The Journal of Social Psychology, 2005, *145*(4), 469–489

Self-Determination and the Use of Self-Presentation Strategies

MELISSA A. LEWIS
CLAYTON NEIGHBORS
North Dakota State University, Fargo

ABSTRACT. The authors evaluated the relationships among individual differences in self-determination and self-presentation. The authors expected less self-determined individuals to report engaging in self-presentation strategies more frequently. To be more specific, the authors expected higher autonomy scores to be associated with the use of fewer self-presentation strategies, whereas they expected higher controlled and higher impersonal orientation scores to be associated with the use of more self-presentation strategies, but for different reasons. Participants (141 women, 111 men, 1 person of unreported gender) completed self-report measures of self-determination and self-presentation. The results indicated that higher autonomy scores were related to the use of fewer self-presentation tactics. Being more controlled was associated with engaging in more self-presentation across the board. Higher impersonal scores were primarily associated with engaging in strategies to gain assistance or prevent high expectations.

Key words: impression management, self-determination, self-presentation

IN THE AREA OF SELF-PRESENTATION, researchers (Gibson & Sachau, 2000; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Lee, Quigley, Nesler, Corbett, & Tedeschi, 1999) have demonstrated that people engage in a variety of strategies that are designed to influence the impression that others form of them. Previous research (Knee & Zuckerman, 1996, 1998; Koestner, Bernieri, & Zuckerman, 1992; Neighbors & Knee, 2003) tentatively supports the idea that individuals who are generally higher in self-determination are less likely to engage in impression management, whereas less self-determined individuals are more likely to engage in impression management. We designed the present study to provide a relatively comprehen-

This research was supported by North Dakota Biomedical Research Infrastructure Network.

Clayton Neighbors is now at the University of Washington, Seattle.

Address correspondence to Melissa A. Lewis, Orientation and Student Success, North Dakota State University, PO Box 5552, Fargo, North Dakota 58105-5552; Melissa.Lewis@ndsu.edu (e-mail).

sive examination of the relationship between individual differences in self-determination and the use of self-presentation strategies.

Self-Presentation Strategies

Self-presentation, also known as *impression management,* is the use of behaviors to intentionally regulate the impressions that observers have of oneself (Goffman, 1959). Managing the impressions of others is instrumental in regulating social rewards and consequences, maintaining or enhancing self-esteem, and constructing and maintaining the self-concept (Baumeister, 1982; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Schlenker, 1980). Typically, the selves that are presented to others are consistent with the self-concepts that individuals privately hold of themselves or perhaps slightly exaggerated in favorable directions (Baumeister; Leary & Kowalski; Schlenker).

Jones and Pittman (1982) developed a taxonomy of impression management techniques that individuals commonly use. Their taxonomy included self-promotion, ingratiation, exemplification, intimidation, and supplication. *Self-promotion* occurs when individuals call attention to their accomplishments to be perceived as capable by observers. *Ingratiation* occurs when individuals use favors or flattery to obtain an attribution of likability from observers. *Exemplification* occurs when individuals go above and beyond what is necessary or expected to be perceived as committed or hardworking. *Intimidation* occurs when individuals project their power or ability to punish to be viewed as dangerous and powerful. Last, *supplication* occurs when individuals present their weaknesses or deficiencies to receive compassion and assistance from others.

Researchers can expand this taxonomy to include a number of additional self-presentation tactics. These include excuses, apologies, justifications, disclaimers, self-handicapping, entitlement, sandbagging, enhancement, and blasting (Gibson & Sachau, 2000; Lee et al., 1999). Excuses, apologies, and justifications serve similar functions. Individuals use *excuses* to deny responsibility for negative events (Tedeschi & Lindskold, 1976). Individuals use *apologies* when they confess to responsibility for harm done to others or negative events or to express guilt and remorse (Tedeschi & Lindskold). Apologies are sometimes used to help restore or to defend an image that has been threatened. Individuals use *justifications* to provide reasons for negative behaviors while accepting some responsibility (Scott & Lyman, 1990). Individuals use *disclaimers* to explain problems before they occur (Hewitt & Stokes, 1975).

Self-handicapping, entitlement, sandbagging, enhancement, and blasting are also self-presentation strategies. *Self-handicapping* occurs when individuals produce obstacles to success with the purpose of preventing observers from making dispositional inferences about one's failure (Berglas & Jones, 1978). *Entitlement* occurs when individuals take credit for positive achievements (Tedeschi & Lindskold, 1976). *Sandbagging* occurs when individuals make false claims of inabil-

ity or engage in a fake demonstration to create low expectations of their performance. *Enhancement* occurs when individuals persuade others that the outcomes of their behaviors are better than they might have originally believed (Schlenker, 1980). Finally, *blasting* occurs when individuals associate themselves with another person or group who is seen positively by others or individuals assert the worth of a group to which they are positively linked (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980).

The underlying assumption behind all impression management strategies is that the impressions that others have of an individual affect that individual. Often, the consequences affect that individual's self-concept and feelings of self-worth. Thus, to the extent that an individual's self-worth fluctuates as a function of outside influences, such as social approval, an individual will be more motivated to engage in impression management. The notion that self-esteem can be unaffected by social approval or disapproval in healthy individuals is untenable (Leary et al., 2003). However, the extent to which self-worth is rooted in external factors, such as social approval, is a likely indicator of the prevalence with which an individual engages in impression management.

