



133
763
THS

THESIS



1
1333

This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
WHO DID YOU SAY YOU WERE?
SELF-CONSTRUAL AND SELF-PRESENTATION:
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE INTERVIEW SITUATION

presented by

Jennifer A. Butler

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Masters degree in Communication

A handwritten signature in cursive that reads "Steven M. Witt".

Major professor

Date 5-5-99

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
JAN 13 2001		
JUN 22 2001		
JUL 13 2005		

**WHO DID YOU SAY YOU WERE? SELF-CONSTRUAL AND
SELF-PRESENTATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE INTERVIEW SITUATION**

By

Jennifer A. Butler

A THESIS

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Communication Arts and Sciences

1999

ABSTRACT

WHO DID YOU SAY YOU WERE? SELF-CONSTRUAL AND SELF-PRESENTATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE INTERVIEW SITUATION

By

Jennifer A. Butler

This study sought to identify differences between verbal self-presentation styles employed by individuals with either independent or interdependent self-construals. Subjects participated in a brief phone interview for the possibility of receiving an award of recognition and money. Participants' interview responses were content coded for self-promoting and others-promoting statements. Individuals who construed the self independently self-promoted more than individuals who construed the self interdependently. Whereas, very little others-promotion occurred throughout these interviews for individuals with both independent and interdependent self-construals. Suggestions are offered for understanding the lack of others-promotion, as well as the implications for cultural influences on self-presentation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES.....	26
Appendix A.....	27
Appendix B.....	28
Appendix C.....	29
Appendix D.....	30
Appendix E.....	31
Appendix F.....	33
Appendix G.....	34
LIST OF FIGURES.....	35
Mean number of thoughts as a function of self-construal and self- presentation style.....	36
INTRODUCTION.....	01
CHAPTER 1	
SELF-CONSTRUAL AND CULTURE.....	03
SELF-PRESENTATION IN INTERVIEW SETTINGS.....	06
THE PRESENT STUDY AND HYPOTHESES.....	07
CHAPTER 2	
METHOD.....	09
Subjects and Design.....	09
Procedure.....	09
RESULTS.....	11
DISCUSSION.....	14
Contributions of the Present Study.....	16
Future Research.....	17
REFERENCES.....	19

INTRODUCTION

Self-presentation is the strategic communication of information about oneself to others in order to elicit a desired impression. Baumeister (1982) identified two major self-presentational motives: desire to please one's audience and "construct one's public self congruent to one's ideal" (p. 3). Self-presentation has also been described as controlling others' impressions of oneself (Higgins 1996; Schlenker, 1980). In short, self-presentation may be employed for various reasons. However, the construction of a public self that is congruent with one's desired self will be emphasized (Baumeister, 1982; Higgins, 1996; Leary, 1993; Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). The desired self is often described by self-presentational models as how one wants to be seen by others (Leary, 1993). However, the way one wants to be seen by others and the strategies used to attain desired impressions of the self may vary depending upon individual differences. Self-construal may be one individual difference factor that explains variation in self-presentation.

An "independent" self-construal has been explained as viewing the self as bounded, unitary, unique, autonomous and stable (Geertz, 1975; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Sharkey & Singelis, 1995). Internal abilities, thoughts and feelings, self expression and personal uniqueness, promoting personal goals, a realization of internal attributes, and a directness in communication often characterize the focus of independent self-construal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis, 1994; Singelis & Sharkey, 1995). Kim, Sharkey and Singelis (1994) explained that the basis for an independent self-construal rests on the ability to self-express and verify one's internal attributes. In sum,

the independent view of self may be explained as separate from others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

An “interdependent” self-construal can be characterized as variable and flexible (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis, 1994). Goals such as fitting into a group and acting appropriately during various situations are often associated with interdependent self-construals. Interdependent self-construals also focus on external elements such as status, roles, and relationships and typically utilize an indirect communication style (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis, 1994; Singelis & Sharkey, 1995). Ultimately, seeing oneself as connected with others may best describe an interdependent view of the self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

This study seeks to identify differences between verbal self-presentational strategies employed by individuals with either independent or interdependent self-construals. Self-construal and self-presentation have been studied independently, however these two concepts have not been examined in relationship to each other. Several studies have considered the influence self-presentation may have on the self (Berzonsky, 1995; Jones, Rhodewalt, Berglas, & Skelton, 1981; McKillop, Berzonsky, Schlenker, 1992; Rhodewalt, 1986; Rhodewalt & Agustsdottir, 1986; Schlenker & Trudeau, 1990), yet no one has considered how self-construal may influence verbal self-presentation. Understanding how self-construal affects self-presentation not only is theoretically interesting but may have numerous implications for the interview situation and provide an explanation for some of the challenges faced by interviewers and interviewees.

