Chapter I

Introduction

The process of understanding who we are as humans and how we come to know ourselves has been at the crux of modern psychology since it’s inception in the late 19th century. Theories of self from classic social psychology claim that the self can only be understood through the individual’s participation in interpersonal communication (Cooley, 1902; James, 1890; Mead, 1934). People present themselves for different reasons, and the act of self-presentation allows us to observe ourselves from the perspective of others (Cooley, 1902; Goffman, 1959; James, 1890; Mead, 1934). A quote by Cooley sums up this idea with the lines, “Each to each a looking glass/Reflects the other that doth pass,” (Cooley, 1902, p. 184). But how might this experience of self that is determined through interpersonal communication differ when the interaction takes place in mediated environments? When individuals are unable to see one another during social interactions and other cues to identity are reduced or simply altered, how does the process of understanding the self through communication with others operate?

In general, theories of self assume that the presentation of self in social interaction influences self-concept in two ways. Individuals both observe their own behaviors and observe others reactions to their behaviors (Baumeister, 1982, 1986; Gollwitzer, 1986; Rhodewalt, 1986; Schlenker, 1986; Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). In a mediated environment both self-presentation behavior and feedback from the audience are altered relative to FTF interaction (Walther, 1996). The present study examines how these differences in 1) presentation and 2) the perception of audience in online communication contexts affect the relationship between self-presentation and
self-concept change. Because current research in computer mediated communication does not address the relationship between self-presentation and self-concept online, the current study was designed by using a framework of interpersonal theories of communication, namely the hyperpersonal model of communication (Walther, 1996), in order to extrapolate predictions of differences between the effects of online and offline self-presentation on self-concept change.

Self-presentation and self-concept

The mediating effect of self-presentation on subsequent behavior has been applied to numerous different contexts (Baumeister, 1982). The effects of self-presentation on altruistic behavior (Cialdini, Darby, and Vincent, 1973; Satow, 1975), conformity and reactance (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955; Cialdini, Braver, and Lewis, 1974), attitude change (Tedeschi, Schlenker, and Bonoma; 1971), and task performance (Zajonc, 1965; Henchy & Glass, 1968; Baumeister, Cooper & Skib, 1979), are just some of the areas in which self-presentation has been shown to influence behavior. But self-presentation does not affect behavior without impacting impressions of the self. Most theories of self-presentation, such as Goffman’s on the “dramaturgical self,” recognize the importance of the relationship between self-presentation and self-concept (Goffman, 1959). Interest in understanding this relationship has led to empirical work on the effects of self-presentations on self-concept (Tice, 1992); self-appraisals (Schlenker & Trudeau, 1990) or a sense of personal autonomy (Schlenker & Weigold, 1990). Research on self-presentational effects on the self has also looked at individual differences, such as strength of self-beliefs and self-esteem (Ross, Snyder and Pace, 1986), mental health factors (Rhodewalt & Agustdottir, 1986), and perceptions of social vulnerability (Schlenker & Wowra, 2003).
A review of the literature concerned with the relationship between self-presentation and self-concept identifies two categories of self-presentation based on actor’s goals (Baumeister, 1982). The first type of self-presentation is driven by social affirmation, or, “audience pleasing.” This type of behavior is used to facilitate social interaction and increase one’s esteem in the eyes of others. According to Baumeister, the effects of “audience pleasing” on identity construction are short lived (Baumeister, 1982). A second motive of self-presentation is constituted by its reliance on the audience as a platform for expressing the ideal self. This is what Baumeister calls “self-construction” and it is motivated by the desire to impress an audience in general, opposed to any particular audience. It is this second form of self-presentation behavior that is of interest to the current study.

**Social construction of self**

The construct of self used in the self-presentation literature is largely based on classic social psychology writing on symbolic interactionism (Cooley, 1902; James, 1890; Mead, 1934). Symbolic interactionists argue that as individuals age they develop patterns for learning about the world through perspective gained during interaction. Because life is a series of interactions, this perspective becomes inherent to the way that individuals understand the self, so that even when no audience is present, the self is processed through the filter of a “generalized other” (Mead, 1934).

William James, the first psychologist to bring the study of self to the forefront of modern psychology, claimed that the process of understanding self objectively through interaction essentially creates two forms of self: the “I” and the “Me” (James, 1980). The “I” is the self that acts. It is not evaluative, but rather the person that one is being when in the process of expressing behavior. Generally it is the “I” that is responsible for initiating and carrying out the act of self-presentation (Schlenker, 1980). The “Me” is the part of the self that is responsible for evaluation. It is what
James called the “empirical self” (James, 1980). The “Me” evaluates the behaviors of the “I” and alters those behaviors based on the social expectations of the environment. In the context of self-presentation research, the “Me” would be responsible for the evaluative cognitions that reinterpret behavior of the “I” to reflect self-concept.

Modern interpretations of symbolic interactionist theories have reframed the distinction of the “I” and the “Me” by recognizing that self-concept is simultaneously constant yet adaptive. Instead of multiple selves, theorists refer to self as a “phenomenal self” (Jones & Gerard, 1967; Rhodewalt, 1986). The “phenomenal self” implies that identity is fluid. And although there are limits to the amount of change that can occur within self-concept in a given circumstance, those limits are also fluid (Rhodewalt, 1986). As a construct within the phenomenal self, self-concept is something that becomes momentarily stable when periods of heightened self-awareness lead to re-assessments of self based on a catalogue of available self information (Jones & Gerard, 1967; Rhodewalt, 1986). As this happens repeatedly throughout a lifetime, self evolves very gradually to incorporate new behaviors (Jones & Pittman, 1982). This is very similar to the classical distinction of the behavioral “I” and the evaluative “Me.” However, by focusing on the distinction between the stable versus the evolving self rather than just active versus evaluative selves, modern theorists have paved a way for testing how self-evaluations alter behavior.

This idea that self is an integration of previously held self-concept and immediate circumstance is also proposed by Schlenker, who writes that “self-identifications should be regarded as activities (thoughts or behaviors) that occur in particular social contexts and are multiply determined (Schlenker, 1986, p.32,). He identifies four components that can influence self-identifications: 1) the actor’s personality, including the self-concept, 2) the actor’s goals and affective state, 3) the situation, and 4) salient audiences (Schlenker, 1980, 1986). Schlenker (1986) argues
that a given self-identification within a particular social context can ultimately influence a more permanent self-concept. Thus, not only is the self-concept something that is constantly evolving, but it is determined by multiple factors. These factors may be constituted in mediated communication.

*Mechanisms of self-concept change: Biased Scanning*

Although it is clear that self-presentation impacts self-concept change, what is the mechanism that mediates this relationship? Perhaps the most frequently cited mechanism behind self-presentation’s effect on self-concept change in the literature on self-presentation is *biased scanning*. Biased scanning is a variant of self-perception theory (Bem, 1972) that emphasizes cognitive mechanisms over behavioral explanations of self-concept change (Jones, Rhodewalt, Berglas, & Skelton, 1981). It states that during self-presentations individuals scan their memories for past behavior that is consistent with the current behavior. By recalling examples of previously similar behavior individuals justify current behavior as exemplary of the self, even when current behavior is externally induced (Fazio, Effrein, & Falender, 1981; Jones et al, 1981, Schlenker, & Trudeau, 1990; Tice, 1992). Biased scanning differs from self-perception theory because it specifies that self-concept change is enacted through recall. In this fashion, self-concept is updated, rather than re-invented as it is in self-perception theory, which explains how self-concept change can occur even when the motivation behind the behavior is superficially imposed, as in many experimental conditions.

