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ABSTRACT

How does inequality shape interpersonal interactions? This dissertation investigates individuals’ impression management strategies when interacting with others across social status divides. Chapter 1 reviews the literature, conceptualizing cross-status interactions as social comparisons and setting up hypotheses based on (a) ambivalent status-based stereotypes of warmth and competence and (b) compensation effects (warmth-competence tradeoffs) in impression management. In Chapter 2, Study 1a shows students’ motivation to affiliate with students at both lower- and higher-status universities, by strategically hiding their higher-status identities versus lower-status identities respectively. Study 1b conceptually replicates social compensation in a workplace context, revealing more warmth- versus competence-related traits, given ingratiation versus self-promotion goals respectively. In Chapter 3, Study 2 shows downward comparers downplayed their competence to appear warmer, and upward comparers downplayed their warmth to appear more competent. In status comparisons with counter-stereotypical targets, Studies 3a and 3b showed impression management strategies no longer diverge, but do not reverse, suggesting a mechanism that combines stereotype-disconfirming and target trait-matching goals. Study 4 shows lower-status participants may be matching the target’s stereotyped traits, while higher-status participants may be disconfirming stereotypes about themselves. In Chapter 4, Study 5 shows participants shifted their impression management strategies, and sent a tangible message to an assumed live interaction partner, with high-status participants cooperating more than low-status participants. Together, these studies show that mere status differences shift individuals’ interaction goals and behavior in conveying two central dimensions of impression formation, warmth and competence.

Keywords: status, social class, stereotypes, social comparison, impression management
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CHAPTER 1: RELATIVE SOCIAL STATUS AS SOCIAL COMPARISON

Inequality has risen to record levels across the globe, and continues to grow – with the United States as the most unequal among high-income industrialized nations (OECD, 2011; Smeeding, 2005). With the vast majority of gains in income and wealth accruing to the very richest, and social movements like Occupy Wall Street bringing awareness of these stark trends, academic research and the popular press have taken increased notice of how inequality impacts individuals and societies (Atkinson, Piketty, & Saez, 2009; Davies, Sandstrom, Shorrocks, & Wolff, 2009; Piketty & Saez, 2003, 2006, 2014; Stiglitz, 2011). Americans would prefer a much more equal society than what they perceive to be the status quo, and yet they dramatically underestimate just how stark inequality actually is (Norton & Ariely, 2011) while overestimating individuals’ upward mobility and underestimating downward mobility (Davidai & Gilovich, 2015). Indeed, a rising tide of increased GDP has lifted very few boats: Despite societies producing more wealth, the accompanying increase in inequality has undermined individuals and societies on measures of physical and mental health, education, social mobility, motivation, and happiness (Oishi, Kesebir, & Diener, 2011; Oishi & Kesebir, 2015; Smeeding, 2005; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009).

In addition to individual and societal-level costs, inequality and stratification also have interpersonal consequences, for example eroding trust and increasing conflict, violence and racial bias (Fiske, Moya, Russell, & Bearns, 2012; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009). The current research builds on the relatively new enterprise of investigating the interpersonal consequences of social stratification: in particular, investigating the social context created by interpersonal interactions across social status divides, and how people cope with these status comparisons by

---

1 Portions of this chapter have been published previously (Fiske, Dupree, Nicolas, & Swencionis, in press; Swencionis, Dupree, & Fiske, in press; Swencionis & Fiske, 2014, 2016).
strategically altering how they present themselves.

The experiments in Chapters 2-4 examine whether comparing downward to a subordinate versus upward to a superior shifts individuals’ concerns about how they will be perceived in an interpersonal interaction, whether specific and diverging impression management strategies— to appear relatively warm versus competent— emerge from relative status divides, how and why individuals engage in these diverging strategies, and whether behavioral consequences result from cross-status interactions in live interpersonal interactions. Specifically, Chapter 2 establishes that both higher- and lower-status individuals care about what a cross-status interaction partner thinks of them, and that individuals engage in social compensation in impression management in a workplace context: ingratiating themselves by highlighting their own warmth while hiding competence, and self-promoting by highlighting competence while hiding warmth. Chapter 3 shows that these compensation strategies emerge from mere status hierarchies, so that individuals who are relatively higher status than their interaction partners downplay their own competence to appear warmer, and relatively lower-status individuals downplay their own warmth to appear more competent. Chapter 4 investigates these interpersonal dynamics in a real-life interaction in the laboratory, and shows that they extend to cooperative behaviors in live interactions, with relatively higher-status participants sharing more resources than lower-status participants, as a tangible signal of their warmth.

These results provide new advances to the literature on interpersonal consequences of social status hierarchies, showing that mere status divides impart specific interpersonal concerns that people address in diverging and potentially mutually incompatible ways. To situate this contribution within existing literatures and set up the experimental hypotheses, the next sections review the relevant background on the psychology of social class and status, social comparisons,
ambivalent trade-offs between warmth and competence, and compensation effects in impression management.

**Social Class and Status: Societal Becomes (Inter)personal**

In their rapidly developing subfield, the social psychologies of social status and class are complex and multidimensional, with researchers continuing to debate the best measures of these constructs (Fiske, 2010; Kraus & Stephens, 2012). Social status is generally defined as a person’s position in a relative social hierarchy, regardless of differences in power. Though higher status often coincides with increased control over valued resources (power), this is not always the case: Sometimes high-ranked individuals lack the ability to enact change, and low-ranked individuals can affect others’ outcomes in substantial ways (Fiske, 2010; Galinsky, Rucker, & Magee, 2015; Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003).

Usually closely related to social status, social class usually does denote differences in power. For example, being born into a family considered lower, middle, or upper class in terms of income, education, and opportunities does indeed place a person at different levels in a relative hierarchy, but also by definition comes with differences in material and other resources such as social and cultural capital, the interpersonal connections and cultural understanding that enable upper-class individuals to achieve higher educational and occupational outcomes, perpetuating inequality (Lamont & Lareau, 1988; Lott, 2012). Even in the absence of power differences, relatively higher status in the form of ordinal rank does confer more importance, respect, and prestige, with a person’s subjective sense of relative position (for example, sense of standing in a hierarchy) being just as important as objective measures (for example, yearly income) in determining outcomes relevant to the self and to interpersonal interactions (Fiske, 2010; Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2009; Kraus & Stephens, 2012).
Objective social class measures such as level of education, income, and occupation—the three most widely used and accepted indices—are obviously important for determining life outcomes such as access to material goods and services. But subjective measures actually relate to physical health outcomes just as strongly, and to psychological well-being and affect even more strongly than do objective measures (Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2011; Kraus & Stephens, 2012). For example, objectively middle-class students in the context of a high-ranked university (with many upper-class students) feel relatively low in social standing, attenuating their feelings of belonging, and ability to regulate their behavior (Johnson, Richeson, & Finkel, 2011). The effects of subjective social class on individual and interpersonal outcomes largely take place through the social contexts specific to working-, middle-, and upper-class backgrounds, for example, with people from similar social-class backgrounds living in the same neighborhoods, attending the same schools, and working with others from their same class background (Kraus & Stephens, 2012; Lamont & Lareau, 1988; Lott, 2012). In this way, societal factors become personal and interpersonal ones (Wagner & McLaughlin, 2015).