Individual Differences in Self-Determination

In their self-determination theory, Deci and Ryan (1985b, 2002) have suggested that humans have basic psychological needs to experience autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Deci and Ryan (1985b, 2002) presumed individuals to naturally gravitate toward contexts and situations that promote psychological growth and satisfaction of these needs. According to self-determination theory, organismic integration leads to refinement of the self as external, and introjected regulations become identified and integrated with the core self (Deci & Ryan, 1985b, 1991, 2002; Hodgins & Knee, 2002). One way to describe this process is to consider the self as a sphere with a solid nucleus at the center but also as more tenuous, unstable, and less defined further away from the center. The nucleus represents the core true self where regulations have been fully integrated, are consistent with each other, and represent core values and interests of the person. The further away regulations are from the core self, the more extrinsic they become. Identified regulations are just outside of the nucleus and consist of behaviors that are personally important or valuable but may not be integrated with other aspects of the self (e.g., personally valuing work despite its conflict with parenting). Further out are introjected regulations that the individual operationalizes as "should"s, "ought"s, pressures, and obligations. Here individuals are motivated by the desire to appear valuable, genuine, hardworking, and interested rather than by the desire to have these characteristics themselves. Extending the analogy, autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs are less directly satisfied as regulations emanate further and further from the core self. Rather, the needs for others' approvals, material successes, and the appearance of worthiness serve as substitute needs (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Kernis, 2000).

Related to organismic integration is the distinction between two different types of self-esteem: true self-esteem and contingent self-esteem (Deci & Ryan, 1995). *True self-esteem* is stable and rooted in the core self, and it represents feelings of worth as a person that are consistent with unconditional positive self-regard. *Contingent self-esteem* reflects the extent to which feelings of self-worth vary as a function of extrinsic factors, such as approval from others (Crocker & Wolfe, 2001; Deci & Ryan, 1995; Leary et al., 2003).

According to self-determination theory, individual differences in self-determination emerge in large part because of chronic exposure to environments that facilitate or impede growth and the satisfaction of needs. Deci and Ryan (1985a, 1985b, 2002) have described individual differences in terms of three different orientations: (a) autonomy orientation, (b) controlled orientation, and (c) impersonal orientation. In Deci and Ryan's (1985a, 1985b, 2002) view, all individuals are to some extent autonomous, to some extent controlled, and to some extent amotivated (impersonal). The autonomy and controlled orientations are typically uncorrelated (Deci & Ryan, 1985b). As for the impersonal orientation, it is negatively correlated with autonomy and positively correlated with the controlled orientation (Deci & Ryan, 1985b).

The autonomy orientation in an individual is a positive indicator of self-determination and reflects a general tendency to base behaviors on core interests and integrated values and to experience true choice in one's behavior. Autonomy is positively associated with self-actualization, self-esteem, and supporting others' autonomies (Deci & Ryan, 1985a). In contrast, the controlled orientation is a negative indicator of self-determination and reflects the tendency to base behaviors on contingencies, pressures, and introjected regulations. The controlled orientation has been associated with lower self-actualization, external locus of control, higher public self-consciousness (Deci & Ryan, 1985a), and defensive responses to environmental stressors (Koestner & Zuckerman, 1994; Neighbors, Vietor, & Knee, 2002). The impersonal orientation is also a negative indicator of self-determination but reflects amotivation and is associated with depression (Deci & Ryan, 1985b) and powerlessness (McHoskey, 1999). It is negatively correlated with self-actualization and self-esteem and positively associated with external locus of control, public self-consciousness, social anxiety, and self-derogation (Deci & Ryan, 1985b).

Previous Research Exploring the Self-Presentation and Self-Determination Relationship

Koestner et al. (1992) showed that more autonomous individuals, relative to more controlled ones, behave more consistently with respect to their attitudes and self-descriptions. Less autonomous individuals experience greater increases in negative affect and greater decreases in state self-esteem when faced with ego-threatening upward social comparisons (Neighbors & Knee, 2003). Behaving in a manner that is consistent with one's values and beliefs is a defining characteristic of

integrity and genuineness. Higher autonomy has also been associated with more honesty and openness, whereas being more controlled has been associated with more defensiveness and less honesty in naturally occurring interactions (Hodgins, Koestner, & Duncan, 1996). Autonomy has also been associated with taking greater responsibility for one's own actions that resulted in harm, whereas more controlled or impersonally oriented individuals responded more defensively and deceptively in attempting to minimize personal responsibility (Hodgins & Liebeskind, 2003; Hodgins, Liebeskind, & Schwartz, 1996). Zuckerman, Gioioso, and Tellini (1988) have shown that more controlled individuals prefer image-based advertisements versus quality-based advertisements. Furthermore, individuals who are more autonomous and less controlled are less likely to engage in self-serving bias, and they report less self-handicapping (Knee & Zuckerman, 1996, 1998). Taken together, these results indicate the possibility that more self-determined individuals have a more stable sense of self that is less strongly tied to the perceived impression of others. To the extent that impression management strategies are rooted in the relationship between self-worth and others' impressions, in the present studies we expected more prevalent use of impression management among individuals who are less self-determined.

Hypotheses

We expected autonomy, controlled, and impersonal orientations to be differentially associated with self-presentation. In general, we expected self-determined individuals to engage in less self-presentation than would individuals who were less self-determined. To be more specific, we expected that higher autonomy individuals would use less self-presentation. In contrast, we expected that individuals who were higher in controlled or impersonal orientations would engage in more self-presentation, but for different reasons. We expected controlled orientation to be most consistently and positively associated with self-presentation strategies aimed at procuring positive impressions from others, such as promotion and enhancement. We expected impersonal orientation to also be positively associated with self-presentation overall, but especially with strategies that are primarily aimed at reducing others' expectations and gaining assistance, such as sandbagging, self-handicapping, and supplication. We expected these relationships to be evident even after accounting for potential gender differences and individual differences in social desirability.

