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ABSTRACT

SETH E. CARTER: It’s Not What You Say But When You Say It: Impression Management and Temporal Construal
(Under the direction of Lawrence J. Sanna)

Temporal processes affect a number of interpersonal phenomena. Four studies examine the role of time in impression management. Specifically, it is predicted that people use indirect self-presentation more and rate it as more effective in the distant future versus near future. The opposite pattern is predicted for direct self-presentation. Study 1 demonstrates this effect using scenario methodology. Study 2 conceptually “reverses” the effect by manipulating impression management and measuring subjective temporal appraisal. Study 3 shows that minimal connections (in this case a shared birthday) are used more in the distant versus near future. Study 4 shows the predicted effect using a real time manipulation. Taken together, these studies demonstrate that time affects both the use and perceived effectiveness of impression management. Future research possibilities are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

I been in the right place but it must have been the wrong time
I'd have said the right thing but I must have used the wrong line
Would've made the right move but I made it at the wrong time

Alan Touissant, as sung by Mac Rebennack (a.k.a. “Dr. John”), “Right Place, Wrong Time”

In “Right Place, Wrong Time,” Dr. John aptly points out that many of our attempts to look good to others fall flat, not due to the content of what we say, but, rather due to the timing of when we say it. For years, psychologists and marketing researchers alike have studied the intricacies of impression management. From delineating specific techniques to examining their effects on others, researchers have been interested in outlining the impact of self-presentation tactics. However, one notable aspect of impression management is missing from these investigations – the notion of timing. Temporal variables have come to be seen as increasingly important to psychological processes (Loewenstein, Read, & Baumeister, 2003; Loewenstein & Prelac, 1992, 1993; Sanna & Chang, 2006; Trope & Liberman, 2003). The overarching theme of this dissertation is that time influences the choice of the type of impression management tactic that is chosen as well as its effectiveness.

This dissertation examines the role of timing in impression management in a variety of contexts. It first establishes that temporal factors can influence impression management, and then it attempts to test underlying mechanisms for this effect while ruling out alternative explanations. The first and second studies are scenario-based, and they manipulate subjective temporal and social distance while measuring the use of direct and indirect self-
presentation. While Study 1 manipulates distance and measures impression management, Study 2 manipulates impression management and measures ratings of subjective temporal distance. It does this by varying the accessibility of thoughts related to indirect or direct self-presentation, and then measures self-ratings of distance from a future event (a job interview). Studies 3 and 4 extend the idea of temporal factors in impression management by manipulating actual time between participants’ use of impression management and the event for which they are self-presenting. Study 3 does this through a “fantasy football” simulation that manipulates actual time along with indirect versus direct associations with football players through a birthday manipulation. While Study 3 measures the use of impression management, Study 4 measures the effectiveness of impression management over time by using a paradigm in which participants believe they are competing for a spot on a team that will vie for a monetary prize. Participants are given chances to use either direct or indirect self-presentation to make themselves look better for an event occurring in the distant or near future. After self-presenting, participants are asked to rate how effective they thought their impression management was.

Taken together, the four studies of this dissertation provide a compelling case that temporal factors do influence both the use and perceived effectiveness of impression management. Further, this dissertation suggests that at least one temporal mechanism underlying the differential use and effectiveness is temporal construal. Temporal construal theory (Liberman & Trope, 2003; Liberman, Sagristano, & Trope, 2002; Trope & Liberman, 2003) proposes that, when making decisions over time, people place more emphasis on general, broader aspects in the distant future but focus more on specific details as the
decision gets closer. These four studies identify numerous facets of these novel and unique hypotheses while using various manipulations, measures, and contexts.

Subjective Temporal Experience

When considering outcomes as they occur in time, psychologists, behavioral economists, political scientists, and even physicists come to the same conclusion – all time is not equal (see Sanna & Chang, 2006; Lowenstein, Read, & Baumeister, 2003). While time can be measured objectively, people have different psychological representations of the passage of time (James, 1890; Schacter, 1996; Brown, Rips, & Shevell, 1985).

These subjective temporal biases can affect individuals’ representations of events across time. When looking back at the past, people will distance themselves from past events and self-concepts that were negative (Ross & Wilson, 2002; Wilson & Ross, 2001; Sanna, Chang, & Carter, 2004; Sanna & Schwarz, 2004). When forming personal narratives about their own lives, people will construct autobiographical memories that are guided by their present motives and goals, influencing distance from past selves to maintain favorable self-views in the present (Wilson & Ross, 2003; Ross, 1989). When considering future outcomes and selves, people often allow various attributional phenomena to influence their estimates of the amount of time it takes to complete a task, leading to the planning fallacy (Buehler, Griffin, & Ross, 1994; Sanna, Parks, Chang, & Carter, 2005). People also tend to underestimate the role of emotional coping in future happiness (Wilson, Meyers, & Gilbert, 2001; Gilbert, Pinel, Wilson, Blumberg, & Wheatley, 1998; Wilson, Wheatley, Meyers, Gilbert, & Axsom, 2000). However, individual differences may be additionally related to this process. For example, defensive pessimists use subjective temporal appraisals to make themselves feel close to future negative selves versus future positive selves, and this may
result in them actually performing better in the future (Sanna, Chang, Carter, & Small, in press; Sanna & Chang, 2003). In sum, people not only acknowledge the role of temporal factors, but they tend to manipulate aspects about themselves in order to capitalize on the functions that temporal awareness affords.

**Construal Level Theory**

Construal Level Theory, first advanced by Liberman and Trope (1998), suggests that individuals use more abstract mental models, known as high-level construals, to represent information about distant-future events, while they use detailed information, low-level construals, to represent near-future events. High-level construals consist of simple, decontextualized information that represents the general, superordinate, and essential features of an event (see Trope & Liberman, 2003). Thus, high-level construals represent the “why” aspects of an action (Vallacher and Wegner, 1987; Higgins & Trope, 1990). On the other hand, low-level construals are made up of concrete information that represents the contextual, subordinate, detailed features of an event (see Trope & Liberman, 2003). As such, low-level construals answer the “how” aspects of an action (Vallacher & Wegner, 1987). The idea of construal levels is based on the premise that people use different mental representations of the same object, event, or person when making inferences (Medin, 1989; Kunda & Thagard, 1996). For example, when making inferences about themselves and others, people often rely on information of varying abstraction levels. Personality traits are seen as more abstract, while situations and intentions are more concrete (Mischel & Shoda, 1995, 1998).

Construal level theory proposes that distant-future events are seen as more abstract, and, thus are represented at a high-level construal. Therefore, at a distance, we tend to only
think of events in terms of a few general features that convey the essence of an event. As the event draws nearer, though, we begin to rely on details and contextual information about the event, and therefore rely on low-level construals. Consider an upcoming vacation to Australia. At the distant future, you dream only of a relaxing break from a hectic schedule and seeing wonderful vistas of nature. The day before you leave, though, you begin to think about details surrounding the trip – jet lag, having to fly in coach, and the bugs and pests in the outback. Certainly, this is a different picture of the trip. While both of these types of information represent your trip, they are reflective of distinctively different types of information.

One implication of construal level theory is that people use superordinate goals to represent distant events (i.e. “I read to broaden my horizons”) and subordinate goals to represent near events (i.e. “I read by flipping pages”) (see Liberman & Trope, 1998; Hampson, John, & Goldberg, 1986). Relatedly, people tend to classify objects into broader and fewer categories in the distant-future (seeing the “big picture”) versus “seeing the details” in the near-future (Trope & Liberman, 2000; Trope & Liberman, 2003).

With respect to preferences over time, temporal changes in the attractiveness of a choice depend on the values associated with each construal level. Some aspects of future options are considered primary while others are secondary. For example, if you wanted to hire someone as an engineer, then his or her technical training would be more important than social skills. Construal level theory suggests that, when hiring the engineer, you would rely more on his or her technical skills (the primary aspect) in the distant future but place more weight on social skills in the near future (the secondary aspect) because technical training is more central to being a good engineer than social skills (see Trope & Liberman, 2000, 2003).
Thus, construal level can influence preferences over time with occasionally surprising consequences.

*Temporal Construal and Behavior Prediction*

Intraindividual contexts provide nice examinations of the mechanics of temporal construal. The theory’s interpersonal ramifications have been established with respect to behavior prediction. When you are asked to predict others’ behavior, the time frame of the prediction matters. When making predictions about someone’s behavior in the distant future, observers are more likely to rely on the correspondence bias, seeing others’ behavior more in terms of traits or dispositions, than when making predictions about someone’s behavior in the near future (Nussbaum et al., 2003). This is because people rely on high-level construals (in this case, traits) when predicting distant future behavior, but they rely on low-level construals (in this case, situations) in the near future. Further, people see greater cross-situational consistency in the behaviors of others when they believe those behaviors represent distant-future actions, rather than near-future actions (Nussbaum et al., 2003). Finally, because disposition is a high-level construal and situationally constrained behavior is a low-level construal, temporal construal is responsible for magnifying the correspondence bias. When asked to make distant-future, and therefore dispositional, predictions about people who had just been forced to write essays for a behavior they did not agree with, observers actually treated situationally constrained behavior as more predictive of what a person would believe in the distant future (Nussbaum et al., 2003).

The reason that temporal construal can have such an effect on person perception lies in the fact that interpersonal perception is driven by related construal processes. The reason for the correspondence bias is that people have difficulty halting the perception process
solely with the information given by the situation, having a need to generalize behaviors into decontextualized dispositions (Jones & Davis, 1965; Trope, 1989; Trope & Liberman, 1993). Within the context of the linguistic categorization model (Semin & Fiedler, 1988), traits and dispositions represent the highest level of abstraction while verbs describing emotional states (e.g. “I am happy today”), interpretive actions (e.g. “I supported her”), and descriptive actions (e.g. “I walked around the neighborhood”) are at the lowest level of abstraction. Therefore, because global traits are less contextualized than situations, information about concrete aspects of the situation is given less weight in predicting distant future behavior than near-future behavior (Nussbaum et al., 2003; Forster, Friedman, & Liberman, 2004).

