Self-Presentational Success in Daily Social Interaction

John B. Nezlek

College of William and Mary

Astrid Schütz,

Chemnitz University of Technology

&

Ina Sellin

Fontane Klinik

Running head: Success in everyday self-presentation

Address of corresponding author:

John Nezlek

College of William & Mary

Department of Psychology

PO BOX 8795

Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795

Phone: Work: 757.221.3881; Fax: 757.221.3896; Home: 0049.371.8579050

email: jbnezl@wm.edu

Abstract

In a study on self-presentation in everyday social encounters, 100 undergraduate students described their social interactions for two weeks using a variant of the Rochester Interaction Record. For each interaction, participants described their self-presentational goals and perceived success in achieving these goals. A series of multilevel random coefficient modeling analyses found that wanting to be liked was a particularly important goal. Moreover, goals and perceived success depended strongly on the type of situation people were in. For example, people wanted to appear competent during work related interactions but interesting and attractive during romantic interactions. Overall, participants were relatively satisfied with their self-presentations. Self-presentational goals were more important in interactions with close others (family and friends) than with strangers or acquaintances. Furthermore, interactions with close others were considered especially successful. Participants felt least successful about their self-presentational performance during work related interactions and most successful about their performance during romantic interactions. Overall, social goals were more important than performance goals, and more of the variance in aspirations and perceived success was within-person (i.e., across interactions) than between-persons.

Self-Presentational Success in Daily Social Interaction

When interacting with others, people are concerned with the impressions others have of them. In terms of psychological research and theory, such concerns are referred to as either self-presentation or impression management. As noted by Schlenker (2002), "Research on self-presentation has exploded in the past 25 years" (p. 492). Despite this increased attention, we believe that research on self-presentation has two important limitations. First, the bulk of it has been conducted in laboratory settings, and frequently, participants in such studies are relative (if not total) strangers. Despite the imaginative and creative methods used in these studies, it cannot be assumed that the self-presentational processes found in such studies generalize to self-presentation in everyday life. They may, they may not.

Second, the bulk of research has focused on self-presentational motives, concerns, or goals. Very little research has concerned self-presentational success (i.e., how well people convey desired impressions). Curiously, in Schlenker's thorough review of major themes and directions in research on self-presentation, self-presentational success was discussed primarily in terms of how well people can deceive others with an emphasis on non-verbal communication (e.g., DePaulo, 1992). The present study was intended to complement existing research by examining self-presentational success within the context of naturally occurring social interaction.

One of the challenges in studying self-presentation is defining exactly what is meant by self-presentation. Self-presentation can occur along a variety of dimensions, and a wide variety of different types of self-presentation have been studied over the years. Our conceptualization of self-presentation was based on two complementary sources. At a broad level, we relied upon Schlenker (1980), who distinguished two broad classes of self-presentational objectives, dealing with social rankings (e.g., being respected) and social attachments (e.g., being liked), and he argued that self-presentation differs as a function of which of these objectives people are pursuing. At a more specific level, we relied on the conceptual framework introduced by Jones and Pittman (1982). They argued that five

attributions are particularly relevant in social encounters: likeability, competence, integrity, power, and helplessness, and further, there are five self-presentational strategies corresponding to these attributions: ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification, intimidation, and supplication.

The present study was designed in part to extend the work of Leary et al. (1994), one of the few studies on self-presentation in naturally occurring social interaction. For two weeks, participants in the present study maintained a variant of the Rochester Interaction Record (RIR; Wheeler & Nezlek, 1977), an established method of studying naturally occurring social interactions. For each social interaction participants described their self-presentational goals and how successful they thought they had been in creating desired impressions, and they described their reactions to the interactions. In addition, they described what they were doing during the interaction and with whom they were interacting. These data allowed us to examine how self-presentation varied across different types of interactions and across interactions with different people and to examine relationships between self-presentational success and reactions to interactions.

We expected that self-presentational goals and perceived success would vary as a function of what people were doing during an interaction, the people with whom they were interacting, and the domain of presentation being considered. For most domains, we expected that goals would be more important and perceived success would be greater in interactions with close others (family and friends) than in interactions with others. We expected that people would be more successful in these types of interactions because people have more experience interacting with close others and therefore know more about how to present themselves successfully. We expected that self-presentational goals would be more important in interactions with close others because people want close others to value and appreciate them.

For performance domains (e.g., competence) we expected that goals and success would be higher in performance related activities (e.g., work) than in other activities. Overall,

we expected that self-perceived success in self-presentation would be positively related to other reactions to interactions. We expected this relationship for both more intrapersonally focused reactions (e.g., enjoyment) and for more interpersonally focused reactions (e.g., feeling liked by others).

The present study borrows much from Leary et al. (1994). In the present study, as in Leary et al., participants maintained a variant of the RIR, and they described their self-presentational motives. Leary et al. focused on differences in these motives as a function of the gender similarity and degree of familiarity of the people who were present in an interaction (e.g., close same-sex friends vs. close opposite-sex friends). Despite its strengths, Leary et al. has some important limitations. First, the study did not concern self-presentational success. Second, the sample studied, undergraduates at Wake Forest University, had a relatively narrow range of interactional partners. Similar to most students at most American residential colleges, the overwhelming majority of their interactions were with peers (i.e., other students) and occurred on and around (Wake Forest) campus. Finally, Leary et al. did not examine how self-presentational goals varied as a function of the nature of the interaction (i.e., different activities). The present study addressed each of these concerns. First, self-presentational success was measured. Second, although the sample consisted of undergraduates, they were not students at a residential college, and they interacted with a wider variety of partners, including family members. Third, analyses of the present data explicitly took into account the nature of the interaction.

Self-presentational behaviors in daily life were examined also by Vonk (2001), although the study used a retrospective survey. Participants responded to a survey published in the Dutch journal Psychology, and the resulting sample was quite heterogeneous. Moreover, people described the self-presentations they made to a wide variety of different types of people (e.g., colleagues, children, in-laws, parents, etc.). Vonk found that the self-presentational strategies people used depended on the kind of person with whom they were interacting and the goal they were pursuing. For example ingratiation was used more often

when interacting with "objects of desire or romance", such as an actual or potential partner, or with subordinates or job applicants. When interacting with superiors such as a potential employer, a boss, a teacher, or a coach, people used the strategy of self-promotion, whereas playing dumb was used with friends, perhaps to avoid competitiveness or envy and to maintain a level of equality. Vonk's results suggest that the target (and by implication the nature of a social interaction) influence self-presentational goals and the self-presentations people make.