Method

Participants

Participants were 253 students (141 women, 111 men) from undergraduate psychology classes. The average age of participants was 20.55 years (SD = 3.23 years). Of all of the participants, 89% were Caucasian, 4% were African American, and 7% were other. Students received extra course credit for participation.

Procedure

We recruited participants from the psychology subject pool using standardized sign-up sheets, which we posted outside the psychology office. After providing informed consent, participants received a packet of questionnaires. The questionnaire packet included (a) instruments that were designed to measure demographic information and self-determination and (b) a comprehensive set of self-presentation questionnaires. Participants completed the packet individually or in groups of 2–15. The average time to complete the questionnaire packet was 30–40 min. On their completion of the questionnaire packet, we debriefed participants and thanked them.

There were two orders for the questionnaire packets. In the first order, self-presentation scales followed the General Causality Orientations Scale (GCOS; Deci & Ryan, 1985a; revised by Hodgins, Koestner, et al., 1996; Ryan, 1989). In the second order, the self-presentation scales were first. We found no significant effects between the two questionnaire orders.

Measures

Self-determination. We used the GCOS (Deci & Ryan, 1985a; revised by Hodgins, Koestner, et al., 1996; Ryan, 1989) to measure autonomy, control, and impersonal orientations. The revised GCOS contains 17 scenarios, each of which precedes an autonomy response, a controlled response, and an impersonal response. Respondents rate the extent to which each response would be characteristic for them. For example, one of the scenarios states the following: "You have been invited to a large party where you know very few people. As you look forward to the evening you would likely expect that ...." The experimenter assesses the autonomy orientation by the response, "You'll find some people with whom you can relate"; the controlled orientation by the response, "You'll try to fit in with whatever is happening in order to have a good time and not look bad"; and the impersonal orientation by the response, "You'll probably feel somewhat isolated and unnoticed." Participants rate each response on a scale from 1 (*very unlikely*) to 7 (*very likely*). The experimenter averages responses for each orientation. Internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) in the present study were .86, .80, and .85 for autonomy, controlled, and impersonal orientations, respectively.

Self-presentation strategies. We assessed the use of self-presentation strategies with the Self-Presentation Tactics Scale (SPT; Lee et al., 1999). The SPT consists of 63 items, which contribute to 12 subscales that measure the following self-presentation tactics: (a) excuse ($\alpha = .83$), (b) justification ($\alpha = .81$), (c) disclaimer ($\alpha = .73$), (d) self-handicapping ($\alpha = .56$), (e) apology ($\alpha = .66$), (f) ingratiation ($\alpha = .81$), (g) intimidation ($\alpha = .84$), (h) supplication ($\alpha = .71$), (i) entitlement ($\alpha = .79$), (j) enhancement ($\alpha = .72$), (k) blasting ($\alpha = .76$), and (l) exemplifica-

tion (α = .82). An example of an excuse item was, "I make up excuses for poor performance." An example of a justification item was, "After a negative action, I try to make others understand that if they had been in my position they would have done the same thing." An example of a disclaimer item was, "I offer explanations before doing something that others might think is wrong." An example of a self-handicapping item was, "I do not prepare well enough for exams because I get too involved in social activities." An example of an apology item was, "I express remorse and guilt when I do something wrong." An example of an ingratiation item was, "I use flattery to win the favor of others." An example of an intimidation item was, "I threaten others when I think it will help me get what I want from them." An example of a supplication item was, "I lead others to believe that I cannot do something in order to get help." An example of an entitlement item was, "When working on a project with a group I make my contribution seem greater than it is." An example of an enhancement item was, "I exaggerate the value of my accomplishments." An example of a blasting item was, "I exaggerate the negative qualities of people who compete with me." Finally, an example of an exemplification item was, "I try to set an example for others to follow." Participants rated each response on a scale from 1 (*very infrequently*) to 9 (*very frequently*). We averaged responses, yielding 12 scores representing the participant's use of self-presentation tactics.

Impression management. We used the impression management scale (Bolino & Turnley, 1999) to assess five subtypes of impression management that are based on Jones and Pittman's (1982) taxonomy: (a) promotion (α = .74), (b) ingratiation (α = .75), (c) exemplification (α = .70), (d) intimidation (α = .81), and (e) supplication (α = .88). An example of a promotion item was, "Talk proudly about your experience or education." An example of an ingratiation item was, "Do personal favors for your colleagues to show them that you are friendly." An example of an exemplification item was, "Arrive at work early to appear dedicated." An example of an intimidation item was, "Let others know that you can make things difficult for them if they push you too far." Finally, an example of a supplication item was, "Pretend not to understand something to gain someone's help." Participants rated each response on a scale from 1 (*never behave this way*) to 5 (*often behave this way*). We averaged responses, yielding five scores representing the use of impression management in the respondent. Bolino and Turnley originally constructed this measure of impression management for use in organizational settings; however, in the present study, we used it with undergraduates.

Sandbagging. We assessed sandbagging by the Sandbagging Scale (Gibson & Sachau, 2000), which consists of 12 items. Subscales of the Sandbagging Scale include the Pressure Factor (α = .88), Exceeding Expectations Factor (α = .84), and Behavior Factor (α = .79). An example item for the Pressure Factor subscale was, "The less others expect of me the better I like it." An example item for the

Exceeding Expectations subscale was, "I like others to be surprised by my performance." An example item for the Behavior subscale was, "I understate my skills, ability, or knowledge." Participants rated each response on a scale from 1 (*disagree very much*) to 6 (*agree very much*). We averaged responses, yielding three scores representing the participant's use of sandbagging.