CHAPTER 1

Self-construal and Culture

Although little research has established a link between culture, self construal, and behavior, some research has shown that self construal differs from culture to culture (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, Marsella, DeVos, & Hsu, 1985; Shweder & Levine, 1984). Markus and Kitayama (1991) explained that culture affects the construal of self and the way in which we see others. For example, cultures that promote connection with community, such as collectivist cultures, steer members of those cultures to develop an interdependent view of the self. That is, collectivist cultures foster interdependent self-construals. On the other hand, cultures that advance individual achievement and responsibility, such as individualistic cultures, lead members of those cultures to view themselves as separate and independent from others. Thus, individualistic cultures encourage the development of independent self-construals. For all practical purposes, predictions for differences in self-concept and behavior for individuals from collectivist or individualist cultures will be the same as for individuals with interdependent or independent self-construals, respectively.

Triandis, McCusker, and Hui (1990) found that the content of the self in collectivist cultures contained more “group-linked” components than for those from individualistic cultures. For example, individuals from collectivist cultures might describe themselves as part of a family (e.g. “I am a son”) or religious group (e.g. “I am Roman Catholic”). Triandis et. al (1990) also noted that collectivists often define the self as an “appendage of the ingroup,” however, individualists see the self as separate and distinct. Self-construal also has a similar effect on self-content. Singelis and Brown

(1995) demonstrated that collectivists or individuals with interdependent self-construals often use contextual information such as interpersonal relationships, situations, group associations and activities to describe themselves. On the other hand, individualists or individuals with independent self-construals tend to describe themselves using descriptions free of context such as abilities, traits, and personal style.

Not only does culture influence personal descriptions of the self, but research has suggested that culture also influences attributions of success (Berzonsky, 1995; Kashima, Siegal, Tanaka, & Kashima, 1992; Miller, 1984; Triandis, 1993; Triandis, Bontempo, & Villareal, 1988). For example, an individual from a collectivist culture often attributes success to help from others or other external factors. Personal success necessarily includes achievement for the group. On the other hand, an individualist will often attribute success to personal ability. In addition, they explain their behavior internally and reference their personality, traits, principles, and attitudes (Triandis, 1993). In sum, Triandis, Bontempo, & Villareal (1988) noted that for individualistic cultures, achievement rests within the individual while those from collectivist cultures believe that groups achieve.

Self-construal becomes even more important to understand when considering its presumed influence upon behavior. Much empirical research suggests a link between the self and behavior (Kraut, 1973; Miller, Brickman, & Bolen, 1975; Shotland & Berger, 1970). For example, Wicklund & Gollwitzer (1982) found peoples' behavior typically consistent with their definition of self. Markus and Kitayama (1991) explained that self-knowledge directs behavior. For example, the interdependent self would behave with respect to others in certain settings. Wicklund and Gollwitzer (1982) claim that the way

in which one defines the self typically leads to behavior that is consistent with the definition of self. In addition, Greenwald, Carnot, Beach, and Young (1987) found that people who labeled themselves as a person who commits a certain behavior would then in turn be more likely to participate in the behavior. Thus, it follows that the way in which one construes the self (i.e. independent or interdependent) directly influences behavior.

Singelis and Brown (1995) specifically established a connection between culture, the self, and communication behavior. They demonstrated that cultural effects can be traced throughout one's self-construal and ultimately behavior. In particular, Singelis and Brown tested a path-analytic model that linked cultural collectivism with interdependent self-construals and communication behavior. Singelis and Brown found support for the idea that a collectivist culture is positively related to an interdependent self-construal and ultimately high-context communication behavior such as sending information that is dependent upon the context or personal internalization for intended meaning. Based on these results and previous research, it seems logical to conclude that culture (collectivism or individualism) influences self-construal (interdependence or independence) which in turn affects communication behavior.

In sum, the literature demonstrates that the self-conceptions have an impact upon thought and behavior. Therefore, one's self-construal may affect self-presentational style. Individuals who construe the self independently may self-present differently than individuals who construe the self interdependently. The literature has demonstrated that often culture is manifest at the individual level of self-construal (i.e. independent vs. interdependent). Thus, this study sought to focus on how differences in self-construal might influence the communication behavior of self-presentation.

Self-presentation in Interview Settings

The interview provides a natural setting for self-presentation. Eder, Kacmar, and Ferris (1989) described the employment interview as one of the recruitment tools most frequently used by organizations. Typically, the first interview or screening interview is kept short (Miller & Buzzanell, 1996) and includes an opportunity for individuals to present themselves to a potential employer. Miller and Buzzanell (1996) explained that self-presentation is a dimension of impression management for the interview. The focus of seeking to persuade others to adopt one's constructed images of the self through information giving and political behavior characterizes the emphasis of self-presentation theory (Baron, 1989; Jones & Pittman, 1982). Strategic self-presentation, the conscious effort to form and develop others' perceptions of one's behavior (Baumeister, 1982; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Schneider, 1981), is particularly important in interviewing due to the potential future ramifications of a job offer. Successful self-presentation might result in a job offer, whereas self-presentational failure could result in no job offer.