Unfortunately, Vonk did not measure self-presentational success (as defined by either the presenter or the target), and it is not clear how accurate the reports she obtained were. One-time, single assessments that ask people to estimate the frequencies of different events over an extended (or indefinite) period of time may be prone to various biases such as selective recall, disproportionate influence of unusual events, and so forth (e.g., Reis & Gable, 2000). Nevertheless, Vonk's study did suggest that it would be useful to examine differences in self-presentation across a broad range of everyday situations.

Along the same lines, an important focus of laboratory research on self-presentation has been understanding how self-presentation varies across different situations. In such research, situations have typically been defined in terms of characteristics of the audience for (or the target of) self-presentation. For example, Doherty and Schlenker (1991) compared the self-presentations people made to audiences who were more or less familiar with the self-presenter's previous performance. Tice, Butler, Muraven, and Stilwell (1995) compared self-presentation towards friends and strangers, Gardner and Martinko (1988) examined self-presentation towards individuals vs. groups, towards high vs. low status audiences, and towards the ingroup vs. the outgroup, and Mori, Chaiken, and Pliner (1987) compared self-presentation interaction partners who varied in social desirability.

Drawing broad conclusions from the existing research on situational influences is difficult, in part because there is no well-established taxonomy of situations or situational variables that can be used to organize these findings. Nevertheless, some preliminary

conclusions are possible. People seem to be more concerned about their self-presentation when interacting with desirable audiences (Mori et al., 1987) and when they want to appear consistent with audiences' previous knowledge (Tice et al., 1995). They also talk more about themselves (and use more excuses) when talking to high status as opposed to low status audiences (Gardner & Martinko, 1988).

Tice et al. (1995) examined how self-presentation depends on familiarity. In a laboratory study, they found that people self-enhanced more towards an audience who did not have previous knowledge about them and who thus could not verify their claims than to audiences who had previous knowledge. Does this mean that people care less about the images they project towards friends than towards strangers? Actually the contrary could be true. As suggested by Tice et al., people care about being regarded as honest by their friends and so they make sure to self-present in a way that is credible. This may mean however, that while people may <u>behave</u> modestly toward their friends, their self-presentational aspirations are <u>higher</u> towards friends than towards strangers. We tested this question directly and asked about self-presentational goals in interactions with different interaction partners.

Despite its volume, research on situational influences on self-presentation suffers from two important limitations. First, most studies have examined only a limited number of variations of situational characteristics, the ubiquitous "two by two" of social psychology. This limit, in combination with the lack of consistency across studies in both the dependent and independent variables that have been used, makes it difficult to understand how self-presentation varies across the broad range of situations that constitute people's lives. For example, if one study compares friends and strangers and another compares friends and romantic partners, it is difficult to know how self-presentation differs between strangers and romantic partners or how the three would differ when examined together.

Second, little attention has been paid to how self-presentation varies as a function of what people are doing while they are self-presenting. For example, people's self-presentational concerns might vary considerably as a function of whether they are

playing golf or eating dinner. Of course, there are some unavoidable confounds between audience and activity in such analyses. For example, people tend to have sex with opposite-sex romantic partners, not with family members or same-sex friends. Therefore, examining the self-presentational concerns people have during sex confounds activity and audience. Nevertheless, there are many activities that do not necessarily confound audience and activity. For example, people may eat dinner with all sorts of others: friends, family, romantic partners, and so forth. Therefore, on balance, we thought it would be informative to examine how self-presentation varied as a function of what people were doing while they were presenting.

Similar to other characteristics of self-presentation, there is no agreed upon definition of self-presentational success. A variety of criteria can be applied: how a self-presenter is evaluated by interaction partners or observers (Albright, Forest & Reiseter, 2001; Schlenker & Leary, 1982), others' compliance with actors' intentions (e.g., does an applicant for a job get the job, Gilmore & Ferris, 1989), and the quality of relations with colleagues (Wayne, Kacmar & Ferris, 1995).

Regardless, much of the research on self-presentational success has been done within organizational contexts, and this research has tended to define success in terms of changes in targets. For example, self-presentational success has been examined in terms of supervisors' perceptions of subordinates' competence (e.g., Wayne & Kacmar, 1981) or likability (Wayne & Liden, 1995), similarity (Wayne & Liden, 1995), and satisfaction of superiors (Wayne et al., 1995). Little attention has been paid to self-presentational success as perceived by the presenter. That is, how do people perceive the success of their self-presentations, and what effects do such perceptions have on what they think and feel about the interactions in which they have presented?

The relative lack of attention that has been paid to self-presentational success in general and to success as perceived by the presenter (aside from the considerable research on deliberate deception and non-verbal behavior) did not provide the basis for making specific

hypotheses or predictions about relationships between specific types of success and specific outcomes. Nevertheless, existing research was sufficient to provide the basis for developing expectations about the broad or general outcomes that should accompany perceived self-presentational success. First, and most directly, if people believe they are successful in creating impressions that they are friendly, likable, competent, and so forth, by implication, they should believe that audiences believe they possess these characteristics. In turn, this means that they think others value them (or at the least think positively of them during the interaction in question), and this inferred reinforcement should make people feel better about themselves and the interactions in which they are self-presenting.

From a somewhat different perspective, self-presentation represents an attempt to manipulate and control one's environment. To the extent that people believe they have been successful at conveying desired images and so forth, they have controlled their environments. A large body of research and theory (e.g., Deci, 1980) suggests that control over one's environment is rewarding, and so people should feel better about interactions in which they have self-presented successfully than they feel about interactions in which they have not been successful.

Different self-presentational strategies may be associated with different outcomes. Self-presentation itself has been found to put a strain on the self-presenter. People who managed impressions may have higher heart rate (Sheffer, Penn, & Cassisi, 2001) and may experience more stress and anxiety (James & Collins, 1997; Wilson & Eklund, 1998). Nonetheless, there may be differences between different situations and different strategies. For example, it may be easier for ingratiators to be liked than to receive enhanced performance evaluations (Kipnis & Vanderveer, 1971). Consistent with this, Godfrey, Jones, and Lord (1986) found that people were less successful when they tried to be regarded as competent than when they tried to be liked.

