

Running head: CULTURE OF HONOR & SELF-PRESENTATION

Culture of Honor and Self-Presentation on MySpace Profiles

Kevin Wallpe

Ball State University

Abstract

Self-presentation through mediated communication is a novel phenomenon that has not been researched in depth. There is a Culture of Honor that is alleged to exist in southern regions of the United States. Research has shown southern males to be more violent and aggressive than their northern counterparts on numerous variables. The current study analyzed whether the Culture of Honor would transfer onto an individual's online self-presentation through the social networking site MySpace.com. Participants were white males between the ages of eighteen and twenty five. It was hypothesized that southern males would present themselves more aggressively than northern males. A content analysis of 320 MySpace profiles revealed that southern and northern males present themselves similarly in terms of aggression. This may be due to the fact that a majority of the Culture of Honor research is related to direct aggression. Self-presentation through mediated communication would be considered indirect aggression and may have led to similar styles of presenting one's self.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Thomas Holtgraves for his participation as my advisor in the current study. His ideas and advice aided me very much throughout this endeavor. I would also like to thank Dr. David Perkins and the Psychology Departmental Honors students for their contribution to the project as well.

Culture of Honor and Self-Presentation on MySpace Profiles

Self-Presentation through mediated communication has become an amplified concern for our society in recent years. With over 700 million social networking users presenting themselves through online profiles (Back et al., 2010), it has evolved into an essential medium for social interaction. Little research has been conducted to test how individuals present themselves online, and the research that addresses this topic has yielded mixed results. In the ever increasing age of technological advances and expanded forms of communication, it is vital to understand how individuals are presenting themselves through this form of media.

A topic that has not been well explored is whether one's culture transfers onto these mediated self-presentations. Certainly there are differences between the styles cultures use to present themselves, but what about cultures within a culture? Are there differences in the ways subcultures present themselves? Within the United States, a Culture of Honor has been alleged to exist within southern regions of the country (Gastil, 1971). Southern males are thought to be more aggressive and violent than their northern counterparts. This research explored whether the Culture of Honor transfers into mediated communication through the popular social networking site MySpace.com.

Online Self-Presentation

The internet has altered the way in which we present our identities (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008). These online presentations are a large part of an individual's overall identity. Identities appear to be social products and not reliant on innate characteristics. An important part of one's self-concept lies in their identity. Self-concept is explained as the thoughts and feelings one has about themselves. An identity is the part of the self through which we are known to others by. Individuals vary in how important their identities are to them (Felson, 1982). The process of constructing an identity, involves two separate parts. Zhao, Grasmuck, and Martin

(2008) define these two parts as “identity announcement” and “identity placement.” The identity announcement is made by the individual claiming the identity, and the identity placement is made by others endorsing the identity. The identity is established when both the announcement and the placement coincide.

An important difference to understand is the difference between online and face-to-face communication. This new technology alters communication, social roles, and identity portrayals (Magnuson & Dundes, 2008); allows for very flexible communication styles (Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008); allows for new ways to relate to others and communicate anonymously to provide minimal social risk (Sheldon, 2008); and the relationships on these sites may involve lower interdependence, commitment, and permanence than offline (Katz & Rice, 2002) . Online communication is not all the same though. The continuum from nonymous to anonymous is vast. There are completely anonymous online environments, such as chatrooms, where an individual can present themselves however they wish. Then there are more nonymous online communication tools, such as Facebook and MySpace, where an individual does not have the enormous freedom that completely anonymous environments allow. MySpace appears to be more anonymous than Facebook, but less anonymous than chatrooms. Individuals appear to act and display themselves differently in less anonymous environments (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008).

Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin (2008) explain that face-to-face interactions prevent individuals from claiming identities that are inconsistent with physical characteristics. In contrast, less anonymous online environments can prevent individuals from pretending to be something they are not if their social background and personality are known to the audience. Completely anonymous environments allow an individual to pretend to be someone else or act

out negative impulses. The freedom one has in an online environment is enormous when compared to face-to-face physical interactions. Even when audio and visual tools are available through the internet, one is still able to maintain this anonymity by not revealing information about their personal background, provided the audience does not already know this information. This “disembodied and anonymous online environment makes it possible to reinvent themselves through the production of new identities” (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008, pp. 1818). When in nonymous environments, it is much more difficult to make false identity claims.

There are three different types of the self that Zhao, Grasmuck, and Martin (2008) explain. The first type involves face-to-face interactions. Individuals tend to wear masks to conform to social norms and these identities become “real.” The second involves anonymous online environments. This environment allows these masks to be taken off and the “true” self to be revealed. The third and final type involves more nonymous online environments. This is where individuals are able to display their “hoped-for-possible selves.” The hoped-for-possible selves are socially desirable identities that would like to be established, and the individual believes they can be established under the right conditions. These online environments seem to reduce the difference between “actual” and “ideal” selves. For example, online dating sites allow individuals to “stretch the truth” about themselves and could also enable a shy person to hide their social anxieties. Online identities allow for a public display of “hoped-for-possible selves” that are otherwise unknown offline. Nonymous online environments encourage realistic and honest self-presentations, but enable truth stretching in an attempt to display a socially desirable identity.

Through this media, individuals are able to produce a socially desirable self that is not produced in the offline context (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008). Users spent more time on

these sites displaying cultural aspects of their identities over individual aspects. The users appeared to be attempting to display a group-oriented identity. Kramer and Winter (2008) point out that individuals are addressing a broad audience through these sites and are unable to tailor their presentations to individual viewers. This may be what causes this group-oriented cultural display. They go on to explain that these sites turn ordinary media consumers into “producers of mass communication content” (pp. 106). This new form of communication blurs the traditional boundaries between interpersonal and mass communication (Sheldon, 2008).

Mallen, Day, and Green (2003) discuss how this communication style has the potential to lead to conflict. “The lack of verbal and nonverbal cues in CMC leads to more conflict between individuals” (pp. 161). It is much easier to argue when you are not face-to-face with the individual with whom you are arguing. This conflict may result from the freedom to disagree since the two parties are not in direct contact with each other, or because it may be difficult to understand the meaning behind the message without certain cues. Although it appears to be untrue that online environments are filled with deviant behavior caused by the anonymity (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008), these environments do allow for much more control over one’s self-presentation (Kramer & Winter, 2008).

Individuals are able to present themselves in a way that differs from their “real life” identities (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008). It allows for the expression of “hidden selves,” but these presentations tend to conform to established social norms. These identity presentations tend to be realistic and honest, but attempt to present a socially desirable self. The users are presenting themselves to an audience beyond known friends, but also to individuals who know the user personally. The online self-presentation involves two identity statements, explicit and implicit. Explicit identity statements involve a self-description, such as an “About Me” section. Implicit

identity statements are the impressions given off by the user, such as interests and hobbies.