Social desirability. We measured social desirability with the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS; Crowne & Marlow, 1964). The MCSDS is a 33-item true–false scale that has been used in numerous studies to assess the tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner. An example item was, "I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake." We summed responses, yielded a score representing the participant's social desirability. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was .82.

Results

Analysis. Our focus in the present study was to evaluate the relationships among self-determination and a comprehensive set of self-presentation strategies. Consistent with previous research, we expected that higher autonomy scores would predict less use of self-presentation strategies (Knee & Zuckerman, 1998), whereas higher scores in controlled and impersonal orientations would be associated with more frequent use of self-presentation strategies. We analyzed data using multivariate multiple regression. Multivariate multiple regression is analogous to multivariate analysis of variance but with continuous—rather than categorical—independent variables. We performed a multivariate multiple regression analysis for each of the three self-presentation scales (the SPT scale, Lee et al., 1999; the Impression Management Scale, Bolino & Turnley, 1999; and the Sandbagging Scale, Gibson & Sachau, 2000). In each multivariate regression, the set of dependent variables consisted of the subscales for the self-presentation measure. We specified autonomy, controlled, and impersonal orientations as the predictors. In all analyses, gender and social desirability were included as covariates. We included social desirability as a covariate to help rule out the possibility that relations between self-determination and self-presentation might be due to individuals' attempts to appear favorably on either or both sets of measures. Gender was included as a covariate because of expected gender differences in previous research pertaining to gender and self-handicapping, apologies, and other self-presentation strategies (Berglas & Jones, 1978; Forsyth, Schlenker, Leary, & McCown, 1985; Harris & Snyder, 1986; Hirt, Deppe, & Gordon, 1991; Hodgins & Liebeskind, 2003; Warner & Moore, 2004). Table 1 presents a correlation matrix of all self-presentation subscales, causality orientations, sex, and social desirability.

SPT scale. We simultaneously regressed the 12 subscales of the SPT scale (excuse, justification, disclaimer, self-handicapping, apology, ingratiation, intimidation, supplication, entitlement, enhancement, blasting, and exemplification) on autonomy, controlled, and impersonal orientations while controlling for sex and social desirability. Autonomy orientation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .77$, $F(12, 234) = 5.71$, $p < .0001$; controlled orientation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .76$, $F(12, 234) = 6.12$, $p < .0001$; and impersonal orientation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .85$, $F(12, 234) = 3.45$, $p < .0001$, all emerged as significant predictors in the multivariate equation. Table 2 shows follow-up univariate results. Overall, higher controlled and impersonal orientations were associated with more self-presentation. In contrast, greater autonomy was generally associated with less self-presentation. The exception was apology, with more autonomous individuals reporting apologizing more frequently.

Impression Management Scale. We simultaneously regressed the five subscales of the impression management scale (promotion, ingratiation, exemplification, intimidation, and supplication) on autonomy, controlled, and impersonal orientations, controlling for sex and social desirability. Autonomy orientation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .94$, $F(5, 240) = 3.16$, $p < .01$; controlled orientation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .90$, $F(5, 240) = 5.47$, $p < .0001$; and impersonal orientation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .87$, $F(5, 240) = 7.44$, $p < .0001$, all were again significant predictors in the multivariate equation. Table 3 shows follow-up univariate results. The results indicated that, overall, controlled orientation was associated with greater use of impression management, whereas autonomy orientation was associated with less impression management. Impersonal orientation was associated with less use of promotion and more use of supplication.

Sandbagging Scale. We simultaneously regressed the three subscales of the sandbagging scale (sandbagging pressure, exceeding expectations, and sandbagging behavior) on autonomy, controlled, and impersonal orientations, with sex and social desirability as covariates. In this analysis, impersonal orientation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .84$, $F(3, 243) = 15.6$, $p < .0001$, was a significant predictor in the multivariate equation, whereas autonomy orientation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .99$, $F(3, 243) = .71$, *ns*, and controlled orientation, Wilks's $\Lambda = .97$, $F(3, 243) = 2.42$, *ns*, were not. Table 4 shows follow-up univariate results. Overall, the results indicated that higher impersonal orientation scores were associated with more sandbagging.

Social desirability was a significant covariate for a number of self-presentation tactics. Individuals who were higher in social desirability generally reported less frequent use of strategies that might be viewed as disingenuous by others (e.g., making excuses, justification, self-handicapping, intimidation, and entitlement). In contrast, social desirability was positively associated with exemplification as assessed by the SPT scale. Lee et al. (1999) worded exemplification items for this scale so that endorsement reflected attempting to set a good example for others to follow. Gender was a significant covariate for intimidation, supplication,

TABLE 1. Correlations of Self-Presentation Subscales, Orientations, Sex, and Social Desirability

