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Abstract

Two studies assessed the relationship between adults' attachment experiences and their preference for and skills at specific self-presentation strategies. In Study 1, individuals were assigned to control and experimental (ingratiation or competence) conditions. Attachment to parental figures was related to spontaneity/comfort during self-presentations and to subjects' efforts to make positive impressions. In Study 2, videotapes from Study 1 were shown to judges who rated the effectiveness of the presentations. Secure subjects were generally more successful in their self-presentations than insecure subjects. They were seen as increasing in liking and competence and as more spontaneous and comfortable than their insecure peers when they were using specific self-presentational strategies. Secure individuals also were especially effective in self-presentational approaches that were not typical for their gender.
Self-Presentation and Attachment Theory

Social psychological research on self-presentation has documented several important and widely used self-presentation strategies, such as ingratiating and attempting to project an image of competence (Godfrey, Jones & Lord, 1986; Jones, 1963; Jones, 1990; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Jones & Wortman, 1973). The literature has also successfully described and predicted situational factors that might elicit particular self-presentation strategies (DePaulo, 1992; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Schlenker, 1980). However, it has been relatively silent on the issue of the developmental antecedents (especially the antecedents in early relationship experience) of the strategies that are systematically preferred by particular individuals and the skills with which particular individuals can enact such strategies.

In this study, I examine the relationship between adults' internal representations of early attachment experiences, and their preferences for using different self-presentation strategies and their skills at executing them. This research is based on Bowlby's attachment theory (1969/82) which has been used to examine ways in which parents influence the general social development of their offspring. The current project takes this research a step further by looking at the relationship between attachment and specific social skills, that is, the effective use of different self-presentation strategies.
Strategies for Self-Presentation

A variety of strategies of self-presentation have been identified by social psychologists. Ingratiation, intimidation, self-promotion, exemplification and supplication (Jones & Pittman, 1982) are some strategies that are effective for achieving specific self-presentational goals. These strategies may be used in a variety of circumstances. Both the situation and the individual's interpretation of it may affect the strategy that an individual will use in a particular situation.

Ingratiation and competence are two strategies of self-presentation (Godfrey et al., 1986; Jones, 1963; Jones, 1990; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Jones & Wortman, 1973) that have been extensively studied in the laboratory. These strategies are also seen frequently in everyday life such as in the workplace, the classroom, politics and in romance. Competence is an effective self-presentation strategy but it works better in concert with ingratiation (Godfrey et al., 1986; Jones, 1990). Ingratiation, on the other hand, can be problematic to carry off successfully (Jones, 1963; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Jones & Wortman, 1973). Jones and Wortman (1973) discuss the "ingratiator's dilemma" which is that in situations where it is important to make others like oneself, it is particularly difficult to use the tactics that would be most effective. Giving compliments and praise to one's boss when one is up for a promotion, for instance, is likely to be seen as blatantly manipulative and may well backfire.

Where and when ingratiation and competence are effective as self-presentation strategies and how individuals differ in their abilities to use different strategies are questions that are still being explored. It is possible that women may be better at or appear better at ingratiation and men at competence if these self-presentation strategies are viewed from a gender role perspective. According to this perspective, sex differences in social behavior result from normative beliefs about gender-appropriate behaviors and sex differences in the skills or abilities associated with these behaviors (Eagly & Wood, 1991). Sex differences in instrumentality and
expressiveness have been linked in many theories to sex-role behavior (Spence, Deaux, & Helmreich, 1985). Presenting oneself as competent may require instrumentality which has traditionally been associated with male gender roles. Being ingratiating, in contrast, calls on the expressive domain in the type of the behaviors which lead to successful ingratiation, i.e., smiling (Jones & Wortman, 1973). Many of these expressive behaviors are more characteristic of women than men (Hall, 1984). The documented tendency for men to specialize in task-oriented behavior and women to engage in more socially facilitative activities in groups (Eagly & Karau, 1991) is also in alignment with this view. Even if these specific self-presentational skills are more frequently used by one sex, there is evidence that androgynous characteristics may be particularly useful, at least in terms of relationship satisfaction (Green & Kenrick, 1994). Therefore, the ability to use both ingratiation and competence effectively may be a highly desirable skill in relational contexts.

Attachment Theory

The attachment bond is initially formed when an infant attempts to maintain or obtain a degree of proximity to the attachment figure in order to promote security and create a secure base for exploration of the environment. Even though attachment relationships are dyadic (between the caregiver and the infant), the attachment behavioral system is organized within the individual parties in the attachment relationship (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986). Attachment behavior is thought to be regulated by internal models that individuals form of themselves in relation to their attachment figures (Bowlby, 1969/82; Bretherton, 1990).

As individuals develop, the goal of the attachment system changes from immediate proximity to the caregiver to a more cognitively oriented concept of availability of important attachment figures. Marvin (1977) shows how the attachment system undergoes changes as children's cognitive capacities develop. Cognitive development allows preschoolers to begin to negotiate proximity with the caregiver to fit both the youngster's and parent's goals by taking into account
multiple perspectives of the situation (Marvin, Greenberg & Mossler, 1976). In adults, the activation of the attachment system may not produce behaviors that bring the attachment figure into physical proximity but may prompt behaviors intended to create a greater feeling of security.

Bowlby (1969/82) notes the attachment system is not engaged all the time. The attachment system is activated by internal stimuli, such as fatigue, or external stimuli that produce anxiety. When one is experiencing an unusual situation, or feeling discouraged or frightened the attachment system is apt to be activated. The attachment figure need not be present for the attachment system to be activated. In infants the absence of the attachment figure may, in fact, cause anxiety that activates the system but other stimuli may also cause an infant to seek the security of an attachment figure. When the goal of the system, felt security, is met the system is deactivated. Sroufe and Waters (1977) propose that attachment behavior is driven by the infant's attempts to attain this security. This drive to find a secure base (Bowlby, 1988) is manifested by different behaviors depending on how the caregiver has traditionally responded to the infant and the infant's perception of the situation.

Internal representational models of attachment relationships are based on infants' experiences with their caregivers. These models might be thought of as constructs that provide the cognitive basis for underlying consistencies of individual behavior with references to attachment figures (Crittenden, 1990). According to Bowlby (1980) the individual creates mental representations which provide models of the workings, properties, characteristics, and behavior of attachment figures, the self, others, and the world in general. Attachment theory posits that there is an inextricable intertwining of the representational model of the attachment figure and the representational model of the self. The infant is thought to develop a working model of the attachment figure based on daily experiences with the caregiver and this is affected by the caregiver's availability and responsiveness. The infant also develops a complementary
working model of self that features the self as being one worthy of the treatment received from the caregiver. More recently attachment theorists have proposed that it is a working model of the attachment relationship rather than models of the individuals engaged in the system that develops first.

Attachment based internal working models are similar to schemas of the self and others (Bretherton, 1990; Markus, 1977, Taylor & Crocker, 1981). In his review of social cognition and object relations, Westen (1991) notes that research on the representational structures underlying attachment behaviors has provided robust evidence for how internal models mediate attachment-related behavior (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). These internal representations not only influence behavior but can also influence feelings, attention, memory, and cognition (Main et al., 1985) which may affect self-presentation goals and the implementation of impression management strategies. The current project rests on the empirically tested assumptions that one's internal models of early attachment relationships are concurrently and longitudinally related to social behaviors and skills (Allen, 1992; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Cohn, 1990; see Cohn, Patterson & Christopoulos, 1991 for a review on peer relationships; Crowell & Feldman, 1988; Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1990; Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Waters, Wippman & Sroufe, 1979), and that working models of attachment relationships while being open to new input are resistant to major change (Egeland, Jacobvitz & Sroufe, 1988; Main & Cassidy, 1988; Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986).

Attachment Classifications and Self-Presentation

Three classifications of attachment relations have been extensively documented in both infants (Ainsworth, 1985a; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Wall, 1978; Ainsworth & Wittig, 1969) and adults (George, Kaplan & Main, 1985; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Adults classified as free and autonomous with respect to attachment coherently relate their attachment experiences and present a balanced accounting of them. In the present study, I predict that
these securely attached individuals will also be balanced in their self-presentations. They will be able to ingratiate effectively (i.e., convey an image of likability and approachability; ingratiation does not necessarily have the negative connotations in the research literature that it does in everyday parlance) when that seems appropriate. They will also be able to convey an image of competence when it is in order, thus demonstrating flexibility in their self-presentations. In contrast, I expect that adults who are insecurely attached (dismissing or preoccupied) will show a preference for one of these two self-presentation strategies and will usually rely on the self-presentation strategy that is in alignment with the gender role that would be traditionally associated with persons of their sex -- ingratiation for women and competency for men. I also expect that insecure persons will be less comfortable than secure persons when they are asked to use a specific self-presentation strategy since they may not usually demonstrate flexibility in responding to interpersonal situations (Kobak, Cole, Ferenz-Gillies, Fleming, & Gamble, 1993).

Individuals who are classified as dismissing of attachment seem to contain attachment relationships by describing them in idealized terms or actively devaluing them. I predict that dismissing males, both because of gender role socialization (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994) and their restraint in relationships (Simpson, 1990), will rely primarily on the self-presentation strategy of competence. By relying primarily on images of competence these dismissing persons could be employing a self-presentational strategy that also contains attachment relationships. In their attempts to appear competent they may be giving off messages like, "I don't need you; I am competent to handle the situation." Dismissing males are expected to be particularly uncomfortable when called upon to be ingratiating because to be ingratiating necessitates that individuals recognize the importance of relationships.

Preoccupied persons, especially preoccupied women, because of their strong focus on relationships, are expected to rely heavily on ingratiation strategies and to be the least
concerned, of the three classifications, about projecting an image of competence. Preoccupied persons may try to be ingratiating but may not be too successful in their attempts because they may be trying too hard to make others like them. Appearing too competent, in contrast, may imply greater self-reliance than this type of person would want to project.

Attachment classifications may predict self-presentational preferences and skills under most circumstances. The attachment system, however, is "activated" in situations that arouse anxiety, fear, uncertainty and stress (Bowlby, 1969/82). In this research, I attempt to activate individuals' attachment systems by inducing self-presentation anxiety (by videotaping them and telling them that their tapes will be assessed by other people). I expect that self-presentation anxiety will be higher for insecure persons than secure persons when they are called on to use a specific self-presentational strategy rather than being allowed to do what is natural and normal for them. This increase of discomfort about the interview situation is expected to be especially high when they are asked to use a strategy that does not conform to gender role expectations.

I also expect that attachment classification will be related to individuals' expectations for success in their self-presentational endeavors. I expect that secure individuals will have high expectations for self-presentation success and will be willing to acknowledge that trying to present themselves effectively was important for them. I expect that dismissing persons may also have high expectations for success but that they will deny (or simply not be aware of) putting effort into making a favorable impression. Preoccupied individuals may have low expectations for success, and because they may feel doomed to fail in interpersonal relationships, they may simply be unwilling to try to impress others.

Design

This experiment was conducted in two parts. The first study was designed to examine the questions of whether individuals of different attachment classifications report different comfort
levels while using different self-presentational strategies and to see whether, when given a choice of self-presentations, attachment classification is related to an individual's preference for different self-presentation strategies. It also explored individuals' flexibility at using different self-presentation strategies and how willing individuals were to try to impress others. The second study examined the impact of different self-presentations on observers and specifically looked at whether persons of different attachment classifications are differentially effective at different self-presentation strategies. In this study I also explore similarities and differences between self-perceptions and others' perceptions of individuals' self-presentation. This is to see how one's thoughts about one's self-presentations relate to the outcomes of self-presentation and if this is different for persons of different attachment classifications. Finally, I consider personality correlates that might account for differences in self-presentation that characterize persons of differing attachment classifications.
STUDY 1

Overview

In this study selected individuals participated in a videotaped interview in which they were given no explicit self-presentational instructions other than to try to make a favorable impression on the audience. They also participated in a second interview during which they were told to use a specific self-presentational strategy. In a follow up session these same individuals were given the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI, George et al., 1985) and they completed a self-report measure of attachment -- the Hazan and Shaver 7-point scale measure of attachment (SRA, Hazan & Shaver, 1987; as modified by Hazan & Shaver, 1990), and the Emotionality Activity Sociability (EAS) Temperament Survey for Adults (Buss & Plomin, 1984). In a group testing session 6 to 8 weeks before the experimental session these subjects also completed several personality scales that might be related to differences in self-presentation effectiveness. In this study, I specifically examined whether individuals of different attachment classifications differentially chose self-presentational strategies and experienced differential levels of comfort when trying to project specific images.

Method

Subjects

Seventy-two undergraduates were selected from 481 students who took introductory psychology during the spring of 1993 and participated in a group testing session where they completed a questionnaire about their attitudes towards the University of Virginia. All of the persons chosen for the pool of potential participants for this study from the larger group testing listed three things that they liked about the University and said they were willing to recommend the University to potential students. Persons in the pool of potential subjects also completed two self-report measures that have been related to adult attachment classifications in past research (see Kobak & Sceery, 1988) -- the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI,
Helmreich & Stapp, 1974), which distinguished between secure and preoccupied individuals; and the Perceived Social Support from Family (PSSFa, Procidano & Heller, 1983), which differentiated dismissing individuals from the other classifications.

Subjects were selected to participate in the study based on a multi-stage sequential selection plan (Cronbach & Gleser, 1957). This strategy was devised because there is currently no short form self-report measure of attachment available that correlates with the classifications derived from the AAI (Borman, 1992; Borman & Cole, 1993a; 1993b; Smith & George, 1993). The procedure was designed to help ensure that the sample included persons of varying attachment classifications (secure, dismissing, and preoccupied).

Pearson correlations between the TSBI (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) and preoccupied attachment status and PSSFa (Procidano & Heller, 1983) and dismissing attachment status were calculated based on the $E$ statistics (Hays, 1988; Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1984) reported by Kobak and Sceery (1988). Since the TSBI (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) had previously differentiated preoccupied persons from secure persons it was decided for stage one to select 28 subjects who scored below 34 (the mean was 36.47) on the TSBI (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) in an attempt to obtain a total of 24 preoccupied persons. After this, for stage two, 22 subjects were selected from those remaining in the pool who for females scored below 9 and for males below 10 (the mean across genders was 14.84) on the PSSFa (Procidano & Heller, 1983) with the goal of obtaining 24 dismissing subjects for the study. Then finally, as stage three, 22 subjects were selected randomly from those persons remaining in the pool to ensure that there was a sufficient secure sample in the study. Half of the subjects selected during each of the selection stages were male and half were female. Three subjects were replaced; two because of technical difficulties while videotaping their interviews. One subject requested we not show his videotaped interview about the University in our second study. The replacement of one subject matched the selection criteria of the subject replaced; the other two replacements
were randomly selected from the pool of remaining subjects.

The final sample consisted of 36 males and 36 females ranging in age from 17 years and 11 months to 22 years and 10 months. Sixty-four percent of the sample was white, 17% African-American, 14% Asian-American, 4% Hispanic, and 1% mixed heritage.

Procedure

Session 1

The subjects were contacted by phone and asked to participate in a two part study about the types of students who like the University of Virginia. They were told that in the first session we would ask them about their opinions of the University and during a second session we would ask them some other questions about themselves and their families. They were also told that their videotaped interview about the University might be used for promotional purposes and that they should come dressed in clothes that they thought would appeal to prospective students (see Appendix A for the complete script).

Each subject participated in control and experimental condition interviews about the University of Virginia. All of the subjects participated in the control condition first. In this condition subjects were told that it was important to make a good impression on the audience and that they could use whatever approach they wanted. They were also told that some people do this by appearing friendly and likeable, others attempt to appear particularly competent, and some people try to figure out what the person viewing the tape would like, while others try to be laid back and relaxed, and perhaps other people use different strategies than these (see Appendix B for the experimenter script for this session).

Subjects were assigned to one of two experimental conditions for a second interview about the University. Nineteen males and 19 females participated in an ingratiation condition and 17 males and 17 females participated in a competence condition. Approximately half of the males and half of the females from each of the selection criterion above were assigned to these
conditions. In the Competence condition subjects were told that we have found that the audience for these videos is usually impressed if the students at the University seem particularly competent and capable, and in the Ingratiation condition students were told that audiences are usually impressed if they like the students at the University. In both of these experimental conditions subjects were requested to use the specific self-presentational strategy that had been described as being successful in the past.

In the both the control and experimental interviews, subjects were asked to list five adjectives that describe their experience at the University of Virginia. After they listed the adjectives they were asked to describe specific experiences that support their descriptions. The format of this interview was similar to the AAI (George et al., 1985) in that it called for both semantic and episodic memories. In recalling early childhood experiences individuals of different attachment classifications vary in coherency of accounts and detail of recall (Main & Goldwyn, in press). It was expected that this interview task might also produce different types of accounts depending on attachment classification although the individual differences were not expected to be pronounced due to both the nature and the recency of the events being recalled.