The present study was intended to extend existing laboratory and field research on self-presentation by examining self-presentational motivation and success in everyday social

interaction. We expected that self-presentational goals and success could be classified in terms of two broad categories, corresponding roughly to interpersonal and status focus, and that self-presentational concerns in these domains would vary as a function of the demands of the situation. We also expected that self-presentational goals (particularly in the interpersonal domain) would be more important when people were interacting with close others than when they were interacting with non-intimates. Finally, on an exploratory basis, we examined sex differences in self-presentational motives goals success, in part because of previous research on sex differences in social interaction (e.g., Nezlek, Wheeler, & Reis, 1983).

Method

Participants

One hundred and six undergraduate students, enrolled at Chemnitz University of Technology, participated in this study, receiving course credit for participation. Following inspection of their data, six participants were excluded from the analyses because of missing data. Of the remaining 100 participants, 86% were women and 98% were Caucasian. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 36 years, with a mean of 22.4 ($\underline{SD} = 3.2$).

Procedure

The procedures for the study closely followed those introduced by Wheeler and Nezlek (1977). During an introductory session, participants were told that the diary study concerned patterns of social interaction and that they would use a structured questionnaire to describe their interactions. They were told to describe every social interaction that had lasted 10 minutes 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. We provided examples 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 told to describe only face-to-face interactions. Telephone and internet conversations were excluded because we believe that the self-presentational aspects of such interactions are different from those of face-to-face interactions. Participants were told how

to access the website that was used to record their data. All instructions were available on this website, and participants were encouraged to contact the experimenters by email if they had any problems.

For 14 days, participants described their social interactions using a variant of the RIR (Wheeler & Nezlek, 1977). They reported the individuals with whom they interacted (using unique initials for each person) as well as the sex of each person, up to three people. Participants also described the relationship they had with each interaction partner: acquaintance, friend, romantic partner, family member, or other. For interactions with more than three others, they indicated how many men and women were present instead of recording individual initials. They also described the nature of the interaction: eating, going out, work, hobbies and relaxation, sex and physical affection, or other.

To assess participants' impression management goals and the impressions they thought they had made upon others, they were asked: "how important was it for you to leave the following impressions with your interaction partner(s)?" and "how do you think your interaction partner(s) perceived you?" Participants answered these questions along seven dimensions: friendly, likable, competent, intelligent, interesting, honest, and attractive. These dimensions tapped Jones and Pittman's (1982) positive self-presentation categories of ingratiation, self-promotion, and exemplification, which proved to be relevant to college students' interactions in previous research (Leary et al., 1994). We also included ratings referring to physical appearance because it is an important dimension for interactions among college students (e.g., Leary et al., 1994; Schütz & Tice, 1997). Participants also rated each interaction along nine dimensions: enjoyment, interest, intimacy, dominance, and feeling calm, safe, wanted, important, and respected. All responses were made using 9-point scales for which 1 represented less and 9 represented more of the construct being rated.

The response categories were discussed until participants understood the definitions, forms, and procedure. They were asked to complete an interaction record as soon as possible after each interaction, or at least once a day. Special forms were made available to

participants in case they had no access to the internet for a whole day (e.g., over a weekend).

At the end of the study, participants answered questions about how they had maintained the

diary (e.g., the accuracy of the diary, the reactivity of the procedure, and technical problems).

Their answers and the analysis of the log-in data suggested that participants followed

instructions and that their diaries accurately represented their social interactions.

The 100 participants whose data were retained for analysis described 4587

interactions, across an average of 11.8 days ($\underline{SD} = 1.99$). The average number of interactions

recorded per day was 3.92 ($\underline{SD} = 1.35$), a figure comparable to previous RIR diary research

(e.g., Leary et al., 1994).

<center>Results</center>

<u>Overview of Analyses</u>

The data collected in this study constituted what is called a hierarchical or nested data

structure. That is, interactions were nested within participants. Accordingly, the data were

analyzed with a random coefficient modeling technique known as hierarchical linear

modeling (HLM; Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, & Congdon, 2000), a technique designed to

analyze nested data structures. Discussions of using multilevel random coefficient modeling

to analyze social interaction diary data can be found in Nezlek (2001, 2003).

One set of analyses examined differences in self-presentational goals and success as a

function of the nature of the interaction, i.e., what was going on during the interaction (eating,

going out, work, hobbies and relaxation, sex and physical affection, and other behaviors). A

second set of analyses examined differences in goals and success as a function of the

relationships participants had with the others present (acquaintance, friend, romantic partner,

family member, or other). A third set of analyses examined relationships between success and

reactions to interactions (enjoyment, interest, intimacy, dominance, and feeling calm, safe,

wanted, important, and respected).

Although desirable, it was not possible to conduct analyses that examined the joint

effect of relational status and nature of an interaction. Conceptually, this was not possible

because some combinations of status and nature would not be expected to occur within this sample (e.g., family members and sex). Practically, it was not possible because many combinations that might be expected to occur did not occur frequently enough across all participants to provide a basis for estimating parameters. It was also not possible to examine how relationships between self-presentational success and reactions to interactions varied as a function of relational status or nature of event because there were not enough interactions of each type across all participants to provide a basis for estimating parameters for each type of relationship or activity.

In these analyses, interaction level phenomena were modeled at what is called level 1 in multilevel terminology, and interactions were units of analysis at level 1. Coefficients were estimated for each participant that represented within-person means or contrasts of interaction variables and within-person relationships between self-presentational success and reactions to interactions. Models and equations are described using the nomenclature that is standard for multilevel random coefficient modeling.

Descriptive Statistics for Self-presentational Goals and Success

To provide a better context for understanding the results of the primary analyses, descriptive statistics for the measures of self-presentational goals and success will be described before the primary analyses are presented. Descriptive statistics were taken from a series of "totally unconditional models," models in which there were no predictors at either the interaction level (level 1) or the person level (level 2) of the model. These analyses provided estimates of the mean for each measure, and more importantly, they provided estimates of the within-subject (level 1, the interaction level) and between-subject (level 2) variances. These descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1.

These data suggest that across all interactions and all participants, goals to appear friendly, likable, and honest were more important than goals to appear competent, intelligent, interesting, and attractive. Moreover, the goal to appear attractive seemed to be the least important of all. Unfortunately, means based on single item measures such as those used in

this study cannot be compared statistically with the multilevel models we used. To examine the differences and similarities of goals statistically, repeated measures analyses of variance of means aggregated within each participant were conducted because it was not possible to compare these means with the multilevel procedures we used. The results of these analyses clearly supported the conclusions stated above (all ps < .001 for comparisons of means that were described as different).