Behavioral explanations of self-concept change developed out of research on cognitive dissonance, which claimed that attitude shifts occurred only through internal dissonance (Festinger & Carlsmith, 1959). Later theorists recognized that although cognitive dissonance was a useful tool for attitude change of a certain nature, it was not mandatory to induce cognitive shifts (Baumeister, 1980). An example of this
alternative explanation originated in a study by Fazio et al. (1981) which found that naturally evoking extroversion or introversion from subjects causes subjects to internalize the trait as part of self-concept simply due to self-presentation. (Fazio et al, 1981). This trait internalization due to self-presentation was not an effect of cognitive dissonance but rather an effect of self-presentation (Fazio et al, 1981). Perhaps more surprising was the fact that internalization of the trait was also evidenced in behavioral measures as introverts chose to sit farther away from a confederate than extroverts (Fazio et al, 1981). Jones et al (1981) found similar results that were also explained without evidence of dissonance. Subjects were asked to act in a self-enhancing or self-debasing manner and a comparison of pre- and post-behavioral measures of self-esteem reflected a shift in self-esteem according to the assigned portrayal (Jones et al, 1981). These authors described their effects as exemplary of the iterative relationship between cognition and self-perception, which they labeled biased scanning (Jones et al, 1981). However, biased scanning on its own may not be sufficient to describe the relationship between self-presentation and self-concept.

If self-presentation influences self-concept because people internalize the traits that they are presenting, then other factors that determine the effects of the trait on self-concept must also be accounted for. Although the first two components of Schlenker’s model of self-identification, 1) actors’ current self-concept and 2) situational goals, have been studied at length in self-presentation research, external factors that constitute the “situation” have not received as much attention. Medium is one obvious factor that might alter the situation. If self-presentation can lead to self-concept change online, the differences in the act of online self-presentation relative to face-to-face self-presentation should be further explored.
Selective self-presentation, biased scanning and self-concept change

Research on self-presentation online has demonstrated that expression of the “true-self” is often easier to do in CMC than in FTF (Bargh, McKenna, & Fitzsimons, 2002). However, there are no theories that describe how self-concept change occurs as a result of online self-presentation. Instead, we can draw on research that describes the effects of self-presentation in interpersonal interaction which may inform how self-presentation effects self-concept change in CMC.

One approach to understanding how individuals relate online is through Walther’s (1996) hyperpersonal model of interpersonal communication. The hyperpersonal model posits that the lack of cues in online communication may actually enhance the quality of online relationships (Walther, 1996; Nowak, Watt & Walther, 2005). Seen as a reaction to theories of online communication that claimed that the reduced cues in online environments detract from the impressions and relationships that people form online (Daft & Lengel, 1986; Kiesler, Siegel, & McGuire, 1984; Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976), the hyperpersonal model predicts an intensification of the effects of interpersonal interaction (Walther, 1996).

The hyperpersonal model has been used to demonstrate that the reduced cues associated with computer mediated communication can lead to more social attraction (Walther, Slovacek & Tidwell, 2001), greater conversational effectiveness (Tidwell & Walther, 2002) and greater perceived credibility of one’s partner (Nowak et al, 2005). In effect, the lack of cues is thought to augment interpersonal attraction through the assumptions that users make about their audiences and the ability to selectively self-present traits that maximize interpersonal relationships (Walther, 1996). Although the hyperpersonal model was constructed to explain interpersonal online behavior, its explanation of selective self-presentation is a useful construct for understanding how
the affordances of communicating in a lean environment can also facilitate self-concept change, even without feedback from the audience.

Selective self-presentation assumes that due to reduced cues and asynchronous communication online, individuals are better able to present those aspects of self that are most flattering and that maximize the positive interpersonal interactions (Walther, 1996). The reduction in cues and asynchronicity of the medium are useful to individuals trying to present positive images of the self because it allows them to pick-and-choose pieces of the self from the entire self-concept in a way that is not afforded by synchronous, media rich communication (Walther, 1996). In addition to increased agency of the user, the very fact that users have few cues and increased time to process those few cues amplifies the effects of those cues in a qualitative way (Walther, 1996).

Recall that biased scanning theory suggests that individuals internalize present behavior by selectively scanning through past behavior to find memories that are consistent with self-presentations. If the hyperpersonal model suggests that this process of self-presenting online is more carefully enacted online, then the act of biased scanning might also be exaggerated in online environments. In particular, as one perceives one’s own behavior in online interaction, the lack of cues can refine the salience of trait confirming behavior. Fewer cues minimize the work required to access trait consistent behavior. Much in the way that selective self-presentation sends a more exacting portrayal of the qualities an individual wishes to enhance during two-way communication, the act of selective self-presentation can refine an individual’s perceptions of self-presentations. Just as perceptions of others are exaggerated due to the poverty of cues online, so might be perceptions of the self.

Another reason that online communication might lead to increased effects of self-presentation on self-concept is due to differences in the behavioral output as a function of online communication. The selective self-presentation process suggests
several reasons that the presentational act differs in online environments, including the fact that CMC communication is: 1) editable, 2) asynchronous, 3) isolated, and 4) less cognitively demanding (Walther, in press). Online self-presentations are afforded more time and cognitive energy during the act of presenting, which may also enhance the effect on self-concept change. As individuals use biased scanning to confirm that present behavior is consistent with previous behaviors, the present behavior may be processed more fully through selective self-presentation. Thus, observations of one’s own selective self-presentation may also contribute to enhanced self-concept change during online communication.

Considered together, selective self-presentation may enhance the effects of biased scanning in three ways. First, the reduction in cues in CMC allows for fewer trait contradictory behaviors to be expressed and later scanned for self-concept change. Second, the cues that are selected for presentation should be highly relevant for the self-concept, and as such may be particularly biasing in the scanning of behavior for assessing self-concept. Finally, the increased processing time afforded CMC communication may lead to a deeper processing of trait consistent cues to be further ingrained into self-concept. As such, selective self-presentation should lead to increased biased scanning, which should facilitate the impact of self-presentation on self-concept change in online communication relative to face-to-face communication.

Audience, biased scanning and self-concept change

The fourth component of Schlenker’s model on self-identification is “salient audience” (Schlenker, 1996). A limited number of studies have been done on the impact of specific characteristics of audience, such as power, attractiveness, expertise, and even size on strategic self-presentation (Jones, 1990; Leary, 1995; Schlenker, 1980; Schlenker & Weigold, 1992; Schlenker & Wowra, 2003; Tedeschi & Norman, 1985). These studies have been interested in qualitative aspects of audience as they
alter an actor’s communication goals. But research has indicated that the basic presence of an audience can enhance the effects of self-presentation (Baumeister & Jones, 1978; Baumeister & Tice, 1984; Greenberg and Pyszczynski, 1985). For example, public presentations have been shown to enhance attitude shift (Baumeister & Jones, 1978), and public evaluations of subjects had a larger impact on self-concept than private evaluations (Baumeister & Tice, 1984; Greenberg and Pyszczynski, 1985). Finally, the presence of an audience has been demonstrated to enhance the internalization of self-presentations on self-concept (Tice, 1992).