Construal levels do affect perception of others with respect to behavior prediction. However, this idea has not yet been extended into the area of impression management. While observers make mistakes when judging dispositions from situationally constrained behavior, there are other factors that lead people to make divergent impressions about someone else. Impression management techniques represent one important group of these factors.

Impression Management

Impression management is an active effort to regulate one’s appearance to others (Schlenker, 1980; Leary, 1995; Jones, 1990). We seek ways to appear more positive, competent, and to be liked in almost all social situations. Whether we spend hours at the mall trying to find “just the right dress” for a cocktail party or stand in front of the mirror rehearsing one-liners for the company Christmas party, everyone tries to make a good impression (Arkin, 1981).
Impression management is vital to our success in daily interactions (Schlenker, 1980; Snyder, 1977). Successful impression management increases our social power and helps us attain resources and social approval (Luginbuhl & Palmer, 1991; Godfrey, Jones, & Lord, 1986, Snyder, 1977). Impression management can also help us define our own self-concepts. Through self-perception (Bem, 1967), we serve as our own audiences. If you want to change your self-concept, you can start by acting in a manner consistent with your new self-definition (Gollwitzer & Wicklund, 1985). When we perform a public act, it has a greater impact on our self-concept than when we act privately (Tice, 1992). Thus, self-presentation has a wide-reaching impact on people, whether through influencing the self-concept directly or influencing the way one appears to an audience.

**Direct Self-Presentation and Indirect Self-Presentation**

Impression management can be broadly characterized into two groups of techniques – direct and indirect self-presentation. On the one hand, direct self-presentation involves attempts to highlight aspects or achievements about oneself in order to look good to others (Leary, 1995). On the other hand, indirect self-presentation involves manipulating one’s ties with successful and unsuccessful others in order to look good.

We often engage *direct self-presentation* tactics to make ourselves appear positive (Jones & Pittman, 1982). Direct self-presentation occurs when people try to actively change others’ perceptions of them. One example of this is when we try to convince others of our attractive traits, known as self-promotion (Jones & Pittman, 1982; Baumeister, 1998). Schuetz (1997) suggested that self-promotion can be divided into three components: modesty, self-disclosure, and favorable self-description. Modesty works well when one’s achievements are known; otherwise, because it involves lowering one’s self-description,
modesty can backfire and decrease prestige (Cialdini & DeNicholas, 1989). Self-disclosure increases liking (Collins & Miller, 1994; Altman & Taylor, 1973), but only if the disclosure is in proportion to how well one knows his/her audience. Otherwise, self-disclosure can make us seem needy or cold, depending on our level of disclosure (Chaiken & Derlega, 1974). Favorable self-description increases people’s prestige (Arkin, 1981), but only if their skill is known or they can prove it (Baumeister & Jones, 1978; Jones, Gergen, & Jones, 1963). Further, people have to know when to stop trumpeting their achievements, otherwise they will be labeled braggarts (Godfrey, Jones, & Lord, 1986).

The potential backfiring of these direct methods of self-presentation highlights an important facet of impression management – direct self-presentation may not always work. There are situations in which more subtle techniques of self-presentation are efficacious. At these times, one might employ indirect self-presentation (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). This involves linking ourselves via a trivial connection to successful others, even though we have not directly aided in their success, in order to make ourselves look better.

While a myriad of indirect self-presentation techniques have been identified (see Cialdini, 1989), they all hinge on people’s manipulations of ties with others in the fashion of Heider’s (1958) proposition of balance theory (Cialdini et al. 1974, 1976). Generally, we affiliate with successful others (basking) (Cialdini et al., 1976; Tesser, 1988) and dissociate with unsuccessful others (distancing or cutting off reflected failure) (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Snyder, Lassegard, & Ford, 1986; Wann, Hamlet, Wilson, & Hodges, 1995).

People tend to associate persons, objects, or events that share only trivial connections or similarities, regardless of the nature of the similarities, in order to maintain cognitive harmony (Heider, 1958; Cialdini et al., 1974; 1976; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Finch &
Cialdini, 1989, Richardson & Cialdini, 1981). Individuals seek to exploit these cognitive associations by aligning themselves with favorably viewed others in an attempt at presenting themselves in a positive light – hence the term “indirect self-presentation” (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). Whereas we employ direct self-presentation tactics by bringing others’ attention to our own positive traits or achievements, indirect self-presentation occurs when we highlight the importance of the achievements of a group with which we are minimally associated.

Because people are often judged simply on the basis of their connections with others (Cialdini & DeNicholas, 1989), these minimal links to others can have interpersonal consequences. As an example, Brewer’s (1979) participants rewarded their own group more than other groups, even though group membership was determined randomly. While participants merely shared a weak and random link to each other, this tie was strong enough to change group members’ perceptions of each other. Further illustrating this point, Gilovich’s (1981) participants rated a potential football player as more talented simply if he shared the same hometown as another famous player. This human need to categorize random events and occurrences allows minimal group associations to connect us with others.

Temporal Construal Theory and Impression Management

The minimal categories of group affiliation capitalized on when we use indirect self-presentation are anything but minimal with respect to construal levels. In fact, because group membership is a broad, decontextualized way to categorize oneself, I hypothesize that indirect self-presentation is represented at a high level of construal. For instance, consider sports fans who cheer for their team, wear team apparel, and watch games on television. When they describe themselves, they think of themselves as fans of the team. Their teams’
successes may wax and wane, but, overall, fanship is akin to a trait for them. Because of the implications of the relationship between traits and high level construals, I would expect that indirect self-presentation is more effective, and is therefore utilized more, in the distant future. In contrast, direct self-presentation fits at a low-level construal because it focuses on actual achievements on specific tasks. Players on the team are more likely to focus on the team’s victories and defeats when describing their own connections to the team. Because of these further implications of situations and low level construals, I would expect that direct self-presentation is more effective and used more in the near future. This corresponds to Semin and Fieldler’s (1988) linguistic categorization model in which specific actions are at the lowest level of abstraction, while traits and dispositions are at the highest abstraction level. Global traits are given more weight and situation-specific actions are given less weight in predicting others’ behavior in the distant future compared to the near future (Nussbaum et al., 2003; Forster et al., 2004).

Even subtle changes in the ways that we describe ourselves can influence our attitudes (Semin & De Poot, 1997; Maass et al., 1989). Attitudes are increasingly seen as more plastic and subject to change, depending on the manner in which they are elicited (DeSteno & Salovey, 1997). It is often the way that we describe our attitudes that changes whether they are seen as dispositional or situational (Blair, 2002). This effect is even seen when describing ourselves (Walton & Banaji, 2002). Nouns are seen as more dispositional and stable than action verbs (Markman, 1989; Gelman & Heyman, 1999). Thus, statements that take on more structured, coherent forms are seen as dispositional, and are therefore likely to be construed at a high level, while statements taking less structured forms are likely to be construed at a low level (see Nussbaum et al., 2003; Trope & Liberman, 2003). I propose
that statements reflecting indirect self-presentation are generally more structured in form and more abstract in nature because they rely on linguistic forms using nouns (e.g., “I am a Yankees fan”), corresponding to a higher level of construal. Direct self-presentation, on the other hand, is often less structured due to its action verb-based form (“I play baseball for the Yankees”) (see Semin & Fiedler, 1988). Thus, I predict that indirect self-presentation matches a high level construal while direct self-presentation matches a low level of construal. For that reason, I expect that people will believe that indirect self-presentation is more stable and will use it more in distant future than near future because of past experience and intuitive recognition. Further, because of the characteristics of construal, indirect self-presentation should be seen as more effective in the distant versus near future.

Though prior researchers have found that descriptive statements differ in terms of construal level, no one has tested how these concepts work in terms of impression management. Thus, my goal is to examine this relationship. The benefits to understanding the effects of construal on impression management are multifaceted. From a theoretical perspective, this would extend the study of timing to the broader context of impression management, while helping establish boundaries to the effects of temporal construal. From a more applied perspective, the ideas in this dissertation may be applicable to agents of social influence, as well as those who encounter them. In order to examine the hypothesis that construal level shapes the effectiveness and use of impression management, I will first establish that impression management is affected by time, then, I will take steps to demonstrate the effects of temporal construal on impression management more specifically.

First, in Study 1, I test whether or not indirect and direct self-presentation differ in temporal construal. Specifically, I hypothesize that people will use indirect self-presentation
more at a distance while using direct self-presentation more in the near-future. I will also examine whether or not statements concerning direct and indirect self-presentation take on the aspects associated with high and low construal levels. Next, in Study 2, along with replicating Study 1, I will test the implications of temporal aspects of impression management. Specifically, whereas Study 1 manipulated time and measured use of direct or indirect self-presentation, Study 2 manipulates self-presentation then measures subjective distance. I predict that, due to construal level, when people are asked to imagine using indirect self-presentation, the future will feel farther away than when they are asked to use direct self-presentation. By “reversing” the manipulation from Study 1, Study 2 aides in establishing the robustness of this effect. In Studies 3 and 4, I will extend the idea that timing can impact impression management using actual time instead of focusing solely on subjective temporal assessments. Study 3 manipulates actual time and minimal connections with successful others. I predict that those connected with the successful others will use that connection more in the distant future versus near future. In Study 4, instead of simply measuring the use of impression management, I measure its perceived effectiveness as well. I predict that, when used in the distant future, indirect self-presentation will be perceived as more effective than when used in the near future. I expect an opposite pattern with direct self-presentation.