Zhao, Grasmuch, and Martin (2008) conducted a study which involved a combination of focus groups, interviews, and a content analysis of 63 Facebook accounts. The study found interesting results when analyzing how users present themselves. A vast majority of users made identity claims that generated desired impressions. Most of the sample did not go into great depth in the “About Me” sections, and tended to make more implicit identity statements. The user’s personality and characteristics were much more likely to appear in the description of interests and hobbies over explicitly mentioning them in the “About Me” section. Through this implicit description style, users were able to engage in cultural self-description by displaying “cultural preferences that they think define them” (pp. 1825).

Kramer and Winter (2008) explain how the ability to present one’s self through descriptions, pictures, videos, and ideas has grown dramatically throughout the last decade. Users are able to present attractive descriptions of themselves through profiles like never before. These profiles are meant to answer the question “Who am I?” Since users can strategically choose which aspects about themselves they want others to see and to carefully construct their self-presentation, it can be expected that individuals will want to give a positive self-presentation by displaying a large number of friends, celebrities, and great effort in the design (Kramer & Winter, 2008). Stable personality traits appear to be a predictor of online self-presentation and although users can strategically present themselves with an attractive description, these presentations are surprisingly accurate and users claim to not want to “play with identities.”

Magnuson and Dundes (2008) also describe these profiles as a context in which users display themselves for others to see. These sites provide a great opportunity for a social construction of the desired reality one hopes for. A content analysis of 100 MySpace profiles

showed that these self-presentations reveal conformity to social norms of masculinity and femininity (Magnuson & Dundes, 2008). Interesting results have emerged from multiple studies that reveal how easy it is to present one's self and alter it as well. Raacke and Bonds-Raacke (2008) administered a questionnaire regarding MySpace and Facebook use to 116 students. They found that 87.1% of their sample made information about themselves available through these sites, while also reporting that they change and update their profiles. Sheldon (2008) reports on the frequency of these changes and found that 50% of the sample claimed to change their profile every few months, 19% changed it every day, and another 19% one to three times per week. With this rate of change, self-presentation becomes all the more flexible and easily constructed.

Uses & Gratifications of Social Networking Sites

The uses and gratifications users have for such sites inevitably will lead to certain styles of self-presentation. Sheldon (2008) surveyed 172 students about the relationship between “unwillingness-to-communicate” and Facebook use. The results have shown that the most frequently reported needs and gratifications are diversion (an escape from problems), personal relationships, personal identity, and information. Individuals seem to use this technology to fill needs that were traditionally filled by other media. The needs that this media appear to fulfill include social interaction, passing time, habit, information, and entertainment. Interpersonal needs that are being fulfilled are the feeling of being less lonely, relationship maintenance, problem-solving, and persuasion. These social networks also appear to be used for work-related interests, romantic relationships, and connecting to people with shared interests. The results of the study found that passing time, relationship maintenance, and entertainment were the most important uses. The less important uses included feeling cool, companionship, and having a

virtual community. Young adults who grew up with this technology tend to use these sites to make friends and keep in touch with old friends and family.

Raacke and Bonds-Raacke (2008) reported similar findings. Within their sample, keeping in touch was the most frequently reported use of the site. Other uses included posting and looking at pictures, making new friends, locating old friends, learning about events, posting social functions, feeling connected, sharing information about themselves, academic purposes, and dating. Zhao, Grasmuck, and Martin (2008) state that 41.3% of their sample was looking for friendship and others were looking for friendship with a combination of dating or relationship. Valkenburg, Peter, and Schouten (2006) surveyed 881 adolescents and found that 35% of their sample reported beginning a friendship through these sites, and that 8.4% formed a romantic relationship. All of these uses, gratifications, and needs involved with online communication lead to different strategic self-presentations. Of course, there are many individual differences involved in the way one presents themselves and their reasons for using such communication tools.

Individual Differences

Kramer and Winter (2008) looked at the individual differences between users and found interesting results. A content analysis was conducted on 58 StudiVZ user profiles. These 58 individuals were then given a personality measure to complete. Individuals with social anxieties tended to need more control over social interactions to feel comfortable. This may be why the results showed that introverted and shy people preferred online communication over face-to-face interactions. Even though these individuals prefer this style of communication, they are less likely to host homepages and are more reserved with their self-presentations by revealing less information. Extraverted individuals display themselves in a less restrained manner and are more

successful at building friendships. This shows that even though introverts prefer online communication, they are still less accomplished and successful with these interactions. Self-efficacy was also found to be related to online self-presentation. Those with high self-efficacy displayed more friends, gave more information, and used more words in their self-description.

Sheldon (2008) reveals similar conclusions. Previous research has shown that users who avoid face-to-face interactions use the internet as an alternative. These users who use the internet as an alternative tend to be socially anxious and are more likely to form relationships online than in face-to-face. Although not all users who form online relationships are less socially skilled than those who do not, it appears that the less socially skilled are more likely to use this alternative to form relationships. This unwillingness-to-communicate seems to have “led to greater use and reliance on internet communication tools” (pp. 68). Lonely people seem to find the anonymity of the internet very liberating. Individuals with social anxieties use these sites to pass time and feel less lonely, but tend to have fewer “friends” on these accounts. Introversion led to less frequent online communication. This leads to the belief that those who are less willing to communicate in physical interactions are also less willing to communicate online. In contrast to these results, surprisingly those that found interpersonal communication less rewarding tended to log onto their accounts more often.

There are also gender differences in the way users present themselves and the uses and gratifications they receive. Magnuson and Dundes (2008), as mentioned earlier, claim that these self-presentations conform to social norms of masculinity and femininity. Through these sites, gender roles may change but are still formed through this new media. The results of the study revealed that males are much less likely to mention their significant other and tend to present themselves as not needing others to define them. Raacke and Bonds-Raacke (2008) report that

men log onto their accounts more frequently than women, but women change the appearance of their profile more often than men. It was also found that men report having more friends than women, and women are much more likely to set their profiles to private than men. Women tend to be more likely to use these sites for maintaining personal connections. Men, on the other hand, are likely to use these sites to pursue sexual interests and dating.

Feedback on Social Networking Sites

Users can give and receive feedback on their own and others accounts and profiles that can have tremendous effects on them (Valkenburg, Peter, & Schouten, 2006). Baker and Moore (2008) point out that this feedback can serve as acknowledgement of the user's cognitions, emotions, and sense of self. Through this media, individuals are able to communicate things they would otherwise be unable to express. Valkenburg, Peter, and Schouten (2006) found that 5.6% of their sample reported always receiving negative feedback, 1.6% mostly negative, 10.1% sometimes negative and sometimes positive, 49.3% mostly positive, and 28.4% always positive. Therefore, most users received positive feedback, but self-esteem was affected by the tone of feedback received. Positive feedback seemed to raise self-esteem and negative feedback lowered self-esteem. Raacke and Bonds-Raacke (2008) showed that the more an individual uses these sites, the more likely their social well-being is impacted by the information and feedback received.