One set of contexts determined by social class is cultural: Working-class contexts lend themselves to more socially connected contexts, fostering interdependence as a model for the self, while middle- and upper-class contexts afford more individualism and creativity, fostering independence as a model for the self (Kraus & Stephens, 2012; Markus & Kitayama, 2010). For example, when given a choice of pens, working-class individuals were more likely to choose a more popular option, while middle-class individuals preferred a more unique option; similarly, in a hypothetical scenario, working-class participants reported they would feel pleased to learn their friend had recently purchased the same new car as them, while middle-class participants reported they would feel annoyed by the diminished uniqueness of their choice (Stephens, Markus, &
While neither of these cultural models for the self is broadly better than the other, they do have consequences in certain contexts, for example in higher education. Largely rooted in American middle- and upper-class values, higher-education institutions strongly foster an independent model of the self, putting at risk “first-generation” students whose parents did not attend college, who tend to have learned to value a more interdependent model (Stephens, Fryberg, Markus, Johnson, & Covarrubias, 2012). This “cultural mismatch” can be ameliorated by (1) presenting the same university orientation materials framed in a more interdependent way, which boosts first-generation students’ achievement with no harm to continuing-generation students (Stephens et al., 2012), and (2) having first- and continuing-generation students learn about the different perspectives and challenges faced by students from different backgrounds, and how they managed to overcome their challenges (Stephens, Hamedani, & Destin, 2014). Both measures aim to shift the influence of the social context by increasing belonging and fit or by more easily discussing differences based on social class backgrounds that resulted in different challenges and approaches.

Recent research builds on how relative differences in social class affect not only aggregate outcomes and individual consequences, but also this dissertation’s focus, interpersonal interactions, showing how individuals gauge where an interaction partner stands on the relative social-class hierarchy and react accordingly. In one investigation of nonverbal behavior in interpersonal interactions, higher-status participants showed greater disengagement: doodling, grooming and checking their cell phones, compared to lower-status participants, who engaged in more laughing, eye contact, and head nodding. From these brief “thin slice” signals of engagement (or lack thereof) in the interaction, separate observers accurately predicted these
participants’ relative socioeconomic status (Kraus & Keltner, 2009), showing one set of interpersonal consequences of status hierarchies. Taking lower-status individuals’ increased prosocial orientation a step further, lower-status participants more accurately read others’ emotional facial expressions (Kraus, Cote, & Keltner, 2010) and were more generous toward fellow participants in material allocations (Piff et al., 2010). Even without overt categorical differences, people effectively communicate and understand signals of social standing, providing a ready basis for social comparisons and inferences.

In the current perspective, two dimensions, competence and warmth (or liking) are critical in forming impressions about others in interpersonal interactions at all levels of a status hierarchy. Perceived warmth and competence drive both evaluations of the self (e.g., Tafarodi & Swann, 1995) and evaluations of others (Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2006; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). As described in various models in social cognition including the stereotype content model (SCM), competence and warmth consistently account for a vast proportion of variance in individuals’ judgments of other individuals and groups (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Fiske et al., 2006, 2002; Wojciszke, 2005). In regard to others, dimensions of warmth and competence respectively may have evolved to answer two basic survival questions regarding another person: Does the other person intend to help or harm? Is the other person capable of acting on those intentions? (Fiske et al., 2006) In the context of interactions within social status hierarchies, targets playing an interdependent versus independent game with the perceiver are perceived as warmer, and higher status targets (denoted by parents’ occupations) are perceived as more competent (Fiske et al., 2006; Russell & Fiske, 2008).

If differences in status help determine how people perceive others (Cuddy et al., 2009; Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008, 2007; Fiske et al., 2006; Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999), and if
people intuitively understand that stereotypes of high or low competence follow from relative status differences, then individuals may also try to counteract status-based stereotypes about themselves in interactions that involve downward or upward comparisons in relative social status.

**Relative Status as Social Comparison**

Though the psychological study of social class is relatively new (Fiske & Markus, 2012; Kraus & Stephens, 2012; Lott, 2012), one framework for investigating the psychology of relative advantage is given by a history of research in social comparison. A longstanding literature tells us that humans are never done comparing themselves to others. Status hierarchies are ever-present, and not only in obvious places like military organizations and corporations; even non-human primates organize themselves hierarchically, and automatically interpret signs of social rank (Fiske, 2010). Because status hierarchies pervade human societies and organizations, interpersonal interactions with lower- or higher-status others are inevitable.

These relentless comparisons to one’s subordinates or superiors can yield useful information: Gauging our relative social standing may help people feel good about themselves when compared to a subordinate, or motivate self-improvement when compared to a superior (Festinger, 1954; Suls, Martin, & Wheeler, 2014). Relative social comparisons can be especially helpful in evaluating the self when cognitive resources are limited (Corcoran & Mussweiler, 2010). Although people might theoretically prefer more absolute indicators for purposes of accurate evaluation of their own abilities or beliefs, in many parts of social life, our standing relative to those around us may be at least as relevant as absolute measures in determining important outcomes, as observed from subjective versus objective measures of social class or rank. Information about relative inequality can serve as a basis for inferring what the actual
objective standard should be (Lowery, Chow, & Crosby, 2009).

Even when objective or absolute status information is available, relative status comparisons may more strongly predict happiness when comparisons are unavoidable. Indeed, although higher absolute income is generally related to greater subjective well being (Kahneman & Deaton, 2010), this relationship is moderated by income inequality: For people who live in more unequal places, happiness is related to their relative, not absolute income (Cheung & Lucas, 2015). Baseline well-being also matters: While unhappy participants’ evaluations of their own performance were influenced by both downward and upward comparison targets, happy participants were influenced only by downward comparisons (Lyubomirsky & Ross, 1997).

When better- and worse-off others are readily available comparison targets, and when perceivers are relatively unhappy, comparisons become even more powerful.

Self-enhancement and self-improvement from relative status comparisons notwithstanding, relentless social comparison can be dangerous. The drive to compare the self to others yields emotions, stereotypes, and behaviors that harm individuals and cross-status relationships (Fiske, 2010, 2011). The disadvantage or discomfort of being a comparison target on either side of a relative status divide may be one reason social class differences are difficult or uncomfortable to discuss (Kraus & Stephens, 2012).

In contrast with Festinger's (1954) theory suggesting that individuals prefer to use objective information (at least when available), instead of relative information about themselves, subsequent research on social comparison reveals that individuals actually constantly and automatically compare themselves to others who are either better- or worse-off on a wide range of dimensions, including social status (Buunk & Gibbons, 2007; Fiske, 2011; Suls et al., 2014; Suls & Wheeler, 2012). Much of this research investigates questions about when and why
individuals choose to engage in upward and downward comparisons: Usually people choose upward comparison targets when they seek inspiration or information about how to learn or improve the self, and prefer downward comparison targets when they seek self-enhancement (i.e., feeling better about their current level of standing) on a given dimension (e.g., Blanton, Crocker, & Miller, 2000; Buunk & Gibbons, 2007; Festinger, 1954; Taylor & Lobel, 1989).

Individuals are more likely to compare the self to a better- or worse-off other when they need not actually interact face to face; people use social comparisons to gauge their standing or motivate improvement, but both kinds of comparisons are uncomfortable when they involve actually interacting with the upward or downward comparison target (Buunk & Gibbons, 2007). One reason may be an awareness that overt social comparisons are uncomfortable for everyone involved.

While past research helps to understand the reasons for engaging in upward and downward social comparisons, people are not always able to choose their preferred comparison target or even whether to compare. In fact, what happens after identifying the comparison target may be the most important part of a comparison. What approach do individuals take when faced with an unavoidable upward or downward comparison, in a situation where they care about the outcome, or about the relationship between themselves and the comparison target? In societies where social class divides are starker than ever, it should matter how individuals cope with difficult interpersonal interactions with better- or worse-off others. One method of coping may be for individuals to shift their impression management strategies, crafting an image of the self to counteract the stereotypes thought to describe members of their low- or high-status group. Such diverging approaches in impression management may provide one way to ease the discomfort of interacting with someone better- or worse-off than the self.
The Target’s Perspective in Social Comparisons

Most of the social comparison literature focuses on the perceiver’s perspective, including perceivers focusing on a downward or upward comparison target according to different goals as described above. However, this describes only one side of any comparison: In an interpersonal interaction, an entry-level employee might focus on qualities about the boss to try to emulate, but the employee might also consider what the boss thinks. The target’s perspective in these comparisons is especially relevant to the interpersonal aspect of status: While people might try to self-improve by copying qualities of higher-status targets, or self-enhance by comparing themselves favorably to lower-status targets, these goals pertain mostly to the self. Moving from the perceiver’s to the target’s perspective allows us to consider what interpersonal goals and concerns people might have in the context of a cross-status interaction: To what extent do people care about what someone else thinks of them in terms of negative stereotypes about their own lower or higher status group?