Thus, the goal of this dissertation is to introduce temporal perspective into the impression management literature. I will do this in a variety of contexts with numerous manipulations and measures. Throughout these contexts, I will suggest that one way to explain changes in use and effectiveness of different impression management techniques is temporal construal. I will test the implications of the way in which construal level can
change which type of information a person highlights. I believe this has a direct link to which self-presentation techniques are employed most often, and, consequently, most effectively.
CHAPTER 2

STUDY 1: HOW TO IMPRESS THE BOSS

As an initial test of the effect of temporal perspective on impression management, Study 1 asked participants to imagine themselves in a scenario where they have a chance to use self-presentation to secure a job interview for a prestigious position. To manipulate subjective temporal construal, participants read that the job was available immediately (near-future construal) or in 3 months (distant-future construal). Participants were then asked to list statements to make to their potential boss in order to secure the job. Trained judges then rated participants’ statements according to how much each statement represented direct or indirect self-presentation. I hypothesized that participants in the distant-future condition would make significantly more statements relating to indirect self-presentation than the participants in the near-future condition. Further, another set of trained judges rated how much each statement corresponded to high and low construal levels. I hypothesized that indirect statements would be rated as possessing more of the qualities of high level construals while direct statements would be rated as containing more of the qualities of low-level construals.

One reason for this hypothesis is because, according to temporal construal theory, people are intuitively aware of construal levels (Trope & Liberman, 2003). Thus, if direct self-presentation occurs at a lower construal level than indirect self-presentation, people should be more likely to use direct self-presentation in the near future than in the distant
future. The opposite should occur in the distant versus near future. Participants should be more likely to rely on indirect self-presentation in the distant future, because it is hypothesized to be construed at a higher level. High levels of construal are characterized by features that are high in abstractness, structure, and goal-relevance. Further, these features are seen as simple and primary (Trope & Liberman, 2003). Attitudes can be shaped by the linguistic forms that they take, with noun-based statements being seen as more dispositional and action verb-based statements seen as more situational (Walton & Banaji, 2002; Semin & Fiedler, 1988, Maass et al., 1989). Statements that are more dispositional are construed at a higher level than those that are situational (Trope & Liberman, 2003). I hypothesize that statements of indirect self-presentation will be rated as containing more of the characteristics of high levels of construal, while direct self-presentation will be seen as existing at low levels of construal.

Method

Participants

Forty participants completed this study for partial credit toward completion of a research requirement for introductory psychology classes. Participants were randomly assigned to either the near-future or distant-future construal condition.

Procedure

Participants were asked to imagine a scenario in which they met a potential employer (see Appendix A for materials). The scenario describes the participant going to a restaurant to celebrate graduating from college. At the restaurant, the participant meets someone who is employed by a company for which the participant would like to work. The potential employer says that the company has a position that might be a good fit for the participant and
Participants were asked to list statements they would make in the job interview in order to get the position. The request for statements was open-ended. After participants listed their statements, the study concluded and they were debriefed.

Three judges were trained to differentiate between indirect and direct self-presentation. After the training session, the judges were asked to rate each statement made by participants (n = 134) as to how much it represented direct or indirect self-presentation. All judges were blind to the hypotheses and conditions within the study.

A different group of three judges was trained to categorize aspects of high and low construal levels (see Trope & Liberman, 2003). These judges were asked to rate each statement (n = 134) with respect to how much it varied along construal dimensions. The characteristics of construal were placed on 21 point scales, with anchors at each end of the scale representing high and low construal level (see Appendix A). The characteristics judged were: abstract vs. concrete; wide-reaching vs. context-specific; trait-like vs. situational; simple vs. complex; structured vs. unstructured; primary vs. secondary; and goal-relevant vs. goal-irrelevant.

In addition to the items measuring characteristics of construal described above, the judges also rated each statement on the dimensions of weak vs. strong and emotional vs. informational.

Results and Discussion

Manipulation Checks
With regard to the total number of statements listed, participants in the distant future condition \((M = 3.18, SD = 1.26)\) did not significantly differ from those in the near future condition \((M = 3.56, SD = .92)\), \(t(38) = 1.05, p > .20\). Thus, time perspective did not systematically affect how many statements people listed.

Time perspective also did not affect how likely people thought they were to get the job. Participants in the distant future condition \((M = .78, SD = .13)\) did not significantly differ from those in the near future condition \((M = .74, SD = .14)\) with respect to self-rated probabilities that they would get the job, \(t(38) = 1.04, p > .20\).

Participants also successfully recalled when the interview was to occur. When asked to record the interview time at the end of the study, all participants correctly recollected that the interview was to occur either the next day or in 3 months, depending on condition. Thus, the temporal perspective manipulation was effective.

Reliability of Judgments

Once participants listed statements, the statements were distributed to three judges with knowledge of the difference between direct and indirect self-presentation. The statements were retyped and no indications of participant identification or temporal perspective condition were present. Judges were asked to indicate the degree to which a statement represented indirect or direct in self-presentational nature. Interrater reliabilities were calculated on judges’ ratings, and the ratings were reliable for both direct and indirect ratings \((\alpha = .97\) and \(\alpha = .96\), respectively).

Another group of three judges was trained to be knowledgeable in the characteristics of construal theory. These judges rated the statements with regard to characteristics of construal in the same manner as described above. Again, judges were not aware of the
hypotheses of the study. Their judgments were also reliable, with interrater reliabilities ranging from $\alpha = .85$ (primary vs. secondary) to $\alpha = .94$ (abstract vs. concrete). Further, these judges were asked to rate how weak vs. strong each statement was ($\alpha = .93$) and how emotional vs. informational each statement was ($\alpha = .95$). Thus, the judgments made of the statements in this study were reliable.

**Dependent Measures**

*Type of self-presentation.* I predicted that participants in the distant future (interview in 3 months) condition would list more statements reflecting indirect self-presentation than those in the near future (interview tomorrow) condition. Judges’ average ratings of the extent to which each statement was direct and indirect were computed for each participant. To test the hypothesis, I conducted a 2 (time: near future, distant future) x 2 (self-presentation: direct, indirect) between-within ANOVA, with the last factor treated as repeated measures. The predicted interaction was present and as expected, $F(1, 38) = 26.40, p < .001, \eta^2 = .41$ (see Figure 1). Participants used direct self-presentation more in the near future versus the distant future, but they used more indirect self-presentation in the distant future when compared with the near future.

*Characteristics of temporal construal.* A different group of three judges rated how much each statement was related to characteristics of high and low construal. The judges were not aware of the hypotheses of the study. The average of the judges’ ratings for direct and indirect self-presentation was used to construct an index of the type of self-presentation. Ratings of indirect self-presentation were subtracted from ratings of direct self-presentation such that positive values on the index represented direct self-presentation, while negative
values indicated indirect self-presentation. To test the hypotheses, the self-presentation scores were regressed on each of the temporal construal items.

Overall, my hypotheses was supported. When compared with direct statements, indirect statements were seen as more abstract, structured, primary, and goal-relevant (see Table 1). There was no significant relationship between indirect and direct statements for the dimensions of trait-like vs. situational; wide-reaching vs. context-specific; and simple vs. complex. Even with these exceptions, the results do indicate that most of the dimensions of temporal construal are present in the predicted manner in this sample of statements.

Statement strength and emotionality. To rule out the possibility that characteristics of construal were not the only differences in the direct and indirect statements, I also had the judges assess the statements on the dimensions of strong vs. weak and emotional vs. informational. Regression analyses were not significant with regard to the strength of the statements, ($\beta = -.10, R^2 = .008$) $F(1, 132) = 1.09, p > .20$, nor the emotionality of the statements, ($\beta = -.13, R^2 = .01$) $F(1, 132) = 1.60, p > .20$. Thus, self-presentation type was unrelated to emotionality and strength.¹

The purpose of Study 1 was to establish that impression management is subject to the effects of temporal perspective. Specifically, by manipulating time and measuring the use of indirect and direct self-presentation, I provided initial evidence that as future temporal distance increases, people are more likely to use indirect self-presentation as opposed to direct self-presentation. Temporal construal theory suggests that people use higher level construals when making decisions about distant future outcomes, and I expect that, because indirect self-presentation is more closely related to global trait-like dimensions, that it is

¹ There were no gender differences in any of the studies in this dissertation. Thus, gender differences are not mentioned further.
construed at a higher level and thus used more for impression management in the distant future. In contrast, I expect that direct self-presentation is used more readily when one has a chance at impression management for the near future, since direct self-presentation relies more on situationally constrained specific behaviors and instances.
CHAPTER 3

STUDY 2: WHAT TIME’S MY INTERVIEW?

Although the theme of Study 2 is similar to that of Study 1, Study 2 extends the idea of temporal construal by measuring subjective distance in response to manipulating self-presentation techniques. While Study 1 manipulated time and measured the choice of impression management, Study 2 reverses Study 1 by manipulating impression management and measuring subjective assessments of time.

Participants read a description of indirect or direct self-presentation techniques. They were asked to list either 3 or 12 statements relating to direct or indirect self-presentation that they might make for a job interview that would occur approximately one month in the future. They were then asked to rate how temporally distant or near the interview felt to them.

