagined rapport with media figures may offer (Gardner, Pickett, & Knowles, 2005), extreme investment in parasocial interaction with admired celebrities has also been associated with problematic tendencies, such as insecure attachment patterns among adolescents (Giles & Maltby, 2004). Moreover, idealization of celebrities has been found to be associated with increased body image concerns among young women in particular (Greenwood, 2009; Maltby, Giles, Barber, & McCutcheon, 2005). It is possible that the pursuit of recognition by a famous other that social media, and often, the media figures themselves encourage, may perpetuate fame fantasies to the exclusion of more realistic and meaningful goals and interactions.

It was not clear to what extent an interest in the wealth and elite access that fame affords would be associated with more frequent and more self-oriented social media use. As it turned out, Status scores were associated with increased overall FB use but only marginally associated with increased posting behaviors on FB. In partial support of predictions, Status-oriented individuals did also have more media "friends"/likes on FB, but they did not report increased frequency of responding to media figure posts on FB. They did, however, show marginally higher frequency of responding to media figures on Twitter. The less robust associations for Status aspects of fame indicate that an interest in a high-class lifestyle may not be as relevant to social media activities as an interest in being recognized and admired.

Similarly, patterns for the appeal Prosocial aspects of fame showed partial support of study hypotheses. It was anticipated that individuals who were more interested in Prosocial, other-oriented aspects of fame would show increased time spent on FB, spend more time reading and responding to others' posts, and follow more media figures on both FB and Twitter. Results supported predictions for overall FB use and for media "friends"/likes on FB; no support was found for the increased frequency of reading or responding to others' posts. Additional marginal associations emerged for FB-posting and frequency of responding to media figure tweets. Interestingly, the Prosocial fame factor showed the sharpest distinctions for cumulative social media account analyses. That is, individuals with both forms of social media accounts scored significantly higher on the appeal of Prosocial aspects of fame than those with one or none. Perhaps merely being plugged into the social networks associated with FB and Twitter reflects an increased investment in social relationships. In line with this idea, Pew research finds evidence that Facebook users report increased numbers of close social ties relative to nonusers (Hampton et al., 2011).

Those using both FB and Twitter also scored higher on Visibility and Fame Fantasy than those using no social media, with marginal distinctions emerging between using both and using only one. Multiple social media networks not only enable connection to multiple social networks, but provide more opportunities to be seen and valued. These findings, along with the pattern that emerged for Prosocial aspects of fame, underscore the dual needs that social media may engage: the need to be seen/valued *and* the need to feel meaningfully and positively connected to others (Nadkarni & Hofmann, 2012). Although such benevolent aspirations are still tied to fame, these findings should temper assumptions that both fame interest and social media use are merely symptoms of an increasingly narcissistic population.

Limitations and Future Directions

The study is limited by the self-report nature of the items and use of two single-item measures (i.e., Fame Fantasy, Fame Realism). However, there is precedent for using single-item measures in recent scholarship (e.g., SIN, Konrath, Meier, & Bushman, 2013), and the findings were primarily in line with predictions. Development of comprehensive social media and fame scales is still in the early stages; future research should continue examining the relative and predictive utility of different approaches. Relatedly, recent scholarship suggests that it is more fruitful to inquire about the emotional or social utility of social media use (e.g., "Facebook plays an important role in my social rela-

tionships"), rather than merely accounting for frequency or type of behavior (Jenkins-Guarnieri, Wright, & Johnson, 2012). The current approach of asking individuals to report on social media behavior frequency seemed better suited to keeping demand low, given the fame questions that were also included. However, more fine-grained research on reported social and emotional utility would be a valuable addition to the current topic.

The fact that many participants did not respond to the social media frequency items as proportions of a whole was unfortunate; however, as noted earlier, responses in the aggregate were significantly correlated with overall frequency ratings. Further, percentages were in line with previous work (Junco, 2012). As such, it is reasonable to assume they functioned as a proxy for frequency of specific behaviors and make a valuable contribution, notwithstanding the confusion. It was also unfortunate that the sample of individuals using just Twitter was too small to make meaningful comparisons among fame indicators. However, this may be an ecologically valid indicator of how uncommon it is for individuals to only be on Twitter without also being on FB, which predated and is more widely used than Twitter. Of note, staying ahead of shifting trends and functionalities of various social media platforms is no simple task for users, let alone scholars. Future research should account for waxing and waning popularity of various sites (e.g., there has been some popular discussion and evidence of a type of "Facebook fatigue" in the last year, Rainie, Smith, & Duggan, 2013; and evidence that teens are increasingly turning to Twitter, in part, to duck their parents who are "invading" FB, Wiederhold, 2012).

