Individual Differences in Self-Presentational Motives in Daily Social Interaction

John B. Nezlek
College of William & Mary

Mark R. Leary
Wake Forest University

In a study of self-presentational motives in everyday social encounters, 164 first-year and upper-class undergraduate students described their social interactions for 1 week using a variant of the Rochester Interaction Record. These descriptions focused on the strength of self-presentational motives and concerns for others' evaluations. Participants also completed measures of individual differences hypothesized to be relevant to self-presentation, which formed four distinct factors. A series of multilevel random coefficient modeling analyses found that individual differences in factors labeled Impression Motivation, Impression Construction Positivity, and Impression Construction Appropriateness were positively related to participants' nervousness in interaction and individual differences in Impression Motivation were positively related to the strength of self-presentational motives in interaction. A fourth factor, Negative Self-Evaluation, was positively related to the strength of participants' self-presentational motives for first-year students but negatively related to self-presentational motives for upper-class students, and Negative Self-Evaluation was related to self-presentation differently for men and women.

Knowing that the impressions other people form of them have important implications for how they are evaluated and treated, people typically want others to perceive them in particular ways (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker, 1980). The kinds of impressions people wish to convey of themselves vary depending on the social context and the identities of the others who are present as well as on the proclivities of the individual himself or herself. A great deal of laboratory research has examined the situational and dispositional antecedents of people's self-presentations (for reviews, see Baumeister, 1982; Leary, 1995; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Schlenker, 1980), but relatively little attention has been paid to people's self-presentations in social encounters outside of the lab-

oratory. Although informative, laboratory research on self-presentation needs to be complemented by studies of naturalistic social behavior because it is not clear how generalizable the results of laboratory studies of self-presentation are. By design, laboratory studies examine behavior in a limited number of artificially created situations, but for phenomena such as self-presentation that are inherently embedded within social contexts, it seems particularly important to examine their workings in naturally occurring social contexts.

This article concerns the relationships between people's self-presentational motives and concerns in everyday social interactions and individual differences in personality constructs that laboratory research has suggested should be related to such motives and concerns. After completing a battery of personality measures, participants described the social interactions they had during the course of a week using a variant of the Rochester Interaction Record (Wheeler & Nezlek, 1977). These descriptions included ratings of their self-presentational motives and concerns. Relationships between individual difference variables and the strength of people's self-presentational motives and concerns in everyday interaction were examined using a series of multilevel random coefficient models.

Leary and Kowalski (1990) suggested that the kinds of impressions that people try to convey of themselves are affected by or reflect two discrete sets of processes—*impression motivation* and *impression construction. Impres-*

sion motivation refers to how motivated people are to control how they are perceived in a particular social encounter. In some situations, people are relatively indifferent to how others perceive them, whereas in other situations, self-presentational concerns are paramount. The degree to which people are motivated to impression-manage is influenced by a variety of factors, such as the perceived goal-relevance of one's impressions (the degree to which making a particular impression will facilitate the achievement of desired goals), the value of those goals, and discrepancies that exist between how the individual desires to be viewed and the impressions that he or she has made. *Impression construction* refers to the particular image(s) a person will try to convey to others. According to Leary and Kowalski, the content of people's self-presentations is affected by their self-concepts, constraints imposed by salient social roles, their desired and undesired identity images, the values of the people to whom they are impression-managing, and the current and potential nature of their public images.

Laboratory studies of self-presentation have examined the relationships between impression management and a wide variety of personality characteristics. Much of this research falls into roughly three categories, reflecting (a) individual differences in impression motivation, such as the degree to which people are motivated to control how they are perceived and evaluated by others, and individual differences in impression construction related to (b) self-evaluations and (c) self-presentational goals.

Individual differences in the extent to which people are motivated to control how they are perceived and evaluated by others are represented by constructs such as public self-consciousness, fear of negative evaluation, and approval motivation. Because deliberate self-presentation requires individuals to think about how they are being regarded by others, public self-consciousness predicts the extent to which people impression-manage. People who are high in public self-consciousness think more about aspects of themselves that are observable by other people—such as their appearance, ways of doing things, and reputations—than people who are low in public self-consciousness (Buss, 1980; Carver & Scheier, 1981; Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975). As a result, they are more attuned to other people's impressions of them and are more concerned with managing those impressions. For example, publicly self-conscious individuals are more sensitive to rejection (Fenigstein, 1979), place a greater emphasis on clothing and makeup to improve the impressions they make (L. C. Miller & Cox, 1982; Solomon & Schopler, 1982), are more accurate in assessing the impressions that other people have of them (Tobey & Tunnell, 1981), and worry more about people evaluating them negatively (Buss, 1980; Leary & Kowalski, 1993).

Taken together, these findings suggest that publicly self-conscious individuals are generally more motivated to manage their impressions than people who are low in public self-consciousness. Likewise, people who are high in approval motivation and who fear being evaluated negatively seem particularly prone to impression-manage (Jones & Tager, 1972; Leary, Barnes, & Griebel, 1986; Millham & Kellogg, 1980; Watson & Friend, 1969). Because social approval and disapproval are affected by other people's impressions of the individual, people who desire approval or fear disapproval should be particularly motivated to monitor and control how they are perceived by others. Consequently, we expected that self-consciousness and fear of negative evaluation would be positively related to the strength of self-presentational motives and concerns in everyday social interaction.

Personality variables that moderate the content of people's self-presentations (i.e., impression-construction) also have been studied. One category of variables that has been investigated in relation to impression construction consists of people's self-evaluations. Generally, people with less favorable self-evaluations, not only present less positive impressions of themselves than people with more favorable self-evaluations but they also focus more on avoiding negative impressions than on fostering positive ones. This pattern is seen quite clearly in the case of trait self-esteem. Overall, people with high self-esteem convey more positive impressions of themselves than people with low self-esteem. In addition, however, people who are high versus low in self-esteem use different self-presentational approaches. Whereas people with high self-esteem appear to be motivated to make positive impressions on other people (reflecting an acquisitive self-presentational style (Arkin, 1981), people who are low in self-esteem appear oriented toward trying to avoid negative impressions (a protective self-presentational style) (Baumeister, 1982; Baumeister, Tice, & Hutton, 1989; Schlenker, Weigold, & Hallam, 1990; Schütz, 1998). For example, Tice (1991) found that people with high self-esteem self-handicapped to enhance success, whereas people with low self-esteem self-handicapped to avoid the negative implications of failure.