When each interview was finished the subjects were then asked to rate how they felt during the interview, and to report the impressions they were trying to convey (see Appendix C for rating scales).

**Session 2**

In a second session that was between 1 and 10 days later the same subjects were asked to continue the study and help us find out more about the type of student who likes the University by participating in the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI, George et al., 1985). This 30 to 60 minute interview asks about relationships with parents and memories of childhood and was administered by trained interviewers (see Appendix D). Following the AAI, subjects were asked to complete several demographic questions (see Appendix E), the SRA (self-report of
attachment, Hazan & Shaver, 1987; as modified by Hazan & Shaver, 1990, see Appendix F), and the EAS Temperament Survey (Plomin & Buss, 1984). At the end of the session subjects were carefully debriefed, consent was obtained to use the videotapes in future studies, and to use the audiotaped Adult Attachment Interview (see Appendix G).

Measures

Measures of Affect, Cognition and Personality

In a group pretesting prior to the experimental session the subjects completed several personality scales (Beck Depression Inventory, BDI, Beck, 1967; Affective Communication Test, ACT, Friedman, Prince, Riggio & DiMatteo, 1980; Affect Intensity Measure, AIM, Larsen & Diener, 1987; Social Anxiety, Leary, 1983; Family Expressiveness Questionnaire, FEQ, Halberstadt, 1986; White Bear Suppression Inventory, WBSI, Wegner & Zanakos, in press) that are designed to measure different aspects of personality that might explain differences in self-presentation effectiveness whether or not they are correlated with attachment status.

Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) Q-sort

The attachment interviews given in this study were classified using a Q-sort that was developed by Kobak (Kobak, et al., 1993) to assess individuals' working models of attachment and the organization of their thought during the AAI. Most of the items in the Q-sort were derived from descriptions used in the AAI classification system of Main and Goldwyn (in press). Kobak (Kobak et al., 1993) reports a Kappa of .65 when comparing Q-sort classifications of dismissing, preoccupied and secure adults to the Main and Goldwyn system classifications for the same adults. Kobak and colleagues reported that 79% of their subjects received identical classifications using the two methods.

The Q-sort assesses two dimensions of individuals' attachment strategies -- security/anxiety and deactivation/hyperactivation of the attachment system. Q-sort items assess both attachment
experiences (e.g., "mother was psychologically available") and qualities of discourse (e.g., "has difficulty gaining insight or generalizing from personal experience"). Each of the 100 Q-sort items was placed into a forced normal distribution across nine points with the endpoints of (1) "extremely uncharacteristic or not like this person" and (9) "extremely characteristic or like this person." Correlations between these rankings of the Q-sort items for a given individual's interview and the ratings of those items for prototype sorts, which are model sorts reflecting the characteristics of each of the attachment styles, were computed and used to determine ratings on the secure, dismissing, and preoccupied scales. In addition a correlation was calculated for the deactivating/hyperactivating dimension. In total, then, four scale ratings were calculated for each individual.

Two coders who were blind to the specific selection correlates of each of the subjects in the study independently sorted transcriptions of each of the AAIs. Coders' sorts were checked for inter-rater reliability each time five sorts were completed. The coder correlations on the four Q-sort scales ranged from .77 (security) to .87 (deactivation), ps <.001.

Subjects were given a specific attachment classification by comparing their individual sorts to prototype sorts for the three attachment classifications. Subjects' classifications reflect the prototype with which their sort had the highest positive correlation. If subjects' sorts showed an equal degree of correlation with an insecure prototype and the secure prototype then subjects were classified as secure. According to the AAI Q-sort 10 subjects were preoccupied, 20 dismissing, and 42 secure.

Results

Description of the Sample

Selection Criteria

The multi-stage sequential selection plan (Cronbach & Gleser, 1957) used to select subjects was designed to help ensure that the sample included relatively equal numbers of persons of
varying attachment classifications (secure, dismissing, and preoccupied) but it did not succeed. When subjects were classified by the Q-sort the distribution across attachment classifications was similar to previous work done on University of Virginia undergraduates in spite of the use of the selection criteria. Kobak and Sceery (1988) found that 53% of their sample was secure compared to 60% of the current sample. Thirty-two percent of the earlier sample was dismissing compared to 27% in the current sample, and 15% was preoccupied in the 1988 group versus 13% of the current group. The selection criteria, the TSBI (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) and the PSSFa (Procidano & Heller, 1983), then, generally did not show the pattern of relationships with attachment classifications that had been shown in previous research (Borman & Cole, 1993; Collins & Read, 1990; Kobak & Sceery, 1988).³

When experimental condition was examined by attachment classification and gender there were unequal distributions of persons of differing attachment classifications in the two experimental conditions (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Sample Characteristics

On a number of other characteristics the sample was similar to other college age groups. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations by gender for the personality, affect, and cognitive style dimensions on which the subjects were measured. As is frequently the case, women's scores on Affect Intensity, Family Expressiveness, Depression, and Fear were significantly higher than men's and there were trends for women to score higher than men on Interaction Social Anxiety, Affective Communication, and Distress.
Individual Differences and Attachment

Gender Differences

Whereas some researchers have found gender differences in adult attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Brennan, Shaver & Tobey, 1991), other attachment researchers have argued that there is no theoretical reason to expect gender differences in attachment classifications (Hazan & Shaver, 1994a). Table 3 shows the number of male and female subjects who were classified as dismissing, secure, and preoccupied by the Q-sort. In the current study, t-tests were computed to see if there were gender differences on the Q-scales and to see if there were gender differences in overall attachment classification. There were no significant gender differences in overall attachment classification. Table 4 shows that males and females had significantly different scores on three of the Q-scales. Females were more secure, and males were more deactivating (Kobak, et al., 1993) and more dismissing (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991).

Differences on Measures of Affect, Cognition, and Personality

In this section I discuss the relationships among the various attachment classifications and the
measures of affect, cognition, and personality. Table 5 shows those measures on which subjects of different attachment classifications differed. Overall attachment classification was not related to Affective Communication (ACT, Friedman, et al., 1980), Social Anxiety (Leary, 1983), Depression (BDI, Beck, 1967) or the Activity and Sociability Scales of the EAS (Buss & Plomin, 1984). Persons who were classified as dismissing reported significantly less Affect Intensity (AIM, Larsen & Diener, 1987) than those classified as secure. This relationship between dismissing characteristics and Affect Intensity (Larsen & Diener, 1987) may be seen as consistent with dismissing persons' tendency to idealize their early family experiences (Dozier & Kobak, 1992; Main & Goldwyn, in press). The process of idealization involves denial of negative emotions and could make it very difficult for dismissing individuals to score highly on a measure that is intended to capture both positive and negative emotional experiences.

Preoccupied persons rated highly on Thought Suppression which may relate to their tendency to be enmeshed with their families. The Q-sort was also related to anger in preoccupied persons. This seems consistent with the "angry" discourse that may characterize preoccupied persons' AAI's (Main & Goldwyn, in press).

Reports of family expressiveness (FEQ, Halberstadt, 1986) were significantly related to the Q-sort. The FEQ is a measure of the family's emotional history, and individuals' internal working models of attachment are theoretically related to their family experiences, so it is particularly interesting to see how the subscales of this measure relate not only to a person's overall attachment classification but also how they relate to scores on the attachment scales. Table 6 shows the relationships among the Q-sort attachment scales and the subscales of the Family Expressiveness Questionnaire. As expected, positive family expressiveness, both
dominant and submissive, was related to security, indicating that secure persons remember a positive emotional climate in their families of origin. Persons who scored high on Q-sort dismissing scale reported less positive expressiveness, both dominant and submissive, in their families and less negative submissiveness than persons who scored low on the Q-sort dismissing scale. Persons who showed high Q-sort preoccupation rated their families as showing high negative dominance, which may relate to current anger which is frequently a feature present in these persons' interviews (Main & Goldwyn, in press). Persons who were highly deactivating reported less family expressiveness on all four subscales of the Family Expressiveness Questionnaire, supporting the idea that they actively disengage from the family's emotional experience.

Insert Table 6 about here

**Relationships Among Self-Reports of Interviews**

**Correlations**

Table 7 shows the relationships among subjects' self-reports of liking and competence during their interviews about the University. All subjects were asked three questions each about liking and competence -- how likeable/competent others would find them ("other"), how likeable/competent they thought they were ("self"), and how hard they tried to be likeable/competent ("try"). Subjects filled out these ratings after each of the two interviews, a control condition and an experimental condition. The correlations under the diagonal show the relationships among these measures for reports about the first interview -- the control condition. The diagonal shows that all measures of liking and competence were stable from the first interview to second. The correlations above the diagonal show the relationships among liking and competence for subjects' self-reports of their second interview, the experimental condition,
in which they were instructed to try to be likeable or to appear competent. For both interviews subjects' reports of how likeable and competent they thought they were and how likeable and competent others would see them were highly correlated (Kenny & DePaulo, 1993). Subjects' reports of how hard they tried to be likeable or to appear competent were less consistently related to how they saw themselves or how they thought others saw them.

For each interview subjects rated their own comfort, spontaneity, lack of self-consciousness and overall satisfaction with the interview. These general feelings about the interviews were related to how likeable and competent the subjects thought they were and how they thought others would think of them. (The lowest of these correlations was $r[72] = .35, p < .01$). The ratings of how subjects generally felt about the interview were also highly correlated with each other for a given interview ranging from $r(65) = .45$ to $r(65) = .66, ps < .001$. The stabilities for these general reports about the interviews ranged from $r(72) = .38$ to $r(65) = .60, ps < .001$. Since the relationships among subjects' feelings about their interviews and subjects' reported effort was more complex, Table 8 shows the relationships among comfort, spontaneity, lack of self-consciousness, and satisfaction and how hard the subjects tried to be liked or tried to appear competent.

Factor Analysis

The subjects in this study completed a total of 19 self-report ratings across their two interviews and because many of these items were highly correlated, factor analytical techniques
were used to see if the number of rating scales could be reduced to a smaller number of theoretical coherent hypothetical variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Both Maximum Likelihood (ML) and Principle Components (PC) extraction techniques were used to examine the factor structure (McArdle, 1990). When oblique rotation was used the estimation process did not converge after 25 iterations. When varimax rotation (orthogonal) was used both ML and PC extracted five factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. The first two factors extracted by ML and PC were similar. The first factor could be considered a first interview factor while the second factor was strictly related to the second interview (see Appendix H for more details on factor composition). Interview 1 and Interview 2 self-reports largely loaded on different factors and the sample size of 72 was only marginally large enough to reliably factor analyze 19 variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989) so the variables from the first and second interviews (8 each) were also analyzed separately. The first interview and the second interview had different factor structures (see Appendix H for more details). Factor analyses were also conducted separately for the two experimental conditions of the second interview because the experimental manipulation had resulted in slightly different correlation patterns among the self-report variables for the two interviews. When the second interview was analyzed for each experimental condition separately, most of the variables had complex loadings so it was decided not to use factors in further analyses (see Appendix H for details).

Overview of Analyses

Taking into consideration the correlations between variables, the experimental manipulations, the theoretical and factor analytical differences between conditions, and missing data, and in an effort to minimize chance findings, I decided to conduct the following analyses. I conducted three series of mixed design ANOVAs and multiple regressions. The subjects' reports of others' perceptions were used in the first series of analyses. The dependent variables for the second series of analyses were subjects' reports of how hard they tried to be liked and tried to
appear competent, and subjects' comfort and subjects' spontaneity were the dependent variables in the third series of analyses.

Three designs with different combinations of between subjects factors were used to predict the dependent variables (see Table 9). In Design 1 there were three between subjects factors -- gender of subject (male/female), experimental condition (ingratiation/competence) and attachment classification (insecure/secure). According to the Q-sort there was only one preoccupied male in the Competence condition, because there was no variance in that cell attachment classification was considered a dichotomous variable (insecure/secure) with both dismissing and preoccupied subjects classified as insecure for Design 1. In the Design 2, the three attachment classifications were retained but the between subjects factor of gender of subject was eliminated. Finally, multiple regressions were conducted with gender of subject, experimental condition, and the Q-sort dimensions (security/insecurity and deactivating/hyperactivating) as predictor variables (Design 3). All of the analyses had two within-subjects factors -- interview (first/second) and type of measure (liking/competence or spontaneity/comfort). In total, then, there were two different mixed design ANOVAs and one design for repeated measures regression conducted on three different groupings of dependent variables.

I will give a brief report about general findings from the self-reports and then examine whether the experimental manipulation was successful. The question of whether the subjects in the Ingratiation condition differed from the subjects in the Competence condition, for their second interviews, will be addressed by analyzing subjects' responses to the experimental manipulation checks. Further evidence of the success of the experimental manipulation will be
assessed by examining the subjects' self-reports of liking and competence. The Interview (Interview 1 /Interview 2) X Condition (ingratiation/competence) X Measure (liking /competence) interactions for subjects' thoughts about how others would perceive them and subjects' reported self-presentational effort should indicate whether subjects had higher expectations about being liked and tried harder to be liked in the Ingratiation condition and expected to be perceived and tried harder to be more competent in the Competence condition, as expected.

Following this, I will focus on the effects that are specifically related to the attachment hypotheses. I will report all significant main effects for attachment. The interactions of attachment and interview will indicate whether persons of different attachment classifications reported increased or decreased expectations for self-presentation success, increased or decreased their self-presentational efforts, and acknowledged differences in spontaneity/comfort from the first to the second interview regardless of the experimental condition. Attachment and measure interactions will show whether persons of one attachment classification differed from persons in the other attachment classifications on how hard they tried to be liked and how hard they tried to be competent, on whether they expected to be liked or to be seen as competent by others, and on feeling spontaneous or comfortable across both interviews. Effects for experimental condition only (ingratiation or competence), or condition and measure without interview (first/second -- i.e. control/experimental) are theoretically less interesting since they do not differentiate between the control and the experimental interviews. The three-way interactions of Attachment X Interview X Condition and the four-way interaction involving measure should show whether persons of different attachment classifications responded differently to the experimental manipulation. The Attachment X Interview X Condition X Gender and the five-way interaction of Attachment X Interview X Condition X Measure X Gender will be examined to see whether secure attachment is related to gender role flexibility in
self-presentation.
General Findings

In both of the analyses of subjects' effort, how hard they tried to be liked and to appear competent, there were main effects for interview and measure. Subjects reported trying harder in the second interview (more conservative estimate was Design 2, \( E[1, 66] = 41.49, p < .001; \) \( M = 4.78 \) for Interview 1 and \( M = 5.99 \) for Interview 2). They also reported that they tried harder to be competent (\( M = 5.21 \)) than to be liked (\( M = 5.56 \)) in Design 2, \( E(1,66) = 6.75, p < .05 \).

Differences Between Experimental Conditions

As part of their self-reports about the interviews, subjects completed manipulation checks on their self-presentational strategies after the two interviews (control and experimental). Subjects specified whether they tried to appear in a way that would make others like them, or tried to appear competent to others, or did not use any particular strategy, or used some other strategy while being interviewed. For the first interview, in which no specific self-presentation instructions were given, 31 of the 72 subjects said they did not use a particular self-presentation strategy, 23 of the subjects said they used a strategy other than trying to be liked or appear competent, 9 subjects said they tried to be competent, 6 said they tried to be liked, and 3 subjects checked more than one response. There were no differences in self-presentation strategies for persons of differing attachment classifications. Sixty-five percent of the persons saying they used a strategy other than those specified, however, were securely attached. Males who endorsed the other strategy option said they either tried to be relaxed or to be themselves. Females who checked the other option mentioned similar strategies but also noted that they were trying to be honest and/or be helpful to prospective students.

Thirty-eight of the original subjects were randomly assigned, within selection criterion, to present themselves in a way that would make them seem particularly likeable during their second interview. The remaining 34 subjects were instructed to try to seem especially
competent during their second interview. Thirty-four of the 38 subjects in the condition in which they were asked to try to seem particularly likeable said this was what they did. The other four subjects were equally divided between saying they used a strategy other than the ones listed and endorsing multiple categories. No subjects in the condition in which they were instructed to try to appear likeable indicated that their primary strategy was to try to appear competent. Two of the subjects in the competent condition did say that their primary strategy was to try to appear likeable but the remaining 32 said that they tried to appear to be especially competent. Table 10 shows that subjects in the two experimental conditions also differed in how hard they tried to be liked during the second interview and how hard they tried to appear competent. There was also a significant difference in the change in how hard they tried to be liked or to appear competent from the first interview to the second. These ratings of trying to be liked or to appear competent and the differences in these attempts between the control and experimental conditions all indicate that the manipulation of the subjects' self-presentations was successful.