A significant and growing literature describes the extensive negative effects of being the target of stigma, one kind of downward status comparison – not only in direct interpersonal interactions, but as a constant condition of life. Crocker and colleagues define stigma as an “attribute or characteristic that conveys a social identity that is devalued in a particular social context” (1998; p. 505). Thus, stigma applies to different social contexts, and varies over time and across cultures; a person could be stigmatized for any number of different devalued characteristics that mark lower status, and could be devalued in terms of warmth, competence, or both (Fiske, 1998; Kraus & Stephens, 2012; Kraus, Tan, & Tannenbaum, 2013; Major & O’Brien, 2005).

Being the target of a downward status comparison has known consequences, as shown by
research on the experience of stigmatized group members, who endure stress as a result of relative status hierarchies. Social stress involved in cross-status and cross-race interactions engenders a physiological threat response, hindering cognitive control and performance on important day-to-day tasks (Mendes, Blascovich, Lickel, & Hunter, 2002; Mendes, Blascovich, Major, & Seery, 2001; Richeson et al., 2003).

In addition to the short-term and interpersonal consequences of being considered “less than,” the experience of stigma also leads to long-term negative effects on achievement and a host of serious negative health effects through emotional and physiological processes (Gallo & Matthews, 2012; Mays, Cochran, & Barnes, 2007; McEwen, 2000; Sapolsky, 2005; for a review, see Major & O’Brien, 2005). These short- and long-lasting negative consequences are all reasons why people might avoid being the target of downward comparisons.

Perhaps more surprisingly, being the target of upward social comparison is also not an entirely positive experience. Humans at the top of a hierarchy can feel unstable or insecure in their high-status position if there is a risk of being overtaken, just like nonhuman primates in unstable hierarchies, resulting in negative health effects due to stress (Fiske, 2010; Sapolsky, 2005). High-status individuals also tend to feel uncomfortable or guilty about their relative advantage, which may have been gained unfairly (Exline & Lobel, 1999, 2001; Phillips & Lowery, 2015).

In particular, Exline and Lobel (1999, 2001) show that individuals feel “sensitivity to being the target of a threatening upward comparison” (or “STTUC”) when they outperform someone they care about in a mutually important domain. The more someone cares about the outperformed person (as expressed in daily diaries), the more negative affect is felt in response to being the target of upward comparisons (Koch & Metcalfe, 2011). This framework brings
together past work on self-evaluation maintenance in social comparisons (e.g., Tesser & Collins, 1988) and other research perspectives to detail how being a target of envy can actually feel aversive, resulting in underestimates of one’s own abilities or performance and feelings of guilt or distress. Ironically, then, higher-status individuals may also encounter situations in which they would rather avoid their envied relative positions, or at least the stereotyped impressions that accompany high status. Thus being the target of downward or upward comparisons can harm individuals and relationships.

Relatively little research has investigated how to reduce the harmful effects of social comparisons. One promising possibility suggests that creating a broader identity that includes the comparison target can attenuate some of the threatening effects of comparison (Gardner, Gabriel, & Hochschild, 2002).

**Ambivalent Warmth-Competence Tradeoffs**

Along with interdependence, social status plays a critical role in how people perceive and categorize others. As noted, social perceivers use common dimensions of warmth and competence to determine others’ good or ill intentions, and their ability to act on those intentions, respectively (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Cuddy et al., 2008, 2007; Fiske et al., 2006, 2002, 1999; Fiske, 2011). Theoretically, warmth and competence judgments vary independently (Wojciszke, 2005), but in practice they are often negatively correlated, so that many groups are stereotyped ambivalently as warm but incompetent, or competent but cold – an effect termed social compensation (Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005; Kervyn, Yzerbyt, & Judd, 2010; Yzerbyt, Provost, & Corneille, 2005). For example, older people are perceived as warm but incompetent, and regarded with pity, whereas rich people are perceived as competent but cold, and regarded with envy (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2006, 2002; Kervyn, Fiske, &
Yzerbyt, 2015). Though it may seem less harmful to perceive groups as positive on one dimension rather than negative on both, regarding people with envy (up) or scorn (down) is detrimental to targets, perceivers, and relationships between them (Fiske, 2011).

These ambivalent, or one-sided, stereotypes are so ingrained that accentuating only one positive dimension about a person actually implies negativity on the omitted dimension – an indirect language of stereotypes perpetuated by both communicators and listeners (Kervyn, Bergsieker, & Fiske, 2012). Indeed, the tendency to focus on the positive dimension of an ambivalent stereotype while implying the negative dimension has increased over the last 75 years, as social norms against expressing overtly negative prejudice have developed (Bergsieker, Leslie, Constantine, & Fiske, 2012).

Applying not just to specific groups, ambivalent stereotypes also imbue how people think about higher- and lower-status others. People spontaneously infer a target person’s competence from status cues (Darley & Gross, 1983; Oldmeadow & Fiske, 2007; Russell & Fiske, 2008), with status and competence judgments positively correlated across 36 cross-national samples (Cuddy et al., 2009, 2007; Durante et al., 2013; Fiske et al., 2006). Ambivalent tradeoffs also apply, with a negative relationship assumed between inferred competence and warmth: People judge higher-status others as more competent but less warm, while lower-status others are judged as warmer but less competent (Cuddy et al., 2009, 2007; Fiske et al., 2002; Fiske, 2010; Kay & Jost, 2003).

As noted, subjective judgments of relative status are at least as important as more objective or absolute levels of status (Fiske, 2010, 2011; Kraus et al., 2009; Moore, Merchant, Kahn, & Pfeifer, 2013). When describing a group, a speaker can subtly but effectively communicate the group’s relative power and status, by referring to one group as the norm and
another (otherwise equal) group as the target of comparison; as a result, listeners judge the normative group as having status, including perceived high agency and low communion (Bruckmüller & Abele, 2010). In this way, inequality, ambivalent stereotypes, and norms of communication may perpetuate stereotypes of high- and low-status targets as respectively cold-but-competent and incompetent-but-warm.

Seeing rich people as clever but cold, or poor people as kind but incompetent, helps people feel better about the unequal status quo, leading them to perceive an increased sense of fairness about general stratification and specific others’ positive or negative outcomes (Glick & Fiske, 2001; Jost, Gaucher, Stern, Nagel, & Newman, 2015; Jost & Kay, 2005; Kay & Jost, 2003). Group members are at least sometimes aware of these stereotypes, with high-status group members recognizing their being perceived as competent (but not necessarily warm) and low-status group members recognizing their being perceived as warm (but not necessarily competent) (Oldmeadow & Fiske, 2010). Reflecting this possibility, on a wider scale, cross-national research shows stereotypes are more strongly ambivalent in countries with higher income inequality, as measured by the Gini coefficient (Durante et al., 2013). In other words, the societal becomes interpersonal: The more people in a given country are stratified by income, the more its citizens think about each other in one-sided terms: cold-but-competent versus warm-but-incompetent. If indeed people in more unequal societies perceive others more ambivalently at the interpersonal level, then people in cross-status interactions may use self-presentational strategies accordingly to counteract these one-sided stereotypes about themselves, because relative status differences are especially salient in cross-status interactions.

The current research investigates how people portray themselves in terms of warmth and competence in interpersonal interactions across status divides. The literature on compensation
between warmth and competence in impression management provides an empirical precedent for this work, and suggests that impression management strategies in the face of group stereotypes depend on the social context.