Prior research has shown that thinking of just a few thoughts is experienced as easy and makes a concept more available and thus more likely to influence later thoughts and opinions. Alternatively, trying to think of many thoughts is experienced as difficult, making the thoughts seem less important when it comes to later opinions (see Schwarz, 1998; Sanna & Schwarz, 2004). Further, accessibility experiences have been implicated as one potential moderator of temporal distancing for past outcomes. Specifically, when participants were able to think of past outcomes easily by listing only a few possible reasons for the outcomes, those past outcomes seemed subjectively closer and more inevitable (Sanna et al., 2004).
Based on this research, I hypothesized that participants who were asked to make 3 indirect self-presentation statements or 12 direct self-presentation statements would rate the interview as being more subjectively distant while those who made 3 direct self-presentation statements or 12 indirect self-presentation statements would rate the interview as being subjectively nearer, even though actual time was held constant.

Method

Participants

Twenty-four participants completed this study for partial credit toward completion of a research requirement for introductory psychology classes.

Procedure

Participants were asked to imagine themselves in a job interview occurring one month from now. They were asked to list thoughts about the statements they would make in the job interview. They were given information about types of statements people often make in job interviews. For half of the participants, the information described direct self-presentation and for the other half, indirect self-presentation (see Appendix B). After reading these descriptions, participants were asked to imagine what they would say in the job interview. Specifically, they were asked to list either 3 or 12 indirect or direct statements that they thought may help them get the job. Listing 3 statements should have been easy while listing 12 statements should have been hard. Thus, by manipulating the ease or difficulty of accessibility of statements relating to direct or indirect self-presentation, I primed the intended constructs (see Sanna & Schwarz, 2004).

Finally, participants were asked to rate how subjectively near or far the interview seemed. This paradigm was adapted from those used in research about temporal subjectivity
for past experiences (see Ross & Wilson, 2002; Wilson & Ross, 2001; Sanna et al., 2004). Participants read, “Future experiences can sometimes feel close or far away, irrespective of when they will actually occur. With the job interview you imagined in mind, please indicate how close or far away the interview feels to you.” As in previous research, participants responded on two 21-point scales (1 = feels very near, 21 = feels very distant; 1 = feels very close, 21 = feels very far away).

I hypothesized that participants in the easy-indirect or difficult-direct self-presentation conditions would rate the interview as feeling more temporally distant than those participants in the easy-direct or difficult-indirect self-presentation conditions. Thus, manipulating the use of types of impression management should have altered participants’ subjective ratings of temporal distance.

Results and Discussion

Accessibility

To assess whether or not the accessibility manipulation was successful, I collapsed the participants (n = 24) across groups and counted how many statements each participant listed, regardless of impression management type. Participants asked to list 3 statements (n = 12) all listed 3 statements. Participants asked to list 12 statements listed 8.08 statements on average (SD = 2.57). There was a significant difference between these two groups, t(22) = 6.84, p < .001, d = 2.75.

Further, I assessed how easy or difficult it was for participants to list their impression management statements with a single 21-point scale item (“-10” = “Very Difficult,” “0” = “Neutral,” “+10” = “Very Easy”). Participants in the 3-statements condition (M = 8.67, SD =
1.44) found it significantly easier to list the statements than participants in the 12-statement condition \((M = -8.92, SD = 1.38), t(22) = 30.6, p < .001, d = 12.47.\)

The accessibility manipulation was powerful and worked in the manner it was supposed to work.

*Temporal Distance*

I predicted that participants in the 3-statements indirect condition and the 12-statements direct condition would rate the future interview as more temporally distant than those in the 3-statements direct and 12-statements indirect conditions. To assess this, I used two single-item measures of temporal distance adapted from prior research. Because the two items were highly correlated, \(r(23) = .86, p < .001\), I averaged the two items to form a composite measure.

I conducted a 2 (3- or 12- statements) x 2 (indirect or direct self-presentation) ANOVA and found a significant interaction, as predicted, \(F(1, 20) = 16.82, p < .001, \eta^2 = .46.\) Further analysis revealed that, as predicted, the participants using direct self-presentation rated the interview as being temporally nearer when they listed 3 \((M = 7.58, SD = 3.57)\) versus 12 \((M = 13.92, SD = 1.43)\) statements, \(t(10) = 4.04, p < .01, d = 2.33\) (see Figure 2). Likewise, participants using indirect self-presentation rated the interview as more temporally distant when listing 3 \((M = 11.00, SD = 3.52)\) versus 12 statements \((M = 7.92, SD = 2.11)\), \(t(10) = 1.84, p = .09, d = 1.06\). Though this latter effect is marginally significant, it is in the direction of the hypotheses.

Study 2 measured self-ratings of temporal distance while manipulating accessibility of indirect and direct self-presentation. It found results consistent with the hypothesis. The pattern of results in Study 2 was as predicted, in that participants in the 3 indirect statements
and 12 direct statements conditions rated the upcoming job interview as more temporally distant than participants in the 12 indirect and 3 direct statements conditions. Thus, manipulating which type of impression management participants used had effects on their ratings of temporal distance of the upcoming event in question.

This study is important in two primary ways. First, it “reverses” the effect found in Study 1. While Study 1 manipulated temporal distance and found that people change impression management strategies, Study 2 manipulated impression management strategies and found that they change temporal construal. By changing the role of the independent and dependent measures in this manner, I more firmly establish that temporal construal and impression management do interact in the manner I am hypothesizing.

Second, this study extends the idea of accessibility into future appraisals. Previous research has examined accessibility and past appraisals and found effects similar to the ones in Study 2 of this project. Specifically, past research has found that, when participants are asked to list thoughts about a positive past event, those that find the thought listing easy are more likely to view the past event as temporally closer than those who have a difficult thought-listing task (see Sanna et al., 2004; Haddock, 2004). Thus, in thinking about past events, accessibility can change temporal appraisal of the past event. The present study examines the role of accessibility in the construction of temporal aspects of a future event.
CHAPTER 4

STUDY 3: FANTASY FOOTBALL

While Studies 1 and 2 demonstrate the interaction of temporal factors and impression management, they rely on scenario methodologies and concern subjective temporal perceptions. Though previous research has found that subjective temporal perception is similar to that of actual time for both the past (see Ross & Wilson, 2003; Sanna et al., 2004) and future (See Trope & Liberman, 2003), a complete analysis of temporal perception should include manipulations of actual time. Additionally, since the link between impression management and time has not been established prior to this project, actual time needs to be taken into account in order to be sure there are no fundamental differences in time perception with respect to impression management. Therefore, Studies 3 and 4 manipulate actual time versus subjective awareness of time as was done in Studies 1 and 2.

Study 3 gives people the chance to use the same information in all conditions of the study. It focuses on manipulating a minimal connection with impression management targets and actual temporal distance from an evaluative event. This is an extension of Study 1 because it adds a real time element to the impression management process. Further, Study 3 increases motivation by awarding a prize to the participants with the best performances. Thus, Study 3 builds on the previous studies in this project by using a real time manipulation and adding a motivational factor.
Study 3 assessed the impact of time on decisions based on indirect and direct self-presentation. The goal was to see whether time could change the evaluative weight that people placed on direct and indirect self-presentation. The study manipulation involved asking participants to compete in a “fantasy football” game that corresponded to the NFL Pro Bowl on February 13, 2005. “Fantasy football” is a popular pastime among NFL fans, and it involves fans picking a “team” of players based on their statistical performance, then pitting that “team” against other fans’ “teams” using the players’ performance in a given game or on a given day. “Fantasy football” provides a novel arena through which to test predictions about the use of indirect and direct self-presentation.

Study 3 manipulated minimal connections with others through a shared birth month. This is a type of indirect self-presentational technique that is used often (see Cialdini, 2001; Finch & Cialdini, 1989; Leary, 1995; Cialdini & DeNicholas, 1989; Cialdini, 1989; Carter & Sanna, under review). Though I did not ask participants to use self-presentation per se, the use of minimal connections with others is a form of indirect self-presentation, so it is included in this study.

I hypothesized that participants who picked their fantasy teams 3 weeks prior to the Pro Bowl game would rely more on indirect minimal connections (through a birthday manipulation), but that participants picking their teams 3 days before the Pro Bowl would rely more on the direct evidence of player quality – statistics from last season. Specifically, I hypothesized that there will be an interaction such that participants who are minimally-connected with the worst players will use the birthday-connection information more in the distant future versus near-future, while participants connected with the best players will choose those players regardless of temporal condition.
Method

Participants

Participants were members of psychology classes who were given a chance at extra credit for their participation in this study. Having participants believe that the extra credit was contingent on task performance ensured that participants would try to win the competition and make the choices they felt were the most advantageous. Two classes completed the study on January 24, 2005 (20 days before the NFL Pro Bowl). Two different classes completed the study on February 10, 2005 (3 days before the Pro Bowl). Participants were told that the students with the top three “fantasy teams” based on the statistics from the actual Pro Bowl would be awarded extra credit.

Procedure

All participants were given a packet containing information about fantasy football, statistics for each player who would play in the Pro Bowl, manipulation checks, and a debriefing (see Appendix D for the packet). Participants completed the packet in order, without going back to pages once they completed them. Each page of the statistics portion of the packet contained the statistics for each player in a given position. For example, the quarterbacks page contained statistical summaries for each of the 6 quarterbacks in the Pro Bowl. Participants were asked to select a specific number of players for each position (in the case of quarterbacks, three of the six players were to be selected).

The statistics contained two general elements. First, each player’s statistics from the past season were given for each fantasy football category. Second, the player’s birthday was given. Based on the information given, the best choices for each position were clear. On average, the best choice should have been the player with the best statistics in the fantasy
football categories from the past season. The statistics are analogous to direct cues of performance. The birthday for each player is analogous to an indirect connection (see Finch & Cialdini, 1989).