Stevens and Kristof (1995) considered self-presentational tactics such as self-promotion and other-enhancement in the interview setting as it relates to interviewer perceptions and interview outcomes. Self-promotion consists of describing the self positively or seeking to appear competent to gain respect. Other-enhancement is a form of ingratiation, a tactic used to create liking and interpersonal attraction. For example, ingratiation tactics are employed when the interviewee verbally praises the interviewer. This study found evidence that the self-presentational tactic of self-promotion was used more than ingratiation throughout interviews. Clearly, appearing capable, through self-promotion is a primary motive in interview settings. The present study, however,

hypothesized that differences in self-construal will qualify this tendency to self-promote during an interview.

The Present Study and Hypotheses

The present study hypothesized that different verbal self-presentational styles are employed based on the way one construes the self. Those who construe the self independently may focus primarily on self-promotion or trying to appear competent and skilled through verbally identifying personal accomplishments and qualifications. Triandis (1993) explained that individualists seek to stand out and remain distinct, even when they are part of a group. Statements such as “I am smart” exemplify self-promotion. Independently construed selves tend to favor independence from in-groups and use the word “I” very frequently throughout communication. For example, sentences formed by individualists often include words such as *I*, *me*, and *mine* (Triandis, 1993). Individuals who construe the self independently see themselves as the central figure and relationships as simply the background (Triandis, 1993). Throughout an interview one might expect to hear self-promotional statements such as “I am intelligent,” “I graduated with a 4.0 GPA,” “I excel,” “I perform well,” or “I am an excellent writer.”

H1a: Individuals who view the self independently will self-promote throughout an interview more than those with an interdependent view of the self.

On the other hand, individuals who construe the self interdependently refer to context and others most extensively. Although the goal of self-presentation is the same, (i.e. appearing competent), the way in which individuals with interdependent self-construals attempt to achieve this goal may be different. The self “includes achievement for the group; I represents the group, cooperation, endurance, order and self-control”

(Triandis, 1993, p. 164). Triandis, McCusker, and Hui (1990) found that “collectivists give more ‘social’ responses when defining the self and incidentally define themselves more frequently with the categories family and ethnic group” (p. 1018). For example, words such as *us*, *we*, and *ours* are often used throughout collectivists’ sentences in contrast to words such as *they* and *them*. As a result, individuals with interdependent self-construals might others-promote more than self-promote. Others-promotion, in contrast to self-promotion, is defined as positive statements extolling the characteristics, roles, and behaviors of significant others who facilitated one’s successes and accomplishments. Others-promoting statements such as “my supervisor is/was great,” “my parents worked hard to put me through school,” and “my friends were always there for me,” might be prevalent throughout an interview with an individual who construes the self interdependently. Specifically, an individual who construes the self interdependently may say more about the groups they belong to than their own personal traits and qualities throughout an interview.

H1b: Individuals who view the self interdependently will others-promote more than those who view the self independently.

CHAPTER 2

Method

Subjects and Design

Kim and Leung's (1997) self-construal scale was administered to 199 students enrolled in communication classes (see Appendix A) at a large midwestern University. Any student enrolled in these classes was eligible to participate in the study. However, 35 students scoring highest on the independent and lowest on the interdependent dimensions and 35 students scoring lowest on the independent and highest on the interdependent dimensions of the pre-test received special verbal encouragement to participate in the main study. Of these 70 students, 52 students agreed to participate. However, due to tape-recorder malfunctioning, data remained for 48 subjects. In addition, one subject's data were eliminated because s/he refused to answer the questions by simply stating "I don't know" to all interview questions. To ensure equal cell sizes, one subject's data were randomly tossed out in the interdependent self-construal group. The results of the pre-test enabled the formation of two groups based upon the subjects' self-construal score: those with independent self-construals and those with interdependent self-construals. In sum, data for 46 subjects was analyzed with 23 subjects in each self-construal group.

Procedure

Upon arrival, participants were greeted by the experimenter and told that the College of Communication was seeking to award one student the Linnea A. Ellis Award for Excellence (see Appendix B). Participants were also informed that the student selected would receive \$50. The experimenter then explained that this study was working in conjunction with the College of Communication simply to observe the Linnae A. Ellis

Award for Excellence interviews for a better understanding of phone interview processes. Participants were assured that these audio tapes would in no way affect the award outcome and were then given a description of the Linnea A. Ellis Award for Excellence. Subjects were also asked to sign a consent form stating their desire to be considered for this award and allowing the phone interview to be audio-taped (see Appendix C). After signing the consent form, the phone rang and the interview commenced. The interviewers were trained confederates who followed the same scripted introduction and schedule of interview questions for each participant (see Appendix D). After the interview, subjects were asked to complete two questionnaires. The first questionnaire was a one-page application for the Linnea A. Ellis award with brief questions pertaining to personal accomplishments, group involvement, extra-curricular activities, and miscellaneous information (see Appendix E). The second questionnaire dealt with the participants' perceptions of the interview, interviewer, and personal attributions of success (see Appendix F). Subjects then left an address and phone number where they could be reached and notified of the results for the Linnea A. Ellis award. After the study had been completed participants were given an information sheet (see Appendix G) and fully debriefed via mail concerning the deception (i.e. fabricated award) and the reason for its use. Upon completion of the study, a random drawing determined the winner of the \$50.