Culture of Honor

Violence has historically been more prevalent in the south (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008; Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996; Nisbett, 1993; Kelly, 1999; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996), and began prior to the Civil War. Numerous studies report that white homicide rates in the south are higher than in the north (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996; Kelly, 1999;

Baron & Straus, 1988; Cohen, 1996). The rural south appears to be the source of the highest homicide rates in this region of the country (Gastil, 1971). There is quantitative and qualitative evidence that the southern culture leads to high homicide rates. Within the south, it is males that commit a majority of the violence (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008). Lee, Bankston, Hayes, and Thomas (2007) go on to state that the Culture of Honor appears to be a white subculture. This appears to be true when considering that there is no evidence of the southern culture influencing black homicide rates.

This culture seems to place an emphasis on masculinity and toughness (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008). The Culture of Honor causes small disputes to become contests for reputation and status (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996). The aggression that is prevalent in these regions is caused by threats to status, reputation, and masculinity. These individuals must redeem themselves through a display of toughness, dominance, and aggression. The southern youth appear to be socialized into thinking highly of their honor and acting in its defense. Nisbett (1993) also suggests that it is white southern males who are taught to create impressions of themselves as being ferocious in defense of their reputation, which is how they are socialized into violence and aggression.

The violence in the south has been attributed to multiple factors other than the Culture of Honor. It is possible that the prevalence of violence is caused by higher temperatures, poverty, slavery, and imitating African American violence (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996; Nisbett, 1993). Baron and Straus (1988) suggest it may be caused by multiple factors such as the frontier living conditions, lynching, use of guns and knives, and the fact that violence was an integral and unavoidable feature of southern life. A combination of southern residence, large black population, high degree of deprivation, low level of family integration, and a high level of

urbanization seem to lead to a higher risk of homicide. Cohen (1996) claims that the frontier mentality of the south, which was conditioned by inadequate law enforcement and loose social controls, led to more individualism and self-reliance. This lack of authority may have led to a culture of “self-help” social control (Lee, Bankston, Hayes, & Thomas, 2007). All of these could have led to a culture that supports and approves violence.

Lee, Bankston, Hayes, and Thomas (2007) suggest many facts about the history of the south that may have led to the development of this culture. Many analysts have argued that the high homicide rates are due to structural factors like poverty and inequality. Another explanation is that the south and north were settled by two different groups of people. The south was settled by the Scotch-Irish, who may have brought with them a culture of interpersonal violence and competition. The tolerance for violence appears to involve threats to honor, family, and property; which seems to be related to a culture of interpersonal violence and competition. Religion has also shown to be a factor. The religious culture of the south has maintained values that are tolerant of violence. This can be seen through higher urban homicide rates where there are more evangelical Protestants.

Honor in this culture is not based on good character, but on strength and power (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). Violence and aggression appear to be used to obtain this honor. Kelly (1999) reports that violence is viewed more positively and constructively in the south than in other parts of the country. Behavior seems to almost always be patterned in terms of culture, and the southern culture is one of violence and aggression (Gastil, 1971). Culture of Honor norms have become socially enforced and embedded in social roles, expectations, and shared definitions of manhood (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996).

The original conditions for the Culture of Honor no longer exist, but the violence rates and Culture of Honor remain (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008). “Cultural norms often persist past the point when they are functional” (pp. 162). They suggest three reasons why the Culture of Honor continues in the south. First, men may misperceive descriptive norms about aggression and believe peers are more aggressive than themselves. Second, men may misperceive injunctive norms about aggression, thinking that others approve and encourage aggression. Third, individuals may not internalize aggressive norms, but encourage them from others. Social norms may persist if people perceive others as supporting and enforcing these norms, even if they privately feel uncomfortable with violence. These perceptions will be dealt with in more depth later.

Nisbett (1993) concludes that the Culture of Honor does persist in southern society. This results in very different views on violence and aggression. Differences in self-protection, insults, and socializing children; as well as argument-related homicides versus felony-related homicides lead to the belief that this culture remains in southern regions of the country. Results have suggested that the cultural norms and values that tolerate violence persist in modern America. These are passed from generation to generation. Even after the culture is no longer functional and southern society has progressed, violence and aggression rates remain high (Lee, Bankston, Hayes, & Thomas, 2007).

Not all violence and aggression is endorsed, approved, and justified within the southern culture. Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, and Schwarz (1996) discuss how homicide rates are higher in the south only for argument or conflict related homicides. They do not appear to be higher for homicides that involve robbery, burglary, or other felonies. The approval of violence only concerns self-protection, response to insult, or socializing children. Nisbett (1993) also reports

that southern men are more likely to endorse violence for defense purposes and are more likely to justify violence in response to an insult. This can be seen in the fact that southern men are much more likely to report owning a gun for protection and defense. Southerners are not more likely to endorse abstract violence, but only as an appropriate response to insults, means to self-protection, and as a socialization tool.

Brown, Osterman, and Barnes (2009) while discussing school violence, also mention that southern culture seems to endorse attitudes that support violence in defense of reputation. The south also appears to socially and legally endorse violence as a sport or entertainment more than their northern counterpart. The Culture of Honor related to school violence will be discussed briefly at the end of this section. Cohen (1996) goes in depth about laws and social policies that appear to approve of certain forms of violence. These forms take the shape of protection of self, home, and property; defending honor; socializing children; and social control. It is possible that the institution of slavery may have led to more approval of violence when it is used to coerce, punish, or maintain social control. Lee, Bankston, Hayes, and Thomas (2007) sum this up by saying that southern violence is not random, but only occurs under certain situations such as conflict resolutions or confrontations where self-esteem and honor are threatened, and not with general criminal violence.

Laws & Social Policy

Culture of Honor norms can also be seen in the laws and social policies of the south through gun control laws, less restrictive self-defense statutes, and more hawkish voting by legislators on foreign policy issues (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996). Nisbett (1993) explains that in much of the south in the early 1900's, it was impossible to obtain a murder conviction if the perpetrator had been insulted or had warned the victim of impending violence.

Kelly (1999) mentions that gun ownership is more common in the south and school discipline is more likely to include corporal punishment. This culture within the legal system can be seen in the death penalty as well. Even though southern and western states are just as likely to sentence someone to death, the south is much more likely to actually execute. The survival of Culture of Honor patterns in the legal system may reinforce congruent attitudes.