Subscale	1	2	3	4
1. Excuse (SPT)	—			
2. Justification (SPT)	.71***	—		
3. Disclaimer (SPT)	.69***	.71***	—	
4. Self-handicapping (SPT)	.46***	.45***	.37***	—
5. Apology (SPT)	.13*	.27***	.36***	.05
6. Ingratiation (SPT)	.63***	.60***	.53***	.48***
7. Intimidation (SPT)	.34***	.30***	.15*	.43***
8. Supplication (SPT)	.58***	.54***	.49***	.48***
9. Entitlement (SPT)	.93***	.57***	.44***	.41***
10. Enhancement (SPT)	.62***	.58***	.40***	.44***
11. Blasting (SPT)	.58***	.50***	.42***	.51***
12. Exemplification (SPT)	.19**	.30***	.31***	.03
13. Promotion	.18**	.18**	.09	.04
14. Ingratiation	.14*	.22***	.21***	.15*
15. Exemplification	.09	.14*	.09	.13*
16. Intimidation	.17***	.18***	.03	.26***
17. Supplication	.40***	.32***	.29***	.33***
18. Pressure	.33***	.38***	.41***	.35***
19. Exceeding expectations	.26***	.31***	.28***	.21***
20. Behavior factor	.21***	.23***	.28***	.24***
21. Autonomy	−.17**	.02	−.04	−.09
22. Controlled	.36***	.38***	.29***	.32***
23. Impersonal	.43***	.40***	.44***	.38***
24. Sex	.03	.06	−.08	.01
25. Social desirability	−.32***	−.33***	−.28***	−.30***

Note. *N*s ranged from 251 to 253 because of missing values. SPT = Self-Presentation Tactics Scale. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

and blasting, with men using these tactics more than women did. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that men use self-presentation, such as intimidation, to emphasize their social influence (Forsyth et al., 1985). In addition, women reported higher use of apologies and promotion, being consistent with previous research specifically relating to use of apologies (Hodgins & Liebeskind, 2003) and with findings that show that women tend to use self-presentational strategies that emphasize their interpersonal abilities (Forsyth et al.).

5	6	7	8	9	10
—					
.16**	—				
−.23***	.43***	—			
.10	.63***	.44***	—		
.06	.65***	.43***	.55***	—	
.06	.61***	.48***	.51***	.82***	—
.01	.54***	.51***	.48***	.61***	.56***
.31***	.32***	.03	.10	.28***	.24***
.13*	.27***	.14*	.10	.42***	.42***
.14*	.42***	.07	.16**	.26***	.22***
.04	.31***	.16**	.12	.21***	.23***
−.28***	.28***	.59***	.29***	.36***	.42***
−.13*	.48***	.40***	.62***	.43***	.40***
−.01	.35***	.20**	.43***	.26***	.24***
.14*	.40***	.22***	.27***	.26***	.18**
−.01	.30***	.27***	.32***	.13*	.06
.29	−.02	−.18**	−.10	−.14*	−.11
.05	.46***	.37***	.38***	.40***	.41***
.11	.42***	.26***	.48***	.40***	.34***
−.26***	.14*	.29***	.08	.15*	.14*
.04	−.21***	−.29***	−.23***	−.28***	−.31***

(table continues)

Discussion

Previous researchers have shown that self-determination is related to the use of some self-presentation strategies, such as self-handicapping (Knee & Zuckerman, 1998). The present research extends previous research by comprehensively evaluating the relationship between self-determination and the use of self-presentation strategies. Overall, the present results provide strong evidence for

TABLE 1. ***Continued***

Subscale	11	12	13	14
1. Excuse (SPT)				
2. Justification (SPT)				
3. Disclaimer (SPT)				
4. Self-handicapping (SPT)				
5. Apology (SPT)				
6. Ingratiation (SPT)				
7. Intimidation (SPT)				
8. Supplication (SPT)				
9. Entitlement (SPT)				
10. Enhancement (SPT)				
11. Blasting (SPT)	—			
12. Exemplification (SPT)	.07	—		
13. Promotion	.09	.23***	—	
14. Ingratiation	.06	.26***	.36***	—
15. Exemplification	.14	.24***	.34***	.51***
16. Intimidation	.36***	.01	.22***	.15*
17. Supplication	.42***	−.03	.09	.19**
18. Pressure	.34***	.06	−.16*	.02
19. Exceeding expectations	.24***	.27***	.20**	.22***
20. Behavior factor	.28***	.01	−.12	.15*
21. Autonomy	−.23***	.18**	.17**	.15*
22. Controlled	.29***	.26***	.23***	.19**
23. Impersonal	.37***	.11	−.02	.03
24. Sex	.25***	.03	−.07	−.08
25. Social desirability	−.41***	.12	−.07	.04

Note. *N*s ranged from 251 to 253 because of missing values. SPT = Self-Presentation Tactics Scale.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

the possibility that individuals who tend to be lower in self-determination engaged in self-presentation more often. To be more specific, individuals who are higher in controlled and impersonal orientations report engaging in more self-presentation strategies, whereas individuals who are higher in autonomy orientation report engaging in fewer self-presentation strategies.

In the present study, we examined the unique relationships between autonomy, controlled, and impersonal orientations and 20 different established subscales that assessed a wide variety of self-presentation strategies. We took a multivariate approach to reduce alpha inflation and to provide an overall evaluation of the primary hypotheses. Univariate results provided much more detail than multivariate

15	16	17	18	19	20
—					
.27***	—				
.13*	.45***	—			
−.01	.18**	.40***	—		
.28***	.16*	.17**	.24***	—	
.11	.18**	.31***	.42***	.32***	—
.07	−.11	−.23***	−.14*	.04	−.02
.14*	.26***	.20**	.21***	.29***	.20**
.08	.18**	.37***	.48***	.28***	.29***
.03	.28***	.20**	.04	.01	−.17**
.04	.24***	−.20***	−.28***	−.16**	−.20**