Results

The interviews were coded by two independent coders who were blind to the study's hypotheses. Specifically, coders broke the participants' interview responses into thought units. Content coding by thought unit allowed the data to cluster naturally. The coding system set criteria by which to evaluate and then categorize the utterances made by participants. Categories for self-promotion included self facts and self evaluations. Self facts included factual information about the interviewee. To qualify as a fact about the self, the statement described something about the self that was potentially verifiable. This category primarily included facts describing the interviewee's activities, behaviors, hobbies, interests, and jobs performed alone. Statements such as "I enjoy jogging" or "I swim every Monday and Wednesday to stay in shape" were coded as self-facts. Self-evaluations were also included in the sum for self-promotion. Self-evaluations were statements of opinion, belief, judgment or feeling that evaluated the internal attributes (e.g. personality, traits, skills, abilities, attitudes) of the interviewee. For utterances to qualify as self-evaluations, the attributes named were qualities about the interviewee that were not associated with relations to others. Statements such as "I am smart" or "I perform well at my job" were classified as self-evaluations. On the other hand, the category of others-promotion included statements of fact and evaluation about other people. Others facts included factual information about people other than the interviewee. To qualify as a fact about another person, the statement described something about the other person that was potentially verifiable. For example, statements such as "my sister is the president of UCA" or "my mother is a teacher" would be classified as an others fact. Others evaluations included statements that evaluated or

judged people other than the interviewee. These statements represented personal opinions, beliefs, assessments, or judgments about persons other than the interviewee. Statements such as “my family works hard” or “my boss is very helpful” were classified as others evaluations. In addition, coders assigned a valence (i.e. positive, neutral, negative) to each thought unit coded as self facts, self evaluations, others facts, or others evaluations. However, only positive and neutral statements were included in the total sum for self-promotion and others-promotion, because negative statements cannot qualify as promotion or seeking to appear competent and skilled. Specifically, positive and neutral self facts and evaluations were summed to equal the total number of self-promoting statements. Likewise, the positive and neutral others facts and evaluations were summed to equal the total number of others-promoting statements. These sums were calculated for subjects with independent self-construals and interdependent self-construals.

To account for the possibility of one subject talking more in the interview than another subject, the self-promoting statements and others-promoting statements were divided by the total number of positive and neutral utterances made by the subject. This measure was computed separately for each of the two independent codings of the interviews. Measures from the two independent coders were used to estimate reliability across the 46 interviews. Each reliability measure was then adjusted (via the Spearman-Brown prophesy formula) to estimate the reliability of the average. The reliabilities were .90 for self-promotion and .96 for others-promotion. The proportion of promoting statements were then analyzed in a self-construal (independent vs. interdependent) X self-

presentation style (self-promotion vs. others-promotion) mixed factorial ANOVA, with the latter factor being a repeated measure.

The analyses revealed a main effect of self-presentational style, $F(1, 44) = 132.94$, $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .58$. Subjects self-promoted ($M = .217$) more than others-promoted ($M = .022$). In addition, a significant two-way interaction was found, $F(1, 44) = 8.20$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$ (see Figure 1), indicating that the effect of self-construal was different at different levels of self-presentational style. Hypothesis 1a predicted that individuals who view the self independently would self-promote throughout an interview more than those with an interdependent view of the self. This hypothesis was supported by a significant simple effect of self-construal for self-promotion, $F(1, 44) = 8.15$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$. Subjects who viewed the self independently self-promoted ($M = .25$) throughout an interview more than individuals with an interdependent view of the self ($M = .18$). However, support was not found for hypothesis 1b, which predicted that individuals who view the self interdependently would others-promote more than those who view the self independently. Subjects with independent self-construals ($M = .007$) others-promoted to the same degree as subjects with interdependent self-construals ($M = .03$), $F(1, 44) = 1.52$, n.s. In sum, subjects with independent self-construals self-promoted more and others-promoted just as little as subjects with interdependent self-construals. Regardless of self-construal level, all subjects self-promoted more than others promoted. Indeed, independent self-construals self-promoted more than others-promoted $F(1, 44) = 104.90$, $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .39$. Likewise, interdependent self-construals self-promoted more than others-promoted, $F(1, 44) = 38.57$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .23$. Therefore, people with independent or

interdependent self-construals exhibited the same self-presentational styles of self promoting more than others promoting.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Discussion

These results are consistent with the hypothesis that individuals who view the self independently self-promote more throughout an interview than those with an interdependent view of the self. On the other hand, there was a lack of support for the hypothesis positing that individuals who view the self interdependently others-promote more than those with independent self-construals. In fact, very little others-promotion took place throughout any of the interviews. However, there are some plausible explanations for the limited occurrence of others-promotion.