This effect of audience on self-presentation has been referred to as a “magnifying effect” (Tice, 1992). Tice argues that this effect of audience is due to the increased attention that needs to be given to an audience, which detracts from the ability to attribute the external source of the presentation. The magnification effect of audience does not require interaction between the individual initiating the self-presentation (sender) and the recipient of the presentation (target), nor does the audience need to be physically present (Tice, 1992). Simply feeling publicly identifiable before an audience is sufficient to alter the effects of self-presentation on self-concept change (Baumeister & Tice, 1984; Greenberg and Pyszczynski, 1985; Tice, 1992). Instead of trying to convince subjects that they would never have an audience, subjects in Tice’s private conditions were told that their self-presentations would be recorded and analyzed at a later time. This was in contrast to subjects that presented before an audience, or who felt public during their self-presentations. This manipulation lends itself well to a CMC replication because Tice was essentially testing the effects of synchronicity of self-presentation on self-concept change.

Online research has demonstrated that impressions of others made without interaction can have an impact on behavior (Douglas, & McGarty, 2001; Tanis, & Postmes, 2005), and research on self-concept has claimed that audience can be
imagined and still impact self-concept (Schlenker, 1980, 1986). If knowledge of a non-interactive audience influences self-concept through CMC self-presentation, self-concept change may occur in many CMC environments when audience is present but not interactive.

The effects of audience online may differ from the effects of audience face-to-face because the nature of an online audience is different. In general, computer-mediated communication (CMC) is assumed to have fewer cues relative to face-to-face communication. Several theories, referred to as cues-filtered out theories (CFO) (Daft & Lengel, 1984) orient their predictions around this observation. For example, social presence theory (Short, Williams & Christie, 1976) notes that there are fewer cues in mediated communication, which leads to a reduction in the salience of others in the communication space. This approach may have implications for the impact of audience and medium on self-concept change. If, as CFO theories would predict, the reduction of cues leads to reduced salience of others, then the impact of audience should also abate in online communication. If this is the case, then social presence theory predicts that audience will have a reduced effect on self-concept change when the audience is online relative to offline.

An alternative approach to understanding audience effects is through the hyperpersonal model described above. The hyperpersonal model suggests that the salience of the other is not necessarily reduced in mediated interaction, but rather intensified in many ways (Walther, 1996). Indeed, the hyperpersonal model might predict that, given the lack of information about the audience, the participants may make general overattributions about that audience (Hancock & Dunham, 2001). Part of the rationale behind predictions of hyperpersonal interactions stems from previous research on behavioral confirmation (Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977). Walther makes the argument that inherent assumptions about other’s are exaggerated in the
absence of disconfirming evidence (Walther, 1996, p.28). The lack of cues to audience can cause individuals to construct an image of an “idealized receiver” (Walther, 1996). In interpersonal interaction, the idealized receiver is presumed to enhance the quality of the interpersonal relationship. But, according to symbolic interactionist theories of self, the relationships with others are the basis of self-concept (Cooley, 1902; James, 1890; Mead, 1934). In this way, the idealized receiver may also enhance self-concept change relative to FTF. If this is the case then we would expect an interaction effect, in which the audience magnifying effect on self-concept is greater online than offline.

**Effects of selective self-presentation and audience on self-concept change**

The present study replicates Tice’s original procedure for examining self-presentation and self-concept change. It also extends this procedure into an online environment that examines how biased scanning operates in the context of 1) selective self-presentation and a 2) mediated audience. The basic design of the Tice study had subjects portray an introvert or extrovert during an interview which was followed up with self-report measures of “actual” extroversion or introversion. Tice used the same measure of introversion/extroversion used by Fazio et al. (1981), as well as the behavioral measure of sitting distance. She used a multiple item bipolar scale to rate the change in self-concept (Fazio et al., 1981). Tice predicted that subjects who had an audience during the self-presentation would internalize the assigned trait of introversion or extroversion to a greater degree than subjects that did not have an audience during the self-presentation. In other words, the difference between the self-concept ratings for introverts and extroverts in the public conditions should be greater than the difference between self-concept ratings for introverts and extroverts in the private condition.

This study intends to test whether selective self-presentation and audience act as mediating factors on the effect of self-presentation on self-concept change in
different mediums. If selective self-presentation afforded during online self-presentations enhances the effects of biased scanning on presentation output, CMC self-presentations should lead to more self-concept change across both audience conditions relative to FTF presentations (H1). In testing the effects of audience, we should encounter results that replicate those findings in FTF (H2) in order to compare the difference between the effect of audience online and offline. If the experience of an audience online is minimized due to a lack of cues we would expect to see a more moderate effect of audience in CMC relative to FTF (H3a). However, if the idealized receiver predicted in the hyperpersonal model enhances perceptions of audience we would expect to see a larger effect of audience in CMC relative to FTF (H3b).

In particular, the following hypotheses were tested:

H1: According to the hyperpersonal model, selective self-presentation should lead to more self-concept change in CMC than in FTF.

H2: Consistent with Tice’s findings, the influence of audience on biased scanning should lead to more self-concept change as a result of public versus private self-presentations in the FTF condition.

H3a: According to cues filtered-out theories, a decreased sense of audience in CMC should lead to a significantly smaller interaction of audience and trait in CMC than in FTF. That is, the effect of the difference between the internalization of each trait based on audience should be smaller in CMC than the difference between the internalization of each trait based on audience in FTF.

H3b: According to the hyperpersonal model, an enhanced sense of audience in CMC should lead to a significantly greater effect of audience and trait in CMC than in FTF. That is, the effect of the difference between the internalization of each trait based on audience should be more pronounced in CMC than the difference between the internalization of each trait based on audience in FTF.
For each set of the hypotheses the same predictions are made for both self-report and behavioral measures of self-concept change. The inclusion of behavioral measures allowed Tice to demonstrate that self-concept change can carry-over into subsequent interactions unassociated with the initial self-presentation. Thus, findings of self-concept change should be consistent across both types of measures for both of the mediums.
CHAPTER II

Methods

Overview

The cover story used in the experiment was described as “the detection of personality traits in others’ self-descriptions” (Tice, 1992). Subjects were told that experiment was being conducted in conjunction with students from the psychology department. They were asked to participate in an interview that would be used by graduate students in the psychology department to test the ability of psychology graduate students to detect various personality traits. Subjects in the public conditions were told that their interviews would be listened to (FTF) or read (CMC) in real time by a single psychology graduate student. Subjects in the private conditions were told that the interviews were being compiled and would be observed by a single graduate student in the psychology department at some point in the future.