Along the same lines, people who are socially anxious, shy, and highly embarrassable appear to employ a protective as opposed to acquisitive self-presentational style (Arkin, 1981; R. S. Miller, 1996; Shepperd & Arkin, 1990), and the same appears to be true for depression. People who are depressed convey less positive, if not negative, impressions of themselves than nondepressed people and display a protective self-presentational orientation oriented toward avoiding disapproval (Arkin, 1981; Swann, Wenzlaff, Krull, & Pelham, 1992; Weary & Wil-

liams, 1990). These patterns suggest that people who hold neutral, if not negative, self-evaluations—such as those who are low in self-esteem, socially anxious, or depressed—try to convey impressions that are consistent with how they see themselves and may be deterred from self-aggrandizement because they lack the confidence that they can convey positive impressions (Arkin, 1981; Leary, 1995; Shepperd & Arkin, 1990). Consequently, we expected that the favorability of people's self-evaluations would be negatively related to self-presentational motives in everyday social interaction.

Another category of individual differences related to impression-construction consists of people's self-presentational goals or styles. People differ not only in the degree to which they manage their impressions but also in the kinds of impressions they typically want to make. For example, one individual may want to be viewed as highly competent but may not be worried about being viewed as friendly and likeable, whereas another person may be more concerned about appearing friendly and may be less motivated to be seen as competent. Research has shown that individual differences in preferred self-presentational style relate to basic psychological motives. For example, people high in need for affiliation wish to be seen as friendly, people high in need for achievement wish to be seen as competent, and people high in need for power prefer to be seen as intimidating (Leary, Kowalski, Martin, & Koch, 2002). Our interest in this study was in the goals to be perceived as friendly (ingratiation), competent (self-promotion), and morally exemplary (exemplification) (see Jones & Pittman, 1982; Schütz, 1998).

Although various self-presentational goals have been identified (Jones & Pittman, 1982; Leary et al., 2000), the available research does not address how discrete or differentiated different goals and styles are; that is, do different goals reflect different concerns or do they reflect a common goal or goals? Therefore, relationships between social interaction and self-presentational goals were examined on a somewhat exploratory basis; that is, if different self-presentational goals are found to be discrete, relationships between social interaction and self-presentational goals can be examined across different goals. On the other hand, if self-presentational goals reflect the operation of a common factor, it might be more appropriate to treat different goals as measures of such an underlying common factor.

Relationships between different personality variables and self-presentation may vary across interpersonal contexts. One particularly potent contextual variable is the length of time that individuals have been in a particular social environment. People who are newcomers to a particular social group are especially motivated to be perceived in ways that will ensure their acceptance by the existing members (Moreland & Levine, 1989). Newcomers may be particularly motivated to present themselves favorably because they wish to establish relationships and they know that making good first impressions (such as being viewed as likeable, competent, and attractive) will help them do so. This would seem particularly true when individuals expect to interact with existing members for a long time into the future (Gergen & Wishnov, 1965).

Moreover, as people spend more time in new environments (i.e., when new environments become familiar and routine), self-presentational motivation usually wanes (Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Moreland & Levine, 1989). Not only have people usually formed some relationships (thereby lowering the necessity of being viewed as a viable relational partner by new acquaintances), but the images that others have already formed of them constrain their subsequent self-presentational options (Schlenker, 1975). Once other people have clear-cut impressions of them, people are less motivated to impression-manage. By studying both first-year and upper-class students, we were able to compare the self-presentational motives of newcomers and old-timers in a particular social environment.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 74 male and 90 female undergraduate students who were recruited from introductory and upper-level psychology classes. There were 76 first-year students and 88 upper-class students. Participants received course credit for participation.

Procedure

The procedures and instructions closely followed those introduced by Wheeler and Nezlek (1977). Participants attended introductory sessions in groups of 8 to 18 during which they were given instructions and completed the 12 measures that were predicted to relate to participants' everyday self-presentations. Some measures assessed individual differences in the motivation to monitor and control other people's impressions and degree of concern of others' impressions: public self-consciousness (Fenigstein et al., 1975), self-monitoring (Snyder's, 1987, revised 18-item scale), the Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (Leary, 1983a), social anxiety (Leary, 1983b), and embarrassability (Modigliani, 1966; for a published version, see Leary, 1991). (Private self-consciousness was included for comparison purposes.) Other measures dealt with constructs related to the positivity of participants' self-evaluations: self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965) and depression (Beck Depression Inventory, Beck, 1967; Center for Epidemiological

Studies Depression Scale, Radloff, 1977). Three measures of self-presentational style were administered, assessing participants' desire to be perceived as friendly (ingratiation), competent (self-promotion), and morally upstanding (exemplification) (Leary et al., 2000).

Participants were told that the study concerned patterns of social interaction and that they would use a structured diary form to describe their social interactions. Participants were told to describe every social interaction they had that lasted 10 min or longer. An interaction was defined as any encounter with one or more other people in which the participants attended to one another and adjusted their behavior in response to one another. Examples were provided to clarify what was an interaction (e.g., a conversation) and what was not (e.g., sitting silently with another person watching TV). Participants were instructed to describe only face-to-face interactions. Telephone conversations were excluded because we felt that the self-presentation elements of phone conversations were sufficiently different from face-to-face encounters to exclude them from consideration. Participants were told to maintain the diary for 7 days.

Using a variant of the Rochester Interaction Record (RIR), participants described each of their social interactions. They indicated who their cointeractants were (using unique initials for each cointeractant) and the sex of each cointeractant for up to three different cointeractants. For interactions with more than three others, they did not record individual initials but rather indicated how many men and women were present. The length of each interaction was reported and participants rated each interaction on nine dimensions.

Four of the ratings described the impressions that participants wanted to make on the people who were present. Participants indicated the degree to which they wanted the other interactants to perceive them as (a) likable, friendly, and socially desirable; (b) competent, skilled, and intelligent; (c) ethical, moral, and principled; and (d) physically attractive, handsome, or pretty. The first three dimensions correspond to Jones and Pittman's (1982) self-presentational dimensions of ingratiation, self-promotion, and exemplification; the fourth was a measure of self-presentational motives involving physical appearance that we thought might be strong in this sample.

Two other scales measured participants' concerns about others' impressions. Participants rated (a) how much they thought about how the other interactants were perceiving or evaluating them during the interaction and (b) how nervous or tense they felt in the interaction. The second rating was included because anxiety in social encounters typically reflects people's concerns with others' impressions of them (Schlenker & Leary,

1982). They also rated each interaction in terms of how enjoyable and intimate the interaction was and how much influence they felt they had over the interaction. Ratings were made using 9-point scales (1 = *not*, 3 = *slightly*, 5 = *somewhat*, 7 = *quite*, and 9 = *very*), labels chosen to represent roughly equal intervals (Cliff, 1959).

The response categories were discussed until participants understood their definitions and felt comfortable with the forms and procedure. Participants were told to complete an interaction record as soon as possible after each interaction occurred, and they received enough forms for the duration of the study. To increase participants' compliance, the research assistants whom they had met in the initial sessions called each participant every other day during the study. They reminded participants to complete the interaction record regularly and answered questions they had. When direct contact was not possible, messages were left on answering machines or with roommates. During the assistants' last call, they reminded participants of the date and time of the follow-up session.