One set of explanations for the lack of others-promotion stems from the qualities of the setting and interviewer. Typically, interviews are independent activities. Interviews tend to demand more discussion of individual accomplishments. This particular interview may have demanded more self-promotion because the award was given to one individual and not a group of people. However, it is possible that in an employment interview where individuals are interviewing for a job that is very connected to others (i.e. coaching position, team leader/manager), more others-promotion may occur. It is also possible that this study found little others-promotion because the interviewer may have been perceived as an outgroup member by individuals who construed the self interdependently. Triandis (1989) explained that “social behavior is

more likely to be communal when the target of that behavior is an ingroup member than when the target is an outgroup member” (p. 517). It is possible that individuals who construed the self interdependently sensed an independent orientation from the interviewer (i.e. an outgroup member) and thus sought to please the interviewer through self-promotion rather than others-promotion. In addition, the very location of the interviews was an individualistic setting (i.e. university campus) in a Western culture. This may have led interviewees to think the interviewer was expecting statements of self-promotion.

Other research suggests that interdependent individuals may not self or others-promote at all. Some recent literature has found that individuals oriented toward collectivism are more likely to engage in self-criticism or self-effacement (Bond, Leung, & Won, 1982; Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto & Norasakkunkit, 1997; Yik, Bond & Paulhus, 1998). Self-criticism or effacement may be demonstrated by self-deprecation or attributing personal success to external factors (Bond, Leung, & Wan, 1982). Because a collectivist orientation has been linked to an interdependent view of the self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis & Brown, 1995) it is plausible that individuals who viewed the self interdependently in this study may have self-criticized throughout their interviews, attenuating their use of others or self-promotion. Likewise, interdependent individuals may have felt internally self-critical throughout the phone interview, but decided not to verbalize the self-criticism because of a feeling that self-criticism was inappropriate for an interview. Thus, individuals who construe the self interdependently may be oriented toward self-criticism rather than others or self-promotion.

Contributions of the Present Study

The employment interview literature has considered the effects of various individual differences such as nonverbal behavior (Rasmussen, 1984), sex (Olian, Schwab & Haberfeld, 1988), and race (Parsons & Liden, 1984) on the employment interview process. However, the individual difference variable of self-construal has not been considered. This study demonstrated that individuals who construe the self independently self-promote throughout an interview to a greater degree than individuals who construe the self interdependently. These findings are particularly important to the interview literature because of self-construal's association with culture. As the workforce continues to diversify, cultural variables will become increasingly important to consider. In addition, if individuals self or others-promote to varying degrees, these different self-presentational styles may differentially be valued depending on the culture or interviewer. This study underscores the importance of testing self-presentational differences in the interview setting.

This study is also unique in that it considers verbal self-promotional behavior. Triandis, McCusker, & Hui (1990) measured self-presentation through a written medium and had participants generate descriptive statements such as "I am a son" or "I am a Roman Catholic." However, this study extends the literature by measuring naturally occurring verbal self-promotional behavior as interviewees describe themselves to interviewers. Most interviews do not take place on paper alone. So, the findings of this study are helpful and interesting because the way one verbally presents the self may have lasting life implications, particularly in an interview setting (e.g. job offer, career direction). Although other interview studies have looked at self-presentation, such as

ingratiation (Jones, 1964; Jones & Wortman, 1973), no study has measured verbal self-promotion.

This study also extends the self-construal literature by testing self-construal and communication behavior. Although Singelis (1994) theoretically links self-construal and high-context communication behavior, very few studies have extended this link by testing other types of communication behaviors. Self-construal has been shown to affect the perceived importance of interactive constraints (Kim, Sharkey, & Singelis, 1994) and an individual's level of embarrassability. However, the behavior of self and others-promotion has not been studied with respect to self-construal. In addition, other studies assessed self-construal through written means (i.e. describe yourself in terms of "I am...") (Triandis, McCusker, Hui, 1990) or examined individuals' reaction time when responding to particular self-descriptive attributes (Rogers, 1981). These previous studies operationally defined self-construal. However, the present study augments the usefulness of the self-construal construct. By finding differences in self-promotion for people with different self-construals, this study demonstrates that self-construal is meaningfully associated with communication behavior.

Future Research

This study provides a foundation for additional testing of promotion and self-construal. As suggested earlier, the interview situation may tend to demand more self-promotional statements rather than statements of others-promotion. Thus, it may be interesting to investigate whether others-promotion occurs in other situations. Specifically, the nature of the interview could be manipulated. For example, interviews could be conducted for both an individual award and a group award. It is possible that a group award may

demand more others-promoting statements, while individual awards demand more self-promoting statements. Based on the results of this study, one would expect to find independent self-construals self-promoting more than interdependent self-construals in the individual award setting. Alternatively, in a group award situation, interdependent self-construals might others-promote more than independent self-construals.