The decomposition of the variances of self-presentational goals was also revealing. For all goals except honesty, at least 60% of the total variance (between plus within) was within persons (or between interactions), whereas for honesty, only 51% of the total variance was at the interaction level. This suggests that goals to be honest varied less across interactions than other goals varied, although it should be noted that there was still meaningful variability at the interaction (within-person) level in the goal to appear honest.

A parallel series of analyses of perceived self-presentational success found similar results. Overall, participants felt that they were perceived as more friendly, likable, and honest than they were perceived as competent, intelligent, interesting, and attractive, with attractive having the lowest mean (all ps < .001 for comparisons of means that were described as different). The decomposition of the variance of self-presentational success also suggested that the bulk of the total variance for most measures was at the interaction rather than at the person level.

The similarities of the two sets of results suggested that the importance of goals and success might be positively related, and this possibility was examined by estimating within-person correlations between self-presentational motivation and success. Following procedures outlined by Bryk and Raudenbush (1992, pp. 65-70) and discussed by Nezlek (2001, 2003), the variance shared between goals and success in the same domain was estimated by comparing the residual level 1 variances from two models. The first was a totally unconditional model of success, and the second was a model in which success was predicted by goal, with goal group-mean centered.

$$y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + r_{ij}$$

$$y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j} (\text{Goal}) + r_{ij}$$

The correlation was estimated by taking the square root of the percent of variance shared by success and goal (i.e., the percent reduction in the level 1 residual variance from the first to the second model). These estimated correlations are presented in Table 1, and as can be seen from the table, most of the correlations were approximately .70, except for attractiveness, which was .83. It should be noted that these estimated correlations take into account between-person differences in both success and goal. These correlations suggest that across all interactions, self-presentational goals and success covaried closely. Although in a strict sense this was true, as will be seen in the next sets of analyses, this covariation was due in part to the fact that the importance of goals and success rose and fell together as a function of the nature of the event and the absence or presence of different relational partners.

Self -presentation and the Nature of Interactions

Participants described each interaction as being one of six types: eating, going out, work, hobbies and relaxation, sex and physical affection, and other behaviors. Such a typology represents a mutually exclusive system – a single interaction was described as belonging to only one of these six categories. For example, participants could not describe an interaction as both work and going out. The percent of interactions that feel into each of these categories was examined using multilevel techniques appropriate for categorical data (Nezlek, 2003). These analyses estimated the following percents: eating (16), going out (08), work (16), hobbies and relaxation (18), sex and physical affection (04), and other behaviors (37).

As discussed by Nezlek (2001, 2003), social interaction diary data that can be classified with a mutually exclusive system can be analyzed with models in which a dependent measure is predicted by a series of dummy-coded variables, one variable for each category in the system. For example, for interactions that were described as a meal (eating), the Eating variable was set to 1, and the other variables were set to 0. Self-presentational

goals and successes were analyzed with the following zero-intercept level 1 (interaction level) model:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_{1j}(Eating) + \beta_{2j}(Go\ Out) + \beta_{3j}(Work) + \beta_{4j}(Relax) + \beta_{5j}(Sex) + \beta_{6j}(Other) + r_{ij}.$$

Deleting the intercept meant that each coefficient represented the mean of the dependent variables for interactions of each type. The Eating coefficient represented the mean for interactions that occurred during a meal, and so forth.

Differences in the importance of goals and successes across different types of interactions were examined with a series of multiparameter tests of fixed effects (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992, pp. 48-56; Nezlek, 2003). Such tests work by testing to see if a constraint leads to a poorer fit of a model. For example, does constraining the difference between two parameters, such as the mean concern for being attractive to others when at work and sex, to 0 lead to a poorer fit? In the case of constraining the difference between two means to be 0, a significant chi-square means that the means are significantly different. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 2.

Differences in the importance of self-presentational goals can be summarized by describing a few patterns. First, during sexual encounters, compared to other types of interactions, participants were the most concerned about appearing attractive and being interesting, and they were the least concerned about appearing competent and intelligent. In contrast, at work, compared to other types of interactions, participants were the most concerned about appearing intelligent and competent, and they were the least concerned about appearing attractive and interesting. When going out, compared to other types of interactions, participants tended to be more concerned about being friendly and liked. As suggested by the unconditional models used to generate the descriptive statistics, there was relatively less variability across different types of interactions in the importance of the goal to appear honest than there was for other goals. In contrast, there was considerable variability across different types of interactions in the importance of the goal to appear attractive. In fact, all six types of interactions were significantly different from each other in terms of how

important it was to be attractive.

As would be expected from the positive correlations between goal importance and success, differences across types of interactions in perceived self-presentational success were somewhat similar to differences in the importance of self-presentational goals (see table 3). For example, there was relatively little variability across types of interactions in how honestly participants believed they were perceived, whereas there was considerable variability in how attractive they believed they were perceived. Participants believed that they were seen as more attractive and interesting in interactions involving sex than in other types of interactions. For other domains, differences in success were not quite as sharp as differences in motives. For example, success in appearing to be competent and intelligent were highest at work, but work and going out interactions did not differ on these two ratings, whereas in the analyses of motives, work and going out did differ.

Self-presentation and Relationships with Others

Participants described up to three different individuals for each interaction, and these descriptions included the nature of the relationship they had with the other people present. To provide a sense of the frequency with which different types of interactional partners appeared, a series of analyses were done to estimate the percent of interactions involving each type of partner. These analyses produced the following estimates: romantic (26), friend (36), family (20), acquaintance (27), other (11). It should also be noted that approximately 59% of interactions were dyads.

In contrast to the mutually exclusive system provided by descriptions of the nature of interactions, these descriptions of relationships produced a non-exclusive (overlapping) categorical system. That is, a single interaction could involve people with up to three different types of relationships. This ruled out using the zero-intercept, dummy-coded model used for the analyses of nature. Instead, self-presentational motives and successes were analyzed with a series of models that contained contrast coded predictors representing the

presence or absence of each type of relationship (1 = relationship present, -1 = relationship not present). These predictors were entered uncentered.

$$y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{Romantic}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{Friend}) + \beta_{3j}(\text{Family})$$
$$+ \beta_{4j}(\text{Acquaintance}) + \beta_{5j}(\text{Other}) + r_{ij}.$$

This meant that each coefficient represented the effect of the presence of each type of relational partner, adjusted for the presence of other relational partners (Nezlek, 2003). Interactions in which no relationships were described (i.e., most group interactions) were excluded from these analyses, leaving a sample of 4514 interactions. The results of these analyses of self-presentational motives and success are summarized in Tables 4 and 5 respectively.