At the follow-up session, participants answered a series of questions about how they had maintained the dairy. Their answers suggest that participants followed instructions and that maintaining the diary did not alter their social interactions appreciably. Participants reported updating their diaries an average of 2.1 times per day, spending an average of 17 min doing this, and reported missing an average of 11% of interactions. On a 6-point scale with endpoints labeled *not at all* and *very much*, participants reported that maintaining the diary did not interfere with their lives very much ($M = 2.3$) and that maintaining the diary did not change what they did and how they thought about themselves very much ($M = 2.5$). These data compare favorably to the reports of participants in other RIR studies (e.g., Nezlek, Wheeler, & Reis, 1983).

RESULTS

The data were analyzed in two stages. First, the measures of dispositions that were presumed to be relevant to self-presentational concerns were factor analyzed. Next, relationships between factor scores from this analysis and reports of daily social interaction were examined with a series of multilevel random coefficient models.

Factor Analyses

The 12 measures of dispositions relevant to self-presentational concerns were subjected to an exploratory maximum-likelihood factor analysis that produced four factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. To create factor scores, the initial solution was subjected to a varimax rotation. An orthogonal rotation was chosen for two reasons. First, when an oblique rotation (direct

quartimin) was used, the resulting factors were not highly correlated. Second, using orthogonal factors simplified the interpretation and presentation of results. By definition, when factors are orthogonal, the variance each shares with other variables is unique, eliminating concerns about the independence of each factor's contribution.

The resulting factor coefficients for the four factors are presented in Table 1. These factors corresponded fairly closely to aspects of Leary and Kowalski's (1990) two-component model. The first factor had large factor loadings for fear of negative evaluation, public self-consciousness, embarrassability, and social anxiety. These variables correspond to those previous research has found to be associated with what Leary and Kowalski termed "impression motivation." Accordingly, the first factor was labeled Impression Motivation (IM). The second factor had a large positive loading for the two depression measures and a large negative loading for self-esteem, and this factor labeled Negative Self-Evaluation (NSE). Previous research has suggested that individual differences in self-evaluation are related to what Leary and Kowalski termed "impression-construction."

The third and fourth factors also measured individual differences that research has suggested are related to individual differences in impression-construction. All three measures of self-presentational style—ingratiation, self-promotion, and exemplification—loaded on Factor 3. Because all three variables involve the desire to be perceived in positive, socially desirable ways (as friendly, competent, and exemplary), Factor 3 was labeled Impression Construction Positivity (ICP). The fourth factor had high loadings for social anxiety and self-monitoring, both of which involve a concern with presenting the "right" image of oneself. Accordingly, this factor was labeled Impression Construction Appropriateness (ICA).

*Relationships Between Factor Scores
and Measures of Daily Interaction*

Most previous research using diaries such as the RIR has relied on ordinary least squares (OLS) analyses to examine relationships between social interaction and other measures. For example, means (aggregated over all or some of a person's interactions) such as average enjoyment in interaction have been correlated with individual differences such as loneliness (Wheeler, Reis, & Nezlek, 1983). These procedures were introduced by Wheeler and Nezlek (1977) and are discussed in detail by Nezlek and Wheeler (1984). Although these procedures have provided empirical support for a wide variety of hypotheses (Nezlek et al., 1983; Reis & Wheeler, 1991), other procedures, generally referred to as ran-

TABLE 1:   Factor Loadings of Individual Difference Measures

Measure	*IM*	*NSE*	*ICP*	*ICA*
	*Factor*			
Fear of negative evaluation	.97			
Social anxiety	.47			.86
Public self-consciousness	.68			
Embarrassability	.48			
Self-esteem	−.35	−.71		
Depression (BDI)		.84		
Depression (CESD)		.73		
Ingratiatory self-presentational style			.78	
Self-promoting self-presentational style			.53	
Exemplifying self-presentational style			.91	
Self-monitoring				.36

NOTE: Only loadings greater than .30 are shown. Private self-consciousness did not load on any of the factors. IM = Impression Motivation, NSE = Negative Self-Evaluation, ICP = Impression Construction Positivity, ICA = Impression Construction Appropriateness, BDI = Beck Depression Inventory, CESD = Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale.

dom-coefficient models, provide important advantages over them.

The random coefficient modeling technique used in the present study was hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) (Bryk, Raudenbush, & Congdon, 1998). These analyses examined the same types of relationships as the OLS analyses used in most previous research but they provided more accurate parameter estimates than the OLS-based analyses (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992; Kenny, Kashy, & Bolger, 1998). In HLM, more reliable units of observation contribute more to the estimation of parameters than less reliable units, and such "precision weighting" is part of a combination of Bayesian and maximum-likelihood estimation procedures used in HLM that separate the true and error variance of a parameter. In contrast, in OLS analyses, true and error variance are not separated. By separating true and error variance, HLM provides more reliable and robust estimates of parameters than OLS analyses (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992, pp. 32-57). See Nezlek (in press) for a discussion of using multilevel random coefficient modeling (MRCM) to analyze social interaction diary data and Nezlek (1999) for another application of the present analytic strategy.

Participants' ratings of interactions were analyzed using the following (within-person) Level 1 model:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + r_{ij}. \qquad (1.0)$$

In these models, y_{ij} was a rating for each interaction (subscripted *i*) for each participant (subscripted *j*), β_{0j} was a random coefficient (an intercept) representing the mean of *y* across all interactions, and r_{ij} represented

error. In essence, this model estimated within-person means for each rating of interactions.

Relationships between individual differences in ratings of interaction and factor scores were examined at what is called Level 2 in multilevel modeling. The basic Level 2 model was as follows:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{Factor}) + u_{0j}. \quad (2.0)$$

In these models, β_{0j} were coefficients from the Level 1 model, γ_{00} represented the grand mean of these coefficients, γ_{01} represented the effect for a factor, and u_{0j} represented error; each factor score was analyzed separately. These analyses examined the same types of relationships as OLS regression analyses of means aggregated across all of a participant's interactions. These initial analyses examined what would be referred to as *main effects* in OLS terms. They examined relationships between the factors and reactions to interactions without considering the possibility that such relationships might vary as a function of other individual differences (other *between-subjects factors* in OLS terms) or that they might vary across different types of interactions (a *within-subjects factor* in OLS terms).

The potential moderating effects on relationships between reactions to interactions and factor scores of two different person-level (i.e., between-subjects) variables were examined: participant sex and year in school. The potential moderating effects of participant sex were examined because sex differences in relationships between individual differences and social interaction have been found in studies over the past two decades (e.g., Nezlek, 1999; Nezlek, Wheeler, & Reis, 1990; Wheeler et al., 1983). The potential moderating effects of year in school were examined because we expected that relationships between self-presentational concerns in social interaction and trait level variables related to self-presentational motives and concerns would vary as a function of people's familiarity with a particular environment.