With respect to the birthday connection, there were two groups of participants – the “worst-players-connection” group and the “best-players-connection” group. In order to control for potential differences in number of or feelings about specific months, the groups were constructed based on randomly assigned months. The “worst-players-connection” group was made up of participants whose actual birthdays were in January, March, August, and November. The “best-players-connection” group consisted of those with birthdays in April, June, September, and October. I manipulated the birthday information such that the football players that were worst, statistically speaking, all had birthdays in January, March, August, and November (just like the “worst-players connection” group). Further, I manipulated the birthdays of the best football players to be in April, June, September, or October (just like the “best-players-connection” group).

After participants completed the fantasy football task, they were debriefed and thanked for participation. Winners were chosen for the competition, as promised, by players’ actual performances in the Pro Bowl. In addition, another winner for each class was randomly chosen from all participants.

Results

As described earlier, my hypothesis was that there would be an interaction such that the participants in the “worst-players-connection” group would be more likely to choose players who shared birthday connections with them in the distant versus near future. To test this hypothesis, I conducted a 2 (connection group: best players, worst players) x 2 (time:
near-future, distant-future) ANOVA. The predicted interaction was present, $F(1, 71) = 14.52, p < .001, \eta^2 = .17$ (see Figure 3). Further analysis revealed that, as predicted, the interaction was due to the “worst-players-connection” participants using the birthday connection more in the distant future ($M = 4.05, SD = 1.08$) than in the near future ($M = 2.21, SD = .86$), $t(36) = 5.83, p < .001, d = 1.88$. There was no significant difference for birthday connection use for participants in the “best-players-connection” group (distant: $M = 5.85, SD = 1.27$; near: $M = 6.00, SD = 1.28$), $t(35) = .36, p > .20$. Thus, participants in the “worst-players-connection” group based their picks on birthday connection information more in the distant future versus near future\(^2\).

In addition, there was a main effect for connection-group, $F(1, 71) = 114.19, p < .001, \eta^2 = .62$. The participants in the “best-players-connection” group chose players whose birth months matched their own ($M = 5.92, SD = 1.26$) significantly more than did the participants in the “worst-players-connection” group ($M = 3.13, SD = 1.34$). There was also a main effect for time, $F(1, 71) = 10.47, p < .01, \eta^2 = .13$, with participants being more likely to choose players based on shared birthdays in the distant future ($M = 4.97, SD = 1.48$) than in the near future ($M = 4.00, SD = 2.19$).

Discussion

There is strong support for the hypothesis that participants will choose a player based on an indirect link (the shared birthday) in the distant-future choice condition, but not in the near-future choice condition. This provides further evidence that people use indirect and direct connections differently at different time points. This study also provides further evidence for the idea that indirect and direct self-presentation exist at different construal

\(^2\)A third condition in which participants did not share a birth month with any of players was also collected, and those participants chose players with the best statistics, regardless of time condition.
levels. Further, it demonstrates that a prototypical indirect connection, the shared birthday similarity, is used differently depending on timing.

This study uses the novel “fantasy football” contest to allow for testing direct versus indirect connections in real time. The previous studies in this project have used scenarios to test other aspects of this phenomenon, but this study extends the notion by manipulating actual time before the event. Such a study is a critical key to establishing the role of construal level in self-presentation.

The indirect and direct connections used in Study 3 were analogous to the information used by self-presenters, though they were not specifically attempts at self-presentation per se. Therefore, Study 4 is designed to replicate the construal level effect in real time, but with more of an emphasis on actual impression management.
The results of Study 3 demonstrated that people use minimal connections differentially at different time frames. Study 4 was designed to directly assess impression management over actual time as opposed to measuring the use of minimal connections and past performances. Study 4 used a situation in which people believed they were competing to be placed on a team that had a chance to win a prize. People were interviewed and given a chance to use either indirect or direct self-presentation. This paradigm allowed me to measure the use of indirect and direct self-presentation more directly than Study 3, while manipulating actual time.

Studies 1 and 3 measured the use of indirect and direct self-presentation, while this study measures self-rated effectiveness of impression management. These are the two dimensions measured by previous research on indirect and direct self-presentation, so it was appropriate to include both dimensions in this project.  

As in Study 3, this study provided motivation (this time through a prize) and manipulated actual time instead of subjective temporal perception. Thus, this was a conceptual replication of Study 3, but it measured perceived effectiveness versus use of

---

1 For examples of measuring the use of impression management, see Cialdini et al., 1974, 1976; Lee, 1985; Snyder et al., 1986; Altman & Taylor, 1973. For examples of measuring the effectiveness of impression management, see Bizman & Yoel, 2002; Finch & Cialdini, 1989; Arkin, 1981.
impression management. Further, this study manipulated impression management rather than minimal connections to others.

I predicted that participants using direct self-presentation who believed that the team task would occur in the near future would rate themselves as being more likely to make the team than those who used direct self-presentation in the distant future. Participants in the indirect self-presentation conditions should have shown an opposite pattern of ratings, believing that they were more likely to make the team in the distant future condition than the near future condition.

Method

Participants

Participants were 61 students enrolled in introductory psychology who completed this study in partial fulfillment of a research requirement.

Procedure

Participants completed this study individually. The study was described as examining aspects of teamwork. When they arrived at the lab, they met a confederate who was posing as a team captain. The participants were told that the team captain would be selecting one more member for her team which would be competing for a prize valued at $20 per team member. The prize would be a gift certificate of the participants’ choice. They were told that they would be competing for this place on the team with a participant who was already placed in a different interview room.

Temporal construal was manipulated by changing the date on which the team competition would supposedly occur. Participants in the near future condition were told that they would be informed whether or not they made the team and allowed to compete for the
prize as soon as the interview was over. Participants in the distant future condition were told that they would find out whether they made the team and allowed to compete for the prize in a session of the study that would occur in 3 weeks.

After meeting the team captain, participants were escorted to a room in the lab where they completed the interview. They were told that the interview was going to take place on the computer, because the study was about computer-mediated interaction in the interview process. Participants were given a log-on password to a session of America Online Instant Messenger, which is a messaging service that allows people to “chat” much like they would on a phone, using the computer and typing their messages to each other. Participants were told that the team captain would be asking them 3 questions to determine whether or not they would make the team. They were told that the captain may ask the other potential team members different questions if she chose to do so.4

Once the participant logged onto the Instant Messenger session, the captain asked the first question. Participants were given the instruction that they may only answer the question given to them and not engage in “small talk” since this might have interfered with the standardization of the study. The participants were given questions relating to either direct or indirect self-presentation (see Appendix D for the three questions in each condition). Direct self-presentation questions concerned aspects about the participants’ own achievements (i.e. “What is the personal achievement that you are proudest of?”) and indirect questions allowed participants to link themselves to the achievement of others (i.e. “If you had to describe your hero, who is it and why is that person your hero?”). Thus, the use of direct and indirect self-

4 Participants were not given information about the questions for the “other” potential team member because it might color their perceptions of their own chances at making the team. That is, if they expected that the other person would get the same questions, they may have felt that their chances were equal to the other person on the basis of that simple facet of the study.
presentation was manipulated through the type of question the participant was asked to answer.

After the interview was over, participants were asked to reflect on how they thought the interview went. They were given a packet that contained items that measured their self-rated probability of making the team and their self-ratings on a scale designed to measure interpersonal prestige (see Appendix D).

After participants finished the ratings packet, they were informed that the study was over, debriefed, and thanked for participation. In order to be fair, all participants were entered into a drawing to select a winner of a $20 gift card to the store of the winner’s choice.

Results and Discussion

With this study, I was interested in assessing how effective participants felt these techniques were when there were actual consequences and benefits to the timing of their self-presentation. I predicted that, in the conditions where construal level matched the impression management technique, participants would view their attempts at self-presentation as being more effective than where the condition did not match the technique. Specifically, I predicted that participants in the direct self-presentation, near-future construal and indirect self-presentation, distant-future construal conditions would be likely to deem their self-presentation as more effective than those in the direct self-presentation, distant-future or indirect self-presentation, near future conditions.

To test this, I conducted a 2 (temporal condition: near-future vs. distant-future) x 2 (self-presentation: direct vs. indirect) ANOVA on participants’ probability ratings and answers to subjective questions concerning how much the interviewer liked them and how well they did on the interview. I also examined participants’ self-rated effectiveness as
measured by a scale of interpersonal prestige. I expected a significant two-way interaction when examining the participants’ expected probabilities of making the team.

**Self-Rated Probabilities**

The first hypothesis of this study was that participants in the “matching” temporal conditions (indirect self-presentation with distant future; direct self-presentation with near future) would rate their probability of securing the position on the team as being greater than those in the “mismatched” conditions (indirect self-presentation with near future; direct self-presentation with distant future). To test this, I subjected the probability ratings to a 2 (temporal condition: near-future vs. distant-future) x 2 (self-presentation: direct vs. indirect) ANOVA. There was a significant interaction, $F(1, 57) = 4.74, p < .05, \eta^2 = .08$. As can be seen in Figure 4, the interaction was as predicted, with participants in the “matched” conditions rating their probabilities as higher ($M = .69, SD = .18$) than those in the “mismatched” conditions ($M = .58, SD = .17$), $t(59) = 2.22, p < .05, d = .63$.

**Ratings about the Interview**

Participants in the “matched” conditions were also expected to rate their performance in the interview more highly than those in the “mismatched” conditions. Results of a 2 (temporal condition: near-future vs. distant-future) x 2 (self-presentation: direct vs. indirect) ANOVA on participants’ scores on the single-item measure their performance showed the predicted interaction, $F(1, 57) = 16.11, p < .001, \eta^2 = .22$ (see Figure 5). Further analysis of the means reveal that the interaction was in the predicted pattern, with “matched” conditions ($M = 5.13, SD = 4.18$) rating their performance more positively than “mismatched” conditions ($M = .42, SD = 4.89$), $t(57) = 4.04, p < .001, d = 1.04$.