When interacting with romantic partners, participants were more concerned about being liked, interesting, and attractive, and they felt that they were more liked and were seen as more interesting and attractive than when a romantic partner was not present. In contrast, when interacting with family members, participants were less concerned about being interesting and attractive and felt that they were seen as less interesting and attractive than when a family member was not present. When interacting with acquaintances or others, participants were more concerned about appearing competent and intelligent, and less concerned about appearing honest.

Interestingly, there were no effects for the presence of acquaintances or others in the analyses of success at being perceived as competent or intelligent, although participants did feel that they were perceived as less honest when acquaintances or others were present than when they were not. Finally, when a friend was present, participants were more concerned about being liked and being seen as friendly and interesting than when a friend was not present, although in the analyses of success, the presence of a friend was associated only with being seen as more liked.

Relationships between Self-presentational Success and Reactions to Interactions

In addition to descriptions of self-presentational goals and success, participants also rated each interaction on nine dimensions: enjoyment, interest, intimacy, dominance/control, and feeling calm/relaxed, safe/secure, liked, important, and respected. One of our primary concerns was to examine how people's reactions to interactions varied as a function of their self-presentational success. Such relationships were examined with series of models in which reactions to interactions were predicted by self-presentational success across the 7 domains participants described.

$$y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{Friendly}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{Liked}) + \beta_{3j}(\text{Competent}) + \beta_{4j}(\text{Intelligent})$$
$$+ \beta_{5j}(\text{Interesting}) + \beta_{6j}(\text{Honest}) + \beta_{7j}(\text{Attractive}) + r_{ij}.$$

These models were used to estimate sets of coefficients representing the relationship between successes and outcomes for each participant. The predictors were entered group mean centered, which meant that individual differences in the predictors did not contribute to parameter estimates (Nezlek, 2001, 2003). These coefficients are conceptually similar to within-person regression coefficients, although they were more accurate than within-person regression coefficients would have been (e.g., Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992). The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 6.

Overall, these analyses suggested that self-presentational success was associated with more positive and rewarding interactions. Being perceived as friendly and likable seemed to be the most reliable and strongest predictors of positive experiences in social interaction, whereas being perceived as competent and attractive were the weakest and most inconsistent predictors. Enjoyment was most strongly associated with being liked and friendly ($p < .01$); whereas intimacy and being respected were most strongly associated with being perceived as likable and honest ($ps < .01$).

Some of the most striking results were the consistent negative relationships between success at appearing intelligent and reactions to interactions (enjoyment, intimacy, being liked, feeling secure, and feeling respected). At face value, these relationships may seem a bit

unusual; however, to an extent, these differences may have reflected differences in reactions and success across different types of activities. As demonstrated above, participants felt that they had been seen as more intelligent at work, and additional analyses found that they enjoyed work interactions less, found them less intimate, and so forth compared to other types of interactions. In this instance, type of interaction served as a sort of "third variable" that could explain the bivariate relationships between success at being intelligent and reactions to interactions.

Examining these results in terms of reactions (i.e., rows in Table 6) suggested that self-presentational success was least strongly related to feeling in control (5 coefficients were not significant) and feeling relaxed (4 coefficients were not significant). Such a difference was also suggested by examining the reduction in residual variance in outcomes that could be attributed to success. (See Nezlek, 2001, for a discussion of the possible limitations of this procedure.) This was done by comparing the level-1 (interaction level) residual variance from the analyses described above with the residual level-1 variance from a totally unconditional model, i.e., a model in which there were no predictors. These results are presented in the last column of Table 6. As can be seen from these data, differences across reactions in the percent of variance shared by the reactions and success were consistent with differences in the number of significant predictors described above. The residual error variance was reduced only 26% for control and 21% for relaxed, whereas for all the other measures the reduction was greater than 30%.

Sex differences

As noted in the introduction, sex differences were examined on an exploratory basis. There was insufficient theory and research to justify firm hypotheses; nevertheless, given the prominence of sex differences in other studies of naturally occurring social interaction, we thought it was appropriate to exam them. Sex differences were examined by including a contrast coded variable representing participant's sex in the level 2 equation of the analyses examining differences in self-presentational goals and success as a function of activity and

interaction partner.

Although there were no consistent sex differences, there were some patterns. For women, compared to men, it was more important (all ps < .05) to appear friendly, liked, interesting, and attractive during relaxation (e.g., informal social events), and correspondingly, women felt more successful in being friendly, liked, and attractive in relaxation than men (all ps < .05). Moreover, women felt more successful than men at being physically attractive when eating, relaxing, and in miscellaneous (other) interactions. There were very few significant sex differences in terms of the impact of the presence of certain relational partners. The only somewhat consistent finding was that men felt that they had been more successful than women in appearing interesting when with friends, family members, acquaintances, and others, although not with romantic partners.

Discussion

When he introduced the study of impression management several decades ago, Erving Goffman (1959) suggested that self-presentation should be studied in everyday encounters. For whatever set of reasons, this advice was not heeded, and the present study was designed to complement the host of laboratory studies on self-presentation and to provide some insight into self-presentation in day to day interactions. Our results suggested that self-presentational goals and successes systematically covary with activities and interaction partners. Self-reported goals were especially high in interactions with close others, and self-perceived success was also high in such interactions.

Starting at a broad level, across all interactions, some goals were more important than others. People were more concerned about appearing friendly, likable, and honest, and they were less concerned about appearing competent, intelligent, interesting, and attractive. Although more research is needed to determine why this occurred, these differences may reflect different domains for which the two groups of characteristics are relevant. Being perceived as friendly, likable, and honest clearly make someone a more desirable partner for socializing. In contrast, being perceived as competent, intelligent, and attractive are

characteristics that refer more to an individual's personal attributes (or individual social value) than to how they interact with others. Although more competent and attractive people may be more sought after as interaction partners than less competent and attractive people, friendliness, likability, and honesty are characteristics that are explicitly embedded in a social context. Such a difference is consistent with the growing body of research that indicates that being accepted by a group is a powerful motive that may have its roots in our evolutionary past (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). People want to be accepted, and they are motivated to present themselves in ways that make acceptance more likely.