The logic underlying these analyses was the same as the logic underlying OLS regression analyses of interactive effects. Following the recommendations of Aiken and West (1991), the moderating effects of sex and year were examined by creating effect-coded variables representing participant sex and year and then multiplying factor scores by these variables. An effect-coded variable and its interactions with a factor were added to the basic Level 2 model (Equation 2.0).

For example, to determine if relationships between reactions to interactions and NSE varied across participant year in school, the following model was examined:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{NSE}) + \gamma_{02}(\text{YEAR})$$
$$+\gamma_{03}(\text{NSE–YEAR}) + u_{0j}. \quad (2.1)$$

In this model, β_{0j} represented a rating of interaction, the γ_{01} coefficient (NSE) represented the main effect for NSE, the γ_{02} coefficient (YEAR) represented the year effect, the γ_{03} coefficient (NSE–YEAR) represented the interaction between NSE and year, and u represented error. It is important to note that these analyses also controlled for any confounding that might have existed between factor scores and participant sex and year in school.

A series of analyses was conducted to determine if relationships between factor scores and reactions to interactions also might have varied across different types of interactions (what would be termed a *within-subject effect* in OLS terminology). Previous research has found that reactions to interactions and correlates of reactions can vary as a function of whether interactions involve only members of the same sex, only members of the other sex, or members of both sexes (e.g., Nezlek, 1999; Nezlek et al., 1990; Wheeler et al., 1983). Accordingly, reactions to same-, other-, and mixed-sex interactions were analyzed separately. This was done by creating three dummy-coded variables, each representing whether an interaction involved only members of the same sex, only members of the other sex, or members of both sexes. These dummy-coded variables were then included in the following no-intercept Level 1 model:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_{1j}(\text{SAME}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{OTHER}) + \beta_{3j}(\text{MIXED}) + r_{ij}. \quad (1.1)$$

In these models, β_{1j}, β_{2j}, and β_{3j} were random coefficients representing the mean of y_{ij} across same-, other-, and mixed-sex interactions, respectively. Individual differences in these coefficients were then analyzed at Level 2 using the same procedures as those used to analyze coefficients representing all interactions (i.e., Equations 2.0 and 2.1). The multivariate equivalent of Equation 2.0 (main effect relationships between factor scores and ratings) is the following:

$$\text{Same: } \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(\text{Factor}) + u_{0j}$$
$$\text{Other: } \beta_{2j} = \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21}(\text{Factor}) + u_{0j}$$
$$\text{Mixed: } \beta_{3j} = \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31}(\text{Factor}) + u_{0j}. \quad (2.2)$$

Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Interactions

Interpreting and understanding the results of HLM analyses requires knowing the distributions of the variables being modeled. HLM provides reliability estimates (defined as the ratio of true to total variance) (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992, pp. 43-44) for all random effects; the

TABLE 2:   Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Interactions

	Mean	Person-Level Variance	Interaction-Level Variance	Reliability
Self-presentational motives				
Want to be seen as likable	6.07	1.97	2.61	.96
Want to be seen as competent	5.60	2.19	2.64	.96
Want to be seen as ethical	4.65	3.33	2.78	.97
Want to be seen as attractive	3.80	2.43	3.99	.95
Self-presentational concerns				
Nervous	1.88	.52	1.64	.90
Thought about others' evaluations	3.21	1.78	2.88	.95
Other reactions				
Enjoyment	6.28	.50	2.27	.87
Intimacy	3.97	1.82	3.55	.94
Influence	4.87	1.03	2.00	.94

TABLE 3:   Coefficients Describing Relationships Between Factor Scores and Ratings of Interactions

Rating	Factor			
	IM	NSE	ICP	ICA
Self-presentational motives				
Want to be seen as likable	.30***	–.05	.18	–.12
Want to be seen as competent	.14	–.05	.20	–.12
Want to be seen as ethical	.07	–.03	.64***	–.01
Want to be seen as attractive	.26**	.06	.15	–.20
Self-presentational concerns				
Nervous	.11**	.24***	–.17***	.13**
Thought about others' evaluations	.22*	.28***	–.05	–.16
Other reactions				
Enjoyment	–.04	–.13**	.21***	–.06
Intimacy	.08	.00	.23**	.07
Influence	.03	.03	.15*	–.02

NOTE: IM = Impression Motivation, NSE = Negative Self-Evaluation, ICP = Impression Construction Positivity, ICA = Impression Construction Appropriateness.
*p > .10. **p > .05. ***p > .01.

sample mean, the within- and between-person variances, and the reliability of the within-person means (the intercepts from Equation 1) are presented in Table 2. These data indicated that the ratings were reliable and that there was sufficient variability among individuals to model (the column labeled "person-level variance"). Descriptive statistics for the personality measures are not presented because these measures consisted of factor scores that are standardized by definition.

IMPRESSION MOTIVATION

The results of the analyses of relationships between participants' ratings of their interactions and scores on the IM factor (consisting of negative evaluation, public self-consciousness, embarrassability, and social anxiety) were straightforward and confirmed expectations. Participants who were more concerned about how others evaluated them indicated that they were more concerned with others' impressions during their daily social interactions. Significant positive relationships (significant γ_{01} coefficients from Equation 2.0) were found between IM factor scores and how much participants wanted to be perceived as likable (t = 2.68, p < .01) and attractive (t = 2.11, p < .05), how nervous they felt (t = 2.04, p < .05), and how much they thought about others' impressions of them (t = 1.94, p < .06). Moreover, these effects were not qualified by the sexual composition of interactions or by participant sex or year in school. The effects were equally strong for same-, other-, and mixed-sex interactions, for women and for men, and for freshmen and for upper-classmen. In contrast to these significant relationships, IM factor scores were not significantly related to the desire to be seen as competent (t = 1.19, p > .20) or ethical (t < 1) or to how enjoyable and intimate interactions were and how influential participants felt they were in interaction (all ts < 1).

The coefficients describing relationships between ratings of interactions and IM factor scores are presented in Table 3. These coefficients are functionally equivalent to unstandardized regression coefficients and can be used to generate predicted values. For example, the mean score across all participants on ratings of how much they wanted to be perceived as likeable was 6.07 (see Table 2), and the coefficient for the IM factor was .30. This meant that the predicted rating of wanting to be liked for participants 1 unit below the mean on the IM factor was 5.77 and the predicted score for participants 1 unit above the mean was 6.37. Note that because the factors are standardized, a 1-unit change is a 1-*SD* change.