Cohen (1996) did an extensive review of social policy and laws within the Culture of Honor states. Laws are meant to “shape the behavior of citizens by defining what is right, wrong, worthy of reward, and worthy of punishment” (pp. 962). As briefly mentioned above, there are little regional differences in attitudes towards the death penalty, but huge regional differences in sentencing and executions. The south and west were more likely to have capital punishment statutes and more likely to sentence criminals to death. After the sentencing, the south was much more likely to actually execute the criminal that was convicted. The rates of death sentences that resulted in executions from 1973 to 1991 were 4.7% in the south, but only 1.8% in the west and 1.2% in the north. Within the south, prisoners on death row in slave states were five times more likely to be executed than the nonslave states in the south. One conclusion drawn from this study is that the south is much more lax on gun control laws. Although the regions did not differ on the regulation of carrying weapons, the north was more in favor of gun control. On the topic of gun control, southerners were less likely to view guns as dangerous weapons that must be monitored.

There are other differences in laws and social policies that are worth mentioning. No southern states have mandatory arrest for domestic violence (Cohen, 1996). Custody codes are also much less likely to mention domestic violence. Southerners seem to support spanking children and are more likely to administer corporal punishment than northerners. To sum up these results, it appears that southern states are more libertarian with gun control regulations,

legal codes have greater approval of violence for self-defense, laws are more lenient towards domestic violence, have a greater tolerance for corporal punishment in schools, and the south appears more hawkish with military affairs and foreign policy. An important distinction to be made when considering laws and social policies is that “regional culture might be stronger on the symbolic violence dimension than on the actual violence dimension” (pp. 975). Baron and Straus (1988) point out that the Culture of Honor may be “woven” into southern culture through these laws and social policies. These positive evaluations of violence by the government, mass media, and sports may lead to violence being used in illegitimate contexts, such as homicide.

Socialization

Along with the laws and social policies, white southern males appear to be socialized into a culture of violence and aggression (Nisbett, 1993). These young white men are taught to create impressions of themselves as being ferocious in defense of their reputations. Lee, Bankston, Hayes, and Thomas (2007) explain how this socialization leads to the transmission and persistence of cultural traits such as attitudes and expectations of violence. They suggest that it is not important where individuals currently live, but rather where they were socialized. They ran the same analyses on homicides that other studies have used, but included the variable of the percentage of the population born in the south. The results showed higher argument-based homicide rates where the percentage of southern-born whites was larger. This result only held with rural areas in which there were more southern-born whites. The percentage born in the south had no influence on urban whites or blacks within the southern region. An interesting result emerged from this study. It was found that the percentage of southern-born whites was significantly related to argument-based homicide outside of the southern region. Their study came to four conclusions. First, white argument-based homicide is more frequent in rural areas

where there are more southern-born whites. Second, this result does not appear to hold with the black population. Third, the southern-born percentage and argument-based homicide relationship remains in urban and rural areas outside the south. Fourth, they found that the relationship remains outside of the structural factors that were mentioned earlier.

There are numerous things that socialize southerners into violence and aggression. It starts early in life with southerners reporting more parental abuse than northerners (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). The south appears more favorable towards spanking children, and therefore children grow up thinking that violence and aggression are acceptable. Baron and Straus (1988) used the Legitimate Violence Index (LVX) to see how southern and northern regions viewed violence. The LVX uses indicators such as mass media preferences, government use of violence, participation in socially approved violence, etc. to measure legitimate violence in these regions. The results showed that the south scored higher on the LVX than the national average, leading to the belief that the south approves of violence and are socialized into this belief.

Kelly (1999) took a more subtle approach to the socialization that occurs. He found that southerners were more likely to subscribe to “macho” magazines, play college football, endorse corporal punishment, and believe children should fight bullies. His study centered on naming patterns in the south when compared to the north. The results were interesting. Seventy eight percent of “gun” names appeared in the south and west, 80% of violent names appeared in these regions, 68% of violent business names came from the south and west with 58% located in the south. Both southern and western businesses had a significantly higher number of violent names than their northern counterparts. The prevalence of violent names and encounters may increase positive evaluations of such aggressive content and behavior. Therefore, the greater availability of violent names will lead to violence being more cognitively available. Since this culture has

been around for awhile, it is likely that southerners' positive view of violence led to increased violent name usage and not the reverse. Experiments have shown that exposure to violent words increases violence and aggression (Kelly, 1999). It appears that the greater use of violent names stemmed from the positive view on violence, but now these violent names and language may actually increase violence and aggression or at least maintain it. The study concludes by mentioning that the regular association of violent words with positive objects, such as churches, makes them difficult to be thought of negatively.

Perception

Vandello, Cohen, and Ransom (2008) reveal that southern men may be more likely to display aggression because of perceived norms. The south places emphasis on masculinity and toughness, which leads to the belief that peers are more aggressive than they actually are. Men may themselves be uncomfortable being violent, but assume other males would be aggressive in the same situation. Aggression may result from conformity to this perceived norm. The results of the study showed that all males believed their peers to be more aggressive than themselves with the largest difference in the south. It seems that they perceive other men to be more aggressive than they actually are when discussing their beliefs and rating other men. The men who perceived other men as more violent also reported fighting more themselves. Southern and northern men rated themselves equally likely to use aggression, but southern men appeared to believe their peers were much more aggressive.

There was no evidence that southern men actively encouraged aggression any more than northern men (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008). Southerners were more likely to perceive another male as encouraging aggression. In the end, southerners were more likely to perceive actual aggression and encouragement of aggression more than northerners. If southerners are

more likely to believe their peers are aggressive, they may project these beliefs onto subtle communications of others during conflicts. This belief of peers endorsing and encouraging aggression may lead an individual to behave aggressively as a way to manage their impression even when this behavior is not expected or privately condoned. “A self-reinforcing cycle can take effect: Ambiguous public reactions following very visible acts of aggression can reinforce people’s belief that there is a strong public norm in support of aggression” (pp. 175). This is an example of pluralistic ignorance, when people are not well informed about peer preferences, this misunderstanding can lead to the endorsement of unpopular norms involving aggression.

The belief that others support and encourage aggression may be enough to create a public endorsement of the norm without private support (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008). If southern men think their peers endorse and encourage aggression, they may behave aggressively to conform even though they do not privately hold these same beliefs. It has been shown that publicly endorsed aggression can occur without private acceptance of the norm. The self-fulfilling prophecy shows that expectations of violence can create violence when neither side privately supports aggression. Studies have also shown that participants act violently because of self-presentational concerns, but never actually internalize the aggressive norms. This leads to the next point, where “even when norms are not privately believed, they may influence behavior by being collective public representations of what people think others believe” (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008, pp. 174).