Subjects were asked to portray either an introverted or extroverted person during the interview and were given a list of the four topics to be discussed during the interview. The questions included a discussion of pastimes with friends, family vacations, current extracurricular activities and the most important thing learned in college. Subjects were told to portray the trait stylistically or in the content of their answers and were encouraged to think of experiences in their past as well as present that support the assigned trait. Subjects were told not to lie, but that they could admit certain details if necessary. This explicit instruction on how to portray the assigned trait was intended to induce self-presentation via the biased scanning mechanism.

---

1 In the original study, subjects were told that the interviews would be evaluated by clinical psychology students. Because there is no clinical psychology program on the Ithaca campus, the story was altered to include graduate students from the psychology department. Using psychology graduate students was an attempt to make the story sound believable and maintain a degree of social distance between the subject and the audience comparable to the Tice study.
Biased scanning assumes that any change in self-concept that accompanies self-presentation is due to the accessibility of trait confirming behavior.

After being given the instructions and motivation for the portrayal, subjects were given a brief description of each trait that construed both introversion and extroversion in a positive manner to avoid any negative social stigma associated with either trait. After it became clear that subjects understood the directions, they were orally given the choice to proceed or withdraw from the study should they feel unable to present the given trait. By doing this, Tice’s procedure reinforces an internal motivation to make the selected trait presentation.

Participants

109 female and 50 male participants were drawn from introductory Cornell communication courses for course credit. 3 subjects chose not participate in the study because they felt that they were unable to portray the assigned trait. During the debriefing, subjects were asked whether or not they believed that there was an audience present during the interview. Four subjects from the public FTF condition and two subjects from the public CMC were dropped from the study because they admitted to not believing that an audience was present.

Procedure

The study consisted of a 2 (trait: introversion/ extroversion) X 2 (audience: public/private) X 2 (medium: FTF/CMC) design. Subjects were randomly assigned to each condition. Each subject was told either to portray an introvert or an extrovert during an interview that would either take place using a headset (FTF) or via a computer (CMC). Some of the subjects were then told that an interviewer would be listening to their interview responses in real time (public) or that their interview would be saved and used for analysis at another time (private).
Offline. Once subjects agreed to participate in the study, they were shown into a room where they were seated in front of a one-way mirror. The procedures in the offline condition replicated Tice (1992) as closely as possible. Subjects in the public conditions were told that the graduate student that would be listening to the interview was already in the adjacent room and that they should wave to the student opposite the double sided mirror. After doing so, a curtain was drawn across the mirror to avoid any self-focusing effect of the mirror. This initial greeting was done to induce a sense of visual identifiability even if that component of publicness did not persist throughout the interview. Participants in the private condition were brought into the same room, but were told that they would not be visible during the interview. The experimenter closed the curtains in front of the subject to emphasize this point and maintain consistency across the two conditions.

Subjects were then given a microphone and headset with which to complete the interview. To maintain consistency across public and private conditions, subjects were told that the experimenter would be asking the interview questions via an intercom. Subjects were told that this was done so that the graduate student would remain as objective as possible during the interview. However, subjects were told that because the experimenter would not be able to hear the responses that they should indicate when they had finished answering each question by signaling to the experimenter using the intercom buzzer.

Also to enhance the effects of an audience in the public conditions subjects were asked to begin the interview by providing their names, ages, majors, hometowns, and dormitories in order to “help the graduate student get to know them better”. In the private conditions, subjects were told that because of the personal nature of the questions was important critical that they not provide any identifying information during the interview.
In the online conditions, subjects were told that they would be participating in an interview to test the ability of psychology graduate students to detect certain personality traits in text. Following the description of the trait and the agreement to participate in the study, subjects were led into an experimental computer room.

Subjects in the public conditions were told that the interview would take place via instant messaging. The location of the graduate student that was allegedly reading the responses was not made explicit. However, as in the FTF public conditions, the subjects were made to think that their answers were being assessed in real-time. Subjects were already logged on to Instant Messenger with the name Cornell00A and the chat box was open to the name Cornell00B. This was the only other user listed in the “friend list” associated with this experiment. This was to ensure that no other users would interrupt the experiment. After assuring that subjects knew how to use the system, subjects were prompted to give an introductory hello to the evaluator as an online analog of the offline wave. It was suggested that they type something basic such as, “Hi,” or, “I’m ready.” They were told to do this in order to let the graduate student know that the interview was about to begin. As in the FTF conditions, the interview questions were delivered to the subjects via the intercom by the experimenter and subjects used the buzzer on the intercom to indicate when they had completed each question. Subjects were told that their responses would not be read by the experimenter. Subjects in the public condition were asked to begin the interview by providing the same bibliographic information provided by subjects in the FTF public condition.

Subjects in the private conditions were told that they would be typing their answers into a text document which would be read by a psychology graduate student at a later date. Subjects in the private condition found a text document open on the
computer’s desktop. They were told to answer the questions in the document and were instructed on how to use the intercom. Subjects in the private conditions were discouraged from using any identifying information throughout the course of the interview. Following the interview in each of the online conditions, subjects completed the same measures completed by subjects in the offline conditions, including the behavioral measure.

**Measures**

Upon completion of the interview, subjects were told that the psychology graduate student would require a “true” rating of subjects’ personalities to compare with their own ratings. All self-ratings were done privately and subjects did not include their names but were given identification numbers. The primary measure of self-concept change used by Tice was taken from Fazio et al, (1981) and utilizes 10 bipolar items to rate intro/extroversion each on 11-point bipolar scales. The items include measures of: talkative-quiet, unsociable-sociable, friendly-unfriendly, poised-awkward, extraverted-introverted, enthusiastic-apathetic, outgoing-shy, energetic-relaxed, warm-cold, and confident-unconfident. (see Appendix A).

In addition, subjects were asked two additional questions that served as manipulation checks. The first was concerned with the audience manipulation and uses the same question as Tice (1992): “To what extent do you think your presentation in this experiment is publicly identifiable? Do you think anyone might recognize you or know what you said during your presentation (including the graduate student evaluator)?” Answers were given on a 5 point scale, with endpoints: 1-*highly publicly identifiable*, 5- *not at all publicly identifiable* (see Appendix B). The second question assessed participants’ perception of their ability to perform the trait. Subjects were asked to rate their ability “to give an accurate portrayal of an [intro/extroverted]
person.” These responses were also given on a 5 point scale, with endpoints: 1-unable to portray [assigned trait], 5-able to portray [assigned trait]. (See Appendix C).

Subjects were instructed to signal their completion of the self-report measures to the experimenter via the intercom. At this point, the experimenter re-entered the room and subjects were told that the experiment was completed. They were then asked to wait in a separate waiting room while the experimenter retrieved paperwork needed to assure fulfillment of credit for participating in the study. Students were asked to bring their chair with them as “there is as student waiting for a different study sitting in the one chair that is in the waiting room.” Subjects were led to a room where a confederate was sitting where they would place their chair and wait for the return of the experimenter. Confederates were given a book to read and were told to appear neutral such that they would neither discourage nor encourage conversation with the subject. The experimenter left the room, and returned after 3 minutes, at which point the confederate was allowed to leave and the subject was debriefed. Any attempt to start conversation with the confederate was recorded. After leaving, the distance between the nearest leg of confederate’s chair and the subject’s chair was measured.