Linking individual differences in self-criticism to one's self-construal may also be interesting. Because the culture literature has found that individuals from collectivist cultures are more self-critical (Bond, Leung, & Won, 1982; Yik, Bond & Paulhus, 1998) and previous literature has linked culture and self-construal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis & Brown, 1995), it seems plausible that interdependent self-construals may use more self-critical utterances when verbally describing the self. To extend the current study one could create a coding category for self-criticism or self-effacement. Utterances that negatively describe the self or attribute personal success to external factors such as luck could be classified as self-critical. These utterances could then be summed and used to compare self-critical and self-promotional statements. Based on previous findings it would be plausible to expect that individuals who construe the self interdependently would self-criticize more than individuals who construe the self independently.

Finally, the results of this study provide a foundation for further inquiry of self-construal and self-presentation. These variables are particularly interesting when seeking to understand the self. By testing different types of promotion and effacement in various settings we may gain a better understanding of how individuals verbally present themselves.

REFERENCES

Baron, R. A. (1989). Impression management by applicants during employment interviews: The 'too much of a good thing' effect. In R. W. Eder & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice (pp. 204-215). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

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

Berzonsky, M. D. (1995). Public self-presentations and self-conceptions: The moderating role of identity status. The Journal of Social Psychology, 135, 737-745.

Bond, M. H., Leung, K., & Wan K. (1982). The social impact of self-effacing attributions: The Chinese case. The Journal of Social Psychology, 118, 157-166.

Eder, R. W., Kacmar, K. M. & Ferris, G. R. (1989). Employment interview research: History and synthesis. In R. W. Eder, & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Geertz, C. (1975). On the nature of anthropological understanding. American Scientist, 63, 47-53.

Greenwald, A. G., Carnot, C. G., Beach, R., & Young, B. (1987). Increasing voting behavior by asking people if they expect to vote. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 315-318.

Gudykunst, W. (1994). Bridging Differences (2nd ed.) (pp. 35-72). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Higgins, T. E. (1996). The "Self Digest": Self-knowledge serving self-regulatory functions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 1062-1083.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hui, H. C. (1988). Measurement of Individualism—Collectivism. Journal of Research in Personality, 22, 17-36.

Jones, E. E. (1964). Ingratiation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

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

Jones, E. E., Rhodewalt, F., Berglas, S., & Skelton, J. A. (1981). Effects of strategic self-presentation on subsequent self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 407-421.

Jones, E. E., & Warman, C. (1973). Ingratiation: An attributional approach. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press.

Kashima, Y., Siegal, M., Tanaka, K., & Kashima, E. (1992). Do people believe behaviours are consistent with attitudes? Towards a cultural psychology of attribution processes. British Journal of Social Psychology, 31, 111-124.

Kraut, R. E. (1973). Effects of social labeling on giving to charity. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9, 551-562.

Kim, M. S. & Leung, T. (1997). A Revised Self-Construal Scale. Department of Speech, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI.

Kim, M., Sharkey, W. F., & Singelis, T. M., (1994). The relationship between individuals' self-construals and perceived importance of interactive constraints. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18, 117-140.

- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 1245-1267.
- Leary, M. R. (1993). The interplay of private and self-processes and interpersonal factors in self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self (Vol. 4, pp. 127-155). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McKillop, K. J., Berzonsky, M. D., & Schlenker, B. R. (1992). The impact of self-presentations on self-beliefs: Effects of social identity and self-presentational context. Journal of Personality, 60, 789-808.
- Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. Psychological Review, 98, 224-253.
- Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1994). A Collective fear of the collective: Implications for selves and theories of selves. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 568-579.
- Marsella, A. J., DeVos, G., & Hsu, F. L. K. (1985). Culture and self. New York: Tavistock.
- Miller, J. G. (1984). Culture and the development of everyday social explanation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 961-978.
- Miller, R. L., Brickman, P., & Bolen, D. (1975). Attribution versus persuasion as a means of modifying behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 430-441.

Miller, V. D. & Buzzanell, P. M. (1996). Toward a research agenda for the second employment interview. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 24, 165-180.

Olian, J. D., Schwab, D. P., Haberfeld, Y. (1988). The impact of applicant gender compared to qualifications on hiring recommendations: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 41, 180-195.

Parsons, C. K., & Liden, R. C. (1984). Interviewer perceptions of applicant qualifications: A multivariate field study of demographic characteristics and nonverbal cues. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 557-568.

Rasmussen, K. G. (1984). Nonverbal behavior, verbal behavior, resume credentials, and selection interview outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 551-556.

Rhodewalt, F. T. (1986). Self-presentation and the phenomenal self: On the stability and malleability of self-conceptions. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), Public self and private self (pp. 117-142). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Rhodewalt, F., & Agustsdottir, S. (1986). Effects of self-presentation on the phenomena of self. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 47-55.