Insert Table 10 about here

For both subjects' reports of how others would view them and how hard they tried, there were interactions between condition, interview, and measure. Table 11 shows the group means for the Condition X Interview X Measure interactions in Design 1 (Gender X Condition X Attachment [insecure/secure]) for subjects' reports of how others would view them, $F(1, 64) = 5.33, p < .05$, and how hard they tried to behave in a specific manner, $F(1, 64) = 19.48, p < .001$. In the first interview there were only small differences between reports of liking and competence but in the second interview subjects reported either greater liking or greater competence in alignment with their experimental condition. Contrasts testing mean differences for the second interviews were significant for subjects' reports of how others would view them,
E(1, 64) = 14.15, p < .001, and for subjects' reported effort to be likable/competent, E(1, 64) = 33.69, p < .001.

Insert Table 11 about here
Attachment Interactions

Subjects' effort and comfort. There were significant main effects for attachment classification in predicting subjects' reported effort at being likeable and appearing competent, and subjects' self-reports of spontaneity and comfort. Secure subjects reported trying harder to be liked and to appear competent (for Design 1, $E[1, 64] = 6.43, p < .05$, and for Design 2, $E[2, 66] = 3.57, p < .05$) and as predicted they also reported higher levels of spontaneity and comfort than insecure subjects (for Design 1, $E[1, 63] = 7.74, p < .01$, and for Design 2, $E[2, 65] = 3.78, p < .05$). Table 12 shows the mean level of reported effort and mean reported spontaneity/comfort for secure and insecure subjects from Design 1.

When these effects were examined in regression analyses with the attachment dimensions (Design 3), equations predicting subjects' reported effort and spontaneity/comfort were also related to the attachment dimensions. In the analysis of subjects' spontaneity/comfort, overall $E(11, 60) = 1.86, p < .10$, the secure dimension was the significant predictor ($\beta = 1.60, p < .05$), while in the analysis of subjects' effort, overall $E(10, 61) = 2.44, p < .05$, it was the interaction of security and deactivation ($\beta = .35, p < .05$) that was significant.

Attachment classification was also related to subjects' spontaneity/comfort. Attachment significantly interacted with interview, Design 1, $E(1, 64) = 5.72, p < .05$. As predicted, secure subjects said they were more spontaneous/comfortable during both interviews than insecure subjects, contrast $E(1, 64) = 10.33, p < .01$. Secure subjects reported increases in spontaneity/comfort from Interview 1 to 2 (increase of .23), whereas insecure subjects reported especially less spontaneity /comfort on the second interview (decrease of .69, $E[1, 64] = 11.60, p < .01$). In predicting spontaneity and comfort with regression, there was a significant
interaction between the Q-sort dimensions of security and deactivation and interview and measure (overall $E[11, 60] = 1.78, p < .05$). In this analysis (Design 3) the interaction of security and deactivation predicted less comfort in the first interview and less spontaneity in the second interview ($\beta = -.47, p < .01$).

As mentioned in the general section above, in all analyses subjects reported differential effort for the first and second interviews (main effect for interview), and differential effort at trying to be liked and to appear competent (main effect for measure). The three-way interaction of Interview X Measure X Attachment was significant (for Design 1, $E[1, 64] = 6.51, p < .05$; for Design 2, $E[2, 66] = 4.86, p < .05$; and for Design 3 the overall $E[10, 61] = 3.22, p < .01$, $\beta$ for deactivation = 1.16, $p < .05$). Table 13 shows the means for this interaction. Contrasts comparing mean differences show that insecure persons (dismissing and preoccupied) reported relatively little effort at trying to be liked in Interview 1 (less than the mean of 5) but they substantially increased for their effort at this for the second interview, $E(1, 66) = 63.85, p < .001$. Secure individuals, on the other hand, showed similar increases in liking and competence from Interview 1 to Interview 2, $E(1, 66) = 28.73, p < .001$. Dismissing individuals also showed increases in trying to appear competent from Interview 1 to Interview 2, but preoccupied individuals showed no differences in their attempts to appear competent, $E(1, 66) = 104.65, p < .001$. This effect did not interact with condition so it reflects general tendencies of persons of different attachment classifications rather than attachment specific responses to the experimental manipulation.

Insert Table 13 about here

Expectations for self-presentation success. Both insecure and secure subjects expected that they would be most effective at their self-presentations in the situations where they experienced
the most spontaneity/comfort. Insecure subjects thought that others would like them better/think
they were more competent during the first interview, but secure subjects thought others would
think especially more highly of them during their second interview (for Design 1, \( F[1, 64] =
6.87, p < .05 \); contrast \( F[1, 64] = 4.77, p < .05 \)).

**Gender.** When predicting subjects' reports of effort at trying to be liked/to appear
competent, attachment interacted with gender (Design 1, \( F[1, 64] = 4.05, p < .05 \)). Secure
individuals said they tried harder to be liked/to appear competent, especially if they were
female, \( t(64) = 1.62, p < .10 \) one-tailed (mean difference 1.28 for females and .15 for males).
The four-way interaction of Condition X Interview X Measure X Gender, \( E(1, 64) = 4.39, p <
.05 \), and the five-way interaction of Condition X Interview X Measure X Gender X A
attachment, \( E(1, 64) = 6.51, p < .05 \), were significant when predicting spontaneity and comfort.
Between the first and second interview women reported relatively large decreases in spontaneity
when they were in the Ingratiation condition (gender appropriate) and males reported decreases
in spontaneity when they were in the Competent condition (gender appropriate). Table 14
shows that this effect was particularly pronounced when the subjects were insecure, \( E(1, 64) =
46.87, p < .001 \). Men also reported relatively large decreases in comfort when they were in the
Ingratiation condition, and women reported especially large increases in comfort when they
were in the Competence condition, with the insecure men showing a large decrease and the
secure women showing the largest increase in comfort, \( E(1,64) = 5.77, p < .05 \). This supports
the idea that secure individuals are more at ease than insecure individuals with behaviors that are
not sex stereotyped.

Insert Table 14 about here

**Individual Differences as Covariates of Attachment**
Because attachment style has frequently been thought of as an individual difference measure rather than purely a relational construct (Kobak, 1994), and because it was not experimentally manipulated, it is possible that the attachment effects were actually caused by some other individual difference variable that is correlated with attachment. In the literature on infant attachment, for instance, there has been an extensive discussion about the relationship of attachment to temperament, pointing to a small to moderate correlation between negative emotionality and attachment behaviors (see Goldsmith & Harman, 1994, for a recent review). It seems then that it is important to distinguish attachment effects from temperamental differences. Affective Intensity (Larsen & Diener, 1987) and Anger (Plomin & Buss, 1984) scores, because of their theoretical relevance to self-presentation and relationship to attachment measures (see Table 5), were used as covariates in Designs 1 and 2 to see if they attenuated the attachment findings described above. These covariates did not affect the results described above.
Conclusions

This study demonstrated that individuals’ assessments of their self-presentations are related to their attachment classifications. Attachment classification was related to individuals' reports of spontaneity and comfort, and to individuals' expectations about their self-presentations during an interview that was "a pilot for a promotional video." The experimental situation was one that was designed to provoke a certain amount of anxiety and make subjects conscious of the impact of their self-presentation, but the situation itself would not account for these attachment specific differences in self-presentation. Attachment was also related to self-reported effort to be liked and to appear competent, and flexibility in usage of self-presentation strategies, suggesting that individuals' concepts of themselves and others in relationships affect their versatility and overall experience of presenting themselves to others.

Secure subjects reported trying hard to be liked/to appear competent, indicating that making favorable impressions on others was important to them. Insecure persons reported relatively little effort at trying to be liked when allowed free choice of self-presentation strategy, in the first interview. There are several possible reasons why insecure persons might put little effort into trying to impress others. Dismissing individuals might be inclined to deny the importance of others, while other insecure individuals might be especially distrusting of others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). This combined effect could account for the lack of distinction between the types of insecure individuals, and in future research an attempt should be made to determine specifically what motivations underlie this lack of effort. From Interview 1 to Interview 2, both secure and dismissing individuals increased their efforts to appear competent. Preoccupied individuals, however, initially put in little effort to appear competent and also showed no difference between interviews in their attempts to appear competent. This effect, especially because it did not interact with condition, supports the idea that preoccupied persons tend to place relatively low value on the importance of trying to appear competent which is what would
be expected of individuals who show high reliance on others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

When subjects' reported spontaneity and comfort were related to attachment, the findings supported the predictions. Secure subjects said they were more spontaneous/comfortable than insecure subjects during both interviews. The insecure subjects, as expected, reported especially low spontaneity/comfort on the second interview. Between the first and second interview insecure persons reported relatively large decreases in spontaneity when they were in the gender-appropriate condition but were relatively uncomfortable if they were in the other condition. This finding provides support for the idea that while insecure individuals may not be as "fresh" in their gender specific self-presentations they are more comfortable when called on to present themselves in traditional gender roles than they are when they are asked to be flexible and present themselves in ways that might violate societal gender expectations.

There were no differences in reported spontaneity/comfort between the preoccupied and dismissing individuals. The lack of discrimination between the two insecure groups on their affective experience is similar to previous research which has shown that the relationship between attachment and affect regulation is clearest for the secure group (Brennan, et al., 1991, Kobak & Sceery, 1988) and that there are some ambiguities when trying to make predictions about specific insecure categorizations (Noller & Feeney, 1994). The lack of discrimination between the two insecure categories also may be attributable, in part, to the nature of the Q-sort, in that it does not distinguish disorganized/disoriented individuals from other insecure types (Kobak, et al, 1993). Disorganized /disoriented individuals may exhibit characteristics of both of the other insecure types, making the distinctions between these groups problematic if this recently acknowledged fourth classification is not analyzed separately (Main & Hesse, 1990; Main & Solomon, 1990). In the current study, it is also possible that there simply were not enough preoccupied individuals, especially males, to discriminate between the two insecure groups.
STUDY 2

Method

Subjects

Three hundred and eighty four students, in partial fulfillment of an introductory psychology course requirement, rated videotapes of subjects who had been interviewed about their University experience. Three judges were eliminated after it was determined that they did not fill out the rating booklet in accordance with instructions.

Videotapes

The videotaped interviews about the University of Virginia made during Study 1 were edited. For each subject four segments of their interviews appeared on four different tapes. For each of the two original interviews, subjects' answers to the questions:

Could you tell me a little bit about your decision to come to UVA; how did you decide to apply here, what other schools were you considering, what was the major thing that made you decide to come to UVA?

and

Could you describe how you feel about the University of Virginia? What was it like when you first arrived and how do you feel about it now?

were considered one rating segment. The other rating segment for each interview was the subjects' answers to:

Can you list five words that describe your experience at the University of Virginia? After you list them I'll ask you why you chose them.

Each subject, then, appeared on four edited tapes (with the exception of one subject whose second interview did not record; in this case the subject is on two edited tapes). Each subject was rated by at least 96 persons (12 persons for each of 4 final videos in two different rating sessions). The judges viewed a total of 24 subjects in a rating session with a break between the
first 12 subjects and second 12. So judges viewed 12 subjects (six males and six females) in one of the two selected segments and then viewed 12 subjects in the other segment. Appendix I contains an ordered listing of which subjects, segments and interviews appeared on each tape. Appendix J contains a list of which tapes were shown in a given rating session.

Procedure

Groups of introductory psychology students were told that they were previewing interviews that might be used in promotional tapes about the University of Virginia. They were told that we were interested their reactions to these tapes and their opinions about whether or not these people should be included in a final promotional video about the University (see Appendix K for the experimenter scripts). The judges saw either 12 persons answering the first question (Segment 1) or 12 persons answering the second question (Segment 2) first. In half of the rating sessions judges viewed clips from Interview 1 first and in the other half of the sessions judges viewed clips from Interview 2 first. Judges were unaware that subjects had been interviewed more than one time; therefore they were unaware of the particular interview they were watching. For each subject the judges saw, the judges completed 10 nine-point rating scales about how much they liked the person, how competent the person was and whether or not the person should be included in the final promotional video. They also said whether or not they knew the person they were rating. A complete list of the questions answered by the judges is included in Appendix L.

Results

Rating Session Characteristics

Judges' Reliabilities

During each experimental session groups of judges viewed two tapes, in one of two orders. Judges' reliabilities were calculated for each of the 10 rating scales separately for each order in each session (see Appendix M for a complete list of alphas). Table 15 shows the range of
alpha for each scale and the median alpha. For eight of the 10 scales alphas for all groups of judges were above .60 and the median alphas for these scales were all in the .80s. For the two scales in which judges assess how hard the original subjects were trying to be liked and trying to appear competent the judges were less reliable. When attempting to gauge how hard the subjects were trying to be liked judges did reasonably well -- no group alpha was less than .50 and the median alpha for the groups of judges on this scale was .74. When judges were assessing subjects' efforts to appear competent they were only marginally reliable with seven groups of judges having alphas on this scale that were less than .60 and the median alpha across all 24 groups of judges being .61. In spite of its marginal reliability this scale was retained because of its theoretical import.

Insert Table 15 about here

**Tape Effects**

Judges viewed two tapes during each experimental session, in a counterbalanced order. For each of the judges' scales t tests were computed comparing the ratings from sessions where the tape was shown first to the ratings from sessions where the tapes were shown second. For the judges' assessment of how hard the subjects were trying to be competent, order of presentation made a significant difference, t(565) = 3.93, p < .001. For three other scales there were also tendencies for order of presentation to make a difference (trying to be likeable, t[563] = 1.86, spontaneity, t[568] = -1.86, whether to include the subject in the promotion, t[570] = -1.74, ps <.10). Given these order of presentation effects I decided only to report ratings made when the tape was the first tape in the rating session. For the first tape viewed judges would not yet have tired of the task, nor would their ratings be skewed by having been exposed to the other segment type prior to making these ratings.
Ratings of the different segments were also compared to each other. When the tape was the first tape shown in an experimental session, there was only one scale where the interview segment made a significant difference\(^7\) out of a possible 10 so ratings for the two segments were averaged in the analyses which follow.

**Relationships Among Judges' Ratings**

**Correlations**

The 10 judges' rating were highly correlated with each other within the respective interviews. For both interviews, ratings of subject likability, competence, comfort, spontaneity, sincerity, how convincing the subject was about UVA and whether the subject should be included in a promotional video about the University were significantly correlated, \(ps < .001\), and ranged between \(r(72) = .76\) (for subject likability with comfort, Interview 1) and \(r(72) = .99\) (for how convincing with whether to include the subject, Interview 1). The two trying scales were significantly correlated with each other, \(r(72) = .81\), for Interview 1 and \(r(71) = .86\), for Interview 2, \(ps < .001\). The correlations for the ratings of how hard the subjects were trying to be liked ranged from \(.21\) (\(N = 72, p < .10\), with competence for Interview 1) to \(.60\) (\(N = 71, p < .001\), with how convincing the subject was during Interview 2) and the correlations for the ratings of how hard the subjects were trying to be competent ranged from \(.13\) (\(N = 72, ns\), with subjects' attractiveness in Interview 1) to \(.60\) (\(N = 71, p < .001\), with how convincing the subject was during Interview 2). The average correlation for ratings of subjects' attractiveness with the other scales for a given interview was \(.54\). The correlations for ratings of subjects' attractiveness and the other scales during Interviews 1 and 2 are shown in Table 16. Judges' impressions of subjects from one interview to the other were quite stable, ranging from \(.40\) (\(N = 71, p = .001\), trying to be competent) to \(.79\) (\(N = 71, p < .001\), subjects' attractiveness). All of the scale stabilities are shown in Table 17.
Overview of Analyses of Judges' Ratings

Two mixed design ANOVAs, which had the same between subjects factors as Designs 1 and 2 in Study 1 (see Table 9), were used to examine judges' impressions of subjects. Attractive persons are frequently attributed a wide array of positive characteristics (see Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986 for a review), therefore ratings of subjects' attractiveness were expected to contribute significantly to judges' overall impressions of subjects. Ratings of subjects' attractiveness, then, were used first as dependent variables in ANOVAs, and also as covariates of other dependent variables. Due to the high correlations among judges' scales, composite variables of judges' overall impressions for each interview were created by averaging ratings of subject likability, competence, comfort, spontaneity, sincerity, how convincing the subject was about UVA and whether the subject should be included in a promotional video about the University. These composites were used as dependent variables in the ANOVAs with ratings of attractiveness as covariates. For both the analyses with ratings of subjects' attractiveness and the analyses with judges' overall impressions as dependent variables, there was one within-subjects factor, interview (Interview 1/Interview 2). In one other series of ANOVAs, judges' views of how hard the subjects were trying to be liked and trying to be competent were used as the dependent variables. Ratings of subjects' attractiveness were again used as covariates and the additional within-subjects factor of measure (liking/competence) was included in these analyses. As with Study 1, the effects of interest are primarily those in which attachment interacts with other factors in the designs.