Debriefing

Following Tice’s debriefing procedure subjects were informed of all hypothesis and manipulations. They were told about the expected effects on self-concept depending on the condition that the subject participated in. Also in keeping with Tice’s debriefing procedure, subjects were asked to remember three instances when they had behaved in a manner opposite of that which they were told to present. They were also told that the self-ratings in the laboratory are not accurate ratings due to the experimental manipulations. The concept of perseveration (Ross, Lepper, & Hubbard, 1975) was also discussed with subjects because doing so was found to best mitigate the likelihood of persevering change in self-concept. Subjects were then
asked to complete the necessary extra credit forms and were allowed to leave after being asked not to repeat the details of the experiment with any of their friends.
CHAPTER III

Results

Manipulation Checks

Perception of Audience. In the original study, Tice found that subjects in the public condition felt more identifiable in public than in private, F(1, 79) = 1807.2, p < .0001. This manipulation check was necessary to assure that increased self concept change was in fact due to an increased sense of audience. In this replication of the Tice study (i.e., the offline condition), subjects in the public condition did not feel more publicly identifiable (M=3.62, SE= .178) than subjects in the private condition (M=3.83, SE=.178), F<1, ns. In the CMC condition, this was not the case. In CMC, subjects in the chat conditions did feel more publicly identifiable (M= 3.16, SE=.189) than subjects that submitted answers to the interview questions in a private text document (M=3.87, SE=.187), report statistic. The following self-report and behavioral results are described in the context of the successful manipulation of audience in CMC and the unsuccessful manipulation of audience in FTF (See Table 1).

Table 1. Perception of Audience
Note: 1=highly publicly identifiable, 5=not at all publicly identifiable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Trait</th>
<th>FTF Public</th>
<th>FTF Private</th>
<th>CMC Public</th>
<th>CMC Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>3.95 0.258</td>
<td>3.76 0.251</td>
<td>3.21 0.264</td>
<td>3.9 0.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>3.33 0.251</td>
<td>3.9 0.258</td>
<td>3.11 0.264</td>
<td>3.85 0.258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation Ability. Subjects’ perceived ability to portray the assigned trait was measured for each condition. Ratings were made on a 5-point scale, (1=unable to portray [assigned trait] and 5=able to portray assigned trait). In the FTF conditions, there was a non-significant difference between how successfully subjects felt they were able to portray the assigned trait in public \((M=3.81, SE=.149)\) and private \((M=3.43, SE=.149)\) conditions. In the CMC conditions, there was an effect of audience. Subjects felt more capable of portraying the assigned trait in private \((M=3.58, SE=.160)\) than in public \((M=4.07, SE=.165)\), \(F(1,69)=4.53, p<.05\). (See Table 2).

Table 2. Presentation Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Trait</th>
<th>FTF Public</th>
<th>FTF Private</th>
<th>CMC Public</th>
<th>CMC Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>3.83 0.22 18</td>
<td>3.63 0.21 19</td>
<td>3.5 0.22 18</td>
<td>3.97 0.22 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>3.78 0.21 19</td>
<td>3.22 0.22 18</td>
<td>3.67 0.22 18</td>
<td>4.18 0.23 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Reported Self-Concept

The primary measure of self-concept change was the same 10 item scale used by Tice (1992) and adopted from Fazio et al. (1981). The directions given to subjects asked them to place an X on the line to indicate, “the degree to which you actually possess” each of the traits. A single score for extroversion was calculated for each subject by summing the scores for the ten 11-point bipolar items in the scale. The lowest possible score was 10 (highly introverted) and the highest possible score was
110 (highly extroverted). This was the same procedure for calculating extroversion scores used by Tice (1992).

The first analysis examined whether the data in the offline condition replicated Tice’s findings. According to Tice’s initial study, participants that performed their self-presentation in the public condition should experience greater self-concept change than participants that performed in the private condition. That is, extroverts and introverts self-report scores should differ more in the public condition than in the private condition. If this were the case, we would expect a significant trait by audience interaction in the FtF condition. A 2 (public/private) X 2 (introversion/extroversion) ANOVA did not reveal the expected effects of audience on trait internalization. In the original study, Tice found a main effect for trait that was moderated by an interaction of trait and audience (See Figure 1). Neither of those results was found in the replication. This result suggests that the replication of Tice failed (H2), although this failure is not surprising given that the audience manipulation check also failed.

Figure 1. Extroversion Scale

The primary question of interest, however, was to determine how the impact of medium and audience affect the relationship between self-presentation and self-
concept via biased scanning in FtF and CMC contexts. To examine this issue, a 2 (public/private) X 2 (introversion/ extroversion) X 2 (FTF/CMC) GLM was performed, which included the measure of presentation ability as a covariate. The covariate accounted for a significant amount of variance $F(1, 141)= 6.68, p<.01$, but the covariate did not interact with any other factors.

This model did not reveal the predicted significant findings for the effect of medium on self-concept change. H1 predicted a medium by trait effect such that the self report ratings for extroverts would have been greater in CMC than in FtF and ratings for introverts would have been lower in CMC than in FtF across both audience conditions. Instead there were no enhanced effects of medium on trait internalization $F(1,141)=1.57, p=.212$. This result is inconsistent with the selective self-presentation hypothesis and suggests that the level of self-concept change after self-presentation was no greater in the CMC condition than in the FtF condition. (See Figures 2 & 3).

![Figure 2. FtF Self-Report](image1)

![Figure 3. CMC Self-Report](image2)

The next analysis examined whether the impact of audience on self-concept change differed across FtF and CMC. If audience effects are diminished in CMC because of decreased presence, as suggested by CFO perspectives, then the effect of audience observed in the CMC condition should be less than the effect observed FtF.
(H3a). If, on the other hand, audience has an increased effect due to the idealization of the audience as proposed in the Hyperpersonal model, then the impact of audience in CMC should be larger than the impact observed in FtF (H3b) The pattern of results does not support either hypothesis. First, no effect of audience was observed in the FtF condition. Second, there was no effect of audience in the CMC condition.

Despite the lack of findings that either audience or medium had an enhancing or dampening effect on the internalization of the assigned trait, an unexpected significant interaction was found between audience and medium, $F(1,141) = 4.19, p < .05$. This finding suggests that regardless of what trait subjects were assigned to portray, subjects in the private conditions were more extroverted in FTF ($M = 82.963, SE = 2.66$) than in CMC ($M = 74.79, SE = 2.80$), while subjects in the public condition were more extroverted in CMC ($M = 80.895, SE = 2.64$) than subjects in FTF ($M = 77.53, SE = 2.59$). This finding reflects a moderating effect of audience and medium on self-presentation that seems to supersede the self-presentation. It may be that audience and medium combined are a unique and powerful factor that can influence self-concept. This finding will be discussed in further detail in the discussion (see Table 3).