Compensation Effects in Impression Management

Warmth and competence judgments matter for the self as much as they do for others (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007). Indeed, appearing warm and appearing competent are two central strategies people reliably use to affect the impressions others form about them (Jones & Pittman, 1982; Leary & Kowalski, 1986; Schlenker & Weigold, 1992). When trying to “ingratiate” themselves, or appear warm and likable, people act agreeable and friendly; when trying to “self-promote,” or appear competent, they assert themselves.

Ingratiation and self-promotion are only two of various possible impression management motives that different social situations demand; Jones and Pittman (1982) describe ingratiation and self-promotion in their taxonomy, in addition to intimidation (appearing dangerous), exemplification (appearing moral), and supplication (appearing vulnerable). These different goals share some qualities between them (for example, a goal to be liked may result in similar behaviors as a goal to be seen as moral), can be held simultaneously, and are not exhaustive.

Everyday social life affords virtually endless opportunities for strategic self-presentation, with combinations of goals that can be quite complex, for example requiring individuals to consider not just what others think of them, but what others think they think, and so on (Goffman, 1959). In Goffman’s estimation, based on theory and ethnographic study, the need to strategically present the self in different ways depending on which audience is watching goes so deep that there may not even be a “true self” behind the layers of acting. Psychological accounts may not go so far as to suggest that all interpersonal behavior has impression management in
mind, but would usually agree that people are strongly motivated to make a good impression, and that social contexts vary widely, calling on different and sometimes overlapping impression-management strategies (Jones & Pittman, 1982).

Impression-management strategies vary widely, and three different strategies each trade off between warmth and competence. First, when *unconstrained by group stereotypes*, individuals emphasize either their own warmth or their own competence, depending on whether the group they want to join seeks someone friendly or intelligent (Holoien & Fiske, 2013). In this situation, not only do participants emphasize the relevant positive dimension, they also downplay the other dimension: To come across as more competent, participants actively *avoid* describing themselves as warm, and to come across as warm, actively *avoid* describing themselves as competent. This compensation effect uniquely emerges between warmth and competence, not other dimensions such as health or political interest (Holoien & Fiske, 2013, Study 2; Yzerbyt, Kervyn, & Judd, 2008), showing these tradeoffs’ strategic nature in managing impressions based on a commonly understood negative relationship between competence and warmth. The current research extends these studies to impression goals of appearing warm or competent that are activated spontaneously by a hierarchical social context, without any explicit prompt to ingratiate or self-promote.

Second, compensation between warmth and competence occurs not only when given explicit social goals to appear warm or competent, but also in interracial interactions *when individuals’ (lack of) warmth and competence are presumed based on stereotypes*. Bergsieker, Shelton, and Richeson (2010) show that members of different racial groups seek to disconfirm pre-existing, group-based stereotypes of their own groups’ (im)morality and (un)intelligence in interracial interactions. Because of divergent stereotypes of Whites as racist (immoral) and
Blacks and Latinos as unintelligent, members of these majority and minority groups show diverging goals in impression management. In both pre-existing interracial relationships, and in laboratory interactions, Whites prefer to be liked, or be seen as warm, more than minorities do, and racial minorities prefer to be respected, or seen as competent, more than Whites do. The more these impression management goals differ in real-life interracial relationships, the more negative emotion results from interracial (but not same-race) interactions, suggesting that these opposing strategies for coping with interracial interactions may backfire and foster misunderstandings. Race may imitate status (Dupree & Fiske, in preparation). The current research extends these studies of interracial interactions to interpersonal interactions across mere status divides.

Third, some strategies might claim a stereotyped positive trait intentionally, rather than try to disconfirm it – specifically, when that trait reflects a social identity related to one’s group, such as strength in achievement in academics or athletics, respectively perceived as involving more competence or more warmth. One strategy for pursuing a positive social identity involves taking pride in the domain in which one’s group is stereotyped as being strong, while discriminating against outgroups who are presumed weak in that domain. For example, students at a high-status school emphasize their perceived superiority on competence, and show ingroup favoritism based on academic skills but not athletic skills (theorized to involve sportsmanship and cooperation), while students at a low-status school emphasize their perceived superiority on warmth, and show favoritism based on athletic but not academic skills, all dependent on the students’ individual levels of collective identification with their school (Oldmeadow & Fiske, 2010). In addition to bolstering their comparative strengths, lower-status individuals tangibly show in-group favoritism by allocating resources to improve their group’s standing (Rubin,
Badea, & Jetten, 2014). As long as the current social situation is amenable to the in-group’s stereotypical strength (e.g., athletic or academic skills), claiming the positive dimension can help maintain a positive, distinct social identity and provide a basis for in-group favoritism.

All three strategies (stereotype-free, stereotype-rejecting, and stereotype-claiming) suggest impression management goals that focus on one dimension while downplaying the other. The dissertation sought to understand the core phenomenon, diverging impression-management goals, as one reason for difficult interactions across social status divides. From previous research on stronger ambivalent stereotypes in more unequal societies (Durante et al., 2013), diverging impression management goals in interracial interactions (Bergsieker et al., 2012), and social compensation in impression management (Holoien & Fiske, 2013), it follows that impression management in downward and upward status comparisons may also require tradeoffs to disconfirm status-based stereotypes of coldness or incompetence. If so, then downward comparers should emphasize their warmth, and upward comparers should emphasize their own competence, to disconfirm stereotypes about their own relatively high- versus low-status.

To our knowledge, no studies to date have investigated (1) whether diverging impression management goals toward warmth versus competence emerge from interactions across mere relative status divides, in addition to the specific interracial interactions already studied, and (2) whether social compensation tradeoffs in impression management arise spontaneously from upward and downward status comparisons, not just when people are prompted to appear competent or warm. If people see others more ambivalently when status divides are starker (Durante et al., 2013), then people may manage impressions accordingly: ingratiating themselves in downward status comparisons, and self-promoting in upward status comparisons.
Experiment Overview

The studies described in Chapters 2–4 investigate the strategies people use to manage interpersonal aspects of status hierarchies. The studies define status as a relative position in a social hierarchy. Because the workplace is the most prominent example of status in Americans’ day-to-day lives (Fiske, 2010), the paradigms draw on workplace scenarios that place individuals in a ranked order. The framework hypothesizes that individuals seek to appear more warm versus competent in downward comparisons, and more competent versus warm in upward comparisons, showing compensation effects (as in Kervyn, Judd, & Yzerbyt, 2009) in impression management across status divides.

First, Study 1a establishes an empirical basis for individuals’ caring what higher- or lower- status others think of them. Specifically, this study tests whether individuals selectively reveal their own lower- versus higher-status identities based on their interaction partner’s status. Study 1b tests whether specific interaction goals to self-promote versus ingratiate in a workplace scenario initiated strategic, compensatory self-presentation in terms of competence versus warmth. Study 2 tests whether downward versus upward status comparisons caused a selective focus on conveying participants’ own competence versus warmth. Studies 3a and 3b disentangle two possible mechanisms for these diverging strategies: Participants might emphasize their own warmth or competence to disconfirm their own stereotyped deficits, but they also might try to match their partner’s (oppositely) stereotyped warmth and competence levels. Further untangling these two possibilities, Study 4 suggests participants’ motivation differs based on the comparison direction, with downward comparers focusing on disconfirming stereotypes about their own warmth and competence, and upward comparers focusing on matching their partner’s stereotyped warmth and competence. Study 5 tests whether diverging impression management
strategies extend to actual interpersonal interactions, and whether these diverging strategies extend to behavior, in the form of tangible cooperative versus selfish outcomes.