Rogers, T. B. (1981). A model of the self as an aspect of the human information processing system. In N. Cantor & J. F. Kihlstrom (Eds.), Personality, cognition and social interaction (pp. 193-214). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

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

Schlenker, B. R., & Trudeau, J. V. (1990). Impact of self-presentations on private self beliefs: Effects of prior self-beliefs and misattribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 22-32.

Schneider, D. J. (1981). Tactical self-presentations: Toward a broader conception. In J. Tedeschi (Ed.), Impression management theory and social psychological research (pp. 23-40). NY: Academic.

Sharkey, W. F., & Singelis, T. M., (1995). Embarrassability and self-construal: A theoretical integration. Personal Individual Differences, 19, 919-926.

Shotland, R. L., & Berger, W. G. (1970). Behavioral validation of several values from the Rokeach value scale as an index of honesty. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 433-435.

Shweder, R. A., & LeVine, R. A. (1984). Cultural theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 580-591.

Singelis, T. M., & Brown, W. J. (1995). Culture, self, and collectivist communication. Human Communication Research, 21, 354-389.

Singelis, T. M., & Sharkey, W. F. (1995) Culture, self-construal, and embarrassability. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26, 622-644.

Stevens, C. K. & Kristof, A. L. (1995). Making the right impression: A field study of applicant impression management during job interviews. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80, 587-606.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. Psychological Review, *26*, 506-520.

Triandis, H. C. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. Cross-Cultural Research, *27*, 155-180.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *54*, 323-338.

Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multitmethod probes of individualism and collectivism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *59*, 1006-1020.

Wicklund, R. A., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1982). Symbolic self-completion. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Yik, M. S. M., Bond, M. H., & Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Do Chinese self-enhance or self-efface? It's a matter of domain. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *24*, 399-406.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

For the following items indicate your degree of agreement with each statement by choosing a number from the scale below. Mark your ratings on your scanner sheets and not on this questionnaire. That is, when you have selected a number representing your response for each question, mark that number on your scanner sheet by filling in the circle containing your chosen rating next to the appropriate item number. If you have any questions about what to do, please raise your hand. It may be helpful to think of "groups" as your peer group.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	UNDECIDED	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

1. I should be judged on my own merits.
2. I voice my opinions in group discussions.
3. I feel uncomfortable disagreeing with my group.
4. I conceal my negative emotions so I won't cause unhappiness among the members of my group.
5. My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.
6. I prefer to be self-reliant rather than dependent on others.
7. I act as a unique person, separate from others.
8. I don't like depending on others.
9. My relationships with those in my group are more important than my personal accomplishments.
10. My happiness depends on the happiness of those in my group.
11. I often consider how I can be helpful to specific others in my group.
12. I take responsibility for my own actions.
13. It is important for me to act as an independent person.
14. I have an opinion about most things: I know what I like and I know what I don't like.
15. I enjoy being unique and different from others.
16. I don't change my opinions in conformity with those of the majority.
17. Speaking up in a work/task group is not a problem for me.
18. Understanding myself is a major goal in my life.
19. I enjoy being admired for my unique qualities.
20. I am careful to maintain harmony in my group.
21. When with my group, I watch my words so I won't offend anyone.
22. I would sacrifice my self-interests for the benefit of my group.
23. I try to meet the demands of my group, even if it means controlling my own desires.
24. It is important to consult close friends and get their ideas before making decisions.
25. I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education and career plans.
26. I act as fellow group members prefer I act.
27. The security of being an accepted member of a group is very important to me.
28. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.

Thank you for your time and participation!!!

APPENDIX B

Description of Award

The College of Communication is seeking to award one student the first annual Linnae A. Ellis Award for Excellence. The \$50 award is given to a promising undergraduate student who demonstrates a special zeal for life, has made a considerable contribution to academic life and the surrounding community, demonstrates leadership, and possesses the spirit of creativity, and university citizenship.

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent Form

Welcome to the interview study! This study is working in conjunction with the Linnae A. Ellis Award for Excellence search committee in an attempt to better understand the phone interview process. The Linnae A. Ellis search committee is conducting interviews in order to select an individual for the Linnae A. Ellis Award for Excellence. If you choose to participate, you will interview with a member of the Linnae A. Ellis search committee via phone. These phone interviews will be audio-taped strictly for the use of the interview study. These audio-tapes will be remain confidential and stored under lock and key. Upon completion of the phone interview, you will be asked to complete a short application for the award and a brief questionnaire dealing with your perceptions of the interview. All responses given throughout the study and application process will remain strictly confidential. Only the search committee and investigator will have access to your responses.

Full participation in this study will take 1 hour or less, and you will be given credit points in your communication course. Although participation in this study is not expected to produce discomfort or stress, please note that you may refuse to answer certain questions or withdraw from the experiment at any time without penalty. If you do choose to withdraw before the end of the experiment, you will receive credit for the amount of time that you participated (e.g., 1/2 credit for 1/2 participation). At the end of the experiment, you will be told the purpose of the study and given the opportunity to sign up for receipt of the final results once the study has been completed. In addition, after interviews have been completed, one student will be selected to receive the \$50 Linnae A. Ellis Award for Excellence. The award recipient will be notified two weeks after the completion of the study. Prize money will be given at that time. The experimenter can answer any questions you have about the study to help you choose whether to participate. Contact Jennifer A. Butler (phone: 355-2170; office: 557 CAS) if you have any further questions or concerns regarding this study.