Table 3. Self-Reported Self-Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Trait</th>
<th>FTF Public</th>
<th>FTF Private</th>
<th>CMC Public</th>
<th>CMC Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>$M = 75.8$</td>
<td>$SE = 3.72$</td>
<td>$N = 20$</td>
<td>$M = 82.4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>$M = 79.3$</td>
<td>$SE = 3.62$</td>
<td>$N = 21$</td>
<td>$M = 83.52$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These averages include the covariate of Presentation Ability.
Behavioral Measure

In addition to the self-report measures of self-concept change, Tice also implemented behavioral measures based on the previous studies of internalization of introversion or extroversion (Fazio et al., 1981). Subjects were asked to sit in a room with a confederate, and the distance subjects sit from a confederate is an operationalization of trait internalization. This operationalization is based on the assumption that introverts should choose to sit farther away than extroverts from the confederate. It demonstrates both the potential “depth” and persistence of certain types of self-concept change, which previous research has referred to as “carry-over” effect (Fazio et al., 1981; Schlenker, Dlugolecki, & Doherty, 1994; Tice, 1992).

According to H1, the distance between introverts and extroverts should be significantly larger for subjects in CMC conditions rather than the FTF conditions. If selective self-presentation enhances the effects of self-presentation on self-concept change, then extroverts in CMC should sit closer than extroverts in FTF and introverts in CMC should sit farther away than introverts in FTF across both audience conditions. This hypothesis (H1) was not supported. An interaction of medium and trait would have produced the expected effect of medium on self-concept change, but that interaction was not found.

Within the FTF conditions, an effect of audience that would have replicated the findings by Tice would have revealed an interaction of audience and trait with the difference between the traits being farther away in the public conditions than in the private conditions (H2). This finding was not revealed. Once again, this finding is not surprising in light of the lack of an effective manipulation of audience in the FTF conditions.
The final two hypotheses set up competing predictions about the effect of audience in each of the mediums. According to Tice’s original hypothesis, feeling public has a magnifying effect on self-concept change. This should have resulted in a significantly larger difference in the distance that extroverts and introverts sit from a confederate in public conditions than in private conditions (H2). The CFO perspective would have predicted that the difference that introverts and extroverts sit from a confederate across audience conditions would be greater in FTF than it would be in CMC conditions. If the effect of audience is moderated by the lack of cues in CMC, than audience would have less of an effect on the internalization of the trait and subjects would not reflect trait internalization in the behavioral measure (H3a). On the other hand, a hyperpersonal model would predict that the heightened impact of audience in CMC would lead to a greater effect of audience on the distance that subjects should sit from one another. If this prediction was confirmed through the behavioral measure, the difference between distance sat for each trait in the public and private conditions would be greater in CMC than in FTF (H3b). In fact neither of these hypotheses was confirmed, as audience did not have a significant effect on the distance that subjects sat in either FTF or CMC. It seems that any effect of audience that may have been evidenced in the self-concept measure did not carry-over into subsequent behavioral measures. (See Table 4).

Table 4. Behavioral Measure of Self-Concept

Distance in inches that subjects sat from confederate.
Measurements were taken from two nearest chair legs from each chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Trait</th>
<th>FTF Public</th>
<th>FTF Private</th>
<th>CMC Public</th>
<th>CMC Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Trait</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis revealed a main effect for trait, $F(1,136) = 4.82, p<.05$. This finding suggests that in a behavioral measure of internalization of self-concept, subjects in both mediums and in both audience conditions sat closer when they had portrayed an extrovert ($M=44.04$, $SE=2.7$) than when they had portrayed an introvert ($M=52.4$, $SE=2.68$). This finding that was not moderated by other factors confirms behavioral interpretations of the effect of self-presentation on self-concept change. The discrepancy between internalization at the self-report and behavioral level of measurement suggests that self-presentation can induce self-concept change at different levels of awareness and this possibility is addressed in the discussion.

Figure 4. FtF Behavioral

Figure 5. CMC Behavioral
CHAPTER IV

Discussion

The present study was designed to replicate findings of the magnifying effect of audience on self-concept change following self-presentation (Tice, 1992). The goals of the study were to replicate Tice’s finding that the difference between trait internalization was greater during public self-presentation (H2), and then to compare that finding with ratings of trait internalization in CMC. It was predicted that selective self-presentation would enhance the effects of biased scanning on self-concept change in CMC relative to FTF (H1). In addition it was predicted that the experience of an “other” online would mediate the effects of audience on self-concept change differently in text. Competing hypotheses were put forth based on different theories from within CMC research about the relationship between mediated communication and person perception. A cues filtered-out approach predicted a decreased effect of audience in CMC (H3a) while a hyperpersonal approach predicted an enhanced effect of audience in CMC (H3b).

Selective Self-Presentation and Self-Concept Change

The hyperpersonal model proposes that selective self-presentation during text based communication affords a more distilled presentation of the desired self (Walther, 1996). In this study, subjects were provided with presentational goals of either extroversion or introversion and were then asked to rely on their own experiences in order to successfully portray the assigned trait, which would enable the mechanism of biased scanning (Jones et al, 1981).

The first prediction was that selective self-presentation should enhance biased scanning by allowing subjects to be “hyper-selective” in scanning their own behavior and also in choosing which aspects of the self to present. In addition, selective self-presentation online allows subjects extended time and cognitive resources to process
their behavior. This affordance of CMC was predicted to enhance self-concept change relative to FTF. Neither the self-report or behavioral measures, however, supported this prediction. Subjects in the CMC conditions did not report higher scores as extroverts and lower scores for introverts relative to subjects in FTF. The behavioral measure of self-concept change also did not display the predicted effect of greater trait internalization online. When asked to sit in a room with a confederate, introverts from the CMC conditions did not sit further away that introverts in the FTF conditions and extroverts in the CMC conditions did not sit closer than extroverts in the FTF conditions. These data suggest that selective self-presentation in CMC did not interact with biased scanning as predicted, and that selective self-presentation did not mediate the relationship between self-presentation and self-concept change.

**Audience and Self-Concept Change**

In understanding the different effects of audience on self-concept change, the first objective was to replicate Tice’s (1992) original study. The results suggest that subjects in the FTF conditions did not experience an increased sense of publicness in the public condition relative to subjects in the private condition. This finding is inconsistent with the results from the manipulation check from Tice’s original study, in which participants in the public condition felt more public than participants in the private condition. This failure suggests that the replication of Tice’s original procedure’s failed, and as such the replication of her original results were unlikely. Indeed, the expected results, in which the self-report measure of self-concept change should have revealed that difference between extroverts and introverts in the public condition should have been greater than the difference between the extroverts and introverts in the private condition, did not materialize. In the original study, the difference between the ratings of self-concept change for subjects in each of the trait conditions was greater in public than in private. Tice interpreted these results as
evidence of a “magnifying effect” of audience. She argued that audience demanded an increased cognitive load that directly detracted from subject’s abilities to attribute the source of the presentation (Tice, 1992). In this way, audience highlighted the behavioral effects of biased scanning in the presence of an audience, without giving individuals enough time to rationalize their behavior (Tice, 1992). This was not the case in the present study, although the failure of the audience manipulation in the FtF condition prevents drawing any conclusions from the present data regarding the original audience-based finding.