Collective and individual views on aggression can be quite different as we have seen. Cohen (1996) while discussing laws and social policies, mentions that social norms equal collective values, and may be much different than individual private beliefs and behaviors. He also states that it is not individuals in the south that are more violent, but rather the southern

culture that is more violent than northern culture. These collective values may affect individual behaviors and attitudes. Vandello, Cohen, and Ransom (2008) support this by saying that powerful norms do not need to correspond to internalized beliefs.

Response to Insult

One of the most researched areas, besides homicide rates, involved with the Culture of Honor is the response to insult. Back to the idea of perception, southern men are more likely to believe that people will think worse of them if they respond passively to an insult (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008). Southerners are more likely to believe their status is damaged when insulted publicly (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996). Southern males stigmatize men who do not respond to insult with violence. Nisbett (1993) reports that southerners are much more sensitive to insults and that provoking a southerner makes them angrier and can prime violent responses to later encountered insult stimuli.

Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, and Schwarz (1996) did an extensive study involving insult and aggression with the southern Culture of Honor. The participants in the study were only nonHispanic white males, since this population is where the Culture of Honor is most prevalent. They had subjects complete a task and walk down the hall to drop it off. There was a confederate in the hall that bumped and insulted these individuals as they passed. There were three conditions in the experiment. The experimental condition was where subjects were bumped and insulted, which was divided into insulted privately and insulted publicly. The control condition was where participants were not insulted.

The results showed that in the experimental condition, northerners reacted to the bump with more amusement and southerners with more anger (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996). The insulted southerners were much more likely to respond with violence, while the

northerners were unaffected. After this, they were given an insult script to fill out and complete. The southerners were much more likely to complete this script with violence than their northern counterparts.

Another part of the study was to test physiological reactions to the insult. The results support differences between northerners and southerners. Cortisol and testosterone were tested before and after the bump and insult (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996). Cortisol is “the hormone associated with high levels of stress, anxiety, and arousal in humans and animals” (pp. 949). The results showed an increase from the baseline of 79% for insulted southerners, 42% for control southerners, 33% for insulted northerners, and 39% for control northerners. Testosterone is the “hormone associated with aggression and dominance behavior in animals and both male and female humans” (pp. 949). The results were similar to cortisol, with an increase from the baseline of 12% for insulted southerners, 4% for control southerners, 6% for insulted northerners, and 4% for control northerners. This shows that there are actual physiological differences in reactions to insults between northerners and southerners.

The final part of the experiment involved participants, after they had either been insulted or not, completing a few more tests and meeting with an evaluator. One of the tests was a “chicken game” to see if insult would affect how far southerners would go before backing out. Insulted southerners went much further than control southerners (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996). The insult appeared to have no affect on the northern sample. After the tests, when interacting with the evaluator, southerners who had been insulted had a much firmer handshake when introduced. There was no corresponding affect on northerners. The insulted southerners were much more domineering than control southerners. Once again, there was no affect on the northern sample. There was a difference in the southern sample as to whether they

were insulted publicly or privately. Privately insulted southerners showed no difference from insulted northerners on damage to their status in the eyes of the evaluator. When insulted publicly, the southerners were much more likely to see the insult as damaging to their status while northerners were hardly affected. Southerners who were insulted publicly saw themselves as losing masculine reputation and status, and were much more aggressive than any other group. This increased aggression may have come from the desire to reestablish themselves in the eyes of the evaluator. Although insulted southerners were more aggressive than any other group, southerners who were not insulted were much more polite than any other group.

School Violence

School violence has recently been examined under the Culture of Honor theory. Brown, Osterman, and Barnes (2009) noticed commonalities among school shooters. These shooters tended to be interested in violent media, had mood disorders or suicidal ideations, and were victims of taunting and rejection. They mention that “school violence preceded by social marginalization, bullying, romantic rejection, or taunting” (pp. 1) results in a threat to honor. After administering surveys, they found that southern students were more likely to report bringing a weapon to school. This may be because students in Culture of Honor states are more willing to report bringing a weapon to school or because it actually is more prevalent. The reason may be uncertain, but Culture of Honor states do have a higher percentage of students who report carrying weapons.

Recorded school violence was analyzed for differences between regions. The results showed that a majority of the perpetrators were Caucasian (Brown, Osterman, & Barnes, 2009). Most school shootings occur during high school. Of the 108 shootings they analyzed, 75% occurred in Culture of Honor states. An even higher percentage of rampage shootings, 80%,

occurred in these states. These rampages are likely to result from threats to the perpetrator's honor or status. Most of this school violence occurred in rural areas, consistent with other Culture of Honor studies. They concluded that the Culture of Honor was a significant predictor of school violence and shootings (Brown, Osterman, & Barnes, 2009).

The Current Research

The Culture of Honor that remains in southern states can be seen through homicide rates, violence, perceived aggression, social policy, naming patterns, and media consumption (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008; Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996; Nisbett, 1993; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Cohen, 1996; Kelly, 1999). Currently, one of the most common forms of self-presentation is through social networking sites such as MySpace.com (Kramer & Winter, 2008). However, no one has yet examined whether the Culture of Honor is reflected through self-presentation on social networking sites. The current research explores this topic.

If southern males feel they must appear tough and masculine in order to defend themselves and their reputation, it would make sense for their online self-presentation to display this aggression. It appears that southern males believe their peers are much more aggressive than they themselves are. With online social networks, it becomes easy to present one's self in a manner that conforms to this perception of their peers. A southern male, therefore, would be unlikely to display himself online in a timid and reserved manner when he is expected to be aggressive and masculine. Therefore, the current research hypothesized that southern males will present themselves more aggressively than northern males. Southerners were expected to be more likely to mention contact sports, violent and profane movies, and use more words in all capital letters than were their northern counterparts. The Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) was used to find the percentage of words related to Aggression, Affect, Anxiety, Anger,

Family, Religion, and Swear. It was expected that southerners would have higher percentages on all of these categories with the exception of affect, in which northerners were expected to show a higher percentage.

Method

Sample

Three hundred twenty MySpace profiles were randomly selected from the “Browse People” section on MySpace.com. The participants were white males between the ages of eighteen and twenty five. These profiles were divided; 160 were from individuals in the south and 160 from the north. There were 20 profiles coded from each capital. Capitals were chosen reasoning that the state’s culture is embedded in the capital city. The Northern states were chosen from the Union states during the Civil War and the Southern states from the Confederacy. Cohen (1996) classified Northern and Southern states, and the sample chosen from the Union/Confederate states were also included in this classification. Sixteen states, eight Northern and eight Southern, were isolated through this classification. Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, Ohio, Massachusetts, and Connecticut were considered Northern. Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, Arkansas, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Louisiana are classified as Southern. From within these states, the capitals are where the samples were drawn. The capitals include Springfield, IL; Indianapolis, IN; Augusta, ME; Lansing, MI; Concord, NH; Columbus, OH; Boston, MA; and Hartford, CT as the Northern capitals. Montgomery, AL; Jackson, MS; Atlanta, GA; Little Rock, AR; Nashville, TN; Columbia, SC; Raleigh, NC; and Baton Rouge, LA as the Southern capitals (see *Appendix 1*).