(table continues)

results and indicated the possibility of theoretically interesting patterns regarding different motivations underlying self-presentation that are associated with being more controlled versus being more amotivated (impersonal). Although both of these orientations are considered negative indicators of self-determination, the controlled orientation was more consistently associated with strategies for bolstering the self-image (e.g., entitlement, self-promotion, ingratiation, enhancement, exemplification). In addition, consistent with previous demonstrations of the relationship between controlled orientation and hostility and aggression (Knee, Neighbors, & Vietor, 2001; Neighbors et al., 2002), in the present study the participants' being more controlled was associated with greater use of intimidation. In contrast, rela-

TABLE 1. ***Continued***

Subscale	21	22	23	24	25
1. Excuse (SPT)					
2. Justification (SPT)					
3. Disclaimer (SPT)					
4. Self-handicapping (SPT)					
5. Apology (SPT)					
6. Ingratiation (SPT)					
7. Intimidation (SPT)					
8. Supplication (SPT)					
9. Entitlement (SPT)					
10. Enhancement (SPT)					
11. Blasting (SPT)					
12. Exemplification (SPT)					
13. Promotion					
14. Ingratiation					
15. Exemplification					
16. Intimidation					
17. Supplication					
18. Pressure					
19. Exceeding expectations					
20. Behavior factor					
21. Autonomy	—				
22. Controlled	.31***	—			
23. Impersonal	−.03	.53***	—		
24. Sex	−.17**	.15*	−.03	—	
25. Social desirability	.06	−.22***	−.33***	−.01	—

Note. *N*s ranged from 251 to 253 because of missing values. SPT = Self-Presentation Tactics Scale.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

tive to controlled orientation, the impersonal orientation was more consistently associated with strategies that present the self less favorably, perhaps as a means of avoiding others' formation of critical impressions. Being more amotivated was associated with engaging in less self-promotion; offering more disclaimers and apologies; and more sandbagging. In addition, being more impersonally oriented was more consistently associated with trying to appear weak and helpless to gain sympathy and assistance from others (supplication). As we expected, being more autonomous was generally associated with engaging in less self-presentation. The exception to this was that more autonomous individuals more frequently apologize. This finding is consistent with previous research indicating the possibility that more

autonomous individuals tend to be less defensive in social interaction and are more willing to take responsibility (Hodgins & Knee, 2002).

Thus, the present results and findings extend the existing self-presentation and self-determination literature by providing a comprehensive analysis between these two areas. The present findings replicate previous work demonstrating less self-serving bias among more self-determined individuals (Knee & Zuckerman, 1998) and extend that finding comprehensively. In general, the present results indicate the possibility that impression management and motivation are inherently entwined. Not everyone is equally concerned with managing the impressions that others form about them, at least not in the ways assessed in the present study. Self-determination theorists have proposed that a controlling or pressured environment will make one sensitive to social approval and expectancies. Consistent with this idea, the present findings indicate the possibility that individuals who are higher in controlled orientation focus on using tactics to gain approval, whereas amotivated individuals (i.e., higher in impersonal orientation) use tactics that prevent the creation of high expectations. In contrast, individuals who are more autonomous appear to be more genuine and authentic in social interactions, as seemingly indicated by overall less frequent use of self-presentation. Previous researchers on impression management have focused largely on how individuals manage the impressions of others. The present research represents an important step toward understanding why individuals manage the impressions of others.

Limitations and Future Directions

The present data are cross-sectional, which limits our ability to make causal inferences. Therefore, future researchers should attempt to rectify this weakness by trying to identify the use of self-presentational tactics and their relationship to self-determination in an experimental design. The use of self-report diaries in everyday life regarding self-presentation tactics in individuals who differ in their autonomy, controlled, and impersonal orientations would be well suited for such an investigation. An additional limitation of the present research is that the sample consisted of students from a single university with very little diversity. It is unclear how results might vary in a more diverse sample. Future researchers should try to find the relationship between self-determination and the use of self-presentation strategies in a more diverse sample. An additional limitation of the present study is that we did not directly examine motivations. Additional research is needed to determine why people engage in self-presentation and how their motivations relate to individual differences in self-determination.

Summary

In conclusion, the present research extends self-determination theory by showing strong relationships between autonomy, controlled, and impersonal

TABLE 2. Summary of Regression Results for Self-Determination as Predictors of Self-Presentation Tactics

Regression criterion	Predictor	*B*	*SE B*	β	Model R^2	*t*(245)
Excuse	Autonomy	–0.59	0.13	–0.27	.30	–4.44***
	Controlled	0.70	0.15	0.33		4.58***
	Impersonal	0.34	0.13	0.19		2.73**
	Sex	–0.20	0.18	–0.06		–1.08
	Social desirability	–0.05	0.02	–0.17		–3.01**
Justification	Autonomy	–0.07	0.14	–0.03	.24	–0.50
	Controlled	0.50	0.16	0.24		3.21**
	Impersonal	0.38	0.13	0.21		2.94**
	Sex	0.06	0.19	0.02		0.34
	Social desirability	–0.06	0.02	–0.21		–3.53***
Disclaimer	Autonomy	–0.14	0.13	–0.07	.22	–1.10
	Controlled	0.23	0.15	0.12		1.58
	Impersonal	0.53	0.12	0.32		4.45***
	Sex	–0.28	0.17	–0.10		–1.62
	Social desirability	–0.03	0.01	–0.14		–2.32
Self-handicapping	Autonomy	–0.294	0.118	–0.160	.20	–2.48*
	Controlled	0.368	0.138	0.204		2.67**
	Impersonal	0.314	0.112	0.202		2.79**
	Sex	–0.116	0.163	–0.043		–0.71
	Social desirability	–0.040	0.013	–0.177		–2.94**
Apology	Autonomy	0.51	0.12	0.29	.15	4.34***
	Controlled	–0.17	0.14	–0.10		–1.25
	Impersonal	0.27	0.11	0.18		2.39*
	Sex	–0.50	0.16	–0.19		–3.07**
	Social desirability	0.01	0.01	0.06		0.95
Ingratiation	Autonomy	–0.2	0.11	–0.11	.30	–1.87
	Controlled	0.75	0.13	0.40		5.60***
	Impersonal	0.30	0.11	0.19		2.74**
	Sex	0.17	0.16	0.06		1.07
	Social desirability	–0.01	0.01	–0.05		–0.95