General Findings

Across all three dependent variables and both designs, there was a main effect for interview.
Judges viewed subjects as more attractive (more conservative estimate, $E[1, 65] = 7.21, p < .01$, for Design 2), they had more favorable overall impressions of subjects (trend for Design 2, $E[1, 64] = 2.87, p < .10$, and $E[1, 62] = 5.42, p < .05$, for Design 1), and they thought subjects tried harder to be liked/to appear competent (more conservative estimate, $E[1, 65] = 156.22, p < .001$, for Design 2) during the second interview (Godfrey et al., 1986). Table 18 shows the means for these interview effects for Design 1.

For both analyses of judges' views of how hard the subjects were trying, there were significant effects for measure (more conservative estimate, $E[1, 65] = 170.45, p < .001$, for Design 2). Judges thought the subjects tried harder to appear competent than to be likeable. Judges also thought that subjects tried especially hard to be competent in the second interview (more conservative estimate, $E[1, 65] = 156.22, p < .001$, for Interview X Measure interaction in Design 2). In the design that included gender, there was also a significant interaction between gender and measure. Table 19 shows that judges thought the females, in alignment with gender role expectations, tended to try harder than males to be liked, $t(62) = 1.82, p < .05$, one-tailed.

Attachment and Gender Interactions

When judges were rating subjects, the gender of the subject frequently had an effect on their judgements. In Design 1, females were seen as significantly more attractive, $E(1, 63) = 4.69, p < .05$, $M = 4.94$, than males, $M = 4.50$. In predicting judges' ratings of subjects' attractiveness, the Interview X Condition interaction was significant (Design 1, $E[1, 63] = 5.02$, and Design 2,
E[1, 65] = 4.01, ps < .05). In Design 1, persons who were in the Ingratiation condition were seen as .40 (almost half of a scale score) more attractive in their second interview, while persons who were in the Competent condition were seen as very similar in their attractiveness across the interviews (.09 increase from Interview 1 to 2) (Godfrey et al., 1986). This effect was demonstrated most strongly by secure males (Q-sort classification) and insecure females (Design 1, E[1, 63] = 4.89, p < .05, t[63] = 5.04, p < .001), supporting the idea that secure persons are more effective than insecure persons when they are using self-presentational strategies that vary from traditional gender role expectations.

Individual Differences as Covariates of Attachment

As with the subjects' self-reports in Study 1, Affective Intensity (Larsen & Diener, 1987) and Anger (Plomin & Buss, 1994) scores, because of their theoretical relevance to self-presentation and their relationship to the attachment measure (see Table 5), were again used as covariates in the analyses. As was the case in Study 1, these covariates did not have a significant effect on the attachment results.
Comparing Subjects' Reports to Judges' Ratings

Correlations between Subjects' and Judges' Ratings

The correlations among subjects' reports and judges' ratings were examined to see whether subjects' and judges' ratings of the same attribute were positively correlated. The pattern of correlations between subjects' and judges' ratings differed for Interviews 1 and 2. For Interview 1, frequently subjects' and judges' ratings of the same attribute were positively correlated. Table 20 shows that for liking and many other positively toned feelings, subjects' positive feelings about their interviews correlated with judges' favorable impressions. Judges' ratings of subjects' attractiveness, however, were only significantly related to subjects' lack of self-consciousness, \( r(65) = .32, p < .01 \). For Interview 2, the only subject scale that was correlated with judges' ratings was subjects' thoughts about their own likability. Subjects' thoughts about their own likability were correlated in the .20s (\( N = 64, ps \) ranging from .03 to .07) with every one of the judges' scales except subjects' attractiveness, \( r(64) = .11, ns. \)

For certain other attributes, however, subjects' and judges' ratings were not correlated at all. The judges' ratings of subjects' trying to be liked or to appear competent were not related to the subjects' ratings about themselves. Similarly, the subjects' ratings of how hard they were trying to be liked and to appear competent were not significantly related to any of the judges' scales. Subjects' reports about their competence and their perceptions of others' views of their competence also showed no significant relationship to any of the judges' scales.

Overview of Analyses Comparing Subjects' and Judges' Ratings

The same combinations of between subjects factors that were used to examine independently subjects' self-reports and judges' ratings (see Table 9, Designs 1 and 2) were
used to compare subjects' self-reports with judges' ratings. In these analyses, however, an additional within subjects factor of rater (self-reports/judges' ratings) was added to the designs. When there were significant interactions with the rater factor, subjects and judges had different perceptions of the subject. When there were significant effects without the rater factor, self-reports and judges' ratings were in similar directions. The three groups of dependent variables that were used to assess the subjects' self-reports were used here to compare the subjects' reports to the judges' reports. First subjects' thoughts about others' perceptions of their likability and competence were compared to judges' actual views of subjects' likability and competence. Next subjects' reports of how hard they tried to be likeable and to appear competent were compared to judges' assessments of subjects' effort in these same areas. The last series of analyses compared subject reports of spontaneity and comfort to judges' impressions of subjects' spontaneity and comfort.

General Perceptions

There were many similarities in the way subjects and judges rated the subjects but there were also some pervasive differences in perspective. Across all designs, subjects thought others would see them as more likeable/competent than was actually the case (more conservative estimate was Design 2, $F[1, 65] = 9.69, p < .05$). Subjects also thought that they exerted more effort to be likeable/appear competent than judges attributed to them (only a trend for Design 2, $F[1, 65] = 3.67, p < .06$, but significant for Design 1, $F[1, 63] = 9.21, p < .01$). The Rater X Measure interactions for these dependent variables show that the subjects rated themselves quite a bit higher than the judges did on how likeable they would appear to others (Design 1, $F[1, 63] = 11.63, p < .01$, $t[63] = 6.23, p < .001$), and the judges thought the subjects exerted especially low levels of effort to seem likeable (more conservative estimate in Design 1, $F[1, 63] = 4.38, p < .04$, $t[63] = 6.79, p < .001$). The means for both the rater main effects and the interaction of rater and measure (liking/competence) for Design 1 are shown in
Table 21. In spite of these differences subjects did agree with the raters that they were actually trying harder to appear competent than to be liked (more conservative estimate for the main effect for measure was Design 2, $E[1, 65] = 36.81, p < .001$). Subjects and judges also agreed that subjects were in fact more competent than likeable (more conservative estimate was Design 2, $E[1, 65] = 33.20, p < .001$; see Table 22).

In examining main effects for interview, both sets of raters (subjects and judges) thought the subjects were more likeable and competent in the second interview (not in Design 2, but in Design 1, $E[1, 63] = 7.82, p < .01$). Both sets of raters also thought subjects tried harder in the second interview (more conservative estimate was Design 2, $E[1, 65] = 105.74, p < .001$; see Table 23 for the combined subject and judge means for interview effects for Design 1). In Design 1 rater (subject/judge) significantly interacted with interview, $E(1, 63) = 7.24, p < .01$ (and a trend in Design 2), for the effort variables, showing that the subjects always gave themselves high scores on effort in comparison to the judges, $t(63) = 3.48, p < .001$, but this was especially true for the second interview, $t(63) = 3.84, p < .001$ (mean differences were .20 and .71 for the respective interviews).

The three-way interaction of Interview X Measure X Condition was significant for both designs and both sets of liking/competence dependent variables. Table 24, which displays the means from Design 1 for these interactions, shows that when subjects' and judges' reports were examined together there were relatively large increases in ratings of subjects' likability and
competence, and their efforts at such, between the first and second interviews, in the condition that called for liking or competence. This indicates that subjects and judges together observed the expected differences between the control and specific experimental conditions.

Insert Table 24 about here

There were however important caveats in the way subjects and raters assessed subjects' effort. The rater and measure factors significantly interacted in three-way interactions with condition and interview, and then in the four-way interaction of Rater X Interview X Condition X Measure. Subjects always saw themselves as putting in more effort to be competent if they were in the Competent condition and more effort to be liked if they were in the Ingratiation condition, but the judges saw them as virtually the same across the two conditions (more conservative estimate was Design 2, $F_{[1, 65]} = 4.94, p < .05$). The subjects also said that they tried harder to be liked in the second interview, if they were in the Ingratiation condition, and harder to appear competent if they were in the Competent condition, $t_{(63)} = 10.48, p < .001$. The judges, in contrast, always saw the subjects as trying harder to appear competent, $F_{(1, 63)} = 51.66, p < .001$. This was especially true for the second interview in comparison to the subjects' self-reports for the Ingratiation condition (see Table 25 for the strongest demonstration of this effect in Design 1, overall $F_{[1, 63]} = 12.10, p < .01$, contrast $F_{[1, 63]} = 138.13, p < .001$).

Insert Table 25 about here

Another difference in the way subjects and judges assessed the subjects was in the area of spontaneity/comfort. Subjects thought they were more spontaneous /comfortable in the first
interview but judges thought that the subjects showed more of these combined qualities in the second interview (the more conservative estimate of this Rater X Interview effect was in Design 2, overall $E[1, 65]=5.69$, $p<.05$, contrast $E[1, 63]=3.93$, $p<.10$). The four-way interaction of Rater X Interview X Condition X Gender was also significant, $E(1, 63)=7.22$, $p<.01$. Males in the Competence condition reported decreases in spontaneity/comfort between the first and second interviews, $t(63)=2.22$, $p<.05$, while females in this condition saw themselves as especially increasing in spontaneity/comfort compared to changes in the judges' perceptions (for self-reports $t[63]=3.24$, $p<.01$, for judges' $t[63]=-.56$, ns, see Table 26 for means, Design 1). Women, then, especially increase in spontaneity/comfort in the condition that was not gender-typed but the judges do not see this.

Attachment Interactions

**Effort.** There was a main effect for attachment when subjects' reported levels of effort and judges' ratings of subjects' effort were the dependent variables both in Design 1, $E(1, 63)=6.99$, $p<.01$, and Design 2, $E(2, 65)=4.82$, $p<.05$. Dismissing persons ($M=5.09$) and preoccupied persons ($M=5.02$) were both rated as demonstrating less effort than secure individuals ($M=5.55$) by subjects and judges. The rater factor also interacted with attachment and gender in Design 1, $E(1, 63)=5.13$, $p<.05$, showing that secure subjects always were rated as trying harder than insecure subjects, $E(1, 63)=5.17$, $p<.05$. The insecure female subjects reported especially low levels of effort, $t(63)=3.11$, $p<.01$ (see Table 27).
In predicting effort, the three-way interaction of Interview X Measure (liking/competence) X Attachment was also significant, $E(1, 63) = 6.17, p < .05$, for Design 1, and $E(2, 65) = 5.01, p < .01$, for Design 2. Table 28 shows that for both subjects and judges insecure individuals, especially preoccupied persons, were rated as showing larger increases in effort to be liked from Interview 1 to 2 than secure individuals, $t(65) = 2.20, p < .05$. Secure individuals, in contrast, were rated as showing relatively large increases in effort to appear competent, compared to their efforts to be liked, from the first to second interviews, $t(65) = 2.77, p < .01$. However, this was qualified by the significant interaction of rater, interview, measure, and attachment, $E(1, 63) = 4.32$, and $E(2, 65) = 3.21$, in Designs 1 and 2 respectively, $ps < .05$. This interaction showed that it was primarily the subjects themselves who reported this effect. The insecure subjects, themselves, reported especially increasing their efforts to be liked and the secure subjects reported especially increased efforts to appear competent from their first to second interviews, $E(1, 63) = 19.10, p < .001$. The judges, in contrast, thought that both the secure and insecure subjects increased their efforts to appear competent more than their efforts to be liked, $E(1,63) = 65.15, p < .001$ (see Table 29).

Insert Tables 28 and 29 about here

**Comfort.** For ratings of subjects' spontaneity/comfort, the subjects and judges agreed, as expected, that secure individuals were more spontaneous/comfortable ($M = 5.79$) than insecure individuals ($M = 5.32$), $E(1, 63) = 5.57, p < .05$ in Design 1 and a trend in Design 2. In Design 1, the rater factor interacted with attachment showing that secure individuals, themselves, reported more spontaneity/comfort ($M = 5.90$) than the insecure subjects, $E(1, 63) = 4.46, p < .05$.

The interaction of attachment with condition was significant for Design 2, $E(2, 65) = 4.33, p$
< .05, and a trend in Design 1, indicating that all raters thought insecure, but especially preoccupied individuals, were more spontaneous/comfortable for both interviews when they were in the Competent condition, while secure individuals were seen as more spontaneous/comfortable for both interviews if they were in the Ingratiation condition. The three-way interaction of attachment with condition and interview was not significant.

The two-way interaction of attachment and interview, however, was also significant in both Design 1, $E(1, 63) = 6.43$, and Design 2, $E(2, 65) = 3.75$, $p < .05$. In Design 1, secure individuals, according to the subjects and the judges, increased in spontaneity/comfort from the first to the second interview (mean increase .34) while insecure individuals, both dismissing and preoccupied, decreased in spontaneity/comfort (mean decrease .24). This supports the expectation that insecure individuals would be more stressed than the secure subjects by the second interview, $t(63) = 2.41$, $p < .05$. When the rater factor was added to this interaction, it was the insecure subjects who reported higher levels of spontaneity/comfort on the first interviews, and the secure subjects to whom judges gave high marks on spontaneity/comfort for the second interview, overall $E(1, 63) = 4.23$ in Design 1 (contrast $E[1 63] = 8.89$, $p < .01$) and $E(2, 65) = 3.33$, in Design 2 $p < .05$, across both conditions (see Table 30).

Insert Table 30 about here

The rater, measure and condition factors interacted with attachment, Design 2, $E(2, 65) = 3.91$, $p < .05$, and attachment and gender, Design 1, $E(1, 63) = 4.16$, $p < .05$. Secure subjects rated themselves as more spontaneous and comfortable than the judges did if they were in the Ingratiation condition. Insecure persons, in contrast (especially preoccupied individuals), rated themselves as less spontaneous than the judges did in the Ingratiation condition, and less
comfortable than the judges did in the Competence condition, \( F(1, 65) = 25.75, p < .001 \). The five-way interaction showed it was the insecure females who gave themselves especially low ratings on comfort in the Competence condition; the insecure males felt especially lacking in spontaneity in that condition, \( F(1, 63) = 12.47, p < .001 \). This might indicate that insecure males lack spontaneity because they regularly use competence as a self-presentational strategy and insecure females, in a similar vein, may feel especially uncomfortable in presenting themselves competently because this may be something they are not accustomed to doing. Of course, this is only speculative since this effect did not involve the interview factor.

For Design 1 the five-way interaction of Rater X Interview X Measure X Condition X Gender and the six-way interaction adding attachment were significant, \( F(1, 63) = 4.69 \) and \( F(1, 63) = 6.37, ps < .05 \), respectively. The effect of subjects seeing themselves as more spontaneous/comfortable during the first interview and judges seeing the subjects as being more spontaneous/comfortable in the second interview was especially strong in the Ingratiation condition for comfort when the subjects were male, and for spontaneity when the subjects were female, \( F(1, 63) = 42.22, p < .001 \). Subjects also reported the largest decreases in spontaneity from the first to second interviews when they were in the gender-typed conditions -- i.e., when women were in the Ingratiation condition and men were in the Competence condition, \( F(1, 63) = 37.75, p < .001 \) (see Table 31). The six-way interaction indicated that the effect was especially characteristic of the insecure subjects; that is, the insecure subjects were especially critical of themselves. Insecure women felt they lacked in spontaneity when they were using a gender-appropriate self-presentational strategy and the insecure men felt uncomfortable when they were using a self-presentational technique that might be considered more gender-appropriate for women.
Expectations and self-presentation success. When subjects' thoughts about how likeable and competent others would see them and judges' actual perceptions were the dependent variables there was a significant interaction between interview and attachment classification, $E(1,63) = 7.06, p = .01$ for Design 1, and $E(2,65) = 3.86, p < .05$, for Design 2. In Design 1, secure persons, in their first interviews, were rated approximately 5.80 on likability/competence, as were insecure persons. Insecure persons' ratings did not change between the first and second interviews but secure persons were rated 6.14 on their second interviews. Thus, in the second interview, in which subjects were instructed to use a specific self-presentational strategy to create a good impression, the secure subjects (by their own reports and the judges' perceptions) were able to do so effectively, $E(1,63) = 5.01, p < .05$. The insecure subjects, however, were not able to use the designated self-presentational strategies to create a better impression than they had created during their first interviews.