**Ratings of Likeability**
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Participants also completed a single-item measure designed to assess how much they thought the interviewer liked them. Consistent with prior hypotheses, I predicted that participants in the “matched” conditions would rate themselves as more likeable than those in the “mismatched” condition. The results of a 2 (temporal condition: near-future vs. distant-future) x 2 (self-presentation: direct vs. indirect) ANOVA revealed the predicted interaction, $F(1, 57) = 8.16, p < .01, \eta^2 = .13$. The pattern of means was as predicted, with “matched” participants ($M = 5.23, SD = 3.79$) rating themselves as more likeable than “mismatched” participants ($M = 2.39, SD = 3.88$), $t(59) = 2.90, p < .10, d = .74$.

**Ratings of Interpersonal Prestige**

Participants were asked to rate what the interviewer thought of them on a number of traits. Six of these traits (“friendly,” “outgoing,” “personable,” “warm,” “likeable,” “pleasant”) comprise the interpersonal dimension of a scale designed to measure interpersonal prestige (see Carter & Sanna, under review). Participants ratings of the traits on this dimension are reliable ($\alpha = .91$), and it provides a useful index of how effective participants felt their efforts at self-presentation were.

When this index was subjected to a 2 (temporal condition: near-future vs. distant-future) x 2 (self-presentation: direct vs. indirect) ANOVA, the predicted effect that participants in the “matched” conditions rated themselves higher than those in the “mismatched” condition was found, $F(1, 57) = 4.90, p < .05, \eta^2 = .08$ (see Figure 6). The pattern of means shows that participants in the “matched” conditions ($M = 3.43, SD = 4.10$) did, indeed rate themselves higher on the interpersonal effectiveness measure than those in the “mismatched” condition ($M = 1.25, SD = 4.22$), $t(59) = 2.04, p < .05, d = .52$. 
Thus, the self-rated effectiveness of indirect and direct self-presentation changed over time, depending on which construal level was manipulated. Participants in the conditions that “matched” (indirect, distant future and direct, near future) rated themselves more positively and their chances at “making the team” greater than those in conditions in which the construal levels did not “match” (indirect, near future and direct, distant future). This study is unique because it measures the effectiveness of impression management instead of its use and it does so with a manipulation of actual time. Further, it examines situations in which construal levels are consistent or inconsistent and proposes that this is a possible implication for why temporal construal matters for impression management.
CHAPTER 6
GENERAL DISCUSSION

This dissertation tested the idea that impression management can be affected by temporal factors. Specifically, I suggested that impression management is differentially affected by timing through the processes of temporal construal. Temporal construal theory (Trope & Liberman, 2003) advocates that features of an event are selectively utilized at different time points relative to the event. Specifically, decontextualized, broader, general information is more useful at distant time points, while specific, detailed information is more useful at near time points, relative to the event in question. Thus, the idea underlying this dissertation was to assess the role of temporal construal in situations of impression management.

Indirect self-presentation is used more and rated as more effective at a distance when compared to direct self-presentation, while direct self-presentation is used more and is rated as more effective in the near future. The studies in this dissertation support this idea using a variety of methodologies, manipulations, and situations. Studies 1 and 2 provide initial tests of the effect using scenario methodologies. Studies 3 and 4 manipulate real time through simulations of a fantasy football contest and audition for group membership. Studies 1, 3, and 4 manipulate time and measure both the use (Studies 1 and 3) and self-rated effectiveness (Study 4) of indirect and direct self-presentation. Study 2 holds actual time
constant, manipulates subjective time and impression management, and measures participants’ ratings of subjective temporal distance. Thus, these studies, when taken as a whole, present a picture of temporal construal in impression management in numerous different lights. While no one study gives the definitive answer to this inquiry, this series of studies is robust.

Implications for Impression Management

Extending indirect and direct self-presentation into a temporal framework is an important step in exploring impression management. Incorporating timing into impression management opens new avenues of research. Impression management is not a static process, but, instead, it can be viewed as a more natural, dynamic process that occurs through time. This is more in line with the actual interpersonal environment. After all, we do not always present ourselves at the exact same time for every interpersonal situation. We must select the right time for the right technique of self-presentation. Prior research has demonstrated that people often use self-presentation in order to foster future success (i.e., on job interviews, when making first impressions) and after a positive or negative event (i.e., being connected with a negatively viewed other, after a victory or defeat). However, past investigations have focused exclusively on time periods directly preceding an event or immediately following an event (Cialdini et al., 1976; Snyder et al., 1986). By extending the time frame to the distant future, this dissertation provides a more complete and nuanced picture of how time may moderate impression management.

It may be that some specific types of direct (e.g. modesty, bragging, disclosure, etc.) or indirect (e.g., basking, boosting, cutting off reflected failure, etc.) self-presentation may work better at some times versus others. It is entirely possible that specific techniques are
more susceptible to temporal factors than others. Future research is needed to delineate the exact nature of this relationship, but this project provides the basis for the exploration. By demonstrating that indirect and direct connections and tactics are influenced by temporal perspective, this study provides the groundwork for these future investigations.

By examining how direct and indirect self-presentation operate in tandem, this dissertation offers a new perspective on tactics of impression management. Most research paradigms focus either on delineating specific techniques (e.g., Cialdini et al., 1976; Finch & Cialdini, 1989; Snyder et al., 1986; Leary, 1995) or on how impression management affects one’s feelings about oneself (e.g., Tesser, 1988) or the social environment (e.g., Jones, 1990). The ideas presented in this dissertation extend the role of self-presentation by delineating how factors (in this case time) can affect choice and effectiveness of self-presentation type. This is a more integrative picture of the mechanics of self-presentation, and should provide future avenues of research possibilities.

**Implications for Time and Temporal Construal**

The temporal effects on impression management may not be limited to investigations of future choices. There is reason to suspect that reflections on the past influence ratings of the effectiveness of impression management as well. Temporal self appraisal theory (Ross & Wilson, 2002; Wilson & Ross, 2003; Sanna et al., 2004) advocates that as temporal distance increases, we tend to view our past selves more negatively. Further, more negative past selves are seen as more temporally distant. The underlying notion is that we tend to bask with positive past selves and cut off the reflected failure of negative past selves. The studies in this dissertation found that indirect self-presentation is represented at a higher level construal, thus providing a complimentary explanation for the results represented by
temporal self appraisal theory. It may be the case that the basking and cutting reflected failure are simply natural attempts at using indirect self-presentation where it is most effective. While the current project looks at self-presentation on other people, it could be extended to fit with self-presentation to the self, as well. It must be noted that, even if temporal construal can account for the results of temporal self appraisal, it in no way diminishes the impact of those findings. It simply provides an extension to previous examinations of the past as well as future.

Another useful broadening of this project would be to look at the effect of the timing of impression management on others’ views of the self-presenter. Previous research has indicated that temporal perspective can change people’s causal attributions of behavior (Frank & Gilovich, 1989), biases in explaining behavior (Nussbaum, et al., 2003), and assessment of risk preference of others (Hsee & Weber, 1997). Related research on variety-seeking as an impression management tactic has shown that temporal placement matters (Ariely & Levav, 2000; Hsee & Zhang, 2004). Specifically, one’s temporal position in relation to others makes a difference in preferences. An extension of this idea is that impression management, as an overall process, has differential effects on one’s audience, depending on one’s timing. Since self-presentation research usually relies on measuring one’s assessment of one’s own attempts at impression management, this project focuses on self-ratings. However, it does not preclude the idea that there are differential effects on others with respect to temporal perspective.

The application of temporal construal to impression management suggests that temporal construal may be used to explain differences in a number of interpersonal processes. Prior research on construal shows that it changes perceptions of events and other
people (see Sagristano, Trope, & Liberman, 2002; Nussbaum et al., 2003), but the studies in this dissertation add a motivational component as well. To the extent that people are motivated to appear in a positive light to others, they often engage in impression management. The fact that time can change impression management tactics demonstrates that people are intuitively aware of the effects of time as it relates to construal. This presents an intriguing view of human social perception that should be examined further in the future.

This project provides a basis for later exploration of the nuances of temporal perspective and impression management. It does so by exploring the role of temporal construal on self-ratings of impression management tactics. Further, it compares the use and usefulness of indirect and direct tactics of self-presentation, giving consideration to timing as a moderator of these techniques. By placing impression management into the framework of temporal construal, this project allows for new and innovative ideas concerning the dynamics of timing, the interpersonal situation, and self-presentation.
**Table 1:** Differences in aspects of temporal construal by statement type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract/Concrete</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured/Unstructured</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Secondary</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-Relevant/Goal-Irrelevant</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-Like/Situational</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-Reaching/Context-Specific</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple/Complex</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Positive β represent values in the direction of the hypotheses. All F-values consist of df (1, 132).*
Figure 1: Statements as a function of time condition and type of self-presentation.
Figure 2: Subjective temporal distance ratings as a function of thought-listing and self-presentation type.

Note: Distance Ratings scale was a 21-point scale, with lower numbers corresponding to closer events and higher numbers corresponding to more distant events.
Figure 3. Players chosen for fantasy teams as a function of minimal connections and time.
Figure 4. Self-rated probabilities of making the team as a function of time and self-presentation type.
Figure 5. Self-ratings of interview performance as a function of time and self-presentation type.

Note: Interview Ratings scale was a 21-point scale, with lower numbers corresponding to worse performance and higher numbers corresponding to better performance.
Figure 6. Interpersonal effectiveness as a function of time and self-presentation type.

Note: Interpersonal effectiveness scale was a 21-point scale, with lower numbers corresponding to worse performance and higher numbers corresponding to better performance. Figure is based on mean responses to the items.
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Study 1 Materials

*Imagine the Following Situation*

Imagine that you have just graduated from college with a degree in business. Your goal is to find a job that you enjoy, which pays well and provides you with security, benefits, and comfort, while also allowing you to be creative.