(table continues)

TABLE 2. ***Continued***

Regression criterion	Predictor	*B*	*SE B*	β	Model R^2	*t*(245)
Intimidation	Autonomy	–0.53	0.12	–0.27	.30	–4.48***
	Controlled	0.78	0.14	0.41		5.68***
	Impersonal	–0.04	0.11	–0.03		–0.39
	Sex	0.50	0.16	0.18		3.10**
	Social desirability	–0.05	0.01	–0.19		–3.33***
Supplication	Autonomy	–0.29	0.11	–0.16	.28	–2.66**
	Controlled	0.44	0.13	0.25		3.45***
	Impersonal	0.50	0.11	0.33		4.72***
	Sex	0.05	0.15	0.02		0.32
	Social desirability	–0.01	0.01	–0.05		–0.91
Entitlement	Autonomy	–0.45	0.12	–0.23	.30	–3.86***
	Controlled	0.73	0.13	0.39		5.43***
	Impersonal	0.23	0.11	0.14		2.08*
	Sex	0.14	0.16	0.05		0.87
	Social desirability	–0.03	0.01	–0.14		–2.45*
Enhancement	Autonomy	–0.46	0.12	–0.24	.30	–3.91***
	Controlled	0.91	0.14	0.48		6.62***
	Impersonal	0.04	0.11	0.02		0.32
	Sex	0.04	0.16	0.01		0.26
	Social desirability	–0.05	0.01	–0.19		–3.31**
Blasting	Autonomy	–0.49	0.12	–0.23	.34	–3.95***
	Controlled	0.42	0.14	0.20		2.89**
	Impersonal	0.28	0.12	0.16		2.39*
	Sex	0.57	0.17	0.19		3.36***
	Social desirability	–0.08	0.01	–0.30		–5.48***
Exemplification	Autonomy	0.199	0.140	0.096	.11	1.42
	Controlled	0.488	0.163	0.242		2.99**
	Impersonal	0.085	0.133	0.049		0.64
	Sex	0.019	0.193	0.006		0.10
	Social desirability	0.048	0.016	0.187		2.94**

Note. Because of missing values, *N*s were 251 for each set of analyses.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

TABLE 3. Summary of Regression Results for Self-Determination as Predictors of Impression Management

Regression criterion	Predictor	*B*	*SE B*	β	Model R^2	*t*(244)
Promotion	Autonomy	0.05	0.07	0.35	.11	0.73
	Controlled	0.34	0.08	–0.25		4.38***
	Impersonal	–0.21	0.06	–0.13		–3.24**
	Sex	–0.19	0.09	–0.06		–2.03*
	Social desirability	–0.01	0.01	0.35		–0.99
Ingratiation	Autonomy	0.056	0.07	0.06	.06	0.82
	Controlled	0.23	0.08	0.24		2.90**
	Impersonal	–0.06	0.07	–0.08		–0.98
	Sex	–0.16	0.09	–0.11		–1.69
	Social desirability	0.01	0.01	0.07		1.11
Exemplification	Autonomy	0.05	0.08	0.04	.03	0.61
	Controlled	0.14	0.09	0.14		1.63
	Impersonal	0.02	0.07	0.02		0.29
	Sex	0.01	0.10	0.01		0.13
	Social desirability	0.01	0.01	0.09		1.35
Intimidation	Autonomy	–0.12	0.06	–0.12	.18	–1.90
	Controlled	0.24	0.07	0.25		3.20**
	Impersonal	–0.01	0.06	–0.01		–0.11
	Sex	0.30	0.09	0.21		3.38***
	Social desirability	–0.02	0.01	–0.18		–2.89**
Supplication	Autonomy	–0.21	0.06	–0.22	.22	–3.37***
	Controlled	0.09	0.07	0.09		1.24
	Impersonal	0.25	0.06	0.30		4.15***
	Sex	0.22	0.09	0.15		2.53*
	Social desirability	–0.01	0.01	–0.07		–1.20

Note. Because of missing values, *N*s were 250 for each set of analyses.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

orientations and the use of self-presentation strategies. This research suggests that self-determination is associated with authenticity and genuineness more than superficiality, artificiality, and deception. More autonomous individuals reported engaging in fewer self-presentation strategies, with the exception that they are more willing to apologize. In contrast, more controlled and imper-

TABLE 4. Summary of Regression Results for Self-Determination as Predictors of Sandbagging

Regression criterion	Predictor	*B*	*SE B*	β	Model R^2	*t*(245)
Pressure	Autonomy	–0.13	0.09	–0.09	.26	–1.44
	Controlled	–0.09	0.10	–0.06		–0.87
	Impersonal	0.57	0.09	0.47		6.76***
	Sex	0.10	0.12	0.05		0.84
	Social desirability	–0.02	0.01	–0.13		–2.23
Exceeding expectations	Autonomy	0.00	0.08	0.18	.10	0.03
	Controlled	0.20	0.09	0.16		2.25*
	Impersonal	0.15	0.08	–0.02		2.08*
	Sex	–0.03	0.11	–0.05		–0.29
	Social desirability	–0.00	0.01	0.18		–0.79
Behavior factor	Autonomy	–0.03	0.12	–0.02	.10	–0.29
	Controlled	0.15	0.13	0.09		1.08
	Impersonal	0.29	0.11	0.20		2.65**
	Sex	0.10	0.16	0.04		0.63
	Social desirability	–0.02	0.01	–0.11		–1.70

Note. Because of missing values, *N*s were 251 for each set of analyses.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

sonally oriented individuals reported engaging in more—but somewhat different—types of self-presentation strategies. The controlled orientation was more consistently associated with image-bolstering self-presentation, whereas the impersonal orientation was more consistently associated with presenting the self less favorably.