A distinction between two broad classes of self-presentational goals, those focused on ensuring good relations and those focused on ensuring a good reputation, recall various distinctions between social/affective and task/instrumental aspects of interaction. Such distinctions have a long history, ranging from Freud's "Arbeit und Liebe" (Work and Love) to Bales' (1950) work on group processes to work on leadership (e.g., Katz & Kahn, 1978) to work on interpersonal styles (e.g., Spence, 1984). In terms of naturally occurring social interaction, Nezlek and Reis (1999), found that socio-emotional and instrumental reactions to interactions formed separate factors that were related in different ways to psychological well-being. A similar distinction has been invoked by evolutionary psychologists who have suggested that depression (as a manifestation of rejection) has two distinct sources (e.g., Gilbert, 1988). One source reflects insecurity in one's social ranking (e.g., competence), and the other reflects insecurity in one's attachments (e.g., being liked).

The possibility that two such dimensions underlie social interaction and by implication, self-presentation, is consistent with the suggestion of Schlenker (1980), and it suggests that the motivational basis for self-presentation introduced over 20 years ago by Jones and Pittman (1982) needs to be re-evaluated. Although their typology has proved valuable, it may be useful to consider other bases as a means of understanding the motives underlying people's self-presentations. Such a re-evaluation may not lead to a discarding of Jones and Pittman's typology; rather, it may lead to a change in the number of motives and

strategies, a change reflecting the recognition of different motivational bases.

In general, self-presentational success covaried with self-presentational goals. That is, people were usually more successful in interactions in which they had higher goals. On the one hand this may reflect a general relation between goals and performance. People tend to expend more effort when they have goals. On the other hand, these relationships may reflect people's attempt to be consistent. Participants reported interactions once a day and retrospectively described goals and successes simultaneously. This may have lead people to make their goals and successes consistent, even in the absence of an audience, and their reports of their success may have reflected such a bias. This bias might be reduced if people provided reports during or immediately after events, such as occurs during "beeper" studies, in which people provide data when signaled. See Wheeler and Reis (1991) for a discussion of the relative advantages of different types of naturalistic data recording techniques.

In addition to these general trends, there were numerous findings that highlighted the importance of distinguishing interactions in terms of activities and interactional partners. As expected, when participants were working they were more concerned with creating a positive impression in terms of task and instrumental dimensions (intelligence, competence, etc.) than during other types of interactions. In contrast, in more socially focused interactions (e.g., going out with friends), they were more concerned with socio-emotional dimensions (being liked and friendly) than in other types of interactions. Interestingly, during sexual interactions, participants were more concerned about what could be considered impressions concerning their social value (e.g., being attractive and interesting) than they were in other types of interactions, and follow-up analyses found no sex differences in these tendencies.

Although differences in motives as a function of the people present during an interaction tended to parallel differences across activities, they also provided a slightly different perspective. For example, when with a romantic partner, participants were concerned about being attractive and interesting – just as they were during sexual interactions; however, when interacting with romantic partners they were also concerned

about being liked – a concern that was conspicuously absent during sexual interactions. When with acquaintances or others (a catch-all category representing no relationship), participants were concerned about status issues, e.g., appearing competent and intelligent, a difference that corresponded to concerns about work-related interactions. Family members were associated with (sharply) diminished concerns about being seen as attractive and interesting, but curiously, there were no effects on measures of other concerns. Families may not provide the universal safe haven that many assume they do.

To our knowledge, the present study is the first to examine relationships between self-presentational success in interaction and reactions to interaction. Broadly speaking, self-presentational success was associated with more positive reactions to interactions, although these relationships varied somewhat as a joint function of the nature of success and the reaction being considered. Being perceived as friendly, liked, honest, and interesting was positively related to most of the outcomes we measured (7or 8 out of 9). These relationships suggest that for the types of interactions participants had, which were primarily socially focused rather than task focused, presenting ones' self in a way that enhances one's social acceptance leads to feel more positively about their interactions and themselves. Recall that some reactions concerned more interpersonal aspects of the interaction (e.g., enjoyment, intimacy), whereas other reactions concerned more intrapersonal reactions (e.g., feeling relaxed and secure).

Our results were not so clear when considering reactions that concerned more status or task focused aspects. For example, perceived control over interactions was related only to success in being perceived as competent and interesting; relationships that are consistent with some of the previous findings. In contrast, being respected, which would seem to be an explicitly status focused reaction, was positively related to success in all domains except being perceived as attractive. Perhaps most interesting was the consistent negative relationships between being perceived as intelligent and five of the nine reactions (the other four relationships were not significant). Intelligence is clearly a status focused characteristic

in contemporary society, and these data suggest that being perceived as intelligent has its costs. To complicate matters even further, in contrast to these results, being perceived as competent (another seemingly status focused outcome) was positively related to five of nine reactions, reactions that included enjoyment (socio-emotional) and control (instrumental).

The relative lack of clarity of our results concerning self-presentation in terms of the status or instrumental domains of interaction may reflect the fact that the vast majority of participants' interactions were more socially focused and status concerns are not that salient for social interaction. Only 15% of interactions were described as work. It should be noted that although this percent may seem low due to the fact that this was a collegiate sample, additional analyses of interactions of adults (data originally presented in Reis, Lin, Bennett, & Nezlek, 1993) found that for adults, the percent of work interactions was only 22. Moreover, it is possible (perhaps likely) that many interactions that occur within the workplace are socially focused. Studying status focused aspects of interaction may require sampling procedures that obtain more status focused interactions than occur within the normal course of people's lives.

The multilevel analyses we used also allowed us to separate within- and between-person variances in self-presentational motives and successes – something that is not possible within a single level data set in which motives are assessed only once or in only one setting. For most goals, 30% or less of the total variance was at the person level – for appearing intelligent it was 40% and for honesty it was approximately 50%. This suggests that relative importance of situational and personal factors in the importance of self-presentational goals depends on the domain the self-presentation concerns, with situational factors being more important than personal factors for most of the motives we measured. This greater salience of situational over personal factors is particularly noteworthy given the fact that only a small minority of interactions were work focused, and as discussed above, self-presentational goals during work interactions may be different than those that are present during socially focused interactions.

For appearing honest (and to a lesser extent appearing intelligent), the between person variance was relatively greater than the within person (situational) variance for other measures, suggesting that these goals may be somewhat more "traited" than other goals. Given the lack of attention to the relative strength of personal vs. situational influences on self-presentational motives, it is difficult to speculate about these differences. Moreover, there was meaningful between person variance for the importance of other goals, suggesting that there might be reliable individual differences in these goals also. Examining individual differences in the importance of these goals is the next logical step in investigating self-presentation in every day social interaction.