IMPRESSION CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATENESS

The results of the analyses of relationships between ratings of social interaction and scores on the ICA factor (consisting of social anxiety and self-monitoring) were also straightforward and consistent with expectations. A significant positive relationship (t = 2.19, p < .05) was found between ICA factor scores and how nervous participants reported being in their daily interactions. Moreover, this effect was not qualified by the sexual composition of interactions or by participant sex or year in school. There were no statistically significant relationships between ICA factor scores and the desire to be seen as likable (t = 1.13, p > .25), competent (t = 1.01, p > .30), ethical (t < 1), or attractive (t = 1.42, p > .15), or how much participants thought of others' impressions (t = 1.31, p > .15), or between ICA factor scores and the enjoyment, intimacy, and influence ratings (all ts < 1). The

coefficients describing these relationships are presented in Table 3.

IMPRESSION CONSTRUCTION POSITIVITY

The results of analyses examining relationships between social interaction and scores on the ICP (consisting of ingratiation, self-promotion, and exemplification) were different from, and somewhat more complex than, the results for the IM and ICA factors. A significant (and very strong) relationship was found between ICP factor scores and how much participants wanted to be seen as ethical ($t = 4.29$, $p < .01$). Interestingly, in contrast to the previous results, stronger dispositional concerns about positive self-presentation were associated with lower nervousness during interactions, as indicated by the significant negative relationship ($t = 2.82$, $p < .01$) between ICP factor scores and participants' ratings of how nervous they felt. Along the same lines, there was also a significant ($t = 3.39$, $p < .01$) positive relationship between individual differences in ICP factor scores and how enjoyable participants found their interactions to be. Higher ICP scores were associated with greater enjoyment. Moreover, none of these effects was qualified by the sexual composition of interactions or by participant sex or year in school. The coefficients representing these effects are presented in Table 3.

In contrast to these unqualified main effects, relationships between some ratings of interactions and ICP scores varied as a function of the gender composition (same-, other-, and mixed-sex) of interactions. The relationship between ICP scores and the desire to appear competent only approached conventional levels of significance when all interactions were considered (Equation 2.0; $t = 1.63$, $p = .12$, see coefficient in Table 3). When relationships between ICP scores and the desire to appear competent were analyzed separately for same-, other-, and mixed-sex interactions (Equation 2.2), ICP scores were significantly related to the desire to appear competent in other-sex interactions ($\gamma_{22} = .35$, $t = 2.58$, $p < .01$), and this relationship approached conventional levels of significance for mixed-sex interactions ($\gamma_{32} = .24$, $t = 1.79$, $p < .07$). In contrast, this effect was clearly not significant ($\gamma_{12} = .14$, $t = 1.01$, ns) in the analysis of same-sex interactions. Predicted scores for this measure for people 1 SD above and below the mean on the ICP factor are presented in Table 4. These results suggest that dispositional concerns about constructing a positive impression are primarily related to concerns about appearing competent in the presence of people of the other sex.

A somewhat different pattern was found for participants' ratings of interaction intimacy. ICP scores were significantly and positively related to intimacy when all interactions were considered together ($t = 1.96$, $p = .05$,

TABLE 4: Predicted Scores for Ratings of Interactions as a Joint Function of Impression Construction Positivity (ICP) and Gender Composition of Interaction

Rating	Same-Sex		Other-Sex		Mixed-Sex	
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Competent	5.18	5.47	5.72	6.40	5.58	6.06
Intimacy	3.42	4.10	4.52	4.52	3.67	3.87
Influence	4.70	4.86	4.91	5.05	4.13	4.49

NOTE: Low ICP = people 1 SD below mean ICP. High ICP = people 1 SD above mean ICP.

see Table 3 for coefficient). Nevertheless, analyses that took the gender composition of interactions into account found that ICP scores were positively related to intimacy only in same-sex interactions ($\gamma_{12} = .34$, $t = 2.65$, $p < .01$); the relationships for other- and mixed-sex interactions were clearly not significant (γ_{22} and $\gamma_{32} = .00$ and .10, respectively; both $ts < 1.0$). Predicted scores illustrating these relationships are presented in Table 4. These results suggest that dispositional concerns about constructing a positive impression are primarily related to the intimacy people experience in interactions with members of the same sex.

Finally, relationships between ICP scores and ratings of influence in interaction also varied as a function of the gender composition of interactions. When all interactions were considered together, the relationship between ICP scores and ratings of influence approached but did not reach conventional levels of significance ($t = 1.74$, $p < .09$, see coefficient in Table 3). When only same-sex interactions were considered, however, the relationship was significant ($\gamma_{12} = .18$, $t = 2.04$, $p < .05$) and approached significance for mixed-sex interactions ($\gamma_{32} = .18$, $t = 1.69$, $p < .09$). In contrast, in the analysis of opposite-sex interactions, this effect was clearly not significant ($\gamma_{22} = .07$, $t < 1$). These results suggest that ICP scores were positively related to perceived influence when same-sex others were present. Predicted scores illustrating these relationships are presented in Table 4.

NEGATIVE SELF-EVALUATION

Analyses of relationships between ratings of social interaction and scores on the NSE factor (consisting of two measures of depression and negatively valent self-esteem) produced two significant relationships that confirmed our expectations and did not vary across participant sex or year in school. Compared to participants who had lower scores on the NSE factor, participants with higher scores were more nervous ($t = 4.06$, $p < .01$) and they thought more about other interactants' impressions of them ($t = 2.49$, $p < .02$). The coefficients representing these effects are presented in Table 3.

In addition to these effects, and unlike the results of analyses involving the other three factors, analyses examining the moderating effects of participant sex and year in school found that relationships between NSE and certain self-presentational concerns and motives varied as a function of participants' sex and year in school. Moreover, some of these effects occurred for some types of interaction but not for others.

The analyses of all interactions (Equation 2.1) of how competent, likable, and attractive participants wanted others to see them produced significant interactions (or interactions that approached significance) between NSE and year in school ($ps < .02, .07$, and $.07$, respectively). Follow-up analyses that took the gender composition of interactions into account found, however, that this interaction was due primarily to self-presentational motives when same-sex others were present. In the analysis of competence, the interaction between NSE and year was significant for same- and mixed-sex interactions ($ts = 2.12$ and 1.99, respectively, both $ps < .05$) and not significant for other-sex interactions ($p > .25$). In the analysis of participants' desire to be perceived as likable, the interaction between NSE and year was significant for same-sex interactions ($t = 2.38, p < .02$) but not for other- or mixed-sex interactions (both $ts < 1$). Finally, in the analysis of the desire to appear attractive, the interaction between NSE and year approached conventional levels of significance for same- and mixed-sex interactions ($ts = 1.71, 1.77, ps < .09, .08$, respectively) and was clearly not significant for other-sex interactions ($t < 1$).