Predictions of diverging impression management strategies are based on the frequently negative correlations (i.e., ambivalence) between competence and warmth, the observed tendency to trade off between warmth and competence based on current social contexts (Holoien & Fiske, 2013) which may be highlighted by mere relative differences in social status, and the need to disconfirm group-based negative stereotypes about the self (Bergsieker et al., 2010). The motivation to disconfirm stereotypes of coldness or incompetence in interracial interactions may indicate a broader phenomenon that extends to relative status divides, and to our knowledge these are the first studies to test this possibility. If so, these diverging impression management goals may be critical in people’s everyday interactions, given the pervasive role of status hierarchies in all societies.
CHAPTER 2: DOES STATUS RAISE IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT CONCERNS?²

Study 1a: Concealing Negative Identities

Why would individuals care in the first place what higher- or lower-status others think about them? This study explores dynamics of interpersonal interactions across status divides, specifically whether individuals emphasize higher- or lower-status aspects of themselves when given the opportunity to choose between emphasizing one of two different pre-existing identities about themselves (i.e., different groups to which they belong). Research in separate literatures has shown evidence for individuals’ sensitivity to being the target of downward scorn (e.g., Major & O’Brien, 2005) and for sensitivity to being the target of threatening upward comparisons (e.g., Exline & Lobel, 1999). This study explores whether these experiences are felt from both sides of a single cross-status interaction.

One way to compensate for one’s different social status would be to minimize the gap between self and other by revealing one’s low-status aspects (versus high-status aspects) depending on the direction of comparison. Study 1a thus tested whether people use a “matching” strategy by selectively revealing high- versus low-status identities respectively to relatively higher- or lower-status others. Moreover, this may suggest a target-matching goal that might also underlie cross-status impression management strategies in subsequent studies. Because school identities are a salient feature of college student life, and because relative college ranks appear to be accessible to students especially at prestigious universities, this study focused on college students’ experiences of interpersonal interactions with students at higher- versus- lower ranked universities.

Method

² Portions of this research were presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology meeting in 2014 and at the European Association of Social Psychology meeting in 2014.
Participants. Participants were 33 undergraduate students (15 female) enrolled in introductory psychology courses at a prestigious university. Participants received partial course credit as compensation.

Procedure. Participants were induced to think about past experiences of describing themselves in terms of their higher-status university identities (“Think back to a specific time when you introduced yourself to someone else as a [high-status university name] student. Whom were you talking to? What was the situation like?”) and also their lower-status state identities (“Think back to a specific time when you introduced yourself to someone, but did not reveal your university identity (for example, “I go to college in [low-status state].”). Whom were you talking to? What was the situation like?”). Participants also rated how they felt in terms of 22 different emotion items when introducing themselves in terms of their higher- and lower-status identities (e.g., proud, embarrassed, alienated, content) on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely; see Appendix A). Some emotion items were drawn from Sensitivity about being the Target of Threatening Upward Comparisons (STTUC) (Exline & Lobel, 1999), and others were added (See Appendix A).

Then, participants completed measures indicating their comfort level with bringing up their higher- and lower-status identities in different interpersonal contexts (How comfortable are you bringing up your [high-status university name/low-status state] identity?): first, in a conversation with a student from a relatively even higher-status university, a student from a

---

3 None of the reported effects were moderated by participant gender, and it is not discussed further. It is possible that in other status-relevant scenarios, especially those in which target gender is specified, that gender may play an additional, important role in impression management strategies (e.g., Steckler & Rosenthal, 1985).

4 We hypothesized these emotion items might play a role in why participants used different impression management strategies depending on comparison direction. However, these emotion factors did not show any effects of condition, so they will not be discussed further.
relatively lower-status university, or a student whose college identity was unknown; and second, situations in which participants actively brought up their own identity in conversations, versus situations in which participants’ identities were revealed by a friend (e.g., “How comfortable would you feel if your friend (who was standing next to you) mentioned that you were a [high status university name] student?”). We manipulated the source of disclosure (self or friend) to be able to see whether results were due to personally wanting to share the identity information, versus merely wanting the information to be known. All comparison targets and situations were presented to all participants, and the order of comparison targets was counterbalanced.

Last, participants completed measures of self-esteem (Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001) and Social Comparison Orientation (SCO) (Gibbons & Buunk, 1999). We hypothesized participants lower in self-esteem and higher in SCO might show more divergent impression management strategies.

**Results and Discussion**

Our main interest was students’ comfort with revealing high- versus low-status identities, to a high- versus- low- versus unknown-status comparison target, either directly or indirectly (i.e., stating one’s own identity vs. a friend revealing one’s identity. A 2 (own identity: high-status vs. low-status) x 3 (comparison target: upward vs. downward vs. unknown) x 2 (revealer: you reveal identity vs. friend reveals identity) repeated measures ANOVA showed three significant main effects: an effect of comparison target, such that students were most comfortable

---

5 Self-esteem moderated the two-way interaction between comparison target and revealer, $F(8,56) = 2.91; p = .01, \eta^2 = .29$, but this three-way interaction was not in an interpretable pattern. No other effects were moderated by self-esteem, and it is not discussed further.

6 SCO $\alpha = .83$. SCO moderated the two-way interaction between revealer and identity, $F(13,19) = 2.92; p = .03, \eta^2 = .81$, but this three-way interaction also was not in an interpretable pattern. No other effects were moderated by SCO and it is not discussed further.
interacting with the higher-status student \((F(2,31) = 13.15; p < .001, \eta^2 = .46)\), an effect of revealers, such that students were more comfortable bringing up identities themselves than having a friend bring up their identity \((F(1,32) = 13.25; p = .001, \eta^2 = .29)\), and an effect of own identity, such that students were more comfortable revealing their low-status identity versus their high-status identity \((F(1,32) = 6.05; p = .02, \eta^2 = .16; Figure 1)\).

Most importantly, the comparison context mattered to how comfortable participants felt discussing their high- and low-status identities: As predicted, a significant two-way interaction between comparison target and own identity showed that when comparing downward or to an unknown target, participants preferred their low-status identities, which was not the case when comparing upward \((F(2,31) = 26.71; p < .001, \eta^2 = .63; Figure 1)\). Additionally, a significant two-way interaction between revealer and identity showed that when their low-status identity comes out, participants prefer to reveal it themselves, with less preference regarding who reveals their high-status identity \((F(1,32) = 5.61; p = .02, \eta^2 = .15; Figure 1)\). The ANOVA did not show a significant 3-way interaction.

Study 1a showed that, at least when participants had a choice between a high- and low-
status identity to reveal, the comparison direction matters, and so does how the identity is revealed. Participants were more comfortable revealing their low-status identities in downward or unknown comparisons, but not in upward comparisons.\textsuperscript{7} When expressing their low-status identity, it seemed especially important to participants to reveal this identity themselves, as opposed to having it revealed by a friend, a preference not evident when revealing their high-status identity. This study showed evidence of spontaneously shifting self-presentation goals in different status comparison contexts, such that participants sought to match their comparison target in both comparison directions. Not only did students prefer for their friend to reveal their high-status identity (versus their low-status identity) in upward comparisons, but they also avoided revealing their higher-status identities to lower-status others, showing initial evidence for impression management concerns in both directions across social status divides.

This study did not address how these different comparisons might lead participants to present themselves in terms of warmth and competence, and did not address whether participants’ matching strategies were respectively due to goals to ingratiate versus self-promote. However, the compensation effect would suggest that revealing a lower-status (less competent) aspect would make one seem warmer in a downward comparison, and vice versa in an upward comparison. The next study addresses these goals by testing whether ingratiation (show warmth) versus self-promotion (show competence) encourages compensation, trading off between competence and warmth. These data will fill out a second component of our general hypothesis about the relationship between status comparison and social compensation in impression management.