Despite its strengths, the present study has important limitations. First, although self-presentation to various types of relational partners was examined, the types of relationships that were examined were not exhaustive. For example, participants did not provide sufficient data to distinguish self-presentation to mothers and fathers or to sisters and brothers. Moreover, certain types of relationships (e.g., spouses) were not studied at all, and given the importance and centrality of marriages to people's lives, it is quite possible that the self-presentational processes that occur with spouses are different from those that occur with other people.

Along similar lines, given the age of the sample, many of the relationships participants had with peers had probably been established in the past few years. It is quite possible that self-presentational processes vary as a function of how well acquainted people are (i.e., how long they have known each other, Tice et al., 1995). Also, most participants were in their late teens and early twenties and may have been in the midst of resolving the types of psychosocial crises described by Erikson (1959), either identity formation or making decisions about intimacy and isolation. People's status in terms of both of these domains would seem to be relevant to the self-presentations they would want to make. Also, a large majority of the present sample were women. Although analyses that took this into account found no sex differences in the results we reported, this does not rule out the possibility that

the sexual composition of our sample influenced the results.

The present results suggest that self-presentational processes vary as a function of what people are doing and with whom they are doing it – leading to the question of which of these two is the more important consideration. Although it may be possible to separate these two types of influences for some specific combinations (e.g., relaxing with close friends vs. working with close friends), it may not be possible to isolate the relative contributions for others. For example, for many people sexual activity is confounded with the presence of a romantic partner or someone of the opposite sex. In such cases, determining the influence of each factor will need to be guided by sound theory and the integration of research about other topics or research from other domains.

Finally, in this study we measured how successfully people thought they had created certain impressions, what is typically referred to as "metaperception". For present purposes, this was a valid and appropriate focus. In the types of everyday social contacts we studied, it is probably uncommon for people to seek explicit confirmation of how successfully they have created certain impressions. They probably assess situations and arrive at summary judgments based on a host of factors, and these summary judgments serve as the basis for evaluating or reacting to the interaction. Existing research on metaperception suggests that how accurately people understand how others see them varies as a function of numerous factors, including, but not limited to the nature of the judgment being made (e.g., traits vs. affect; Kenny & DePaulo, 1993) and the specific relationship shared by the actor and the target (e.g., Levesque, 1997). The present data did not allow such distinctions, and such questions are important and should be the focus of future research.

Despite these limitations, we believe that the present study and results meaningfully extend our understanding of self-presentation while they also challenge us to consider new ways of thinking about and studying self-presentation. Existing research about self-presentation consists primarily of laboratory based studies, and although this knowledge base has been and will remain valuable, it needs to be complemented by more studies of the

presentation of self in everyday life, the title of the book that basically started it all. We envision an ebb and flow of laboratory and field work regarding self-presentation. The results of studies using one approach should serve as stimuli for studies using the another, and we hope that this study serves that purpose.

References

Albright, L., Forest, C., & Reiseter, K. (2001). Acting, behaving, and the selfless basis of
metaperception. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 81, 910-921.

Bales, R. F. (1950). Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

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

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

Deci, E. L. (1980). The psychology of self-determination. Lexington, MA: Heath.

DePaulo, B. M. (1992). Nonverbal behavior and self-presentation. Psychological Bulletin,
111, 203-243.

Doherty, K., & Schlenker, B.R. (1991). Self-consciousness and strategic self-presentation.
Journal of Personality, 59, 1-18.

Erikson, E. E. (1959). Identity and the life cycle. Psychological Issues, 1, 1-171.

Gardner, W. L., & Martinko, M. J. (1988). Impression Management: An observational study
linking audience characteristics with verbal self-presentations. Academy of
Management Journal, 31, 42-65.

Gilbert, P. (1988). Psychobiological interaction in depression. In S. Fisher & J. Reason (Eds),
Handbook of life stress, cognition, and health. pp. 231-262. New York: Wiley.

Gilmore, D. C., & Ferris, G. R. (1989). The effects of applicant impression management
tactics on interviewer judgments. Journal of Management, 15, 557-564.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Oxford: England Doubleday.

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

James, B., & Collins, D. (1997). Self-presentational sources of competitive stress during
performance. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 19, 17-35.

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 Associates.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations, 2 ed. Wiley: New York.

Kenny, D. A., & DePaulo, B. M. (1993). Do people know how others view them? An empirical and theoretical account. Psychological Bulletin, 114, 145-161.

Kipnis, D., & Vanderveer, R. (1971). Ingratiation and the use of power. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 17, 280-286.

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.

Levesque, M. J. (1997). Meta-accuracy among acquainted individuals: A social relations analysis of interpersonal perception and metaperception. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 72, 66-74.

Mori, De A., Chaiken, S., & Pliner, P. (1987). "Eating lightly" and the self-presentation of femininity. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 53, 693-702.

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. (2003). Using multilevel random coefficient modeling to analyze social interaction diary data. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 20, 437-469.

Nezlek, J. B., & Reis, H. T. (June, 1999). Causal relationships between quality and quantity of social interaction and psychological well being. International Network On Personal Relationships Conference, Louisville, KY.

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.

Raudenbush, S. W., Bryk, A. S., Cheong, Y. F., & Congdon, R. (2000). HLM. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software.

Reis, H. T., Lin, Y., Bennett, E. S., & Nezlek, J. B. (1993). Change and consistency in social participation during early adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 633-645.

Reis, H. T., & Gable, S. L. (2000). Event sampling and other methods for studying daily experience. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology (pp. 190-222). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schlenker, B. R. (2002). Self-presentation. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds), Handbook of self and identity. (pp. 492-518). New York: Guilford.

Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1982). Audiences' reactions to self-enhancing, self-denigrating and accurate self-presentations. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,18(1), 89-104.

Schütz, A., & Tice, D. M. (1997). Associative and competitive self-enhancement in close relationships moderated by trait self-esteem. European Journal of Social Psychology, 27, 257-273.

Sheffer, C. E., Penn, D. L., & Cassisi, J. E. (2001). The effects of impression management demands on heart rate, self reported social anxiety, and social competence in undergraduate males. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 15, 171-182.

Spence, J. T. (1984). Masculinity, femininity, and gender-related traits: A conceptual analysis and critique of current research. Progress in Experimental Personality Research, 13, 1-97.