Gender. In Design 1, interview and attachment interacted with measure (liking/competence) and gender to create a significant four-way interaction, $E(1,63) = 5.48, p < .05$, for subjects' and judges' combined perceptions of subjects' likability/competence. For secure males the greatest increase in their ratings from Interview 1 to Interview 2 was on their likability, whereas secure females were rated has having greater increases in competency. The ratings of insecure persons actually decreased from Interview 1 to Interview 2 on the same scales that their same-sex secure counterparts' ratings increased. The five-way interaction of Rater X Interview X Gender X Condition X Attachment was also significant when subjects' reports of how they thought they would appear to others were compared to the judges' actual reports, $E(1,63) = 4.17, p < .05$, Design 1. With one exception, both the subjects and the judges thought that the
secure subjects improved their self-presentations more from the first to the second interview than did the insecure subjects. The one exception was that the judges thought the insecure females improved relatively more than the secure females in the Ingratiation condition.

There were also significant four and five-way interactions of Interview X Measure (spontaneity/comfort) X Gender X Condition, $F(1, 63) = 4.39, p < .05$, and Interview X Measure X Gender X Condition X Attachment, $F(1, 63) = 5.23, p < .05$, when predicting spontaneity and comfort. These interactions show that men generally decreased in spontaneity and comfort from the first to their second interviews, except when spontaneity was measured in the Ingratiation condition, while women increased in spontaneity and comfort in every situation except for spontaneity in the Ingratiation condition. Furthermore, male decreases in spontaneity and comfort happened exclusively for the insecure males and the single decrease of spontaneity for women in the Ingratiation condition was likewise for the insecure females (see Table 32).

Conclusions

**Subjects' and Judges' Perceptions**

In this study subjects reported that their behaviors were consistent with what was requested of them. When they were asked to try be likable to others they said they did this, and when they were asked to try to appear competent to others they also said that this is what they had done. Post hoc analyses of the descriptors that subjects used in the control and experimental conditions revealed that 55% of the subjects in the Ingratiation condition and 53% of the subjects in the Competence condition changed at least one of their descriptors of the University during the second interview. In spite of subjects' reported efforts, projected outcomes, and changes in their descriptors, the judges in Study 2 did not clearly see the specific differential
self-presentational emphases for the subjects' experimental interviews.

The judges did, however, see many differences between the subjects' first and second interviews, and they were appropriate ones. Post hoc analyses of the judges' ratings of subjects' likability/competence revealed a tendency for interview, liking/competence, and condition to interact, $F(1, 63) = 3.25, p < .10$ in Design 1. The contrast comparing judges' ratings of likability for the second interview of the Ingratiation condition and judges' ratings of competence for the second interview of the Competence condition to the other means in the interaction showed that these mean were significantly higher than the others, $F(1, 63) = 62.18, p < .001$. The judges also thought the subjects generally tried harder, were more attractive, and made better overall impressions in the interview in which subjects were making deliberate attempts to use specific self-presentational strategies. Further, in many other ways, judges did perceived the subjects differently during the second interview depending on whether the subjects were trying to be likable or competent.

Secure persons, according to their own reports and the judges' perceptions, tried harder than the insecure persons to create favorable overall impressions. The amount of effort that subjects exerted towards creating favorable impressions also varied by interview and attachment classification. During the first interview insecure subjects exerted low levels of efforts to be liked but preoccupied individuals especially increased these effort for the second interview. For the second interview insecure subjects reported relatively low effort at appearing competent. Again this effect was largely determined by preoccupied individuals lending support to the hypothesis that high levels of competency are not consistent with preoccupied individuals' self-concept. Secure individuals, in contrast, reported similar increases in efforts to be liked and to appear competent from the first to the second interview. This effort paid off for them in terms of the judges' rating them as showing a relatively large increase in competency across the two interviews.
Secure persons thought that they would be seen as more likable/competent on their second interviews and they were. Insecure persons' ratings on likability/competence, in contrast, did not change from the first to the second interviews. Secure persons, then, were not only more willing to exert effort towards making favorable impressions on others, but they were also generally successful when they tried.

There is one interesting exception to the finding that secure persons make the greatest improvements in terms of likability/competence between the control and experimental conditions. It has to do with insecure females in the Ingratiation condition. In the judges' ratings these women were seen as especially more attractive during their second interviews compared to their first interviews. Judges also rated them as increasing more from the first to the second interviews on likability/competence. Both of these findings, however, have more to do with how poorly these women appeared during their first interviews than how well they did when they were asked to make others like them. When explicitly asked to try to seem likable to others these women were able to make a favorable impression but when the self-presentational strategy was one of their own choosing, in the control condition, they were not well received by the judges.

Subjects generally saw themselves in a more positive fashion than the judges did (Lewinsohn, Mischel, Chaplin, & Barton, 1980). Subjects thought that they would appear to be more likeable/competent than they actually did appear. They also reported exerting more effort to be likable/competent than the judges detected. This was definitely the case in the second interview. In many instances subjects also gave themselves higher ratings on spontaneity/comfort than the judges gave them but there were also definite differences in both the subjects' and judges' assessments of spontaneity and comfort based on attachment classification. Consistent with the ideas that secure individuals have positive self-concepts (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) and that positive illusions are related to healthy psychological
functioning (Taylor & Brown, 1988), secure subjects gave themselves particularly high ratings on spontaneity/comfort.

**Gender-Roles and Attachment**

The results of this study are supportive of the interactive model of gender-related behavior purposed by Deaux and Major (1987). In this model, gender-related behavior is seen as being influenced by the perceiver (the judges, in this case), the target (the subjects), and the situation. In the current study, the subjects and the judges did not interact so their respective behaviors could not actually influence the other persons' reactions. It is apparent, however, that an interactional context is not necessary for gender-schema to influence the perception of behavior.

There were pronounced gender differences in the way the judges viewed the subjects. These differences generally conformed with societal expectations; i.e., women were seen as projecting more liking and men as more competence. Even when subjects' self-reports acknowledged feelings that were not gender-typical, i.e., women feeling more spontaneous/comfortable in the Competence condition, the judges were not necessarily aware of these deviations from gender schemas.

In subjects' self-reports there was some evidence that secure subjects exhibited more flexibility than insecure subjects in enacting roles that were stereotypically associated with the opposite sex. These differences become clearer when the judges' reports are taken into account. Both subjects and judges gave secure males the greatest increase of all groups of subject in their ratings from Interview 1 to Interview 2 on likability. Secure females, however, showed greater increases in competency than liking from the first to second interviews. Both sets of raters, then, gave the secure individuals increased ratings across interviews for the self-presentation strategies that were not gender-typed. Additionally, judges' estimation of secure males' attractiveness increased from the first to the second interview when these men were in the Ingratiation condition.
Even when the judges do not make clear gender-based distinctions about the subjects' behaviors, in some instances the insecure subjects do. Insecure women gave themselves low ratings on spontaneity for the experimental interview in the Ingratiation Condition. Insecure men in the same condition reported relative discomfort. This is consistent with the idea that insecure persons feel a lack of spontaneity in the gender-typed conditions and that they also feel uncomfortable in situations where they are called on to use a strategy that is not gender-typed.

As the study of adult attachment becomes more focused on relationship issues (Hazan & Shaver, 1994a) there is an increasing need to look at the relationship between attachment and gender role socialization (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994; Kobak, et al., 1993). There are indications in the literature that this may be a fruitful line of investigation. First, attachment researchers have found evidence that secure persons are preferred as relationship partners (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994; Pietromonaco & Carnelley, 1994). Second, in other research it has been found that the androgynous pattern of gender characteristics is the most desirable set of attributes in relationship partners (Green & Kenrick, 1994). Finally, there are documented correlations between attachment, and instrumentality and expressiveness (Collins & Read, 1990) indicating that secure persons are more likely to exhibit androgynous characteristics than insecure persons.

Although neither gender attributes nor current relationship status of the subjects in this study were assessed, secure individuals did demonstrate flexibility in self-presentations. It is possible that secure individuals are able to be flexible in their self-presentations because they possess both instrumental and expressive characteristics. This in turn may be related to secure persons' greater likelihood of being involved in a romantic relationship (Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994). It is also possible, however, that being in a secure relationships allows one to develop both instrumental and expressive characteristics. Further research should be done to explore the links between flexibility in gender roles, relationship satisfaction and attachment status.
An alternative explanation for the association between security and flexibility in the usage of self-presentation behaviors that are not gender-typed may be related to the relationship of security to "openness" in viewing relationships. Security, as assessed by the Q-sort, may be more reflective of an attachment orientation or state of mind than it is of an internal model based on a specific attachment relationship (Kobak, 1994). Secure individuals come from a diversity of backgrounds and not all of them are characterized by responsive caregiving (Main & Goldwyn, in press). What these individuals have in common with each other is their ability to reflect on and objectively evaluate their attachment experiences (Main & Goldwyn, in press). It may be that in the current study, this openness to new contextual information was demonstrated by secure individuals' ability to be responsive to the situational demands. In the experimental conditions, subjects were explicitly told that they would be highly regarded if they enacted a specific self-presentational strategy. Secure subjects were seen as more likable/competent than the insecure subjects in the experimental interviews regardless of the type of self-presentational instructions. Secure subjects were also seen as trying harder and as more spontaneous/comfortable than insecure subjects across all situations. This indicates that they did relatively well with gender-typed self-presentations and were especially better able to respond to situations that called for a counter-normative approach.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

These studies were based on a complicated sampling methodology so it seems especially important to address the issue of generalizability before elaborating on the theoretical implications of the results. One way of addressing this issue is to compare this sample to other groups. I collected a number of measures of affect, personality and cognition -- the Beck Depression Inventory, the Affective Communication Test, the Affect Intensity Measure, Social Anxiety, the Family Expressiveness Questionnaire, the White Bear Suppression Inventory, and the EAS Temperament Survey. On all of these measures the means for the current sample were
similar (well within one standard deviation of the reported means) to the means of groups on which the measures were normed. As reported in Study 1, subjects in this experiment also exhibited characteristic gender differences on these individual difference measures. On these measures, then, this group of college students was quite typical. Subjects in this study also showed usual patterns in the ways they viewed themselves compared to the ways judges viewed them (Godfrey, et al., 1986; Kenny & DePaulo, 1993). The proportions of subjects falling into the various attachment classifications also was quite similar to Kobak and Sceery's (1988) earlier study at this same university. In many ways, then, this sample has substantial similarities to the samples of many studies conducted with college students.

In this study attachment classification was related to self-presentation. There were definite differences between the secure and insecure subjects. These differences support the idea that secure individuals are more effective than insecure persons in their self-presentations to others. Overall the secure individuals were seen as trying harder and being more spontaneous/comfortable in their self-presentations. When the subjects were asked to use specific self-presentational strategies in their second interviews the secure subjects were more spontaneous/comfortable than insecure subjects. The secure individuals were also seen as more likable/competent than the insecure subjects in both of the experimental conditions. Secure and insecure individuals used different approaches for their second interview. From the first to the second interview insecure subjects increased their efforts to be likeable while secure subjects particularly tried harder to appear competent.

Strategic Self-Presentation

In the current study subjects were asked to try to seem likable or to appear competent to others. These instructions sought to highlight the positive attributions that are associated with ingratiating and self-promotion (Jones & Pittman, 1983). There are, however, downsides to both of these approaches. If one tries too hard to be ingratiating, one can be perceived as
obsequious and a sycophant. If one tries too hard to appear competent then one is apt to be thought of as conceited or a fraud. The pitfalls normally associated with ingratiation (Jones & Wortman, 1973) may have been tempered in this experiment because the targets for the subjects' self-presentations were not present. The alleged audience for the subjects' self-presentations was potential university students and this may have made it difficult for the subjects to use some of the "tried and true" techniques of ingratiation. For instance, subjects in the current study could not tailor their opinions to agree with the persons to whom they were trying to be likable, nor were the subjects able to do favors for these persons (Jones & Wortman, 1973). Removing the self-presentations from an interactional context, then, called for the subjects to be likable in other unspecified ways which the secure subjects were especially spontaneous and comfortable doing.

Whereas the experimental design may have helped subjects avoid the pitfalls associated with ingratiation, the same features of the design could have increased the probability that subjects would fall into the traps traditionally associated with self-promotion. In trying to appear competent to an invisible audience it might be particularly easy to appear the braggart in relating one's achievements. Judges did note that secure individuals increased their attempts to appear competent from the first to the second interview but this did not have the negative ramifications that can be involved in self-promotion. The secure individuals regardless of experimental condition were seen by the judges as more likeable/competent during their second interviews. This may be because secure individuals also increased their efforts to be likable. Secure individuals seemed to intuitively know that if ingratiation is introduced into attempts at self-promotion the costs are relatively small and one may even be seen as more competent than if one just tried to be self-promoting (Godfrey, et al., 1986).

Interactional Expectancies

Internalized information about the attachment relationship (Bowlby, 1969/82; Crittenden,
Self-Presentation and Attachment

1990; George & Solomon, 1989) influences peoples’ behavior by guiding their appraisals of social situations (Bartholomew, 1990). Both secure and insecure subjects, in the current study, thought that they would be seen as most likable/competent for the interview during which they reported the most spontaneity/comfort. For insecure individuals this was the first interview; for secure individuals this was the second interview. It seems that both secure and insecure individuals' affective expectations reflect their affective experience (Wilson & Klaaren, 1992). The judges, however, had more favorable opinions of all subjects for their second interviews which is similar to the secure subjects' perceptions but differs from the insecure subjects' own thoughts. In terms of spontaneity/comfort the secure individuals, perhaps due to healthy self-concepts, always saw themselves in a more positive light than the judges. The insecure individuals, in contrast, reported particularly low levels of spontaneity/comfort in the interview where the judges saw them as most spontaneous/comfortable. It is possible that experiences with inappropriately responsive caregivers may have encouraged insecure individuals to engage in behaviors that camouflage their real feelings, thus making it difficult for others to accurately assess insecure persons' true needs.

People frequently seek out information that confirms their self-concepts (Sedikides, 1993; Swann, Stein-Seroussi, & Giesler, 1992; Swann & Read, 1981). So persons are likely to seek social feedback that is consistent with the self-concept that they have developed based on their attachment experiences. If insecure individuals inaccurately communicate their true feelings to others then they may be especially likely to create relationships where others are not responsive to their needs. This could reaffirm insecure individuals' thoughts that they are not worthy of supportive relationships. People tend to recreate relationships which are similar in many ways to relationships they have previously experienced (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986) and insecure individuals' inability to accurately communicate their affective state may play a major role in creating unresponsive relationship partners (Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994).
Attachment and Young Adult Social Functioning

Children have few objective ways of learning about themselves. Their experiences with their attachment figures from infancy, then, serve as an important source of information about and validation for self-concept and self-worth (Cassidy, 1990). For Bowlby (1969/82) the basis for internally held models of both the self and others comes from an infant's early interaction with a primary caregiver. The way the child comes to organize "feelings, needs, attitudes, expectations, cognition, and behavior (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986, p.52)" about the attachment relationship affects subsequent relationships.

In the current study, attachment was related to young adults' affective functioning and cognitive processes. The relationships among Q-sort ratings of attachment and Affect Intensity, Thought Suppression, Anger and Family Expressiveness were all theoretically consistent. Dismissing persons reported low Affect Intensity about positive and negative emotional experiences. Preoccupied persons reported high levels of Thought Suppression and Anger. Secure individuals remembered positive emotional experiences in their families and deactivation of the attachment system was associated with few memories of family emotional behaviors. Individuals' self-presentations were related to their attachment classifications and these effects were not explained by affective functioning.

Carnelley, Pietromonaco, and Jaffe (1994) found that relationship functioning for college women was related to both attachment and other aspects of family functioning. This supports the idea that there are other aspects of individuals' developmental history that may be important to examine when looking at the relationship of attachment to social functioning. The relationship of attachment to affective and cognitive processes, like the ones measured in this study, then may have important consequences in social development. These relationships should be explored in future research.