To illustrate the nature of these interactions, predicted values for participants' ratings of the degree to which they desired to appear competent, likable, and attractive in same-sex interactions for first-year and upper-class participants 1 *SD* above and below the mean on the NSE factor were calculated and are presented in Table 5. The interaction is similar across all three measures of self-presentational motives. NSE scores were positively related to the strength of these three self-presentational motives for first-year students but were negatively related to the strength of these motives for upper-class students.

Relationships between NSE and self-presentational motives in social interaction also were moderated by participant sex. Analyses that considered all interactions together (Equation 2.1) of how competent, likable, and attractive participants wanted others to perceive them produced significant interactions (or interactions that approached significance) between NSE and participant sex ($ps < .09, .05$, and $.05$, respectively). Predicted scores for men and women 1 *SD* above and below the mean on NSE indicated that for women, NSE scores were positively related to concerns about how much others liked them (low NSE = 5.85, high NSE = 6.13). In contrast, for

TABLE 5: Predicted Scores for Strength of Impression Management Motives in Same-Sex Interactions as a Joint Function of Year in School and Negative Self-Evaluation (NSE)

Rating	First-Year		Upper-Class	
	Low	High	Low	High
Competent	5.11	5.71	5.56	4.95
Likable	5.60	6.29	5.92	5.30
Attractive	2.46	3.28	3.06	2.80

NOTE: Low NSE = people 1 *SD* below mean NSE. High NSE = people 1 *SD* above mean NSE.

men, NSE scores were negatively related to concerns about how much others liked them (low NSE = 6.59, high NSE = 5.55).

Follow-up analyses that took the gender composition of interactions into account found, however, that for ratings of the desire to be perceived as competent and attractive, this statistical interaction was due primarily to self-presentational motives when members of the other sex were present. In the analysis of the desire to appear competent, the interaction between the NSE factor and sex was significant for other-sex interactions ($t = 2.19, p < .05$) but was not significant for same- or mixed-sex interactions ($ps > .10$). In the analysis of concerns about appearing attractive, the NSE-sex interaction was significant for other-sex interactions ($t = 2.66, p < .01$), approached conventional levels of significance for mixed-sex interactions ($t = 1.66, p < .10$), and was not significant for same-sex interactions ($t < 1$). Consistent with this pattern, analyses of how much participants thought about others' impressions produced a significant NSE-sex interaction for other-sex interactions ($t = 2.06, p < .05$) but not for same- and mixed-sex interactions ($ps > .20$).

To illustrate the nature of this interaction, predicted values for desires about appearing competent and attractive in interactions with members of the other sex and how much participants thought about their impressions were calculated separately for men and women 1 *SD* above and below the mean on the NSE factor. As shown in Table 6, NSE scores were positively related to the strength of these concerns for women and negatively related to the strength of these concerns for men.

DISCUSSION

The results paint an intriguing picture of the relationship between various personality variables and people's self-presentational motives and emotions in real interpersonal interactions. Overall, relationships between personality variables and self-presentational motives and concerns confirmed our expectations. First, individual differences in participants' general IM were posi-

TABLE 6:   Predicted Scores for Ratings of Other-Sex Interactions as a Joint Function of Participant Sex and Negative Self-Evaluation (NSE)

Rating	Women		Men	
	Low	High	Low	High
Competent	5.85	6.17	6.59	5.49
Likable	5.87	6.19	6.63	5.55
Attractive	5.12	5.62	6.04	4.70

NOTE: Low NSE = people 1 SD below mean NSE. High NSE = people 1 SD above mean NSE.

tively related to how much they thought about others' impressions of them, their desires to be perceived as likeable and attractive, and how nervous they felt during their daily interactions. It is informative that general concerns with social evaluation (as reflected by measures of public self-consciousness, fear of negative evaluation, social anxiety, and embarrassability) were related to the desire to be perceived as friendly and attractive but not competent or exemplary. People who score high on this dimension appear to want to endear themselves to others but not necessarily to garner respect. Previous research by Godfrey, Jones, and Lord (1986) showed that people react quite differently to ingratiating and self-promoting self-presentations, and our participants appeared to realize this fact.

Although we had initially assumed that some of the variables that loaded on the IM factor (particularly public self-consciousness) would predict a generalized desire to make impressions on others (i.e., impression-motivation) (Leary & Kowalski, 1990), the data clearly showed that participants who scored high on this factor were interested specifically in being perceived in ways that would lead others to like and accept them rather than motivated to make all kinds of impressions. Thus, indicators of self-presentational worries such as social anxiety, fear of negative evaluation, and embarrassability moderate impression-construction processes as well.

Second, measures of ICA were positively related to how nervous people were. Whether this finding reflects the fact that people who are more concerned with making the "right" impression are more nervous (Schlenker & Leary, 1982) or the fact that dispositional social anxiety loaded highly on the ICA factor is unclear. In any case, the results involving the IM and ICA factors showed that dispositional concerns with self-presentation manifested themselves in participants' self-presentational motives in everyday social encounters as well as in how socially anxious they felt when interacting.

The pattern for the ICP factor was somewhat different. Most noteworthy is the fact that wanting to be perceived positively was negatively related to how nervous

participants felt in social interactions and was positively related to how enjoyable interactions were. These findings stand in contrast to those described earlier in which IM was positively related to nervousness in interaction. It is possible that people who report that they generally want others to perceive them as highly likeable, competent, and ethical (i.e., those who score high on the ICP factor) are relatively confident in their ability to make these desirable impressions. As a result, they may feel less nervous during social encounters and enjoy them more. In contrast, people who report being concerned about others' evaluations—those who are high in public self-consciousness, fear of negative evaluation, and embarrassability, for example—are more likely to doubt that they will make desired impressions and be evaluated positively and, thus, feel more nervous. Therefore, this pattern may reflect Arkin's (1981) distinction between acquisitive versus protective approaches to self-presentation. People who score high in ICP may approach social interactions with positive expectations of self-presentational success and adopt an acquisitive approach, whereas those high in IM harbor doubts that they will make the impressions they desire and respond protectively. Although both are interested in managing their impressions, their motives and emotional reactions differ.

When considering relationships between social interaction and scores on the ICP factor, it is important to keep in mind that this factor represented a sort of general concern to be perceived positively. Although ingratiation, self-promotion, and exemplification are conceptually distinct self-presentational goals (Godfrey et al., 1986; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Leary et al., 2000; Schütz, 1998), in the present sample, people who were highly motivated to be perceived positively on one dimension were also highly motivated to be perceived positively highly on another. Correlations between the three self-presentational goals ranged from .49 to .73.

The findings for the NSE factor were perhaps the most complex and interesting of the results. Overall, more negative self-evaluations were associated with a heightened sensitivity to the self-presentational nuances of social interactions. Compared to participants with more positive self-evaluations, participants with more negative self-evaluations generally thought more about how other people were evaluating them and were more nervous during their daily social encounters. To the extent that both depression and low self-esteem are associated with the perception that one is not adequately valued and accepted by others (Leary, Koch, & Heckenbleikner, 2001), participants who scored high on this factor may be chronically concerned about how other people perceive and evaluate them.