Independent samples t-tests were conducted to ensure that the populations did not differ significantly. The population of the Northern states ($M = 6,674,896$) did not differ significantly

from the Southern states ($M = 5,558,693$), $t(14) = .608$, $p > .5$ (two-tail test). The population of Northern capitals ($M = 322,276$) also did not differ significantly from the Southern capitals ($M = 305,470$), $t(14) = .125$, $p > .9$ (two-tail test). MySpace asks for zip codes when defining the location in the “Browse People” section. Zip codes were randomly selected for each capital from a collection of zip codes within each of these cities. The sample was drawn from individuals who live within five miles of these zip codes, along with those whom reside within the selected areas.

Coding

The “About Me”, “Interests”, and “Details” sections were coded from the MySpace profiles.

Details & Demographics. The “Details” section was included in the analysis. The data was entered directly as it was shown on the MySpace profile. The details that were coded included Age, Relationship Status, Sexual Orientation, Religion, Income, Here For (uses), Education, and whether they Smoke or Drink. Not all individuals listed every detail on their profile. The details that were on the profile were entered into SPSS and the details not mentioned were entered as “missing.”

Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) program. The Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) is composed of two features, the processing component and the dictionaries. The words included in the dictionaries were decided on by a panel of judges. There have been multiple revisions to the dictionaries where some categories were added and others deleted. These dictionaries are divided into two types of words, content and style. Content words convey the content of the communication, such as nouns, regular verbs, and many adjectives and adverbs. Style words, which include only about 500 words in our language, are words such as pronouns, prepositions, articles, conjunctions, auxiliary verbs, and other esoteric categories (Tavaszik & Pennebaker, 2010, pp. 29).

The LIWC contains 80 categories in which language can be classified. The major categories are attentional focus; emotionality; social relationships; status, dominance, and social hierarchy; social coordination and group processes; honesty and deception; close relationships; and thinking styles (Tavaszik & Pennebaker, 2010). Words function to provide insight into an individual's thought processes, emotional states, intentions, and motivations (Tavaszik & Pennebaker, 2010, pp. 37). The LIWC is a probabilistic system meaning that words may be included if they are used out of context. Tavaszik and Pennebaker (2010) report that hundreds of studies involving psychological processes have been examined with the eighty LIWC categories.

The Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count was used to code the "About Me" sections for the percentage of words involving Anger, Affect, Family, Religion, Swearing, and Anxiety. An "Aggression" dictionary was created using a list of aggressive words (see *Appendix 2*). This list was created by priming undergraduates with an aggressive scene and having the participants perform a word completion task (Huesmann, 2009). It should be noted that there was overlap between this dictionary and other LIWC dictionaries. Not all of the aggressive words were listed in other dictionaries, and those that appeared in other dictionaries were included in multiple LIWC categories. The Aggression dictionary was created to combine these aggressive words into a single dictionary.

Kids-in-Mind.com. Movies from the "Interests" section were coded using the website Kids-in-Mind.com. The ratings given by this site for "Violence & Gore" and "Profanity" were included in the analysis. These ratings were on a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 being absent and 10 being extreme. Not all individuals listed a specific movie in their interest section and were therefore not included in the analysis. If the movie was not in the Kids-in-Mind.com database it was excluded.

Contact Sports. The “Interests” Section was also coded for the mentioning of contact sports as an interest or hobby. Contact sports were defined as any sport in which physical contact is a normal occurrence (football, soccer, rugby, boxing, wrestling, etc.). Also included as contact sports were sports involving guns (hunting, paintball, etc.). This variable was coded as the number of contact sports mentioned. For example, listing “football” would be coded as “1” while listing “football” and “boxing” would be coded as “2.”

Capital Letters. The number of words in all capital letters in the “About Me” section was coded. This did not include the use of a capital “I” or any abbreviations. If the entire “About Me” section was in capital letters, the Word Count produced by the LIWC was entered in as the number of words in all capital letters. These few profiles where this occurred may have included “I” and abbreviations if they were used in the section. This should not skew the results since there were such a large number of words in all capital letters in these individual’s “About Me” sections.

Results

Details & Demographics. An independent samples t-test was performed to test the age of the northern and southern samples, and yielded no significant difference (see *Table 2*). Crosstabs, Frequencies, and Chi-Square tests were conducted on Relationship Status, Sexual Orientation, Religion, Income, Here For (Uses), Education, Smoking, and Drinking. The Religion variable was recoded to include outliers (Buddhist, Scientologist, Hindu, and Mormon) into the “Other” category. These religions, classified as outliers, had only one individual claiming affiliation. The distribution of religious affiliation varied significantly over culture, $\chi^2(11, N = 203) = 32.244, p < .01$. There were no significant differences on any other variables within the Details & Demographics (see *Table 1*)

Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC). An independent samples t-test was conducted on the Word Count, Aggression, Affect, Anxiety, Anger, Family, Religion, and Swear variables produced by the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count. Southerners used a higher percentage of Anxiety words ($M = .21$) than northerners ($M = .06$). This did show a significant difference between northerners and southerners, $t(183) = -1.983, p < .05$ (two-tail test). There were no significant differences between samples involving the other LIWC categories (see *Table 2*).

Kids-in-Mind.com. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to test differences between movie interests in northern and southern samples. No significant differences were found (see *Table 2*).

Contact Sports. An independent samples t-test was performed to test differences between interests in contact sports. The northern and southern samples showed no significant differences in regard to this variable (see *Table 2*).

Capital Letters. An independent samples t-test was conducted to analyze the number of words in all capital letters within these individual's "About Me" sections. There was no significant difference between the northern and southern samples (see *Table 2*).

Not every individual mentioned or disclosed these variables in their profiles. These percentages are referred to in *Table 3*. This revealed interesting results for the Anger and Aggression LIWC categories, since the number of individuals who used these words in their "About Me" section was higher in the north while the percentage of words within these profiles was higher in the south (*Table 3* compared to *Table 2*).

Discussion

There were very few significant differences found in the current research. Southerners and Northerners seem to display themselves similarly in terms of aggression. These results

should not be dismissed as uninformative based on the fact that they failed to support the hypothesis. Instead, they should be applied to future theory and research. It may be that social and cultural norms do not transfer over to this new form of online communication and self-presentation. More research is needed on mediated online self-presentation before any conclusions can be drawn. The differences between direct and indirect aggression should be looked at in more detail when examining these self-presentations.