Thank you,

Jennifer A. Butler



I have read the description of the research procedures involved in the Interview study and the Linnae A. Ellis Award for Excellence application process and feel that the procedures have been explained to my satisfaction. I also understand that the phone interview will be audio-taped. In light of this information, I voluntarily choose to apply for this Linnae A. Ellis Award for Excellence and participate in the Interview study to receive credit in my communication course. I understand that I may refuse to answer certain questions, refuse to participate in certain procedures, or withdraw from the experiment without penalty.

Your Signature

Today's Date

Print your name

PID

APPENDIX D

Interviewer Script and Question Schedule

Phone rings and participant answers “hello”

Intro for R: “Hello, my name is _____ and I’m from the LAE award for excellence search committee. We are conducting brief 15-20 minute phone interviews in order to get to know applicants better and select a qualified individual for the \$50 LAE award for excellence.

Q1—R: “To get started, why don’t you begin by briefly telling me about yourself.”

Q2—R: “Describe your greatest success.” Follow-up probe: “To what do you attribute that success?”

Q3—R: “How would your friends describe you?”

Q4—R: “The Linnae A. Ellis Award will be given to an undergraduate who “has made a considerable contribution to academic life and the surrounding community.” How have you demonstrated these qualities?”

Q5—R: “The Linnae A. Ellis Award recipient will be someone who demonstrates leadership and university citizenship. How have you demonstrated these qualities?”

Q6—R: “What makes you feel proud?”

Q7—R: “And finally, what makes you especially qualified to receive the Linnae A. Ellis Award for Excellence?”

Conclusion for R: “Thank you for applying for the LAE award for excellence. It was enjoyable getting to know you better. Let the experimenter know that we are finished with the phone interview so you can complete the written application for the LAE award. We will be notifying you of our LAE recipient sometime this summer. The \$50 will be awarded at that time. Do you have any questions? OK, well, thanks and good luck.”

3. Describe your contribution to academic life at Michigan State University.

4. Describe your contribution to the surrounding community in which you live.

5. What makes you especially qualified to receive the Linnae A. Ellis Award of Excellence?

I certify that the information on this application is complete and correct.

Signature

Date

APPENDIX F

Interview Study Questionnaire

The following questions are designed to tap your personal perceptions of the interview you have just experienced. For each question, rate your degree of agreement with each of the four statements by choosing a number from the scale below.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
strongly				neither				strongly	
disagree			agree	nor	disagree			agree	

Mark your ratings on your scanner sheets and not on this questionnaire. That is, when you have selected a number representing your response for each question, mark that number on your scanner sheet by filling in the appropriate item number. If you have any questions about what to do, please ask the experimenter. All responses will remain confidential and will in no way affect the outcome of the LAE award or the \$50 prize. Please answer questions carefully and honestly.

1. I felt pleased with my interview performance.
2. I liked the interviewer.
3. The interviewer seemed similar to me.
4. Overall, I found the LAE phone interview enjoyable.
5. I cared about performing well during the interview.
6. I believe I have a good chance of receiving the LAE award.
7. I have previous interview experience.
8. I have received other University awards.
9. The interviewer did a professional job of interviewing me.
10. The interview seemed typical of other interviews I've had.
11. I find phone interviews more comfortable than face-to-face interviews.
12. I felt I was able to accurately present myself to the interviewer.

APPENDIX G

Information Sheet

The interview process is extremely complex. Specifically, the issue of self-presentation emerges as an area that demands additional attention and focus. This study seeks to understand self-presentation styles within the interview context.

In general interviews are used to gather information about individuals, situations, or future planning. However, the most common type of interview is the applicant interview (i.e. applying for a job or award) where an individual seeks to present oneself as competent and capable. Typically, the outcomes of interviews have significant consequences and may influence the direction of an individual's life or career. Thus, self-presentation is important to examine in order to understand the different styles of self-presentation individuals' employ within the interview context.

The purpose of this study is to consider self-presentational styles based on an individual's self-construal. The study will identify different self-presentational styles employed by individuals who construe the self independently or separate from others and interdependently or connected to others. We hope this research provides a foundation for understanding self-presentational differences and ultimately improving communication and understanding between the interviewer and the interviewee

Thank you very much for participating in this experiment. If you have any further questions about his study, please feel free to contact Jennifer A. Butler (office – 557 Communication Arts Building; phone – 353-2170).

Research References:

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

Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion and Motivation. Psychological Review, 98, 224-253.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Mean number of thoughts as a function of self-construal and self-presentation style.

Figure 1