Although their general self-presentational concerns did not differ as a function of whether participants were

first-year or upper-class students, relationships between self-evaluation and ratings of self-presentational motives in interaction did. Among first-year students, those with more negative self-evaluations had stronger desires to be perceived as competent, attractive, and likable than those with less negative self-evaluations, whereas among upper-class students, the relationship between self-evaluation and these motives was reversed. Of importance, however, this pattern was obtained for same- and mixed-sex encounters but not for interactions that involved only members of the other sex. This pattern suggests that newcomers with negative self-evaluations may be particularly motivated to present themselves favorably when members of their own sex are present, possibly as a means of establishing same-sex friendships (Leary, 1995; Moreland & Levine, 1989). Among upper-class students, however, depression and self-esteem were negatively related to motives to be perceived as competent, likeable, and attractive in interactions with people of one's own sex.

The reversal of the relationship between self-evaluation and self-presentational motives over time may be associated with the learned helplessness that often accompanies depression (Peterson, Maier, & Seligman, 1993). When people first enter a new social environment, they are understandably interested in establishing friendships and want to convey favorable impressions that will make them attractive as friends. Because they do not feel adequately accepted, newcomers with negative self-evaluations may be particularly interested in conveying positive impressions that will lead to friendship, leading to stronger self-presentational motives in interaction compared to newcomers with less negative self-evaluations. Over time in the social environment, however, individuals with negative self-evaluations (who may be less likely than those with more positive self-evaluations to establish adequate friendships) may feel that they are unable to control other people's responses to them. This could mean that those with more negative self-evaluations might not try as hard to convey positive impressions in interactions, even as they continue to think and worry about other people's reactions to them. Of course, the relationship between self-evaluation and self-presentation is likely to be reciprocal: Cumulative self-presentational successes and failures are likely to influence self-evaluation at the same time that self-evaluation influences self-presentational motivation.

The interesting question is why the decline in self-presentational motivation over time for those with negative self-evaluations did not occur in interactions with people of the other sex. One possibility is that the rewards associated with relationships with those of the other sex are sufficiently high to maintain a high degree of self-presentational motivation even when one's inter-est in impressing other people is otherwise low. For heterosexuals, relationships with the other sex may be viewed as both more important and more tenuous than same-sex relationships (Nezlek, 1993), leading people to exert more self-presentational effort in cross-sex interactions (Leary et al., 1994). Thus, the tendency for people to be more highly motivated to present favorable images to those of the other sex may have led participants with negative self-evaluations to want people of the other sex to view them as competent, likeable, and attractive regardless of how long they had been at college.

Systematic differences were obtained between the self-presentational motives of men and women as a function of self-evaluation. Scores on the NSE factor were positively related to women's desire to be perceived as competent, attractive, and likeable in other-sex interactions, whereas for men, the pattern was reversed. Women with more negative self-evaluations preferred a relatively self-enhancing self-presentational style, whereas men with more negative self-evaluations preferred a relatively self-effacing style. Given that the positive relationships between self-evaluation and concerns about others' evaluations and nervousness did not vary between the sexes, these differences in men's and women's specific motives do not appear to be due to differences in their general self-presentational concern or motivation. Rather, they suggest that women and men with negative self-evaluations adopted different self-presentational strategies when interacting with members of the other sex.

The data suggest that women with more negative self-evaluations may think that their interpersonal goals vis-à-vis men are best achieved by relatively favorable self-presentations. Perhaps women with more negative self-evaluations realize that people often develop unfavorable impressions of them (Dobson, 1989; Howes & Hokanson, 1979), particularly when they excessively seek reassurance from others (Katz & Joiner, 2001). Thus, women with more negative self-evaluations may try to compensate for the negative effect of their more negative self-evaluations on men's impressions of them by promoting slightly more positive images of themselves than they normally do (cf. Baumeister & Jones, 1978).

Men may not have shown this effect because, although men with more negative self-evaluations are rejected as strongly as women with more negative self-evaluations, men are less likely to express their depressive affect to other people (Hammen & Peters, 1978). Thus, men may not feel the need to compensate by conveying more positive self-images. Furthermore, men with more negative self-evaluations may believe that self-effacement will evoke nurturance, reassurance, and support from women (Shepperd & Kwanvick, 1999). Whatever their cause, self-presentational differences between

participants with different self-evaluations may not have emerged in same-sex interactions because people's responses to individuals of their own sex vary less as a function of these individuals' self-evaluations (depression) than do responses to individuals of the other sex (Hammen & Peters, 1978).

In conclusion, most of the personality variables we studied were related to the impressions that participants desired to construct in their everyday lives and to their reactions to their daily interactions. The fact that these individual differences were related to impression-motivation and impression-construction as expected supports predictions regarding the nature of these constructs, demonstrating the ecological validity of previous findings obtained in laboratory studies, and attesting to the criterion-related validity of the measures that are commonly used to assess them. The links between self-evaluation and participants' self-presentational motives were particularly intriguing. More negative self-evaluations appeared to attenuate self-presentational motives over time in a social environment, at least in interactions that involve others of one's own sex, and self-evaluation related differently to the self-presentational motives of men and women. Women with more negative self-evaluations were more self-presentationally motivated than those with more positive self-evaluations, whereas the reverse was true for men. With a few exceptions, the link between self-evaluation (and depression) and self-presentation has not been investigated or discussed (see Hill, Weary, & Williams, 1986; Weary & Williams, 1990), but our findings suggest that it may deserve additional attention.

Given that psychological interest in impression management may be traced to Erving Goffman's (1959) seminal book *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, it is somewhat ironic that relatively little research has, in fact, examined self-presentational processes in ordinary social interactions. The present study demonstrates the usefulness of self-report diary methodologies such as the RIR for studying self-presentation in everyday life and suggests some potentially fruitful directions for such research.

REFERENCES

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Arkin, R. M. (1981). Self-presentational styles. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), *Impression management theory and social psychological research* (pp. 311-333). New York: Academic Press.

Baumeister, R. F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin, 91*, 3-26.

Baumeister, R. F., & Jones, E. E. (1978). When self-presentation is constrained by the target's knowledge: Consistency and compensation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 608-618.

Baumeister, R. F., Tice, D. M., & Hutton, D. G. (1989). Self-presentational motivations and personality differences in self-esteem. *Journal of Personality, 57*, 547-579.

Beck, A. T. (1967). *Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects.* New York: Harper & Row.

Bryk, A. S., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1992). *Hierarchical linear models.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bryk, A. S., Raudenbush, S. W., & Congdon, R. (1998). *HLM.* Chicago: Scientific Software.