There has long been an assumption that users on these social networking sites create an “idealized self” and do not display their actual personality (Back et al., 2010). This belief has been supported by numerous studies employing a content analysis research design. Recently, another view of online self-presentation has emerged. This view states that social networking sites are an extended social context in which an individual presents and expresses actual personality characteristics and a more accurate presentation (Back et al., 2010, pp. 1). This may be for two reasons. These profiles included information about reputation that is difficult to control, and friends give subtle feedback and accountability on one’s profile.

Back et al. (2010) correlated accuracy measures, ideal-self ratings, and observer ratings of 236 online social networking users. The results of this study found no evidence of self-idealization by the users (Back et al., 2010). The accuracy of personality through self-presentation in this study was significant on all personality dimensions. This data suggest that individuals appear not to be using these sites to present an ideal self. Based on this information, these sites appear to be “an efficient medium for expressing and communicating real personality” (pp. 3). This leads to the belief that there may be a more subtle difference in the way people present themselves in face-to-face physical interaction compared to an online mediated form of communication.

Zhao, Grasmuck, and Martin (2008) differentiated between three types of the self. The first is when people wear masks to conform to social norms such as face-to-face interactions. The second is when individuals allow these masks to be taken off and reveal their “true” selves such as anonymous online environments similar to chat rooms. The final type of self is the “hoped-for-possible” self which is the socially desirable identity that is longed for. This occurs in anonymous environments when one can “bend the truth” a bit and exaggerate desired qualities and deflate the undesirable. It becomes plausible that the online self-presentations are more accurate than face-to-face presentations. Users’ self-presentations have been found to be surprisingly accurate (Kramer & Winter, 2008).

Research has shown that social networking users who avoid face-to-face interactions use the internet as an alternative (Sheldon, 2008). These individuals may use this alternative because they find it difficult to conform to social norms and view this online media as a more comfortable context. Vandello, Cohen, and Ransom (2008) mention that powerful norms do not need to correspond to internalized beliefs. It is possible that aggression may come from the pressure to conform to these social norms (Cohen & Zeichner, 2006).

Gender role stress is the pressure for males to conform to their designated masculine role (Cohen & Zeichner, 2006). Males are socialized to conform to gender role norms and expectations. This conforming causes men’s’ behavior to be consistent with these norms as to what is “appropriate” masculine behavior. The current study leads to an assumption that these strong social and cultural norms do not correspond with online self-presentation. The fact that online environments are not as personal as face-to-face physical environments may involve less stress to conform to these social and cultural norms, reasoning that there are no immediate consequences for not following these norms.

Limitations & Future Research

The Culture of Honor has been related mostly to direct aggression. Direct aggression is much different than indirect aggression. For example, murdering a coworker (direct) is vastly different compared to emailing that same coworker saying “sometimes I just want to kill you” (indirect). A majority of the research on the Culture of Honor has measured direct aggression through homicide rates, school violence, response to insult, etc. (Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008; Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996; Nisbett, 1993; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Cohen, 1996). Very few studies have studied indirect aggression applied to the theoretical framework of the Culture of Honor. Presenting one’s self online would be an indirect form of aggression, and the current research suggests that indirect aggression may not display the Culture of Honor. Future studies should explore this detail in more depth.

The samples used in the current study were from capital cities in the chosen states. These capitals were mostly urban in nature and may have led to the fact that there were minimal differences found between samples. The Culture of Honor is most notable in rural areas of the south (Lee, Bankston, Hayes, & Thomas, 2007). It is unclear whether differences between northern and southern rural samples would have been found. This may be an interesting sampling alternative for future research to employ.

Lee, Bankston, Hayes, and Thomas (2007) argue that it is not important where the individual is currently residing, but rather where they were socialized. The current research could not include this variable due to the inability to find where these individuals were socialized. It may have been that there were differences between individuals born and socialized in the south when compared to individuals born elsewhere and currently living in the south. This could have influenced the northern sample as well by having southern born individuals currently residing in

the north. Further research is needed to fully understand the relationship between social and cultural norms applied to online self-presentation.

References

- Back, M. D., Stopfer, J. M., Vazire, S., Gaddis, S., Schmukle, S. C., Egloff, B., & Gosling, S. D. (2010). Facebook Profiles Reflect Actual Personality, Not Self-Idealization. *Psychological Science*, 1-3.
- Baker, J. R. & Moore, S. M. (2008). Distress, Coping, and Blogging: Comparing New MySpace Users by Their Intention to Blog. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11, 81-85.
- Baron, L. & Straus, M. A. (1988). Cultural and Economic Sources of Homicide in the United States. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 29, 371-390.
- Bower, B. (1998). Culture of Honor Reveals a Violent Streak. *Science News*, 154, 165.
- Brown, R. P., Osterman, L. L., & Barnes, C. D. (2009). School Violence and the Culture of Honor. *Psychological Science*, 1-6.
- Cohen, A. B. (2009). Many Forms of Culture. *American Psychologist*, 64, 194-204.
- Cohen, D. (2001). Cultural Variation: Considerations and Implications. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 451-471.
- Cohen, D. (1998). Culture, Social Organization, and Patterns of Violence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 408-419.
- Cohen, D. (1996). Law, Social Policy, and Violence: The Impact of Regional Cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 961-978.
- Cohen, D., Bowdle, B. F., Nisbett, R. E., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, Aggression, and the Southern Culture of Honor: An "Experimental Ethnography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 945-960.
- Cohn, A. & Zeichner, A. (2006). Effects of Masculine Identity and Gender Role Stress on Aggression in Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 7, 179-190.
- Dong, Q., Urista, M. A., & Gundrum, D. (2008). The Impact of Emotional Intelligence, Self-

- Esteem, and Self-Image on Romantic Communication over MySpace. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11, 577-578.
- Felson, R. B. (1982). Impression Management and the Escalation of Aggression and Violence. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 45, 245-254.
- Gastil, R. D. (1971). Homicide and a Regional Culture of Violence. *American Sociological Review*, 36, 412-427.
- Huesmann (2009). Forty-seven aggressive 5-letter words. *Personal communication*.
- Katz, J. E. & Rice, R. E. (2002). *Social Consequences of Internet Use: Access, Involvement, and Interaction*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kelly, M. H. (1999). Regional Naming Patterns and the Culture of Honor. *Names*, 47, 3-20.
- Kramer, N. C. & Winter, S. (2008). Impression Management 2.0: The Relationship of Self-Esteem, Extraversion, Self-Efficacy, and Self-Presentation Within Social Networking Sites. *Journal of Media Psychology*, 20, 106-116.
- Lee, M. R., Bankston, W. B., Hayes, T. C., & Thomas, S. A. (2007). Revisiting the Southern Culture of Violence. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 48, 253-275.
- Magnuson, M. J. & Dundes, L. (2008). Gender Differences in 'Social Portraits' Reflected in MySpace Profiles. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11, 239-241.
- Mallen, M. J., Day, S. X., & Green, M. A. (2003). Online Versus Face-to-Face Conversations: An Examination of Relational and Discourse Variables. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 40, 155-163.
- Nisbett, R. E. (1993). Violence and U.S. Regional Culture. *American Psychologist*, 48, 441-449.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South*. CO: Westview Press.