After graduation you take a trip to visit some friends in New York City, a city where you’d eventually like to live. Imagine that you are waiting for a table at a restaurant along with some friends and you begin talking about your recent graduation. Someone in a group of other diners waiting nearby overhears your conversation and introduces himself. It turns out that he owns a large advertising firm. He mentions that he overheard that you have just graduated and are on the job-market looking for a job. You talk for a while and he mentions that he owns a large marketing firm and that they are looking for several new employees. During the conversation, he tells you that there is a position on a marketing team in his firm that is available in 3 months.

Imagine the job interview that will take place in 3 months. Imagine the things that you will tell the interviewer in 3 months in order to try to make yourself look good because you think the job description sounds perfect. On the lines below, please list statements you could make that would make a positive impression on the interviewer.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
Imagine the Following Situation

Imagine that you have just graduated from college with a degree in business. Your goal is to find a job that you enjoy, which pays well and provides you with security, benefits, and comfort, while also allowing you to be creative.

After graduation you take a trip to visit some friends in New York City, a city where you’d eventually like to live. Imagine that you are waiting for a table at a restaurant along with some friends and you begin talking about your recent graduation. Someone in a group of other diners waiting nearby overhears your conversation and introduces himself. It turns out that he owns a large advertising firm. He mentions that he overheard that you have just graduated and are on the job-market looking for a job. You talk for a while and he mentions that he owns a large marketing firm and that they are looking for several new employees. During the conversation, he tells you that there is a position on a marketing team in his firm that is available immediately.

Imagine the job interview that will take place the next morning. Imagine the things that you will tell the interviewer the next morning in order to try to make yourself look good because you think the job description sounds perfect. On the lines below, please list statements you could make that would make a positive impression on the interviewer.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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1. When was the interview going to occur? ________________

2. How confident are you that you could get the job, based on the statements you made? ________________

3. What seems unnatural about this scenario?
Ratings scales used by judges of direct and indirect statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Is the statement an example of direct self-presentation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Is the statement an example of indirect self-presentation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratings scales used by judges of temporal construal aspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide-Reaching</td>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-like</td>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-Relevant</td>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We are interested in the kinds of statements people make in job interviews. Specifically, we are interested in indirect self-presentation. The following are examples of indirect self-presentation.

It is when someone manipulates minimal connections with another person or group in order to look good to others. For example, you might claim to pull for the same sports team as the person you are trying to impress.

You might also try to distance yourself from people that are seen as failures. For instance, if your fraternity was placed on probation for hazing, you might say to other people that you had nothing to do with it and you hardly go to fraternity meetings anymore.

You might wear name brands, drop the names of celebrities you have met, or claim a connection with the other person’s hometown or alma mater.

With these types of actions in mind, think about the interview you have 1 month from now. In the spaces below, please list 3 (12) indirect self-presentation statements that you might make to your potential boss in order to impress him. Even though you may be making up these statements, imagine that it is a “right place” in the conversation for each one and that the statements are accurate. Remember, you really want to impress the boss and win your dream job!
We are interested in the kinds of statements people make in job interviews. Specifically, we are interested in direct self-presentation. The following are examples of direct self-presentation.

It is when you strategically manipulate things about yourself in order to look good.

It can include announcing your achievements to others, for example talking about awards or honors you won.

It can include being modest about your achievements. For instance, remarking after an MVP performance in a game that it was “a team effort,” even though you won the game for the team.

It can involve ingratiating yourself to others, complimenting them on things they have done well, in order to appear gracious.

It can also involve self-disclosure, telling others information about yourself to make them like you more.

With these types of actions in mind, think about the interview you have 1 month from now. In the spaces below, please list 3 (12) direct self-presentation statements that you might make to your potential boss in order to impress him. Even though you may be making up these statements, imagine that is a “right place” in the conversation for each one and that the statements are accurate. Remember, you really want to impress the boss and win your dream job!
Future experiences can sometimes feel close or far away, irrespective of when they will actually occur. With the job interview you imagined in mind, please indicate how close or far away the interview feels to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feels Very Close</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Feels Very Far Away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels Very Near</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Feels Very Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**FANTASY FOOTBALL – NFL PRO BOWL**

The NFL Pro Bowl will take place in 3 **weeks on Sunday, February 13th** in Honolulu, HI. This football game pits the best players from each division of the NFL against each other. It is a chance for the best players in the league to show off some of the talent that made them the best.

Fantasy football leagues have become exceedingly popular in the last few years. We are interested in looking at the nuances of this phenomenon. In the upcoming task, you will be asked to assume the role of a member of a fantasy football league. The winner of this fantasy football game will receive a $20 gift card to the restaurant or store of his/her choice. Before we get started, though, we have listed some information on Fantasy Football for those that may not be familiar with how it works.

To start a fantasy football game, participants draft football players that they think will perform well in the upcoming game. You will be given a certain amount of players to draft for each position, along with a breakdown of scoring for that position. Your goal is to assemble the fantasy “team” who will score the most points, as defined by the breakdown, in the upcoming game (in this case the Pro Bowl). To help you, we have given you the stats of each Pro Bowl player from this past season.

Fantasy Football games are typically played on a weekly basis - each week your team will compete against other teams from your league. The team that scores the most points from their players' performance that week wins the game. To prepare for a game, you'll need to set your lineup before the game is played.

On the following pages are stats for each player in the game, the scoring for each position, and spaces to choose your players. Remember, whoever’s “team” of players performs the best in the Pro Bowl wins the prize. The winner will be notified after the Pro Bowl is over. You can watch the Pro Bowl to see how your “team” performs. It will take place **IN THREE WEEKS, FEB. 13, at 7:30pm on ESPN**!

Turn the page to begin…
Quarterbacks – Pick 3

Scoring:
1 point for every 20 yards passing  
4 points for every passing touchdown (TD)  
1 point for every 10 yards rushing  
6 points for every rushing touchdown (TD)

Here are your 6 choices for Quarterback. You will choose 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarterback</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>2004 Stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daunte Culpepper</td>
<td>4/14/1977</td>
<td>4,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Vick</td>
<td>1/13/1980</td>
<td>2313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brady</td>
<td>3/20/1977</td>
<td>3690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Brees</td>
<td>8/29/1979</td>
<td>3159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peyton Manning</td>
<td>10/9/1976</td>
<td>4,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49 yards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list your 3 choices for Quarterback in the blanks below.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Halfbacks – Pick 3

Scoring:
1 point for every 10 yards Rushing
6 points for every Rushing touchdown (TD)
1 point for every 10 yards Receiving
6 points for every Receiving touchdown (TD)

Here are your 6 choices for Halfback. You will choose 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Born: 8/15/1978</th>
<th>2004 Stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edgerrin James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rushing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Receiving</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Born: 9/26/1977</th>
<th>2004 Stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rushing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Receiving</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Born: 11/10/1973</th>
<th>2004 Stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rushing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Receiving</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Born: 10/8/1975</th>
<th>2004 Stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiki Barber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rushing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Receiving</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Born: 6/14/1979</th>
<th>2004 Stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LaDainian Tomlinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rushing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Receiving</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Born: 1/6/1977</th>
<th>2004 Stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahman Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rushing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Receiving</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list your 3 choices for Halfback in the blanks below.

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________
ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
Fullbacks – Pick 1

Scoring:
1 point for every 10 yards Rushing
6 points for every Rushing touchdown (TD)
1 point for every 10 yards Receiving
6 points for every Receiving touchdown (TD)

Here are your 2 choices for Fullback. You will choose 1.

William Henderson
Born: 9/19/1971
2004 Stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rushing</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tony Richardson
Born: 3/3/1971
2004 Stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rushing</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list your 1 choice for Fullback in the blank below.

_________________________________________________________________________________

ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
Wide Receivers – Pick 4

Scoring:
1 point for every 10 yards Receiving
6 points for every Receiving touchdown (TD)

Here are your 8 choices for Wide Receiver. You will choose 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>2004 Stats Receiving</th>
<th>Yards</th>
<th>TD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Harrison</td>
<td>8/7/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre Johnson</td>
<td>11/19/1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Johnson</td>
<td>1/22/1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hines Ward</td>
<td>3/1/1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Horn</td>
<td>4/30/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhsin Muhammad</td>
<td>6/21/1973</td>
<td></td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrell Owens</td>
<td>10/16/1973</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javon Walker</td>
<td>9/8/1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list your 4 choices for Wide Receiver in the blanks below.

____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
___________________________________________________
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Tight Ends – Pick 2

Scoring:
1 point for every 10 yards Receiving
6 points for every Receiving touchdown (TD)

Here are your 4 choices for Tight End. You will choose 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>2004 Stats Receiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alge Crumpler</td>
<td>8/7/1977</td>
<td>Yards: 774, TD: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Witten</td>
<td>11/19/1981</td>
<td>Yards: 980, TD: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Gonzalez</td>
<td>10/1/1976</td>
<td>Yards: 1258, TD: 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list your 2 choices for Tight End in the blanks below.

____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
Kickers – Pick 1

Scoring:
3 points for every Field Goal made (FGM)
1 point for every extra point made (XP)

Here are your 2 choices for Kicker. You will choose 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David Akers</th>
<th>Adam Vinatieri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born: 8/17/1974</td>
<td>Born: 9/19/1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Stats</td>
<td>2004 Stats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Goals</td>
<td>Field Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGM</td>
<td>FGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Points</td>
<td>Extra Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP</td>
<td>XP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list your 1 choice for Kicker in the blank below.