\textsuperscript{7} In our sample of high-status students, it is possible that unknown comparisons may seem likely to be downward, in which case they prefer not to reveal their higher status identity.
Study 1b: Impression Management in the Workplace

Study 1a observed effects of status comparisons, and Study 1b sought to examine social compensation separately. In a more focused test of impression-management strategies, Study 1b examined whether a focus on ingratiation versus self-promotion motives in a workplace scenario would cause participants to describe themselves using relatively more warmth- versus competence-related adjectives; this conceptual replication of social compensation in impression management (Holoien & Fiske, 2013) used a different setting and different dependent variables, setting up the standard by which Studies 2-5 could provide evidence for compensation effects in response to mere relative-status divides.

Participants imagined a job interview scenario in which the interviewer especially cared about whether the prospective candidate was a “team player” (ingratiation motivation) versus an “efficient worker” (self-promotion motivation), and reported how they would describe themselves (Operario & Fiske, 2001). We hypothesized participants would invoke more warmth than competence adjectives when ingratiation was relevant, more competence than warmth adjectives when self-promotion was relevant, and with intermediate numbers of warmth and competence traits when both or neither motive was relevant.

Method

Participants. We recruited 240 participants (126 female) through Amazon.com’s Mechanical Turk, and compensated them at current market rates. Participant gender marginally moderated the four-way interaction between ingratiation, promotion, events and trait dimension, F(1,224)= 4.06; p = .05, η^2 = .02, but this interaction was not in an interpretable pattern. No other effects were moderated by participant gender, nor were effects in subsequent studies.

---

8 Participant gender marginally moderated the four-way interaction between ingratiation, promotion, events and trait dimension, F(1,224)= 4.06; p = .05, η^2 = .02, but this interaction was not in an interpretable pattern. No other effects were moderated by participant gender, nor were effects in subsequent studies.
compensation and selection criteria were identical in all subsequent Mechanical Turk studies.\(^9\)

**Procedure.** Participants were informed that the study concerned interpersonal communication in different types of interview settings, and that they would imagine describing to an interviewer different hypothetical events that have happened to them, as well as different personal qualities. First, participants rated themselves on 20 trait adjectives, half competence-related (e.g., *ambitious; capable*) and half warmth-related (e.g., *considerate; generous*), selected from a previous study (Anderson, 1968) and pre-tested on an independent sample to be similar on overall likability. This rating exercise was provided to have participants reflect on both warmth- and competence-traits that they would later be able to convey to their interviewer before the interview scenario began, and the ratings were not intended to be analyzed, nor did we hold hypotheses about certain participants who happened to rate themselves differently on these traits.

Next, participants were randomly assigned to one of four different interview conditions: ingratiation (“You have been assigned to an interviewer who cares most about whether you are a team player with strong social skills”), self-promotion (“…whether you are an efficient worker with a strong work ethic”), both (“…cares equally about whether you are an efficient worker with a strong work ethic, and whether you are a team player with strong social skills”), or neither (“You have been assigned to an interviewer”). Participants were asked to imagine how they would share information about themselves with such an interviewer.

Next, participants read a list of 10 hypothetical events related to competence, and were asked to imagine these events had happened to them at some time in the past. For each

\(^9\) In all studies conducted on Mechanical Turk, we decided a priori to recruit 50 participants per between-participants cell, recommended by Simmons (2014) as a starting point to detect reliable but small to medium effects.
participant, these events were either all positive (e.g., developed a complex filing system for your company) or all negative (e.g., left the windows open while washing your car), and were presented in random order (items pre-tested in Fuhrman, Bodenhausen, & Lichtenstein, 1989). Participants decided which of these hypothetical past experiences, if any, they would share with their interviewer.\(^{10}\)

As the critical dependent variable in Study 1b, participants then reported which of the trait adjectives about themselves they would share with their interviewer. They were given a list of 10 warmth adjectives and 10 competence adjectives (Appendix B), with the option to share vs. not share each of these traits in the interview setting, with no limit on the number of items shared.\(^{11}\) Thus, participants could select anywhere from 0 to 10 warmth adjectives and from 0 to 10 competence adjectives. Last in the interview scenario, participants rated how they would feel talking to this interviewer about themselves, using 22 emotion items on a scale of 1 (\textit{not at all}) to 5 (\textit{extremely}). Lastly, participants completed measures of self-esteem (Robins et al., 2001)\(^{12}\) and SCO (Gibbons & Buunk, 1999).\(^{13}\)

**Results and Discussion**

Our main interest was to conceptually replicate the compensation effect (Kervyn et al., 2009) with variables suited to impression management in workplace social comparisons. Thus

---

\(^{10}\) Event type was manipulated to give another opportunity to share positive or negative competence-related information in the interview scenario as another opportunity to emphasize one’s own high or low competence, prior to the critical dependent variable.

\(^{11}\) There was a main effect of trait dimension, such that participants shared significantly more competence traits ($M = 6.96$, $SD = 2.42$) than warmth traits ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 3.18$) about themselves, $t(239) = -3.84$, $p < .001$. This result is likely related to the fact that competence is stressed in interview settings. However, our primary interest was the interaction effects.

\(^{12}\) Self-esteem moderated the main effect of trait dimension, $F(4,201) = 2.91$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .06$, such that participants with higher self-esteem shared more warmth traits than participants with lower self-esteem, while self-esteem did not differentiate the number of competence traits shared. Self-esteem did not moderate any other effects.

\(^{13}\) SCO $\alpha = .54$. SCO did not moderate any effects.
we tested whether participants described themselves using more competence versus warmth adjectives when given a goal to self-promote (versus when not given a goal to self-promote), and more warmth versus competence adjectives when given a goal to ingratiate (versus when not given a goal to ingratiate). The resulting overall 3-way design was thus 2 (between-participants ingratiation vs. no ingratiation: team player and “both” conditions, versus efficient worker and “neither” conditions) x 2 (between-participants promotion vs. no promotion: efficient worker and “both” conditions vs. team player and “neither” conditions) x 2 (repeated measures trait dimension: warmth vs. competence).14 Tests of the specific compensation effects for the pure ingratiation and pure self-promotion conditions will follow.

Trait dimension interacted with both ingratiation goals ($F(1,232) = 105.03; p < .001, \eta^2 = .31$) and self-promotion goals ($F(1,232) = 29.27; p < .001, \eta^2 = .11$), indicating that when given a goal to ingratiate (alone or in the “both” condition), participants shared more warmth ($M = 7.33, SD = 2.67$) versus competence ($M = 6.32, SD = 2.53$) traits ($F(1,232) = 16.67, p < .001$), a pattern that flipped when not given an ingratiation goal (warmth $M = 4.61, SD = 3.08$; competence $M = 7.62, SD = 2.11; F(1,232) = 107.91, p < .001$). Self-promotion goals also prompted compensation: When given a goal to self-promote (alone or in “both” condition), participants shared more competence ($M = 7.18, SD = 2.10$) versus warmth ($M = 5.11, SD = 3.09$) related traits ($F(232) = 50.97, p < .001$), not the case without a self-promotion goal ($p=.53$); see Figure 2, collapsed across event valence to show the two-way interactions relevant

14 As described in the methods section, we also manipulated the valence of the hypothetical past competence-related events, which we thought might also affect self-descriptions. However, this variable did not interact with other variables of interest.
Testing the main hypothesis for this study, simple effects tests showed that participants did indeed downplay competence to appear warmer in the pure ingratiation condition, and downplayed warmth to appear more competent in the pure self-promotion condition: This compensation strategy did in fact emerge in both the pure ingratiation (warmth $M = 7.98$, $SD = 2.60$; competence $M = 5.90$, $SD = 2.89$; $F(232) = 26.16, p < .001$) and pure self-promotion conditions (warmth $M = 3.47$, $SD = 2.64$; competence $M = 7.66$, $SD = 1.99$; $F(1,232) = 115.37, p < .001$); compensation was also evident in the “neither” condition (warmth $M = 5.88$, $SD = 3.05$; competence $M = 7.59$, $SD = 2.25$; $F(1,232) = 17.00, p < .001$), possibly due to the general interview context, which may suggest an emphasis on self-promotion (Figure 2). Note that not only is the goal-relevant dimension higher, but the goal-irrelevant dimension is lower, in each case. That is, ingratiation lowers competence, and self-promotion lowers warmth, relative to the other goal and to the “neither” condition. With no limit on the number of traits shared, warmth and competence traits shared are independent of each other (i.e., this trade-off is not dictated by the dependent variable).