Buss, A. H. (1980). *Self-consciousness and social anxiety.* San Francisco: Freeman.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation: A control-theory approach to human behavior.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Cliff, N. (1959). Adverbs as multipliers. *Psychological Review, 66*, 27-44.

Dobson, K. S. (1989). Real and perceived interpersonal responses to subclinically anxious and depressed targets. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 13*, 37-47.

Fenigstein, A. (1979). Self-consciousness, self-attention, and social interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 75-86.

Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*, 522-527.

Gergen, K. J., & Wishnov, V. B. (1965). Others' self-evaluations and interaction anticipation as determinants of self-presentation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2*, 348-358.

Godfrey, D. K., Jones, E. E., & Lord, C. G. (1986). Self-promotion is not ingratiating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 106-115.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* New York: Anchor.

Hammen, C. L., & Peters, S. D. (1978). Interpersonal consequences of depression: Responses to men and women enacting a depressed role. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87*, 322-332.

Hill, M. G., Weary, G., & Williams, J. (1986). Depression: A self-presentation formulation. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public self and private self* (pp. 213-239). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Howes, M. J., & Hokanson, J. E. (1979). Interpersonal consequences of depression: Responses to men and women enacting a depressed role. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 88*, 625-634.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1, pp. 231-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jones, S. C., & Tager, R. (1972). Exposure to others, need for social approval, and reactions to agreement and disagreement from others. *Journal of Social Psychology, 86*, 111-120.

Katz, J., & Joiner, T. E. Jr., (2001). The aversive interpersonal context of depression: Emerging perspectives on depressotypic behavior. In R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Behaving badly: Aversive behaviors in interpersonal relationships* (pp. 117-147). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Bolger, N. (1998). Data analysis in social psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 233-265) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Leary, M. R. (1983a). A brief version of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9*, 371-376.

Leary, M. R. (1983b). Social anxiousness: The construct and its measurement. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 47*, 66-75.

Leary, M. R. (1991). Social anxiety, shyness, and related constructs. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 161-194). San Diego: Academic Press.

Leary, M. R. (1995). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Leary, M. R., Barnes, B. D., & Griebel, C. (1986). Cognitive, affective, and attributional effects of potential threats to self-esteem. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4*, 461-474.

Leary, M. R., Koch, E. J., & Heckenbleikner, N. R. (2001). Emotional responses to interpersonal rejection. In M. R. Leary (Ed.), *Interpersonal rejection* (pp. 145-166). New York: Oxford University Press.

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 34-47.

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1993). The Interaction Anxiousness Scale: Construct and criterion-related validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 61,* 136-146.

Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., Martin, K. M., & Koch, E. J. (2002). Individual differences in self-presentational style. Manuscript in preparation, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC.

Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., & Martin, K. M. (2000). *Individual differences in self-presentational style.* Manuscript in preparation, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Leary, M. R., Nezlek, J. B., Downs, D., Radford-Davenport, J., Martin, J., & McMullen, A. (1994). Self-presentation in everyday interactions: Effects of target familiarity and gender composition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67,* 664-673.

Miller, L. C., & Cox, C. L. (1982). For appearance's sake: Public self-consciousness and makeup use. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8,* 748-751.

Miller, R. S. (1996). *Embarrassment: Poise and peril in everyday life.* New York: Guilford.

Millham, J., & Kellogg, R. W. (1980). Need for social approval: Impression management or self-deception? *Journal of Research in Personality, 14,* 445-457.

Modigliani, A. (1966). *Embarrassment and social influence.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Moreland, R. L., & Levine, J. M. (1989). Newcomers and old-timers in small groups. In P. Paulus (Ed.), *Psychology of group influence* (Vol. 2, pp. 143-186). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nezlek, J. B. (1993). The stability of social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65,* 930-941.

Nezlek, J. B. (1999). Body image and day-to-day social interaction. *Journal of Personality, 67,* 793-817.

Nezlek, J. B. (2001). Multilevel random coefficient analyses of event and interval contingent data in social and personality psychology research. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 771-785.

Nezlek, J. B., & Wheeler, L. (1984). RIRAP: Rochester interaction record analysis package. *Psychological Documents, 14,* 6. (Ms. No. 2610)

Nezlek, J., Wheeler, L., & Reis, H. (1983). Studies of social interaction. In H. Reis (Ed.), *Naturalistic approaches to studying social interaction: New directions for methodology of social and behavioral science, No. 15* (pp. 57-75). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nezlek, J. B., Wheeler, L., & Reis, H. (1990). Academic performance and social behavior. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7,* 291-309.

Peterson, C., Maier, S. F., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1993). *Learned helplessness: A theory for the age of personal control.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1,* 385-401.

Reis, H. T., & Wheeler, L. (1991). Studying social interaction using the Rochester Interaction Record. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 24* (pp. 270-318). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Schlenker, B. R. (1975). Self-presentation: Managing the impression of consistency when reality interferes with self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32,* 1030-1037.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1982). Social anxiety and self-presentation: A conceptualization and model. *Psychological Bulletin, 92,* 641-669.

Schlenker, B. R., Weigold, M. F., & Hallam, J. R. (1990). Self-serving attributions in social context: Effects of self-esteem and social pressure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 855-863.

Schütz, A. (1998). Autobiographical narratives of good and bad deeds: Defensive and favorable self-description moderated by trait self-esteem. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17,* 466-475.

Shepperd, J. A., & Arkin, R. M. (1990). Shyness and self-presentation. In W. R. Crozier (Ed.), *Shyness and embarrassment: Perspectives from social psychology* (pp. 286-314). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Shepperd, J. A., & Kwanvick, K. D. (1999). Maladaptive image maintenance. In R. M. Kowalski & M. R. Leary (Eds.), *The social psychology of emotional and behavioral problems* (pp. 249-277). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances/private realities.* New York: Freeman.

Solomon, M. R., & Schopler, J. (1982). Self-consciousness and clothing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8,* 508-514.

Swann, W. B., Jr., Wenzlaff, R. M., Krull, D. S., & Pelham, B. W. (1992). Allure of negative feedback: Self-verification strivings among depressed persons. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101,* 293-306.

Tice, D. M. (1991). Esteem protection or enhancement? Self-handicapping motives and attributions differ by trait self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 711-725.

Tobey, E. L., & Tunnell, G. (1981). Predicting our impressions on others: Effects of public self-consciousness and acting, a self-monitoring subscale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7,* 661-669.

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33,* 448-457.

Weary, G., & Williams, J. P. (1990). Depressive self-presentation: Beyond self-handicapping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 892-898.

Wheeler, L., & Nezlek, J. (1977). Sex differences in social participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35,* 742-754.

Wheeler, L., Reis, H., & Nezlek, J. (1983). Loneliness and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45,* 943-953.