Although the self-report measures revealed no differences across trait or audience conditions in FtF, the behavioral measures of self-concept change revealed that presentation of the assigned trait caused a shift in self-concept in the direction of that trait. Subjects that were asked to portray an extrovert sat closer to a confederate than subjects that were asked to portray an introvert. This behavioral finding indicates that self-presentation can impact self-concept change, although it does so in a way that makes it inaccessible to subjects at the self-report level of measurement. The differences between behavioral and self-report measures are discussed further below.

Unlike the FTF condition, the manipulation of audience was effective for subjects in the CMC conditions. Subjects that participated in self-presentation over IM with the impression that their responses were being read reported feeling more public than subjects who responded to the interview questions in a text document. The effective manipulation of audience allows for further exploration of the predictions for the effects of audience in CMC.

The first hypothesis on the effects of audience in CMC predicted that the lack of cues in mediated environments should decrease the effects of audience on self-concept change. Cues-filtered out theories suggest that the reduction in cues in mediated environments makes the target of an interaction less salient (Daft & Lengel,
1984). From this perspective, audience in CMC should not be as influential as a FTF audience in magnifying the effects of biased scanning which in turn should lead to a smaller difference in the internalization of introversion and extroversion across medium and audience conditions. The results did not support this prediction. Audience did not have a significantly larger effect in inducing self-concept change in FTF public conditions relative to private conditions than it did in CMC. Although the failure of the audience manipulation in the FtF condition makes it difficult to draw any conclusions from comparisons across CMC and FtF, it was not the case that audience had no effect on self-concept change, as might be expected by CFO views of audience that suggest that the audience becomes diminished in CMC contexts. Instead, the interaction between medium and audience, discussed below, suggests that audience does play a role in self-concept change in online contexts.

The impact of audience on self-concept change, however, was also not consistent with the second prediction regarding audience. Recall that the hyperpersonal model of interpersonal communication suggests that online communication can lead to interactions that are more intense relative to offline interactions (Walther, 1996). This model proposes that online, individuals may overattribute positive characteristics to the recipient of selective self-presentation, known as an “idealized receiver” (1996). This process of over-attribution of characteristics in the face of minimal cues may also pertain to the perception of audience during non-interactive self-presentation. The lack of cues to audience was expected to augment its effects on self-concept change subsequent to self-presentation relative to FTF. Hypothesis 3b predicted that the difference between self-concept change in public and private conditions in CMC would be greater than the difference between self-concept change in public and private conditions in FTF. However, the difference between
public and private levels of self-concept change was no larger in the CMC condition than in the FtF condition. Therefore hypothesis 3b could also not be confirmed.

Self-report measures of self-concept change did not support any of the original hypotheses concerning the effects of audience in CMC. In fact, in none of the conditions was there a significant difference between the self-report ratings of self-concept change for introverts and extroverts. As in FTF, this lack of a difference in self-concept ratings between trait conditions suggests that self-presentation alone did not impact self-concept change at the self-report level. However, as in FTF, the lack of findings in the self-report measures is not consistent with results from the behavioral measure. In CMC subjects portrayed some level of internalization of the assigned trait that was evidenced in the distance subjects sat from a confederate. Introverts sat farther away than extroverts regardless of the presence of an audience during the self-presentation. The degree to which introverts sat farther away from the confederate than extroverts was the same across the CMC and FtF conditions, suggesting that self-presentation in different mediums does not change the impact of a behavioral internalization of self-presentation. The discrepancy between the findings in the self-report measure and the behavioral measure of self-concept change is discussed further below.

One possible explanation for the lack of self-concept change could be that subjects did not actually portray the assigned trait. In the original study by Tice, the completed interviews were rated by a blind coder in order to “evaluate the alternative, artifactual interpretation of the data suggesting that participants in the public conditions gave more extreme self-portrayals than participants in the private conditions” (Tice, 1992, p.444). Tice argued that while subjects should be significantly more introverted when asked to portray an introvert and extroverted when asked to portray an extrovert, these ratings should not differ across audience
conditions. The interviews were rated on a scale of 1-5 to assess the degree of introversion-extroversion. This bipolar scale was used in the same manner that self-report measures were used by subjects, with low scores indicating an introverted presentation and high scores indicating an extroverted presentation. Tice observed that ratings of interviews found a significant difference between the degree of introversion and extroversion for interviews based on the trait that subjects were assigned. However she did not find a difference in the degree of introversion or extroversion because of audience.

To assess the issue of whether participants were able to portray their traits in the present study, the same procedure and analysis was carried out. Coders blind to the manipulation assessed each self-presentation performance and rated them for level of extroversion. As in the Tice study, the present study found that third-party coders rated extrovert-assigned presentations as more extroverted (M= 4.2, SE=.18) than introvert-assigned presentations (M=2.7, SE=.17) $F(1, 106) = 9.92, p<.01$. This effect was equivalent across the two medium conditions, suggesting that the difference between extrovert and introvert presentations was the same in FtF and CMC. These results indicate that participants in both the FtF and CMC conditions were able to perform their assigned traits, and therefore the lack of self-concept change was not a function of an inability to present the assigned trait.

The “Situation”: The joint effects of Audience and Medium

Although none of the predicted effects for audience and medium were observed, it was not the case that audience and medium did not interact to affect self-concept change. Extroverts in CMC rated themselves as less extroverted when in the public condition than in the private condition. This effect was not observed in the FtF condition. How can we make sense of the observation that participants assigned to act extroverted in CMC when an audience was present rated themselves as less
extroverted than private extroverts or even introverts? One approach to understanding these effects is through Schlenker’s model of self-identification (Schlenker, 1993). Schlenker’s model of self-identification states that the construction of identity is dependent on four main factors: 1) the actor’s personality, including the self-concept, 2) the actor’s goals and affective state, 3) the situation, and 4) salient audiences (Schlenker, 1980, 1984, 1985, 1993). On his four factor model of self-identification, Schlenker writes that situation influences self-concept in two ways: First, through the affordances and constraints of the given context, and secondly, through the capacity to activate “particular goals, scripts or plans, and identity images” (Schlenker, 1993, p.35). The results from self-report measures of self-concept in this study suggest that typing or talking, with or without an audience, may actually create four distinct “situations” (Schlenker, 1993) each of which may have different impacts on self-concept change. Each situation may have different scripts associated with that situation and the affordances and constraints may not only differ between mediums, but at the conjuncture of medium and audience. For example in the case of this study, one can imagine that subjects asked portray an extrovert while typing alone in a room would recognize the inconsistency of that self-presentation: Writing, alone to oneself, is not an extroverted activity. For this reason, these subjects might actually perceive themselves as being introverted. It is conceivable that the difference of communicating in text versus in voice combined with the lack of an audience was simply too different from one’s expectations of what it means to portray an extrovert. For instance, it may be that scripts of extroversion typically involve interactive or public settings. For example, being extroverted in a spirited IM discussion may not seem entirely inconsistent with the expectations of extroversion. Similarly, one might imagine that even if forced to be extroverted while answering questions alone into a voice recorder, one may find sufficient cues to communicate extroversion, possibly by
speaking loudly or with increased of intonation. Instead, the lack of voice cues and the lack of audience combined seemed to act together to create a “contrast effect” on the perception of self-presentation. The idea that one was truly an extrovert was incompatible with the situation surrounding the self-presentation.