\footnote{ANOVA showed a significant 4-way interaction ($F(1,232) = 4.14; p = .04, \eta^2 = .02$), though this result was not of primary interest to the main hypotheses regarding compensation between warmth and competence based on social goals.}
Emphasis on being a “team player” (i.e., ingratiation) led participants to describe themselves using significantly more warmth vs. competence traits, and emphasis on being an “efficient worker” (self-promotion) led participants to use significantly more competence vs. warmth traits.

A subsidiary goal was to see whether participants’ disclosing positive versus negative events differed depending on motivations to promote versus ingratiate, but a main effect of event valence ($F(1,232) = 243.85; p < .001, \eta^2 = .51$) was not qualified by any interactions of interest; the interview setting likely discouraged discussing negative events.

Thus, Study 1b showed compensation between participants’ revealing warmth vs. competence traits based on social goals during an interview setting: Participants with an ingratiation goal shared more warmth vs. competence traits about themselves, and participants with a self-promotion goal shared more competence vs. warmth traits. This study conceptually replicated the compensation effect in a workplace scenario and showed that participants placed differential importance on displaying their own competence vs. warmth, depending on the
Together, Studies 1a and 1b showed that (a) participants in cross-status interactions do feel they have reason to craft impressions according to the status-comparison direction, and conceal higher- or lower-status identities accordingly, and that (b), trading off between sharing warmth and competence traits about the self by downplaying the off-dimension is one appropriate way to manage impressions and appear relatively more warm or competent in a work context. The next study seeks to show that these diverging strategies of downplaying competence versus warmth emerge spontaneously from downward and upward comparisons in social status, the first study to do so to our knowledge.
CHAPTER 3: DIVERGING STRATEGIES, AND DIVERGING REASONS FOR THEM

Study 2: Spontaneous Diverging Strategies

Study 2 investigated whether diverging impression management strategies spontaneously emerged from upward and downward mere status comparisons. Specifically, this study tested whether participants’ impression management strategies in terms of warmth and competence adjectives diverged in downward versus upward status comparisons. Participants imagined interacting with someone in their workplace who was ranked below, above, or equal to them, with no reporting responsibilities to each other (to isolate status from power differentials; Fiske, 2010). We hypothesized participants would prioritize describing themselves using warmth-(versus competence-) related traits when interacting with a subordinate; conversely, we expected participants would prioritize describing themselves using competence- (versus warmth-) related traits when interacting with a superior. If ingratiation and self-promotion strategies are consciously relevant, then participants may also report higher importance of appearing warm versus competent in downward versus upward comparisons.

Method

Participants. We recruited 151 participants (83 female) through Mechanical Turk.

Procedure. Participants learned that the study concerned interpersonal communication in different types of interactions, and were asked to imagine their workplace had organized a new initiative in which employees were paired with others from non-overlapping divisions. Participants were randomly assigned to imagine being paired with an employee who was in a lower-ranked position, higher-ranked position, or a same-rank position as theirs. Because they

16 The studies described in this chapter are reported in (Swencionis & Fiske, 2016), and portions were presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology meetings in 2014, 2015, and 2016, and at the European Association of Social Psychology meeting in 2014.
belonged to different divisions, they were also informed, for upward, downward, and neutral comparisons respectively: They did not report to their partner, their partner did not report to them, or they were not connected to their partner in any way.

After free-responding to describe how they thought the interaction would go, participants rated the extent to which they wanted their partner to know each of 20 different traits about themselves. Ten traits conveyed competence (e.g., ambitious; capable), and ten conveyed warmth (e.g., considerate; generous). Traits were chosen from Anderson (1968), pre-tested on an independent sample for similar overall likability, presented in randomized order, and rated from 1 = definitely do not want them to know, to 7 = definitely want them to know. Ratings were averaged within warmth and competence dimensions to measure participants’ self-presentation in terms of warmth and competence.

Next, participants were asked directly about their self-presentation goals, and rated how important it was to be liked versus respected on a scale of 1 (most important to be liked) to 7 (respected), and how important to be seen as competent (1) versus warm (7) by their interaction partner. Participants could also free-respond, listing up to 5 other items to share about themselves. Participants then rated how they would feel about the interaction, using 22 emotion items (Appendix C).

**Results and Discussion**

Our main interest was whether an emphasis on presenting competence versus warmth would emerge spontaneously from upward versus downward comparisons. Indeed, a 3 (downward vs. upward vs. neither) x 2 (warmth vs. competence) ANOVA showed a significant interaction ($F(2,148) = 4.14; p = .02, \eta^2 = .05$; Figure 3). Specifically, downward comparers rated warmth ($M = 5.90, SD = .74$) significantly higher than competence ($M = 5.73, SD = .76$)
traits, and upward comparers rated competence \((M = 5.92, SD = .78)\) marginally higher than warmth \((M = 5.74, SD = .83)\) \((F(1,148) = 3.56, p = .06)\) traits. Neutral comparers did not differentiate \((p = .76)\).

*Figure 3.* Downward comparers wanted to convey warmth vs. competence traits, and upward comparers wanted to convey competence vs. warmth traits, with no difference in neutral comparisons.

Status also shifted participants’ explicitly self-reported importance of appearing warm versus competent: ANOVA showed a significant effect of status \((F(2,148) = 5.48; p = .005)\), with Tukey’s test showing downward comparers \((M = 3.29, SD = 1.68)\) held significantly stronger warmth goals than neutral comparers \((M = 2.33, SD = 1.42, p = .004)\), and though not significant, trending in the expected direction with stronger warmth goals than upward comparers \((M = 2.65, SD = 1.53, p = .12)\) (Figure 4). Though we predicted similar differences in liking versus respect goals, explicit self-reports did not differ by status \((ps > .14)\). As one
speculative interpretation, liking goals seem similar to goals to appear warm, but participants may have wanted to appear warm (or competent) for other, perhaps simpler, reasons than wanting to be liked or respected. Nonetheless, participants’ explicit impression goals, in addition to traits shared, depended on the comparison direction, with downward comparisons shifting goals toward warmth.

![Figure 4](image.png)

*Figure 4.* Participants’ explicit reports of self-presentational strategies revealed significantly greater importance of conveying warmth in downward versus neutral comparisons, and marginally greater importance of conveying warmth in downward versus upward comparisons.

Lastly, emotion ratings did not differ by condition, suggesting explicitly measured emotional responses to status cannot explain diverging impression management strategies. We also included emotion ratings in Studies 3a and 3b. They did not differ and are not discussed further.

Study 2 supports a compensation effect in impression management across status divides, in which participants disconfirm stereotypes of themselves as either competent-but-[relatively]
cold or warm-but-[relatively] incompetent. However, a possible alternative explanation suggests participants may be trying to match what they assume are the target’s levels of warmth and competence, based on status stereotypes, which would produce a similar result in terms of impression management strategies. For example, participants might downplay their own warmth when interacting with a superior, not to differentiate themselves from their (assumed) warm-but-incompetent low-status peers, but to appear similar to the (assumed) competent-but-cold superior. Studies 3a and 3b sought to disentangle these explanations by describing targets’ actual warmth and competence, in addition to relative status.

**Study 3a: Disconfirming Coldness, or Matching Warmth?**

Study 3a investigated whether an interaction partner’s status or actual traits would drive participants’ impression management strategies when the target’s traits conflicted with status-based stereotypes. In addition to learning the target’s relative rank at work, participants also learned the target was rumored to be very friendly or not very friendly, yielding an opportunity to match these warmth traits, regardless of relative status.