The attachment classifications based on early family experiences were related to subjects'
self-reported spontaneity/comfort and efforts to be likable/competent in the current study. 
Whereas subjects’ experiences with their families were not observed their thoughts about their 
parents as evinced in their attachment interviews did relate to these aspects of social functioning. 
In this light, then, the current study adds to the literature on how parental relationships influence 
many aspects of young adults' functioning (Bell, Allen, Hauser, O’Connor, in press; Cutrona, 
Cole, Colangelo, Assouline, & Russell, 1994, Kobak & Sceery, 1988). In many everyday 
situations young adults are called upon to work with other individuals. The ability to get along in 
relationships and be perceived as competent is a highly valued skill in the college environment. 
Even if one is not always successful in these endeavors, the willingness to try may be 
appreciated by others. These findings about self-presentation and attachment, then, 
complement what is already known about attachment and social processes. The current study 
provides information on how a basic social skill -- self-presentation (DePaulo, 1992), may 
contribute to interpersonal relationships.
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Footnotes

1. A fourth classification has recently been documented in some classification systems. Main and colleagues have created a fourth adult classification -- unresolved with respect to trauma or loss, which is associated with the infant disorganized /disoriented category (Main & Hesse, 1990; Main & Solomon, 1990). Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) also argue for a fourth adult attachment classification that they describe as fearful.

2. Since the initial data for this study were collected, it is increasing being recognized that there are definite limitations to using the three-item rating scale of Hazan and Shaver (1987) to classify attachment (Borman, 1992; Borman & Cole, 1993a; 1993b; Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994; Hazan & Shaver, 1994b; Smith & George, 1993); therefore only the attachment classifications derived from the Adult Attachment Interview (George, et al., 1985) will be reported here.

3. The TSBI, in contrast with Borman and Cole (1993), had no relationship to the Q-sort dimensions. The PSSFa also was not related to the Q-sort.

4. Seven female subjects left 4 items blank on each of the self-reports about the interviews. A two group model was run in LISREL 7 testing the hypothesis that the correlations between items that all females had completed were the same for the females who had completed the whole form and those who had not. This hypothesis was not supported by the data (chi square (90) = 224, p < .000) indicating that there were differences between these two groups. The LISREL estimation process is an extremely rigorous test of group differences so Fisher's z transformation was applied to individual correlations and they were compared (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) for the two groups. Using this methodology three correlations differed
significantly between the groups. Both types of analyses point to potential problems if the group with missing data is assumed to be similar to the group without missing data.

5. Each grouping of dependent variables was tested for experimenter effects. There were no experimenter effects for subjects' reports of others' perceptions of liking and competence, nor were there any experimenter effects for subjects' reports of their efforts to be liked and to appear competent. Experimenter did, however, interact with the interview and also created a significant three-way interaction with interview and condition when the dependent variables were subjects' reports of their spontaneity and comfort. The experimenter in Study 1 was always the same gender as the subject, therefore it was difficult to disentangle experimenter effects from gender effects, so the analyses of subjects' spontaneity and comfort also included the experimenter as a covariate.

6. A t test with separate variance estimates (Hayes, 1988) on the manipulation check for the first interview revealed no difference between subjects who later were asked to try to be likeable and those who were asked to try to seem competent. There were also no differences for subjects in the two experimental conditions, when they were in the control interview, between their reports of how hard they tried to be liked and how hard they tried to seem competent.

7. For ratings of subjects' sincerity, judges' gave subjects higher scores if they were shown the segment where subjects were discussing their decision to come to UVA (Segment 1). The mean rating of sincerity for Segment 1 was 6.37 and for Segment 2 it was 6.14, t(284) = 2.54, p < .05.
8. The number of descriptors that changed from the experimental to the control condition was coded by two independent coders. Their intraclass correlation was .92.
Table 1

Number of Subjects in Each Experimental Condition by Attachment Classification and Gender of Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Classification</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Means and Gender Differences for Personality, Affect and Cognitive Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem (TSBI)</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Support (PSSFa)</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect Intensity (AIM)</td>
<td>144.99</td>
<td>159.18</td>
<td>3.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>37.39</td>
<td>37.46</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>1.79#a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect Communication (ACT)</td>
<td>67.67</td>
<td>73.56</td>
<td>1.67#a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Expressiveness (FEQ)</td>
<td>205.67</td>
<td>228.71</td>
<td>2.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression (BDI)</td>
<td>6.94b</td>
<td>11.31c</td>
<td>2.07*d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought Suppression (WBSI)</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>49.61</td>
<td>1.34*a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued next page

Table 2 continued
Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAS Temperament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.81#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** There were equal numbers of male and female subjects in each cell except as indicated. For all scales higher values constitute more of the attribute. Positive $t$-values indicate that females had more of the attribute. $df = 70$ unless noted.

$a_{df} = 54. ~ b_{n} = 18. ~ c_{n} = 16. ~ d_{df} = 32.$

$#p < .10. ~ *p < .05. ~ **p < .01. ~ ***p = .001.$
### Table 3

**Number of Males and Females by Q-Sort Attachment Classifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Presentation and Attachment
Table 4

Means and Gender Differences on Attachment Q-Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>2.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deactivating</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Greater t-values indicate that males had higher means on the attribute. df = 70.

*p < .05.
Table 5

Means on Personality, Affect, and Cognitive Measures by Attachment Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Dismissing</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Preoccupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect Intensity (AIM)</td>
<td>140.15</td>
<td>156.33</td>
<td>158.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Expressiveness (FEQ)</td>
<td>201.05</td>
<td>220.13</td>
<td>237.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought Suppression (WBSI)</td>
<td>44.37</td>
<td>46.87</td>
<td>59.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAS Temperament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Subscripts in the same row that differ from each other indicate means that are significantly different from each other at $p < .05$
### Table 6

**Correlations Among the Family Expressiveness Questionnaire Subscales and Attachment Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Expressiveness Questionnaire Subscales</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deactivating</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**  \( N = 72. \)

\( ^* p < .05. \)  \( ^{**} p < .01. \)
Table 7

Correlations Among Subjects' Self-Report Ratings of Liking and Competence during Interviews about the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|              | Other | Self\(^a\) | Try   | Other | Self\(^a\) | Try \n
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Self(^a)</th>
<th>Try</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Self(^a)</th>
<th>Try</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self(^a)</td>
<td>.80***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Self(^a)</th>
<th>Try</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Self(^a)</th>
<th>Try</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self(^a)</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. "Other" entries are subjects' ratings of how they think others will see them. "Self" entries are subjects' self-perceptions. "Try" entries are how hard subjects tried to appear this way. Above the diagonal are the correlations for the second interview, the diagonal is the stability between interviews, and below the diagonal are the correlations for the first interview. \(N = 72\) unless otherwise indicated.  
\(^aN = 65.\)  
\(*p < .05. \quad **p < .01. \quad ***p < .001.\)
Table 8

**Correlations Among Subjects' Feelings about Their Interviews and Reports of How Hard They Tried to be Liked or Tried to Project Competence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings about Interviews</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.22#</td>
<td>.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.23#</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Self-Conscious(^a)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction(^a)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.23#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Self-Conscious(^a)</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction(^a)</td>
<td>.22#</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** \(N = 72\) unless otherwise indicated.

\(^a\)\(N = 65\).

\(#p < .10. \ *p < .05, \ **p < .01, \ ***p < .001.\)
Table 9

**Between Subjects Factors for Mixed Design ANOVAs and Repeated Measures Regression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Between Subjects Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.     | Gender of Subject (Male/Female)  
|        | Experimental Condition (Ingratiation/Competence)  
|        | Q-Sort Attachment Classification (Insecure/Secure)  |
| 2.     | Experimental Condition (Ingratiation/Competence)  
|        | Q-Sort Attachment Classification  
|        | (Dismissing/Secure/Preoccupied)  |
| Regression | Gender of Subject (Male/Female)  
| 3. | Experimental Condition (Ingratiation/Competence)  
|     | Q-Sort Dimension (Insecurity/Security)  
|     | Q-Sort Dimension (Hyperactivating/Deactivating)  |
Table 10

Differences in Self-Report Ratings of Attempts at Trying to be Liked or Seem Competent for Experimental Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Ingratiation&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Competent&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Reports</strong></td>
<td>Mean (Std)</td>
<td>Mean (Std)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>6.61 (1.39)</td>
<td>5.62 (1.56)</td>
<td>2.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>5.89 (1.57)</td>
<td>6.79 (1.25)</td>
<td>-2.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between Control and Experimental</td>
<td>5.92 (1.63)</td>
<td>6.59 (1.73)</td>
<td>2.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.59 (1.70)</td>
<td>1.59 (1.62)</td>
<td>-2.58*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Liking and competence refer to subjects’ efforts to be liked or appear competent. df for pooled variances were used.

<sup>a</sup>n = 38.  
<sup>b</sup>n = 34.

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
Table 11

Subjects' Reports of Liking and Competence by Condition and Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Comp minus Like)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thoughts about others' views</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation condition</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence condition</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation condition</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence condition</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attempted effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation condition</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence condition</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation condition</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence condition</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Mean Subject Reports of Effort at Being Liked/Appearing Competent and of Spontaneity/Comfort by Attachment Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment classification</th>
<th>Trying to be liked/to appear competent</th>
<th>Spontaneity/Comfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>(Secure minus insecure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Differences in Effort at Trying to be Liked and to Appear Competent from Interview 1 to Interview 2 by Q-Sort Attachment Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Classification</th>
<th>Try Liking</th>
<th>Try Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Difference (2-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Differences in Reported Spontaneity and Comfort from Interview 1 to Interview 2 by Condition, Gender of Subject, and Attachment Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference in Spontaneity</th>
<th>Difference in Comfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ingratiation Competence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ingratiation Competence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure-Insecure</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure-Insecure</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview 2 minus Interview 1
Table 15

Range of Alphas and Median Alpha on Judges' Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much did you like the person you just saw?</td>
<td>.71 -.92</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How hard do you think the person on the tape was trying to be liked?</td>
<td>.50 -.84</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How competent did the person seem?</td>
<td>.71 -.89</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How hard do you think the person on the tape was trying to appear competent?</td>
<td>.25 -.76</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How comfortable did the person seem?</td>
<td>.81 -.96</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How natural and spontaneous did the person seem?</td>
<td>.77 -.95</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How sincere did the person seem?</td>
<td>.64 -.90</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How attractive did you find the person on the tape?</td>
<td>.70 -.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If you were thinking about attending UVA, how convinced would you be that you should attend UVA by the person you just saw on the videotape?</td>
<td>.80 -.94</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Would you include this person's interview in a promotional video about UVA?</td>
<td>.75 -.94</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16
Correlations of Ratings of Subjects' Attractiveness and Other Ratings of Subjects During Each Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interview 1</th>
<th>Interview 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratings of Subjects' Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 72</td>
<td>N = 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability</td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try liking</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try competence</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01. *** p < .001.
Table 17

Stabilities of Judges' Impressions of Subjects from Interview 1 to Interview 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges' Scales</th>
<th>Stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likability</td>
<td>.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try liking</td>
<td>.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try competence</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>.59***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include</td>
<td>.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>.79***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p ≤ .001.
Table 18
Means for Judges' Ratings by Interview for Design 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interview 1</th>
<th>Interview 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impression</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>5.42^b*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>200.36^b***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a df = (1, 63).  ^b df = (1, 62).

*p < .05.  ***p < .001
Table 19  
Judges' Views of Subjects' Effort to be Liked and to Appear Competent by Subjects' Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>8.83**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.83**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^df = (1, 63).

**p < .01
### Table 20

**Correlations Among Subjects' Self-Reports and Judges' Ratings for Interview 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects' Self-Report Scales</th>
<th>Other Like</th>
<th>Spont</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Lack of Self-Conscious</th>
<th>Self Satisfy</th>
<th>Judges' Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects' Self-Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judges' Scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.23#</td>
<td>.23#</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.24#</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.22#</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.24#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>.23#</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.24#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.21#</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.23#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Correlations between the subjects' and the judges' ratings of the same attribute are highlighted.

#p < .10.  *p = .05.  **p = .01.
Table 21  
**Means for Subjects' and Judges' Ratings for Liking and Competence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Comp minus like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of others' perceptions</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges' impressions</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(1, 63)$</td>
<td>15.04***</td>
<td>11.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Comp minus like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject reported effort</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges' perceived effort</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(1, 63)$</td>
<td>9.21**</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Column one represents the main effect of rater (self/judge). Columns two through four represent the Rater X Measure (liking/competence) interaction; therefore only one $F$ is given for these columns.

*p < .05. **p < .10. ***p = .001.
Table 22

Means for Combined Subjects' and Judges' Ratings by Liking and Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Comp minus liking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reports of others' perceptions/ Judges' impressions</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>33.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject reported effort/ Judges' perceived effort</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>36.81***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*df = (1, 63).

***p < .001
### Table 23

Means for Combined Subjects’ and Judges’ Ratings of Liking and Competence by Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Interview 1</th>
<th>Interview 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reports of others’ perceptions/</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges’ impressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject reported effort/</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>149.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges’ perceived effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* df = (1, 63).

**p < .01.  ***p < .001
Table 24
Means for Combined Subjects’ and Judges’ Ratings for Each Interview by Liking and Competence, and Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reports of others' perceptions/judges' impressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (2 minus 1)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject reported effort/judges' perceived effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (2 minus 1)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\text{df} = (1, 63)\) for Interview X Condition X Measure interactions.

**p < .01.  ***p < .001
Table 25

**Means for Subjects' and Judges' Ratings of Subjects' Efforts to be Liked and to Appear Competent for Each Interview by Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ingratiation condition</th>
<th>Competence condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects' Effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interview 1</th>
<th>Interview 2</th>
<th>2 minus 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judges' Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interview 1</th>
<th>Interview 2</th>
<th>2 minus 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26
Judges' Ratings of Male and Female Subjects' Spontaneity/Comfort for Each Interview by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Ingratiation</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reports</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges' ratings</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reports</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges' ratings</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

Means for Subjects' and Judges' Ratings of Male and Female Subjects' Effort to be Liked/Appear Competent by Attachment Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment classification</th>
<th>Insecure</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Secure minus insecure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reports</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges' ratings</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reports</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges' ratings</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

Means for Combined Subjects' and Judges' Ratings of Subjects' Efforts to be Likable and to Appear Competent for Each Interview by Attachment Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment classification</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoccupied</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29

Means for Subjects’ and Judges’ Ratings of Subjects’ Effort to be Liked and to Appear Competent for Each Interview by Attachment Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Judges</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Self Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>3.98 4.48</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.80 4.70</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>1.82  .22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>5.13 4.69</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>6.31 4.90</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>1.18  .21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 30

**Means for Subjects' and Judges' Ratings of Subjects' Spontaneity/Comfort by Interview and Attachment Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Attachment classification</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2 minus 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>Self-reports</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judges' ratings</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Self-reports</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judges' ratings</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31

Means for Subjects' and Judges' Ratings of Male and Female Subjects' Comfort and Spontaneity for Each Interview by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ingratiation condition</th>
<th>Competence condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Judges</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued on next page
Table 31 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ingratiation condition</th>
<th>Competence condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Judges</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spontaneity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comfort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32

Means for Combined Subjects’ and Judges Ratings of Subjects’ Comfort and Spontaneity for Each Interview by Condition by Gender and Attachment Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Spontaneity</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition</strong></td>
<td>Q-sort</td>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure males</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure males</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued on next page
Table 32 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Spontaneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition</strong></td>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure females</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure females</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 minus 1</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A
Telephone Script

Hello my name is __________________. I am calling from the psychology department to ask you to participate in a study which is designed to look at what types of people are willing to recommend the University to other people. If you remember when you participated in the group pretesting session at the beginning of the semester you were asked several questions about how you felt about the University of Virginia. You were selected to participate in this study because of the way you feel about the University.

This experiment will be conducted in two sessions, each will be an hour, so you will get two hours worth of experimental credit. In the first session we will be interviewing you about your experiences here at UVA and then during the second session we will talk to you about things that may have affected your choice to come here and why you like or dislike the University. I think you will find this study fun and interesting since it is a study where your opinion really counts. Can I set up a time when you could come in for the first part of the study? We will schedule your second session when you come in.

I'm glad you are willing to participate in this study since it is important that we get information from people like yourself. Let me tell you a bit more about the study. As I said before, during the first session we will be interviewing you about the University. The psychology department has gotten involved in this project since the faculty can provide guidance and insight into personality and individual differences that might contribute to individuals feelings about the University. The interview about UVA will be videotaped. We hope to incorporate portions of this interview into a promotional videotape about the University. Since the audience for the final product will be prospective students we ask that you come dressed in a way that you think will make a favorable impression. In a second session, we will ask you some other questions about things that might make a difference in your experience at UVA. This information should help us better understand UVA students and who we should be attempting to market the University to.

Do you have any questions?