____________________________________________________

ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
Defensive Ends – Pick 3

Scoring:
1 point for each Tackle (TA)
0.5 point for each Assist (AS)
4 points for each Sack (SA)
3 points for each Forced Fumble (FF)
2 points for each Fumble Recovery (FR)

Here are your 6 choices for Defensive End. You will choose 3.

### Bertrand Berry
Born: 4/11/1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tackles</th>
<th>Fumbles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dwight Freeney
Born: 8/7/1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tackles</th>
<th>Fumbles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### John Abraham
Born: 8/26/1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tackles</th>
<th>Fumbles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Julius Peppers
Born: 9/28/1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tackles</th>
<th>Fumbles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Patrick Kerney
Born: 9/20/1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tackles</th>
<th>Fumbles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Jason Taylor
Born: 1/4/1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tackles</th>
<th>Fumbles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list your 3 choices for Defensive End in the blanks below.

____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
Interior Linemen – Pick 3

Scoring:
1 point for each Tackle (TA)
0.5 point for each Assist (AS)
4 points for each Sack (SA)
3 points for each Forced Fumble (FF)
2 points for each Fumble Recovery (FR)

Here are your 6 choices for Interior Lineman. You will choose 3.

Sam Adams
Born: 11/20/1973
Tackles
TA  AS  SA  FF  FR
26  15  5.0  0  0

La’Roi Glover
Born: 1/18/1974
Tackles
TA  AS  SA  FF  FR
31  10  7.0  1  0

Richard Seymour
Born: 3/9/1979
Tackles
TA  AS  SA  FF  FR
25  15  5.0  1  1

Shaun Rogers
Born: 10/27/1979
Tackles
TA  AS  SA  FF  FR
49  19  4.5  0  1

Marcus Stroud
Born: 6/13/1978
Tackles
TA  AS  SA  FF  FR
38  16  4.5  2  1

Kevin Williams
Born: 4/30/1980
Tackles
TA  AS  SA  FF  FR
52  17  11.0  2  3

Please list your 3 choices for Interior Lineman in the blanks below.

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
Outside Linebacker – Pick 3

Scoring:
1 point for each Tackle (TA)
0.5 point for each Assist (AS)
4 points for each Sack (SA)
1 point for each Pass Deflection (PD)
5 points for each Interception (INT)

Here are your 6 choices for Outside Linebacker. You will choose 3.

Keith Brooking  
Born: 4/6/1975
Tackles  Pass Defense
TA  AS  SA  PD  INT
86  15  2.0  6  3

Joey Porter  
Born: 8/18/1977
Tackles  Pass Defense
TA  AS  SA  PD  INT
37  17  7.0  12  1

Derrick Brooks  
Tackles  Pass Defense
TA  AS  SA  PD  INT
109  28  3.0  6  1

Takeo Spikes  
Born: 4/14/1976
Tackles  Pass Defense
TA  AS  SA  PD  INT
68  35  4.0  18  5

Marcus Washington  
Born: 3/9/1977
Tackles  Pass Defense
TA  AS  SA  PD  INT
87  19  4.0  3  0

Marcus Washington  
Born: 11/7/1982
Tackles  Pass Defense
TA  AS  SA  PD  INT
46  14  10.5  1  0

Please list your 3 choices for Outside Linebacker in the blanks below.

____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
Inside Linebacker – Pick 2

Scoring:
1 point for each Tackle (TA)
0.5 point for each Assist (AS)
4 points for each Sack (SA)
1 point for each Pass Deflection (PD)
5 points for each Interception (INT)

Here are your 4 choices for Inside Linebacker. You will choose 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Tackles</th>
<th>Pass Defense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Farrior</td>
<td>10/1/1975</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Lewis</td>
<td>6/16/1975</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Morgan</td>
<td>1/7/1978</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Trotter</td>
<td>3/22/1977</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list your 2 choices for Inside Linebacker in the blanks below.


ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
**Corner Back – Pick 3**

Scoring:
- 1 point for each Tackle (TA)
- 0.5 point for each Assist (AS)
- 4 points for each Sack (SA)
- 1 point for each Pass Deflection (PD)
- 5 points for each Interception (INT)

Here are your 6 choices for Corner Back. You will choose 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Tackles</th>
<th>Pass Defense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ronde Barber</strong></td>
<td>10/8/1975</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Champ Bailey</strong></td>
<td>9/3/1978</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dre Bly</strong></td>
<td>3/31/1977</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tory James</strong></td>
<td>1/12/1973</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lito Sheppard</strong></td>
<td>6/19/1981</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chris McAlister</strong></td>
<td>11/13/1977</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list your 3 choices for Corner Back in the blanks below.

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
Safety – Pick 3

Scoring:
1 point for each Tackle (TA)
0.5 point for each Assist (AS)
4 points for each Sack (SA)
1 point for each Pass Deflection (PD)
5 points for each Interception (INT)

Here are your 6 choices for Safety. You will choose 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>INT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Lynch</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born: 3/31/1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Dawkins</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born: 9/3/1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Polamalu</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born: 10/29/1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lewis</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born: 11/12/1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Reed</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born: 6/19/1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Williams</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born: 1/24/1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please list your 3 choices for Safety in the blanks below.

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

ONCE YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
Good luck with your picks! We will notify the winner on Monday, Feb. 15th. Below are just a few questions concerning your prize eligibility and this Fantasy Football contest.

1. What is your favorite NFL team? ________________________________

2. Do you know of any players from this team in the Pro Bowl (please circle a response)?
   Yes  No

3. If you answered Yes to Question 2, please list the players’ names below.
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

4. What is your birthdate (MM/DD/YYYY)? ___/___/_____

5. If you win, where would you like your gift card to be from?
   __________________________

6. Did you use the birthday of the player to help you make your picks?  Yes  No

7. If so, how did you use the birthday?

8. Was there anything about this contest that seemed unnatural to you (if so, use the space below to respond)?

9. Please list your name and contact information below so that we can send your gift card if you are the winner.
Debriefing – Fantasy Football Contest

The contest in which you have just participated is part of a study conducted by Seth Carter and Lawrence Sanna at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Don’t worry, it is still a contest in which there is a winner, just as described above. However, there are two groups of participants taking this study. The first group, of which you are a part, is asked to fill out the questionnaire forms approximately 2 weeks prior to the Pro Bowl. The second group is asked to fill out the questionnaire approximately 2 days before the Pro Bowl. There will be a winner from each group of participants.

The reason for having the groups fill out the questionnaires at these two different times is to compare differences in answers between the two groups. As you may have noticed, there was information given about the birthdays of each player, along with their statistics. There was a reason behind this. Probabilistically speaking, your best choice in each group would have been the player with the best statistics from the season. That is, in the absence of other information, the statistics would be the best predictors of performance in the Pro Bowl. Most people will use the statistics to guide their choice. However, what if the player was born in the same month as you? If your birthday is in January, March, April, June, August, September, October, or November, you saw players with birthdays in the same month as your own. Those with birthdays in February, May, July, and December did not see players who shared birth months with them. If your birthday was in April, June, September, or October, the players who shared birth months with you were also the strongest players, statistically speaking. You had an easy choice. For those with birthdays in January, March, August, or November, though, you had a tougher choice. The players with birthdays in the same month as you were less strong, statistically speaking.

Even though you probably didn’t realize it, you may have made your picks, at least in part, on the basis of these trivial birthday connections. This is known as an automatic response. We often use these minimal connections to make ourselves look better. For instance, these connections have been seen in reasoning for cheering for sports teams, wearing name brands, namedropping of celebrities one has met, and feeling pride when one shares the same hometown as a celebrity. People use these connections to look better to others, known as indirect self-presentation. Further, because we are likely to automatically pick up on these connections, we use them in decision-making (like picking fantasy football teams) as well.

What we are interested in is how the subjective awareness of time changes how people use these indirect connections. We hypothesize that people are more likely to use these indirect connections if an event is further away versus when it is closer. Thus, those who shared a birth month with the less successful players will be more likely to use that minimal birthday connection in the 2 week condition (of which you were a part) than the 2 days condition.
If you would like more information concerning this research, please do not hesitate to contact me at scarter@email.unc.edu. Thanks again for your participation, and I’ll let you know if you won!
Appendix D:

Materials from Study 4

Questions asked in the direct self-presentation condition.

1. What awards or honors have you won?
2. What is the personal achievement that you are proudest of?
3. Describe a time when you had to work hard to meet a specific goal.

Questions asked in the indirect self-presentation condition.

1. Have you ever met anyone famous? If so, who did you meet, and what were the circumstances?
2. What organizations do you belong to?
3. If you had to describe your hero, who is it and why is that person your hero?
We are interested in your thoughts about whether or not you made the team. In the blank below, please provide your estimate of the probability how sure you are that you made the team.

_____________ (0% - 100%)
Interpersonal Prestige Scale
The following are traits often that we often use to describe ourselves. Based on your interview for the team, please rate yourself on how you think you appeared to your interviewer. Please circle your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unfriendly</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Friendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Oblivious</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Perceptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Introverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Outgoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unintelligent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Intelligent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unpleasant</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Incompetent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Impersonal</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Personable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Ignorant</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Knowledgeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Callous</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Warm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Likeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfriendly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Obtuse</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Astute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Disrespectable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Respectable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Simple-minded</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Intellectual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unattractive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Ineffective</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Weak</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. How much do you think your interviewer liked you?

*Please circle your response below.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please list the reasons why you answered the way you did in question 1.

3. How would you rate your performance in the interview?

*Please circle your response below.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horrible</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Wonderful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please list the reasons why you answered the way you did in question 3.

5. Do you think you made the team? Please state why you feel this way.
1. Was there anything that seemed unnatural to you about this study? If so, please elaborate.

2. What do you think this study was examining?

3. Did you know your interviewer before today? Yes No
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