In contrast to the lack of significant findings for internalization in the expected direction, this unexpected internalization in the opposite direction suggests that the effect of audience and medium were important in changing the way one views the self subsequent to self-presentation. This finding, though unexpected, supports the idea that the phenomenal self does not activate self-concept change unless something in the environment forces an awareness of self (Rhodewalt, 1986). However in this study, the factors that determine awareness of self in a situation may have been those factors that caused the individual to notice the discrepancy between self-presentations and norms of behavior.

*The “I” and “Me”*

The results from the behavioral measures paint a different picture of the effects of self-presentation on self-concept change. Subjects in both medium conditions and across both audience conditions reflected an internalization of the assigned trait: extroverts sat closer to the confederate than introverts across all medium and audience settings. This anomalous finding is also is not consistent with Tice’s findings that both self-report measures and behavioral measures a magnifying effect of audience on self-concept change. Support for the discrepancy between the self-report and behavioral measures of self-concept compel one to revisit the theoretical distinction of self according to William James (James, 1890). The fact that trait internalization occurred at some fundamental level of self that was not accessible to conscious processing reflects the difference between the “I” that acts and the “Me” that observes. If correlations between perceived ability and self-concept reflect the relationship
between perceptions of self and *conscious* self-concept change, then perhaps it is not so surprising that the behavioral measure of internalization would best reflect behavior, regardless of perceptions of the self or the audience. This interpretation is not consistent with Tice’s findings, but it is a possible explanation for the difference between measures of self-concept change in this study.

*Limitations and Future Directions*

The present study was constrained by a number of important limitations. The primary limitation of the study was the failed replication of the Tice experiment. The procedures of this experiment followed the original study as closely as possible, but the procedure failed to heighten the sense of publicness for subjects in the public audience condition in FTF. In the public FTF condition, subjects needed to believe that they were waving to someone that could see them, and speaking to someone that would hear them without any visual or audio confirmation of the presence of an audience. The oddity of this manipulation may have been aggravated by the experimenter’s poor lying skills. This was in contrast to the public CMC condition in which subjects were not told about the exact location of the evaluator. This, along with the fact that asynchronous communication makes zero feedback less unusual in CMC, made it easier to convince subjects of having an audience in CMC. Nonetheless, only four subjects were identified as suspicious in FTF, compared to two participants in CMC. These participants were removed from the analysis; however, other suspicious participants may have kept their suspicions private. Additional research is required in order to determine whether the Tice audience manipulation can be replicated.

Another potential problem with the design of the study was the use of traits that may have been confounded with medium and audience. Results from trait internalization suggest that the behavioral norms associated with each trait may have complicated self-presentation. In particular, because the portrayal of extroversion is
typically associated with an increase in behavior and the portrayal of introversion is associated with a decrease in behavior, the effects of medium and audience on self-presentation of these traits may have been based on quantitative differences rather than qualitative difference. This effect is supported by the data and suggests the use of more neutral traits.

An additional problem with the use of introversion and extroversion is the difference in the prior self-concept of a communication student population relative to a psychology student population related to these traits. As evidenced by the overall higher ratings of extroversion in this study relative to the Tice (1992) study, subjects in this population tended to rate themselves as more extroverted, regardless of the assigned trait. Being a “communication student” was the implicit identification when participating in the study. It is possible that being extroverted is a critical component of the “communication student” self-concept that was made salient at the start of participation. Future research examining self-concept of the same design should consider using different traits, particularly with a communication student population. Use of different traits may allow for less of a confound of the trait with medium and audience.

Finally, additional research should consider the ecological validity of testing the effects of self-concept change in new online spaces. The finding that audience and medium interacts to create unique impacts of self-concept change is an encouraging finding for research attempting to establish the practice of self-presentation for “self-construction” in online spaces. In fact, there has been anecdotal evidence that the popularity in blogging is in part due to the affordance of the medium for identity construction (Blood, 2002). In online spaces where the audience is not only highly asynchronous, but also of unknown size, the effects of self-presentation on self-concept change might be altogether different. Social Impact theory (Latane & Nida,
1981) predicts that the impact of additional audience members should be marginally decreasing. That is, the impact on social processes of changing from zero to one people in an audience is larger than the change from, say nine to ten people in an audience. While this theory would predict marginal differences in audiences up to a size of ten, it is not clear how the impact of audience size changes as it approaches very large or unknown numbers, representative of many online audiences.
CHAPTER V

Conclusion

The results from this study suggest that online self-presentation has a limited but unique impact on self-concept change. We expected that audience would have either an enhancing or diminishing effect on self-concept change in CMC relative to FTF. We also predicted that selective self-presentation would enhance the effects of self-concept change regardless of audience. However, these results were not observed. Instead we discovered an unexpected interactive effect of audience and medium that impacted the manner in which people perceived their own self-presentations. This finding suggests that audience and medium together contribute to the mediating effect of “situation” on the effects of self-presentation on self-concept change (Schlenker, 1993). Using the four-factor model of identification described by Schlenker, if the contrast of portraying a specific trait in a specific environment is too inconsistent with the “scripts” one has associated with the act of self-presentation, then it appears that individuals may react by internalizing the opposite characteristic. The presence, or absence of an audience is another component of the situation that can mediate internalization of self-presentations.

The possibility that the medium of a self-presentation plays an important role in creating the “situation” has important implications for the potential impact of CMC on self-presentations of different types of traits. For example, it may be that portraying intelligence, humor, consideration, fear or any other emotion may interact in a particular way in online environments which may result in an internalization of the opposite trait. In addition, audience may be just one other factor out of many characteristics of the medium that can mediate that effect. Future research is necessary to determine if there are identifiable online “situations” that have
systematically mediating effects on the relationship between self-presentation and self-concept. In particular, further exploration of the various forms of audience that are unique to online environments could continue to uncover unexpected findings of self-presentation in text on self-concept.
APPENDIX A

EXTROVERSION SCALE

Please put an X on the line at the point that represents the degree to which you actually possess each of the following traits.

1. Talkative ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Quiet
2. Unsociable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Sociable
3. Friendly ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Unfriendly
4. Poised ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Awkward
5. Extraverted ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Introverted
6. Enthusiastic ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Apathetic
7. Outgoing ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Shy
8. Energetic ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Relaxed
9. Warm ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Cold
10. Confident ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Unconfident
APPENDIX B

PERCEPTION OF AUDIENCE

To what extent do you think your presentation in this experiment is publicly identifiable? Do you think anyone might recognize you or know what you said during your presentation (including the psychology graduate student)?

- highly publicly identifiable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
- not at all publicly identifiable
APPENDIX C

PRESENTATION ABILITY

Do you think that you were able to give an accurate portrayal of an [introverted/extroverted] person?

unable to portray trait ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ able to portray trait
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