O.K. We will see you in Gilmer Hall Room 032. Do you know where that is in the basement, on __________, at _______. Remember to come dressed appropriately and bring your schedule with you so we can set up a second session. Thanks a lot. We will see you then.
Appendix B

Experimenter Script for Video Interviewing

Hi, welcome, we are glad you could make it today. My name is ___________ and I will be conducting the videotaped interview about the University of Virginia that you were told about on the phone. As we told you on the phone we are interested in finding out more about people who would be willing to recommend the University of Virginia to others who might be interested in the school. I believe we told you that this is the first part of a two part experiment. In this session we simply want to learn more about how you feel about UVA. In the second session we will ask you more questions since we want to learn more about the personality characteristics of people who are willing to recommend UVA. The department of psychology has gotten involved in this project since we have expertise in personality and individual differences which might help us better understand what type of person will like the University. Before we begin could we take a moment to schedule a second session?

[Schedule Session 2 and write down when and where this person should come]

The first thing I need to do for today's session is to have you sign a consent form to participate in this study.

[Fill out consent form]

O.K. Before we start I have one other form that I would like you to fill out. As we mentioned to you on the phone we may be interested in using part of your tape in a promotional tape to be shown to prospective University of Virginia students. The admissions department staff and Dean will be looking at these tapes to decide which tapes we might use. I was wondering if this would be alright with you. Please sign this form if it is alright for us to use the tape to promote the University. If when we finish with the interview, you are not happy with the tape you can change your mind about this; just let me know then.

[Fill out viewing of video form]

Before we begin the interview let me just say that it is important for you to make a good impression on our audience for this video. Some people do this by appearing friendly and likeable; that is they think of the audience and try to make the audience like them. Other people attempt to make a good impression by appearing competent; they try to seem particularly capable and competent. Still other people try to seem natural or laid back while other people use other approaches. We don't care what method you use to make a good impression but we are interested in seeing that potential students form a favorable view of the students they see on our videotape.

I think we are ready to begin the interview.

[Start the video recording]

Could you tell me a little bit about your decision to come to UVA; how did you decide to apply here, what other schools were you considering, what was the major thing that made you decide to come to UVA?

Could you describe how you feel about the University of Virginia? What was it like when you first arrived and how do you feel about it now?

Can you list three words that describe your experience at the University of Virginia? After you list them I'll ask you why you chose them.

O.K. You say that you find the University to be ____________ or the University is
Would you describe an incident or a memory that relates to this description of the University?
(Repeat for the other 2 words).

If there was one thing that you have learned above all else from your experience at the University of Virginia, what would it be?

Thanks for participating in this interview.

[Turn off video equipment]

Could you take a moment to answer a few questions about this videotaping before we continue with the interview.

[Video review form #1]

[For ingratiation as condition #2]

Since we hope to use these tapes for promotional purposes and are not sure what type of impression will be most effective with our audience of potential students or what the admissions office will think is best we want to interview you one more time. This time, instead of having you pick any way you want to try to make a good impression, we would like you to use one particular strategy. We want you to try to get the people who will view this tape to like you. Get them to think that you are a really friendly, likable person. We will ask you the same questions as before, but this time answer them in whatever way you think will make you seem most friendly and likable. You can use the same answers you gave before or you can give different ones -- it's up to you. The same thing is true for the three words. Pick ones that you think will make you seem friendly and likable. They can be some of the same ones as before or they can be all different. It's up to you. Just consider this a whole new interview, even though the questions are the same.

Any questions? I think we are ready to begin the interview. Remember, you want to come across as very friendly and likable, you should try to make the people who will see this tape like you as much as possible.

**************

[For competence as condition #2]

Since we hope to use these tapes for promotional purposes and are not sure what type of impression will be most effective with our audience of potential students or what the admissions office will think is best we want to interview you one more time. This time, instead of having you pick any way you want to try to make a good impression, we would like you to use one particular strategy. We want you to try to get the people who will view this tape to think you are a very competent person. Get them to think that you are an extremely competent, capable person. We will ask you the same questions as before, but this time answer them in whatever way you think will make you seem most competent and capable. You can use the same answers you gave before or you can give different ones -- it's up to you. The same thing is true for the three words. Pick ones that you think will make you seem competent and capable. They can be some of the same ones as before or they can be all different. It's up to you. Just consider this a whole new interview, even though the questions are the same.

Any questions? I think we are ready to begin the interview. Remember, you want to come across as very competent and capable, you should try to make the people who will see this tape regard you as extremely competent.

**************
[Start the video recording]

Could you tell me a little bit about your decision to come to UVA; how did you decide to apply here, what other schools were you considering, what was the major thing that made you decide to come to UVA?

Could you describe how you feel about the University of Virginia? What was it like when you first arrived and how do you feel about it now?

Can you list three words that describe your experience at the University of Virginia? After you list them I'll ask you why you chose them.

O.K. You say that you find the University to be ______________ or the University is ___________. Would you describe an incident or a memory that relates to this description of the University?

(Repeat for the other 2 words).

If there was one thing that you have learned above all else from your experience at the University of Virginia, what would it be?

Thanks for participating in this interview.

[Turn off video equipment]

Before we end today's session would you take a moment to answer a few questions about this videotaping.

[Video review form #2]

That will be it for today, remember we will see you on ______________ for the second part of the study.
Appendix C
Video Review Form
Interview #

1. Did you try to use any particular strategy while you were being interviewed? (Please check the one response that best describes your interview)
   ___ I tried to appear in a way that would make others like me.
   ___ I tried to appear in a way so that others would think I was competent.
   ___ I did not use any particular strategy.
   ___ Other, please specify. ____________________________________________.

For the following questions please circle the appropriate rating on the rating scales.

2. When other people view this tape they are:
   not likely           certain to
   to like me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 like me

3. When other people view this tape they will think I am:
   very           very
   incompetent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 competent

4. When I was being interviewed I was:
   very           very
   uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 comfortable

5. To what extent did you to appear in a way that would make others like you?
   I did not try           I tried
   very hard 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 very hard

6. To what extent did you to appear in a way that would make others think you were competent?
   I did not try           I tried
7. While I was being videotaped, I was:

not very natural  very natural
and spontaneous and spontaneous
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

8. While I was being videotaped, I felt:

very not very self-conscious self-conscious
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

9. During the interview, I thought I was:

not very very likable likable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

10. During the interview, I thought I was:

very very incompetent competent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

11. Overall, how satisfied do feel about the interview you just gave?

not very very satisfied satisfied
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Appendix D
Adult Attachment Interview (AAI)

Introduction:
We have started asking people about the way they feel the kind of parenting they had in childhood has affected them. So, we'd like to ask you about your early relationship with your family and what you think about the way it might have affected you. I'll ask you mainly about your childhood, but we'll get on to your later years and what's going on right now. This whole interview will probably take us about an hour.

1. Could you start by helping me get oriented to your early family situation, and where you lived and so on? If you could start out with where you were born, whether you moved around much, what your family did at various times for a living?

Did you see much of your grandparents when you were little?
[Did they die before you were born? How old was your mother at the time? Did she tell you much about this grandfather?]
[Were there brothers and sisters living in the house, or anybody besides your parents?... Are your brothers and sisters living nearby now or is your family pretty scattered?]

2. I'd like you to try to describe your relationship with your parents as a young child...if you could start from as far back as you can remember? I think I'm starting to get a picture of what your family life was like.

3. Now I'd like to ask you to choose five words that reflect your childhood relationship with your mother. I know this may take a bit of time, so go ahead and think for a minute...then I'd like to ask you why you chose them.

Okay, now let me go through some questions about your description. You say that the relationship or she was (you used the phrase) _____. Are there any memories or incidents that come to mind with respect to her (being) _____.

4. Now I'd like you to choose five words that reflect your childhood relationship with your father. I'm going to ask you again why you chose them. (Same probe as for Question 3).

5. To which parent did you feel the closest and why? Why isn't there this feeling with the other parent?

6. When you were upset as a child, what would you do?

When you were upset emotionally when you were little, what would you do?
Can you illustrate with specific incidents?

Can you remember what would happen when you were hurt a bit physically? Again, do any specific incidents come to mind?

Were you ever ill when you were little? Do you remember what would happen?

7. What is the first time you remember being separated from your parents?

How did you or they respond? Are there any other separations that stand out in your mind?

8. Did you ever feel rejected as a young child? Of course, looking back on it now, you may realize it was not really rejection, but what I’m trying to ask about here is whether you remember ever having felt rejected (refers to parents) in childhood.

[How old were you when you first felt this way, and what did you do? Why do you think your parent did those things - do you think he/she realized he/she was rejecting you?]

9. Were your parents ever threatening with you in any way - maybe for discipline, or maybe just jokingly?

(optional: If S has trouble answering ... Say - Some people have told us for example that their parents would threaten to leave them or send them away from home).

A few people have memories of some kind of abuse. Did anything like this ever happen to you, or in your family?

[How old were you at the time? Did it happen frequently?]

[Do you feel this experience affects you now as an adult?]

10. How do you think these experiences with your parents have affected your adult personality?

Are there any aspects to your early experiences that you feel were a set-back in your development?

11. Why do you think your parents behaved as they did during your childhood?

12. Were there any other adults with whom you were close, like parents, as a child? Or any other adults who were especially important to you, even though not parental?

(Find out ages, whether this person lived with the child, or had any caregiving responsibilities and the significance and nature of this relationship).

13. Did you experience the loss of a parent or someone else close to you (sibling, or close family member) while you were a young child?

[Could you tell me about the circumstances, and how old you were at the time?]
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[How did you respond at the time? Was this death sudden or was it expected?]

[Can you recall your feelings at the time? (Can try: How did you find out, where were you when you found out?)]

[Have your feelings regarding this death changed much over time?]
[Were you allowed to attend the funeral, and what was this like for you?]

[(If a close family member): What would you say was the effect on (other parent or) household, and how did this change over the years?]

[Would you say this loss has had an effect on your adult personality?]

13a. Did you lose any other important persons during your childhood? (Same queries).

13b. Have you lost other close persons, in adult years? (Same queries).

14. Have there been many changes in your relationship with your parents (or remaining parent) since childhood? I mean from childhood through until the present?

15. What is your relationship with your parents like for you now as an adult?
   How much contact do you have with your parents at present?
   (optional: Ask about sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction).

16. Is there any particular thing which you feel you learned above all from your own childhood experiences?
Appendix E
Background Questions in Session 2

1. Are your two biological parents currently married to each other?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No
      ___ They were never married to each other.
      ___ They are divorced.
      ___ One or both of my parents are dead.
      ___ I do not know who my biological parents are.
      ___ Other:

2. Before you came to college, did you ever live for an extended period of time with someone other than your parents?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes
      With whom:
      For how long:

3. What was your score on the verbal SAT? ________________________________.
   May we verify this information with your Dean? ___ Yes
   ___ No

4. How old are you? _____ years _____ months

5. Please indicate your racial/ethnic identity
   ___ African American   ___ Asian/Pacific Islander   ___ Latino/Hispanic
   ___ Native American   ___ White   ___ Other
The following questionnaire is concerned with your experiences in romantic love relationships. Take a moment to think about the most important romantic relationships you've been involved in. For each relationship, think about: How happy or unhappy you were and how your moods fluctuated; how much you trusted or distrusted each other; whether you felt you were emotionally too close or not close enough; the amount of jealousy you felt; how much time you spent thinking about your partner; how attracted you were to the person; how the relationship might have been better; and how it ended. (Thinking about these good and bad memories will help you answer the following questions accurately.)

Read each of the three self-descriptions below and then rate how much you agree or disagree that each one describes the way you are in relationships. Circle one of the numbers below each self-description. (Note: The terms "close" and "intimate" refer to psychological or emotional closeness, not necessarily to sexual intimacy.)

1. I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others; I find it difficult to trust them completely, difficult to allow myself to depend on them. I am nervous when anyone gets too close, and often, love partners want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being. (Circle one number below.)

   Disagree  Disagree  Disagree  Mixed; Agree Agree Agree
   Strongly Moderately Slightly Not sure Slightly Moderately Strongly
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me or won't want to stay with me. I want to get very close to my partner, and this sometimes scares people away. (Circle one number below.)

   Disagree  Disagree  Disagree  Mixed; Agree Agree Agree
   Strongly Moderately Slightly Not sure Slightly Moderately Strongly
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I find it relatively easy to get close to others and am comfortable depending on them. I don't often worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to me. (Circle one number below.)

   Disagree  Disagree  Disagree  Mixed; Agree Agree Agree
   Strongly Moderately Slightly Not sure Slightly Moderately Strongly
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Focused Debrief

1. How comfortable did you feel during the videotaping in this study?

2. Did you think that all of the types of things we asked you during the second session related to what type of person would like UVA?

3. Did anything seem unusual to you about this study?

4. Did you think that we were asking you too many questions about your family?

4. How do you think we will use the videotape you made during the first session?
Debrief

I would like to tell you a few more things about the study you just participated in before you leave today. As we told you when we were making the videotape, we are interested in having other people see you when you are trying to make a favorable impression. We videotaped you twice. The first time we told you simply to try and make a good impression while the second time we gave you specific instructions about how you might try to make a good impression on others. In this study we suggested that some of the people we videotaped try to make a favorable impression by trying to make the audience for the videotape like them, and we suggested to other people that they try to appear competent. We are interested in seeing how people try to make favorable impressions and how other people react to these different self-presentation strategies, which is why we suggested that different people do different things when they were being videotaped.

There are many personality factors that might affect how you present yourself to others which is why you completed several measures that measure dimensions of personality that might affect your self-presentation.

We know that family relations can affect many areas of people's lives but we do not know how they affect people's self-presentation attempts. That is one of the reasons we asked you so many questions about your family. Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969/82) speculates that people form internal models or scripts based on their early relations with their caregivers that affect a number of areas of adult functioning. Other experiences in new relationships, or changes in the relationship with the caregiver may produce revisions in the model but generally the models are difficult to change. Models, however, do change as people process their experiences. The reason we asked you questions about your early relations with your family was to see how the models you have formed of your attachment relations might affect the way you presented yourself on the videotape. We think that most people learn to do what works best for them in their family and that for different people this might be different. Although we asked you about your childhood experiences, we are more interested in how people talk about their experiences than about exactly what happened to you. One of the main things we look at when we look at peoples' models of their relationships is how "coherently" they are able to talk about their experiences.

In this study we are particularly interested in how your scripts might affect the way you present yourself to others. During the first part of this study we stressed the importance of creating a favorable impression on others and we did not hide the fact that we were videotaping from you because we thought that if you were a little anxious about being videotaped it would be more likely that your attachment system would be activated. When individuals are stressed or anxious they are likely to invoke scripts of how others have related to them when they are looking for security (Bowlby, 1969/82). We do hope that this was not too stressful for you and we want you to know that whereas we hope to show your videotape to other people we do not intend to use your tape for promotional purposes or to show it to admissions personnel.

We do want to use your videotape as we said, but instead of showing it to prospective students we would like to use it in further research. You already signed a consent form indicating that it is OK for us to use your responses, but as we said in the consent form we want to get your
permission specifically to let us use your videotape. I would also like to get you permission at this time for a few people to listen to the interview that we did about your family. This tape will only be listened to by a small number of researchers who will be looking at the way you talk about your relationships. Your name will not appear anywhere on either the video or audio tapes we made today. Just to reassure you that we will not be using your tape for promotional purposes I have marked the video viewing form you signed earlier to show that this form is not valid.

Would you mind signing this new form for us?

We think this research will answer important questions and thank you for participating in it today. It will be a while before we know the results of this study, but if you would like to check on its progress you may contact Kathy Bell (Rm. 210B, Gilmer). I would be happy to answer any questions or comments, please free to put comments in Kathy Bell's mailbox in Gilmer 103.

In case you would like to speak with anyone about some of the memories you had of your childhood we have listed some numbers below.

Just one more thing--if you know anyone who might participate in this study, please do not discuss it with them. It takes a lot of work to collect data as we did with you today, and if a subject comes to the experiment knowing what to expect their data are useless for our purposes. Thanks again!

Mary Ainsworth Clinic: 982-4737
Student Health Mental Health Services: 924-5556
CONSENT FORM FOR USE OF INTERVIEWS

Attitudes Towards the University of Virginia
Spring 1993

All tapes will be kept confidentially, your name will not appear anywhere on either tape.

Please check the alternative that you find acceptable:

**VIDEOTAPES**

___ I grant permission for the researchers to use the videotapes of me during this session in their research studies and reports. I understand that it is possible that in future research, these tapes might be coded by observers, who might be students.

___ Please erase my tape.

**AUDIOTAPES**

___ I grant permission for the researchers to use the videotapes of me during this session in their research studies and reports. I understand that it is possible that in future research, these tapes might be coded by trained researchers, who might be students.

___ Please erase my tape.

______________________________
Information from this study with the admissions office there are some people in this study that would like us to share this information so we thought we would ask you about it. Please check the response below that indicates your true feelings.