- Raacke, J. & Bonds-Raacke, J. (2008). MySpace and Facebook: Applying the Uses and Gratification Theory to Exploring Friend-Networking Sites. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11, 169-174.
- Sheldon, P. (2008). The Relationship Between Unwillingness-to-Communicate and Students' Facebook Use. *Journal of Media Psychology*, 20, 67-75.
- Smiler, A. P. (2006). Conforming to Masculine Norms: Evidence for Validity among Adult Men and Women. *Sex Roles*, 54, 767-775.
- Tausczik, Y. R. & Pennebaker, J. W. (2010). The Psychological Meaning of Words: LIWC and Computerized Text Analysis Methods. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 29, 24-54.
- Valkenburg, P. M., Peter, J., & Schouten, A. P (2006). Friend Networking Sites and Their Relationship to Adolescents' Well-Being and Social Self-Esteem. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 9, 584-590.
- Vandello, J. A., Cohen, D., & Ransom, S. (2008). U.S. Southern and Northern Differences in Perceptions of Norms About Aggression. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39, 162-177.
- Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24, 1816-1836.

Appendix 1

Cities, States, & Zip Codes

<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Zip Code</u>
Northern Sample:		
Springfield	Illinois	62794
Indianapolis	Indiana	46226
Augusta	Maine	04330
Lansing	Michigan	48911
Concord	New Hampshire	03301
Columbus	Ohio	43207
Boston	Massachusetts	02108
Hartford	Connecticut	06112
Southern Sample:		
Montgomery	Alabama	36116
Jackson	Mississippi	39209
Atlanta	Georgia	30311
Little Rock	Arkansas	72209
Nashville	Tennessee	37221
Columbia	South Carolina	29203
Raleigh	North Carolina	27615
Baton Rouge	Louisiana	70816

Appendix 2

List of Aggressive Words

spear	wham	kill
kick	hurt	harm
choke	shoot	shout
burn	snare	hit
smack	smite	knife
kick	stab	snub
shear	shark	sharp
drown	anger	chop
fight	hate	cut
ax	war	fume
slap	rape	cruel
force	fire	feral
fort	nasty	rude
raid	beat	slay
smack	punch	abuse
slash	smash	

Huesmann (2009). Forty-seven aggressive 5-letter words. Personal communication

Table 1

Demographics & Details Percentages and Chi-Square as a Function of Location

<u>Variable</u>	<u>North %</u>	<u>South %</u>	<u>X²</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
Relationship Status:			5.186	.394
Single	65.2	69.2		
Married	5.1	4.5		
Engaged	3.8	1.9		
In a Relationship	23.4	24.4		
Divorced	.6	0.0		
Swinger	1.9	0.0		
Sexual Orientation:			6.044	.109
Straight	92.6	96.6		
Gay	3.4	3.4		
Bi	2.7	0.0		
Not Sure	1.3	0.0		
Religion:			32.244	.000**
Agnostic	11.1	1.8		
Atheist	10.0	4.4		
Catholic	16.7	8.0		
Christian-Other	41.1	71.7		
Jewish	4.4	0.0		
Other	10.0	8.8		
Protestant	2.2	5.3		

Wiccan	4.4	0.0		
Income:			5.779	.566
Less than \$30,000	40.0	51.4		
\$30,000-\$45,000	20.0	15.7		
\$45,000-\$60,000	7.5	7.1		
\$60,000-\$75,000	5.0	1.4		
\$75,000-\$100,000	2.5	1.4		
\$100,000-\$150,000	2.5	2.9		
\$150,000-\$250,000	3.8	0.0		
\$250,000 and Higher	18.8	20.0		
Here For (Uses):				
Dating	35.6	32.5		
Relationship	28.1	23.1		
Networking	24.4	21.3		
Friends	85.0	76.9		
*Users may mention more than one use				
Education:			8.557	.128
High School	53.0	46.7		
In College	22.0	33.3		
Grad School	1.5	.7		
Some College	15.2	16.3		
College Grad	6.1	3.0		
Post Grad	2.3	0.0		

Smoke:			.106	.745
Yes	34.8	32.7		
No	65.2	67.3		
Drink:			.006	.939
Yes	63.5	64.0		
No	36.5	36.0		

** $p < .01$

*Users may mention more than one use

Table 2
 Means & *t* values for LIWC Categories, Movie Ratings,
 and Contact Sports as a Function of Location

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Northern Mean (SD)</u>	<u>Southern Mean (SD)</u>	<u><i>t</i></u>	<u>Sig.</u>
Age	21.43 (2.1)	21.82 (2.036)	-1.708	.089
Word Count	97.78 (112.27)	84.33 (106.31)	1.101	.272
Aggression	.3062 (.7319)	.4676 (2.174)	-.890	.374
Affect	6.1512 (4.801)	6.0753 (5.21)	.136	.892
Anxiety	.056 (.2574)	.2079 (.9342)	-1.983	.049*
Anger	.3814 (.8631)	.5755 (2.381)	-.969	.334
Family	.4232 (1.313)	.3629 (1.242)	.423	.673
Religion	.1992 (1.213)	.3505 (1.656)	-.932	.352
Swear	.3843 (1.378)	.3198 (1.263)	.437	.663
Movie Violence	6.31 (2.418)	6.0 (2.443)	.754	.452
Movie Profanity	6.49 (3.166)	6.06 (3.034)	.830	.408
Contact Sports	1.37 (.742)	1.19 (.592)	1.053	.297
Capital Letters	11.77 (31.574)	12.30 (17.730)	-.075	.940

*Note: Standard Deviations in Parentheses Adjacent to Means

* $p < .05$

Table 3

Percentage of Individuals Who Include These Variables in Their Profiles

as a Function of Location

<u>Variable</u>	<u>North %</u>	<u>South %</u>
*Details and Interests:		
Religion	56.3	70.6
Capital Letters	16.3	16.9
Movie Interests	44.4	43.1
Contact Sports	16.9	20.0
*LIWC Categories:		
Aggression	23.1	19.4
Affect	83.8	84.4
Anxiety	6.9	11.9
Anger	26.3	21.3
Family	17.5	15.6
Religion	10.6	12.5
Swearing	19.4	15.0