The present study was not designed to inquire about more specific aspects of individuals' social media profiles, such as the number of friends, content of posts/pictures, or specific media figures followed or friended. Capturing the *content* of social media profiles, as some scholars have started to do, in the context of fame appeal would be an important next step in this line of work. Not only would this side-step methodological concerns regarding self-report data, but it would help clarify whether individuals with higher fame and visibility goals posted more glamorous pictures of themselves and/or more self-promotional status updates or tweets.

Another related development that would be important to assess with respect to fame fantasizing and appeal is the online phenomenon that has now been coined the "humblebrag" by comedy writer Harris Wittels. Wittels penned a book on the subject in 2012 based partly on a Twitter feed he started, designed to cull examples of individuals engaging in "the art of false modesty," of which celebrities are often the easiest target. However, the first chapter in Wittels' book, titled: "Ugh, I know famous people!," focuses not on celebrities but on those who name-drop famous others in a seemingly understated way (e.g., "so um what does one wear to a party in which John (sic) Hamm is present?"; Wittels, 2012, p. 11). Individuals preoccupied with fame and visibility may be more likely to use social media for thinly veiled self-promotion and/or to report brushes with fame, a habit that may ultimately serve to alienate them from actual friends and colleagues. Additional research is needed to examine this possibility.

In sum, individuals who are more compelled by the recognition and admiration that fame confers appear to use social media in ways that may ostensibly increase their own potential to be seen and admired. Future research is needed to clarify the underlying motivational threads linking fame appeal to social media use, and to determine whether and when such behavior is ultimately beneficial or problematic. More nuanced work is also needed to understand the role that self-worth plays with respect to both fame appeal and social media use. The need to be seen and valued is powerful and primitive; the extent to which social media actually enables individuals to meet those needs may vary depending on motivation and use patterns. Individuals who are overly preoccupied with visibility may risk becoming overly dependent on social media use, and, more specifically, on others' (including famous others') positive feedback or lack thereof. Such individuals may also be attempting to solve a more substantive void with a superficial panacea. As Sheldon et al. (2011) noted in a recent examination of FB use and loneliness, social media may offer an "overly tempting coping device . . . one that feels good but does not actually address underlying feelings of social disconnection in life" (p. 9). Ultimately, this is a rich area of inquiry that merits ongoing empirical investigation.

References

Anderson, B., Fagan, P., Woodnutt, T., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2012). Facebook psychology: Popular questions answered by research. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 1,* 23–37. doi:10.1037/a0026452

Ashe, D. D., Maltby, J., & McCutcheon, L. E. (2005). Are celebrity-worshippers more prone to narcissism? A brief report. *North American Journal of Psychology, 7,* 239–246.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 497–529. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Braudy, L. (1986). *The Frenzy of Reknown: Fame and Its History*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buffardi, L. E., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Narcissism and social networking web sites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34,* 1303–1314.

Carpenter, C. J. (2012). Narcissism on Facebook: Self-promotional and anti-social behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52,* 482–486.

Caughey, J. (1984). *Imaginary social worlds: A cultural approach*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Duggan, M., & Brenner, J. (2013, February 14). Demographics of social media users-2012. *Pew Internet & American Life Project*. Retrieved from http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2013/Social-media-users.aspx

Eagly, A. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

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,* 1143–1168. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00367.x

Engle, Y., & Kasser, T. (2005). Why do adolescent girls idolize male celebrities? *Journal of Adolescent Research, 20,* 263–283. doi:10.1177/0743558404273117

Gardner, C. L., Pickett, M., & Knowles, M. (2005). Social snacking and shielding: Using social symbols, selves, and surrogates in the service of belonging needs. In K. D. Williams, J. P. Forgas, & W. von Hippel (Eds.), *The social outcast: Ostracism, social exclusion, rejection, and bullying* (pp. 227–242). New York: Psychology Press.

Giles, D. (2002). Parasocial interaction: A review of the literature and a model for future research. *Media Psychology, 4,* 279–305. doi:10.1207/S1532785XMEP0403_04

Giles, D., & Maltby, J. (2004). The role of media figures in adolescent development: Relations between autonomy, attachment, and interest in celebrities. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36,* 813–822. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00154-5

Goffman, E. (1959). *Presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

Greenberg, J., Kosloff, S., Solomon, S., Cohen, F., & Landau, M. (2010). Toward understanding the fame game: The effect of mortality salience on the appeal of fame. *Self and Identity, 9,* 1–18. doi:10.1080/15298860802391546

Greenwood, D. N. (2009). Idealized TV friends and young women's body concerns. *Body Image, 6,* 97–104. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2008.12.001

Greenwood, D. N., & Long, C. R. (2011). Attachment style, the need to belong and relationship status predict imagined intimacy with media figures. *Communication Research, 38,* 278–297. doi:10.1177/0093650210362687