___ I would like you to share my video about UVA with the admissions office.

___ I do not want my video interview to be shown to the admissions office.

In addition there is the possibility that researchers working on this study would like to use your video at professional meetings in which this research is discussed. Please check the response below that indicates your feelings about this.

___ I do not want my video to be shown at professional meetings.

___ I grant my permission for my video to be shown at professional meetings in which this research is being discussed.

(Signature)  (Signature)
Appendix H
Factors for ML and PC Extractions

When ML and PC extraction techniques were applied to the 19 variables in the subjects' self-reports there was a great deal of similarity in the first two factors extracted by the two techniques. The first factor could be considered a first interview factor while the second factor was strictly related to the second interview. For both ML and PC, satisfaction with the video, how likeable subjects thought they were, subject comfort, and subject spontaneity for each interview loaded on the factor associated with the respective interview. (Some of these variables are complex, having loadings of greater than .30 on more than one factor.) How competent subjects thought they were during the interview loaded on the interview 1 factor for interview 1 but only loaded most heavily on the interview 2 factor for the second interview when ML extraction was used. In addition factor 1 by either extraction included the subjects' thoughts about how likeable and competent others would see them during their first interview. When ML extraction was used subjects' lack of self-consciousness also loaded on the factor for the associated interview but when PC was used these two variables formed their own factor (factor 4). The structure of this lack of self-consciousness, PC factor 4, may not be reliable since the lack of self-conscious variables also have loadings above .50 on the factors that were associated with the respective interview (factor 1 or factor 2).

The third factor by both techniques could be called a trying factor. For both PC and ML it included how hard the subject tried to be liked during both the first and second interviews and how hard the subject tried to appear competent during the first interview. How hard the subject tried to appear competent during the second interview had the highest loading on this factor for the ML extraction but for the PC extraction, even though this scale's weight on this factor was .46, it loaded more heavily on factor 5. By both extraction techniques subjects' reports of how hard they tried to be competent during the second interview were related to the factor where
subjects' perceptions of how competent others would think they were during the second interview loaded. For PC extraction there were five factors -- interview 1, interview 2, trying (minus trying to be competent during the second interview), lack of self-consciousness, and competence during the second interview (self-perceptions, others' perceptions, and trying). For the ML extraction the first three factors were similar but factors 4 and 5 each consisted of a single variable -- subjects' thoughts about how competent others would think they were and their thoughts about how likeable others would find them during the second interview. From analyses then it seems that subjects' self-reports from the first and second interviews are generally distinct from each other and that subjects' reports of trying to be liked and to appear competent during the interviews are not substantially related to the other self-reports.

When the variables from the first and second interviews (8 each) were analyzed separately, ML and PC extraction techniques with oblique (SPSS, oblimin) and orthogonal rotations (SPSS, varimax) yield very similar results for the first interview. The ML extraction with the varimax rotation yielded the clearest factor pattern. Two factors were extracted. One factor was a trying factor -- subjects' reports of how hard they tried to be liked and to appear competent during the first interview. The other factor included all of the other self-report variables for the first interview.

For the second interview the results were not as clear cut. PC analyses of the second interview variables produced factors similar to those extracted in interview one; however, several of the variables loaded on both factors regardless of the rotation method. The ML analyses produced different factor structures for the oblique and orthogonal rotations. When oblimin, the oblique rotation, was used the two factors were correlated .41. The second factor consisted solely of subjects' reports of how hard they tried to appear competent while the first factor included all of the other self-report variables from the second interview. When varimax rotation was used the two factors were extracted. They might be called a likeable factor and a
competence factor. The variables that loaded on the likeable factor were how likeable the subjects thought they were, how likeable they thought others would see them, satisfaction with the interview, spontaneity, lack of self-consciousness, and how hard subjects tried to be liked. Only subjects' self-perceptions of how likeable they were and how hard they tried to be liked did not load above .30 on the second factor. The competence factor consisted of how competent the subjects thought others would see them, how hard subjects tried to be competent, how competent subjects thought they were and subject comfort. For the competence factor only subjects' reports of how hard they tried to appear competent did not also load on the liking factor. The complexity of the factor structure for the second interview is not surprising since the subjects were in two different experimental conditions.

When the experimental conditions were analyzed separately, for the likeable condition PC (oblimin and varimax) and ML (varimax) yield the same two factors. Factor one is a self factor with comfort, satisfaction with the interview, self-perceptions of competence and likability, lack of self-consciousness and spontaneity all having high loadings. Most of these variables, however, also loaded on the other factor and when an oblique rotation was used the factors were correlated .36. The second factor for these analyses was a trying/other factor with how hard subjects tried to be liked and competent, and how likeable and competent they thought others would see them loaded heavily on it. Almost all of these variables, like the ones that loaded on the first factor, had loadings above .30 on both factors. When ML extraction was used with oblimin rotation subjects' reports of how likeable they were had a higher loading on the second factor than the first but the loadings for this variable on the two factors were almost the same. In this case subjects' reports of likability loaded .63 on factor 1 and .62 on factor 2. When factor analysis was done for the second interview for subjects in the competence condition the factors extracted were very similar to those factors that were extracted when interview one was analyzed. The single difference was that even in the ML extraction with
varimax rotation the subjects' perceptions of how competent they would appear to others and subjects' comfort loaded above .30 on both factors.
Appendix I

If we are using segment one that segment will consist of the subjects responses to question #1 and question #2. Segment 1 will start as soon as the subject starts responding to the interviewer and will continue until the subject has completed the answer to question #2.

If we are using segment two we will start with the interviewer asking the subject to choose three words that describe the experience at UVA and continue until right before the interviewer begins to ask about the three words.

All tapes will start with subject 236 as the first subject. This is a practice subject and the segments 1 and 2 are prerecorded on her copy tape. We always use her segment 2 from her first interview and her segment 1 from her second interview. After she is put on the tape you need to put at 60 second rating pause.

Odd number tapes will be made from the **first** interview of all the other subjects and even number tapes will be made from the **second** interview. So tape one will always be segment 1 interview 1, tape 2 will be interview 2 segment 1, tape 3 will be interview 1 segment 2 and tape 4 will be interview 2 segment 2. Each group of 4 tapes will be given a letter designation so the tapes contain 101-106 and 201-206 will be called A, 107-112 and 207-212 will be B, etc.

Before making each final tape get the original tapes of the subjects that will be on that tape and put them in order. So for group A tapes 1 and 3 that would be 101-102 per below and for **tape 2 and 4 that would be the reverse order** starting with 102 right after the 236 sample. Make sure that the original tape is on the interview that you want before you make the final tape.

After the first real subject the rating pause will be 50 seconds and then after each subsequent subject the pause will be 40 seconds. You do not need to do anything on the tape for the break.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Group E</th>
<th>Group F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>236 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master list
X is tape groups A and B
Y is tape groups C and D
Z is tape groups E and F

Experimenter 1
X1 A1 and B4 version A
X2 A2 and B3 version A
X3 B1 and A4 version B
X4 B2 and A3 version B
Y1 C1 and D4 version B
Y2 C2 and D3 version B
Y3 D1 and C4 version A
Y4 D2 and C3 version A
Z1 E1 and F4 version A
Z2 E2 and F3 version B
Z3 F1 and E4 version A
Z4 F2 and E3 version B

Experimenter 2
X1 A1 and B4 version B
X2 A2 and B3 version B
X3 B1 and A4 version A
X4 B2 and A3 version A
Y1 C1 and D4 version A
Y2 C2 and D3 version A
Y3 D1 and C4 version B
Y4 D2 and C3 version B
Z1 E1 and F4 version B
Z2 E2 and F3 version A
Z3 F1 and E4 version B
Z4 F2 and E3 version A
Last semester we selected a number of students to be piloted for a promotional video about the University of Virginia. They were students who were in introductory psychology at the time. We videotaped them discussing their impressions of the University and we have now edited the videotapes so that today you will see excerpts from a number of their interviews. In today's study we would like your help in selecting which students to include in the final production. We feel that your help will be valuable since not too long ago you were prospective students and have a good sense of the types of things that will convince other students to come here. Basically we see you as the experts in helping us make the final selection.

In the study today you will be seeing a number of students that we are thinking about using in a promotional video. All of the students were given the same interview. They were asked to tell about their decisions to come to UVA and to discuss what it was like when they arrived and how they feel about it now. They were also asked to choose three words to describe how they feel about the University. In today's session you will see some excerpts from these interviews. We have chosen two sections that we think will give you a flavor for the total interviews and will provide you with enough information to let us know how you feel about the people on the video tapes.

For the first half of today's session you will be seeing people talking about their decisions to come here and how they feel about the school. After that we will take a short break for you to stretch and then we will see some more people in a different segment of the interview. For each of the persons you will see today you will be asked to make a number of ratings.

If you could take a moment now and complete the information on the front of the rating booklet. Your ID # is the last five digits of your social security number. I think you all know your sex. For the experimenter please put my initials (CB or WW). Today's date is: and your session number is (X1, etc.).

Now could you please open your rating booklet and I will go over them with you. For each person you will see today the first thing we ask you is whether you know the person on the videotape. All you need to indicate is "no" - you don't know the person or "yes" - you do. After that we ask you to use a 9 point rating scale to tell us how much you like the person. So if you did not like the person very much you would circle a number close to 1 but if you liked the person a lot you would circle a number close to 9. If you felt pretty neutral about this person then you would circle a number in the middle of the scale like around a 5, we ask that you be honest about how you really feel. The scale works the same way for the other questions. So for the next question we ask you how hard you thought the person was trying to be liked, in this case if you did not think the person was trying hard to be liked, you would circle a number closer to 9. After that we ask you how competent, how natural and spontaneous the
person was, how sincere the person was, how attractive you found the person, how convinced you be to attend UVA by the person, and your opinion about whether we should include this person in our promotional video.

We ask you a number of questions about the persons' competence and likability. We have found that these are important ingredients in successfully promoting the University. We also ask you if you know the people on the tape, we ask this because we think you might be a little biased towards your friends. We want you to rate anyone you know just like you would rate the other people but we would like to know that you know them. The people on these tapes have given us permission to have other people rate their videos but it might be better if you did not discuss the fact that you were rating them with them because we do not intend to let them know whether or not we will use them for a while and this might make them feel nervous.

Before we begin I just want to say a word about the quality of the tapes. The interviewers we used for these pilots were not professionals and they did not consistently center the person being interviewed in the camera. That will not be the case in the final production so try to ignore these details and focus on the person you are rating. How competent is this person? How much do you like this person? Should we include this person in the final video?

The first person you will see is for practice. We have a longer rating pause after her than the other people so that you can get use to the ratings. Do you have any questions before we begin?

[start tape -- after first tape take a 5 minute break]

The second tape we will show you today is a little shorter than the first one. For this tape we will be doing the same thing but you will be rating a different group of people and the segment of the interview you are rating is different. This time you will be seeing the part of the interview when the pilot persons are deciding on the three words that they think describe the University. People in other sessions of this experiment will rate these new people on the parts of their interviews that were similar to the ones you saw before our break. Again remember to focus on the person being interviewed not the quality of the tape. The first subject is practice again to get you back in the swing of making these ratings.

[start tape]

I want to thank you for participating in this study. We have a lot of tapes like these to get opinions on so I want to let you know that you can participate in this experiment more than one time. On your credit slip I have written a letter designation, that letter stands for the group of people you rated today. You can participate again but it needs to be for a different group of people. Today's group was group (X Y or Z) so that means you can participate in rating two other groups (X and Y, Y and Z, or X and Z). If you have any questions about this study you can contact Kathy Bell. Her office is Gilmer 210B.
Last semester we selected a number of students to be piloted for a promotional video about the University of Virginia. They were students who were in introductory psychology at the time. We videotaped them discussing their impressions of the University and we have now edited the videotapes so that today you will see excerpts from a number of their interviews. In today's study we would like your help in selecting which students to include in the final production. We feel that your help will be valuable since not too long ago you were prospective students and have a good sense of the types of things that will convince other students to come here. Basically we see you as the experts in helping us make the final selection.

In the study today you will be seeing a number of students that we are thinking about using in a promotional video. All of the students were given the same interview. They were asked to tell about their decisions to come to UVA and to discuss what it was like when they arrived and how they feel about it now. They were also asked to choose three words to describe how they feel about the University. In today's session you will see some excerpts from these interviews. We have chosen two sections that we think will give you a flavor for the total interviews and will provide you with enough information to let us know how you feel about the people on the video tapes.

For the first half of today's session you will be seeing people choosing three words that describe their experience at UVA. After that we will take a short break for you to stretch and then we will see some more people in a different segment of the interview. For each of the persons you will see today you will be asked to make a number of ratings.

If you could take a moment now and complete the information on the front of the rating booklet. Your ID # is the last five digits of your social security number. I think you all know your sex. For the experimenter please put my initials (CB or WW). Today's date is _____ and your session number is ____ (X1, etc.).

Now could you please open your rating booklet and I will go over them with you. For each person you will see today the first thing we ask you is whether you know the person on the videotape. All you need to indicate is "no" - you don't know the person or "yes" - you do. After that we ask you to use a 9 point rating scale to tell us how much you like the person. So if you did not like the person very much you would circle a number close to 1 but if you liked the person a lot you would circle a number close to 9. If you felt pretty neutral about this person then you would circle a number in the middle of the scale like around a 5, we ask that you be honest about how you really feel. The scale works the same way for the other questions. So for the next question we ask you how hard you thought the person was trying to be liked, in this case if you did not think the person was trying hard to be liked, you would circle a number closer to 9. After that we ask you how competent, how natural and spontaneous the person was, how sincere the person was, how attractive you found the person, how convinced you be to attend UVA by the person, and your opinion about whether we should include this person in
our promotional video.

We ask you a number of questions about the persons' competence and likability. We have found that these are important ingredients in successfully promoting the University. We also ask you if you know the people on the tape, we ask this because we think you might be a little biased towards your friends. We want you to rate anyone you know just like you would rate the other people but we would like to know that you know them. The people on these tapes have given us permission to have other people rate their videos but it might be better if you did not discuss the fact that you were rating them with them because we do not intend to let them know whether or not we will use them for a while and this might make them feel nervous.

Before we begin I just want to say a word about the quality of the tapes. The interviewers we used for these pilots were not professionals and they did not consistently center the person being interviewed in the camera. That will not be the case in the final production so try to ignore these details and focus on the person you are rating. How competent is this person? How much do you like this person? Should we include this person in the final video?

The first person you will see is for practice. We have a longer rating pause after her than the other people so that you can get use to the ratings. Do you have any questions before we begin?

[start tape -- after first tape take a 5 minute break]

The second tape we will show you today is a little longer than the first one. For this tape we will be doing the same thing but you will be rating a different group of people and the segment of the interview you are rating is different. This time you will be seeing the part of the interview when the pilot persons are talking about their decision to come to UVA and how they feel about the University. People in other sessions of this experiment will rate these new people on the part of their interviews that were similar to the ones you saw before our break. Again remember to focus on the person being interviewed not the quality of the tape. The first subject is practice again to get you back in the swing of making these ratings.

[start tape]

I want to thank you for participating in this study. We have a lot of tapes like these to get opinions on so I want to let you know that you can participate in this experiment more than one time. On your credit slip I have written a letter designation, that letter stands for the group of people you rated today. You can participate again but it needs to be for a different group of people. Today's group was group (X Y or Z) so that means you can participate in rating two other groups (X and Y, Y and Z, or X and Z). If you have any questions about this study you can contact Kathy Bell. Her office is Gilmer 210B.
Appendix L

Ratings of Interviews

Do you know this person?  _ ___ no ___ yes

1. How much did you like the person you just saw?
   not at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  very much

2. How hard do you think the person on the tape was trying to be liked?
   not trying  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  trying hard

3. How competent did the person seem?
   not very incompetent  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  very competent

4. How hard do you think the person on the tape was trying to appear competent?
   not trying  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  trying hard

5. How comfortable did the person seem?
   very uncomfortable  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  very comfortable

6. How natural and spontaneous did the person seem?
   not natural and spontaneous  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  very natural and

7. How sincere did the person seem?
   not sincere  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  very sincere

8. How attractive did you find the person on the tape?
   not very attractive  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  very attractive
9. If you were thinking about attending UVA, how convinced would you be that you should attend UVA by the person you just saw on the videotape?

| not convinced | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very convinced | 8 | 9 |

10. Would you include this person's interview in a promotional video about UVA?

| do not include | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | definitely include | 8 | 9 |
## Appendix M

### Judges' Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th># Judges</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>TryL</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>TryC</th>
<th>Comf</th>
<th>Spon</th>
<th>Sinc</th>
<th>Attr</th>
<th>Conv</th>
<th>Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z4</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>