REFERENCES

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

Berglas, S., & Jones, E. E. (1978). Drug choice as a self-handicapping strategy in response to non-contingent structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36,* 405–417.

Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring impression management in organizations: A scale development based on the Jones and Pittman taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods, 2,* 187–206.

Cialdini, R. B., & Richardson, K. D. (1980). Two indirect tactics of image management: Basking and blasting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39,* 406–415.

Crocker, J., & Wolfe, C. T. (2001). Contingencies of self-worth. *Psychological Review, 108,* 593–623.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlow, D. (1964). *The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence.* New York: Wiley.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985a). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 19,* 109–134.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985b). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol. 38. Perspectives on motivation* (pp. 237–288). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem. Plenum series in social/clinical psychology* (pp. 31–49). New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11,* 227–268.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3–36). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Forsyth, D. R., Schlenker, B. R., Leary, M. R., & McCown, N. (1985). Self-presentational determinants of sex differences in leadership behavior. *Small Group Behavior, 16,* 197–210.

Gibson, B., & Sachau, D. (2000). Sandbagging as a self-presentation strategy: Claiming to be less than you are. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26,* 56–70.

Goffman, E. (1959). *Presentation of self in everyday life.* Garden City, NJ: Anchor Books.

Harris, R. N., & Snyder, C. R. (1986). The role of uncertain self-esteem in self-handicapping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(2), 451–458.

Hewitt, J. P., & Stokes, R. (1975). Disclaimers. *American Sociological Review, 40,* 1–11.

Hirt, E. R., Deppe, R. K., & Gordon, L. J. (1991). Self-reported versus behavioral self-handicapping: Empirical evidence for a theoretical distinction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*(6), 981–991.

Hodgins, H. S., & Knee, C. R. (2002). The integrating self and conscious experience. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 87–100). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Hodgins, H. S., Koestner, R., & Duncan, N. (1996). On the compatibility of autonomy and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22,* 227–237.

Hodgins, H. S., & Liebeskind, E. (2003). Apology versus defense: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39,* 297–316.

Hodgins, H. S., Liebeskind, E., & Schwartz, W. (1996). Getting out of hot water: Facework in social predicaments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71,* 300–314.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives of the self* (pp. 231–261). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kernis, M. H. (2000). Substitute needs and the distinction between fragile and secure high self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry, 11,* 298–300.

Knee, C. R., Neighbors, C., & Vietor, N. A. (2001). Self-determination theory as a framework for understanding road rage. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*(5), 889–904.

Knee, R. C., & Zuckerman, M. (1996). Causality orientations and the disappearance of the self-serving bias. *Journal of Research and Personality, 30,* 76–87.

Knee, R. C., & Zuckerman, M. (1998). A nondefensive personality: Autonomy and controlled as moderators of defensive coping and self-handicapping. *Journal of Research and Personality, 32,* 115–130.

Koestner, R., Bernieri, F., & Zuckerman, M. (1992). Self-regulation and consistency between attitudes, traits, and behaviors. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18,* 52–59.

Koestner, R., & Zuckerman, M. (1994). Causality orientations, failure, and achievement. *Journal of Personality, 62,* 321–346.

Leary, M. R., Gallagher, B., Fors, E., Buttermore, N., Baldwin, E., Kennedy, K., et al. (2003). The invalidity of disclaimers about the effects of social feedback on self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 623–636.

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

Lee, S., Quigley, B. M., Nesler, M. S., Corbett, A. B., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Development of a self-presentation tactics scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 26,* 701–722.

McHoskey, J. W. (1999). Machiavellianism, intrinsic versus extrinsic goals, and social interest: A self-determination theory analysis. *Motivation and Emotion, 23,* 267–283.

Neighbors, C., & Knee, C. R. (2003). Self-determination and the consequences of social comparison. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37,* 529–546.

Neighbors, C., Vietor, N. A., & Knee, C. R. (2002). A motivational model of driving anger and aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 324–335.

Ryan, R. M. (1989). *The revised general causality orientation scale.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Rochester, NY.

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

Scott, M. R., & Lyman, S. M. (1990). Communication and social order. In D. Brissett & C. Edgley (Eds.), *Life as theater: A dramaturgical sourcebook* (pp. 219–242). Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.

Tedeschi, J. T., & Lindskold, S. (1976). *Social psychology: Interdependence, interaction, and influence.* New York: Wiley.

Warner, S., & Moore, S. (2004). Excuses, excuses: Self-handicapping in an Australian adolescent sample. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 33*(4), 271–281.

Zuckerman, M., Gioioso, C., & Tellini, S. (1988). Controlled orientation, self-monitoring, and preference for images versus quality approach to advertising. *Journal of Research in Personality, 22,* 89–100.

Received June 30, 2004
Accepted March 16, 2005