Greenwood, D., Long, C., & Dal Cin, S. (2013). Fame and the social self: The Need to belong, narcissism, and relatedness predict fame appeal. *Personality and Individual Differences, 55,* 490–495. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.04.020

Hampton, K., Goulet, L. S., Marlow, C., & Rainie, L. (2012, February 3). Why most Facebook users get more than they give. *Pew Internet & American Life Project*. Retrieved from http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2012/Facebook-users.aspx

Hampton, K. N., Goulet, L. S., Rainie, L., & Purcell, K. (2011, June 16). Social networking and our lives. *Pew Internet and American Life Project*. Retrieved from http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2011/Technology-and-social-networks.aspx

Hargittai, E., & Litt, E. (2011). The tweet smell of celebrity success: Explaining variation in Twitter adoption among a diverse group of young adults. *New Media and Society, 13,* 824–842. doi:10.1177/1461444811405805

Horton, D., & Wohl, R. R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations of intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry, 19,* 215–229.

James, W. (1890). *Psychology*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.

Jenkins-Guarnieri, M. A., Wright, S. L., & Johnson, B. (2012). Development and validation of a Social Media Use Integration Scale. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 2,* 38–50. doi:10.1037/a0030277

Junco, R. (2012). Too much face and not enough books: The relationship between multiple indices of Facebook use and academic performance. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28,* 187–198. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.08.026

Konrath, S., Meier, B. P., & Bushman, B. J. (2013). *Development and validation of the Single-Item Narcissism Scale (SINS)*. Manuscript under review.

Konrath, S. H., O'Brien, E. H., & Hsing, C. (2011). Changes in dispositional empathy in American college students over time: A meta-analysis. *Per-

sonality and Social Psychology Review, 15, 180–198. doi:10.1177/1088868310377395

Kross, E., Verduyn, P., Demiralp, E., Park, J., Lee, D., Lin, N., Shablack, H., Jonides, J., & Ybarra, O. (2013). Facebook use predicts declines in subjective well-being in young adults. *PLOS One, 8,* 1–6.

Maltby, J. (2010). An interest in fame: Confirming the measurement and empirical conceptualization of fame interest. *British Journal of Psychology, 101,* 411–432. doi:10.1348/000712609X466568

Maltby, J., Giles, D. C., Barber, L., & McCutcheon, L. E. (2005). Intense-personal celebrity worship and body image: Evidence of a link among female adolescents. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 10,* 17–32. doi:10.1348/135910704X15257

Marwick, A., & boyd, d. (2011a). To see and be seen: Celebrity practice on Twitter. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 17,* 139–158. doi:10.1177/1354856510394539

McKenna, K. Y. A., & Bargh, J. A. (1998). Coming out in the age of the Internet: Identity de-marginalization' from virtual group participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 681–694.

Nadkarni, A., & Hofmann, S. G. (2012). Why do people use Facebook? *Personality and Individual Differences, 52,* 243–249. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.007

Panek, E., Nardis, Y., & Konrath, S. (2013). Mirror or Megaphone?: How relationships between narcissism and social networking site use differ on Facebook and Twitter. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29,* 2004–2012. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2013.04.012

Rainie, L., Smith, A., & Duggan, M. (2013, February 5). Coming and going on Facebook. *Pew Internet & American Life Project.* Retrieved from http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2013/Coming-and-going-on-facebook.aspx

Rubin, A. (2002). The uses-and-gratifications per-spective of media effects. In J. Bryant & D. Zill-mann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 525–548). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schlenker, B. R. (2003). Self-presentation. In M. Leary & J. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 492–518). New York: Guilford Press.

Sheldon, K. M., Abad, N., & Hinsch, C. (2011). A two-process view of Facebook use and relatedness need-satisfaction: Disconnection drives use, and connection rewards it. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100,* 766–775. doi:10.1037/a0022407

Smith, A., & Brenner, J. (2012, May 31). Twitter use 2012. *Pew Internet & American Life Project.* Retrieved from http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2012/Twitter-Use-2012.aspx

Toma, C. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2013). Self-affirmation underlies Facebook use. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39,* 321–331. doi:10.1177/0146167212474694

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic.* New York: Free Press.

Uhls, Y. T., & Greenfield, P. M. (2012). The value of fame: Preadolescent perceptions of popular media and their relationship to future aspirations. *Developmental Psychology, 48,* 315–326. doi:10.1037/a0026369

Wiederhold, B. K. (2012). As parents invade Face-book, teens tweet more. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 15,* 385.

Wittels, H. (2012). *Humblebrag: The art of false modesty.* New York: Grand Central Publishing.