Tice, D. M., Butler, J. L., Muraven, M. B., & Stilwell, A. M. (1995). When modesty prevails: Differential favorability of self-presentation to friends and strangers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 1120-1138.

Vonk, R. (2001). Aversive self-presentations. In R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), <u>Behaving badly: Aversive behaviors in interpersonal relationships</u>, (pp. 79-116). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wayne, S. J., & Kacmar, K. M. (1981). The effects of impression management on the performance appraisal process. <u>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 48,</u> 70-88.

Wayne, S. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1995). Coworkers response to others' ingratiation attempts. <u>Journal of Managerial Issues, 7,</u> 277-289.

Wayne, S. J., & Liden, R. C. (1995). Effects of impression management on performance ratings: A longitudinal study. <u>Academy of Management Journal, 38,</u> 232-260.

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

Wheeler, L., & Reis, H. (1991). Self-recording of everyday life events: Origins, types, and uses. <u>Journal of Personality</u>, <u>59</u>, 339-354.

Wilson, P., & Eklund, R. C. (1998). The relationship between competitive anxiety and self-presentational concerns. <u>Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 20,</u> 81-97.

Authors' Notes

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Self-presentational Motives and Success

	Motives			Success			
Domain	Intercept	Between	Within	Intercept	Between	Within	Corr.
Friendly	7.56	.61 (28)	1.55 (72)	7.28	.50 (21)	1.84 (79)	.72
Liked	7.52	.60 (27)	1.62 (73)	7.27	.54 (23)	1.77 (77)	.73
Competent	6.43	1.34 (39)	2.08 (61)	6.19	1.14 (39)	1.78 (61)	.68
Intelligent	6.45	1.30 (40)	1.97 (60)	6.30	1.13 (42)	1.54 (58)	.70
Interesting	6.53	.99 (30)	2.28 (70)	6.27	.87 (30)	2.07 (70)	.72
Honest	7.65	1.25 (48)	1.33 (52)	7.51	1.15 (46)	1.33 (54)	.67
Attractive	5.36	1.03 (22)	3.64 (78)	5.42	1.96 (45)	2.83 (55)	.83

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent the percent of total variance at each level of analysis.

Table 2

Self-presentational Motives Across Different Activities

Domain	Eat	Going Out	Work	Relax	Sex	Other
Friendly	7.61bc	7.85a	7.51bc	7.72ab	7.32c	7.45c
Liked	7.54c	7.90a	7.46c	7.68b	7.38c	7.40c
Competent	6.17c	6.45b	7.10a	6.41b	5.92c	6.31b
Intelligent	6.28c	6.60b	7.06a	6.44b	5.37d	6.36c
Interesting	6.38d	7.18b	6.45d	6.72c	7.82a	6.29d
Honest	7.67ab	7.68ab	7.52bc	7.71a	7.63abc	7.66ab
Attractive	5.30d	6.40b	4.83f	5.74c	7.95a	5.00e

Note: Within rows, means sharing a subscript were not significantly different at $p < .05$.

Table 3

Differences in Self-presentational Success Across Different Activities

Domain	Eat	Going Out	Work	Relax	Sex	Other
Friendly	7.37b	7.58a	7.12c	7.45ab	7.39abc	7.15c
Liked	7.32b	7.54a	7.12c	7.43ab	7.47ab	7.12c
Competent	6.17bc	6.29ab	6.39a	6.21b	6.03c	6.12bc
Intelligent	6.30bc	6.48ab	6.52a	6.33bc	5.67d	6.25c
Interesting	6.19d	6.79b	6.07d	6.46c	7.45a	6.10d
Honest	7.52a	7.54a	7.38b	7.57a	7.63a	7.52a
Attractive	5.43d	6.26b	4.85f	5.78c	7.65a	5.16e

Note: Means sharing a subscript were not significantly different at $p < .05$.

Table 4

Coefficients Representing the Effects of the Presence of Different Interaction Partners on

Self-presentational Motives

Domain	Romantic	Friend	Family	Acquaint	Other
Friendly	.06[a]	.09**	.05	.00	.03
Liked	.10**	.13**	-.03	-.02	.03
Competent	-.04	-.02	-.01	.13**	.21**
Intelligent	-.04	.05	.04	.17**	.27**
Interesting	.28**	.10**	-.25**	.02	.00
Honest	.10*	.05	-.02	-.14**	-.13**
Attractive	.94**	.09	-.42**	.00	-.04

Note: * significant at $p < .05$ or beyond, ** significant at $p < .01$ or beyond, [a] significant at $p < .10$.

Table 5

Coefficients Representing the Effects of the Presence of Different Interaction Partners on

Self-presentational Success

Domain	Romantic	Friend	Family	Acquaint	Other
Friendly	.05	.05	-.02	-.01	-.07a
Liked	.09*	.07*	-.02	-.06a	-.08*
Competent	-.05	-.06	.03	.00	-.05
Intelligent	-.03	.00	.08*	.02	-.02
Interesting	.20**	.02	-.19**	-.09*	-.17**
Honest	.06a	.00	-.07*	-.17**	-.22**
Attractive	.78**	-.01	-.35**	-.10*	-.12*

Note: * significant at $p < .05$ or beyond, ** significant at $p < .01$ or beyond

Table 6

Self-presentational Success as a Predictor of Interaction Outcomes

Outcome	Intercept	Friendly	Likable	Interesting	Competent	Intelligent	Honest	Attractive	Shared Variance
Enjoy	7.06	.38	.24	.14	.06	-.12	.09	.07	41
Intimacy	6.77	.14	.29	.14	-.03 [x]	-.13	.27	.13	37
Liked	7.64	.06 [x]	.27	.11	.03 [x]	-.09	.16	.06	39
Relaxed	6.86	.30	.18	-.03 [x]	.07	.01 [x]	.06 [x]	-.05 [x]	26
Secure	7.28	.14	.21	.12	.09	-.08	.18	.00 [x]	32
Interested	7.08	.13	.13	.21	.04 [x]	-.03 [x]	.19	.03	32
Control	5.37	-.02 [x]	.00 [x]	.07	.16	.03 [x]	-.04 [x]	.00 [x]	21
Respected	7.40	.10	.24	.08	.06	-.04	.18	.03 [x]	41
Important	6.53	.07	.06 [x]	.18	.07	.05 [x]	.13	.09	33

Note: All slopes except those marked with "x" were significantly different from 0 at $p < .05$.