We made three different predictions: (1) In the *stereotype-disconfirming* hypothesis, participants manage impressions based on relative status: conveying more warmth than competence traits to subordinates, and more competence than warmth traits to superiors, across all friendliness conditions. (2) In the *matching* hypothesis, participants manage impressions based on their partner’s high or low warmth: conveying more warmth than competence traits to friendly coworkers, and more competence than warmth traits to unfriendly coworkers, across all status conditions. (3) In the *intermediate* hypothesis, participants combine disconfirming and matching strategies: conveying more warmth than competence traits toward the stereotypical friendly subordinate, and more competence than warmth traits to the stereotypical unfriendly
boss, with little or no discernible difference between warmth and competence when interacting with a counter-stereotypical friendly boss or unfriendly subordinate. In this intermediate case, neither disconfirming nor matching would be the sole reason for diverging strategies (and neither hypothesis could be ruled out entirely).

**Method**

**Participants.** We recruited 202 participants (83 female) through Mechanical Turk.

**Procedure.** As in Study 1, participants were randomly assigned to imagine being paired with a superior or subordinate, with no interdependence (Studies 3a and 3b had no same-rank condition).

New to Study 3a, participants also learned the target’s reputed friendliness: “…you hear from a co-worker that this person is [not] very friendly.”

Also new, participants chose which traits about themselves they would share, instead of rating each trait. Participants could share anywhere from 0 to 20 traits from a combined, randomized list (10 warmth and 10 competence; same traits as Study 1b and Study 2). We used this dichotomous measure for each trait to permit fewer unsure responses. The number of warmth and competence traits shared served as impression management measures. Participants were also asked about their self-presentation goals and emotions (Appendix D).

**Results and Discussion**

Replicating Study 2’s status compensation effects, a 2 (downward vs. upward) x 2 (warmth vs. competence) ANOVA showed a significant interaction ($F(1,198) = 14.86; p < .001, \eta^2 = .07$; Figure 5). Collapsing across friendliness conditions, downward comparers shared significantly more warmth ($M = 6.66, SD = 2.84$) than competence ($M = 5.58, SD = 2.80$; $F(1,198) = 11.94, p = .001$) traits, and upward comparers shared more competence ($M = 6.39, SD$
than warmth ($M = 5.83, SD = 3.20; F(1,198) = 4.03, p = .046$) traits (Figure 5).

These compensation effects were strongest in stereotype-consistent conditions: Participants shared significantly more competence ($M = 7.04, SD = 2.63$) than warmth ($M = 5.59, SD = 3.39$) traits with unfriendly superiors ($F(1,198) = 10.07, p = .002$) and significantly more warmth ($M = 7.38, SD = 2.56$) than competence ($M = 5.63, SD = 2.75$) traits with friendly subordinates ($F(1,198) = 16.44, p < .001$), but did not compensate toward counter-stereotypical friendly superiors or unfriendly subordinates ($p$’s >.39). In other words, participants compensated for stereotypes of their relative status, but counter-stereotypical targets mitigated this effect, suggesting an “intermediate” combination of disconfirming and matching strategies.

In addition to the disconfirming effect, a 2 (friendly vs. unfriendly) x 2 (warmth vs. competence) ANOVA also showed a significant interaction ($F(1,198) = 11.93; p = .001, \eta^2 = .06$), supporting matching as well. This effect seems driven by sharing more warmth versus competence traits with friendly targets: Collapsing across status, participants shared significantly more warmth ($M = 6.70, SD = 2.89$) than competence ($M = 5.74, SD = 2.64$) traits with friendly targets $F(1,198) = 10.44, p = .001$), while participants shared marginally more competence than warmth traits with unfriendly targets ($p = .09$). This result supports matching, in addition to disconfirming, when targets are described as friendly.

Further supporting the intermediate hypothesis, the three-way interaction between status, stereotypicality, and trait dimension ($F(1,198) = 11.93; p = .001, \eta^2 = .06$) reiterates that, in line with status stereotypes, participants compensated between warmth and competence toward stereotypical but not counter-stereotypical targets.
Figure 5. Downward comparers shared more warmth than competence traits and upward comparers shared more competence than warmth traits, but only when the target’s friendliness matched status stereotypes.

Together, results support the intermediate hypothesis between stereotype-disconfirming and target trait-matching accounts: Participants used diverging strategies toward stereotypical friendly subordinates and unfriendly bosses, an effect attenuated by counter-stereotypical friendliness information. Participants are not solely disconfirming stereotypes, nor are they solely matching their interaction partners: The target’s status and traits are both important. Neither the stereotype-disconfirming hypothesis nor the matching hypothesis is exclusively supported, but neither is ruled out.

**Study 3b: Disconfirming Incompetence, or Matching Competence?**

In Study 3b, complementary to Study 3a, participants learned about a lower- or higher-ranked coworker’s intelligence, yielding an opportunity to match an intelligent target’s
competence, regardless of status. Three alternate predictions followed from Study 3a: (1) stereotype-disconfirming, (2) target trait-matching, and (3) intermediate.

Method

Participants. We recruited 200 participants (92 female) through Mechanical Turk.

Procedure. The procedure was identical to Study 3a, except that instead of learning about the upward or downward comparison target’s reputed friendliness, participants learned about the target’s reputed intelligence: “…this person is [not] very intelligent.” Dependent variables were identical to Study 3a.

Results and Discussion

Replicating Study 2 and Study 3a, participants sought to disconfirm status stereotypes, supported by a 2 (downward vs. upward) x 2 (warmth vs. competence) ANOVA showing a significant interaction ($F(1,196) = 9.71; p = .002, \eta^2 = .05$; Figure 6). This interaction appears driven by participants’ downplaying competence to subordinates: Collapsing across target intelligence conditions, downward comparers shared significantly more warmth ($M = 6.52, SD = 2.96$) than competence ($M = 5.22, SD = 2.83; F(1,196) = 16.91, p < .001$) traits, while upward comparers did not share more competence than warmth traits in this study ($p = .78$) (Figure 6).

Again, participants compensated more toward stereotypical targets. Downward comparers shared significantly more warmth ($M = 6.83, SD = 2.69$) than competence ($M = 4.79, SD = 2.81$) traits with stereotypical unintelligent subordinates ($F(1,196) = 19.79, p < .001$), and did not differentiate toward counter-stereotypical intelligent subordinates ($p = .19$). Upward comparers shared marginally more competence ($M = 6.83, SD = 2.69$) than warmth ($M = 6.07, SD = 3.08$) traits with stereotypical intelligent superiors ($F(1,196) = 2.63, p = .11$), but did not differentiate toward counter-stereotypical unintelligent superiors ($p = .18$).
In addition to disconfirming, results also support matching, evidenced by a 2 (intelligent vs. unintelligent) x 2 (warmth vs. competence) ANOVA yielding a significant interaction \((F(1,196) = 9.62; p = .002, \eta^2 = .05)\). This matching effect appears driven by downplaying competence traits toward unintelligent targets: Collapsing across comparison directions, participants shared significantly more warmth \((M = 6.60, SD = 2.98)\) than competence \((M = 5.34, SD = 2.81)\) traits with unintelligent targets \((F(1,196) = 17.45, p < .001)\), while not differentiating toward intelligent targets \((p = .79)\). This result supports matching, in addition to disconfirming, specifically for stereotypical unintelligent subordinates.

Again supporting the intermediate hypothesis, the three-way interaction between status, stereotypicality, and trait dimension \((F(1,196) = 9.62; p = .002, \eta^2 = .05)\) shows status divides prompted social compensation toward stereotypical but not counter-stereotypical targets.
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**Figure 6.** Downward comparers shared more warmth than competence traits and upward comparers shared more competence than warmth traits, but only when the target’s intelligence
matched status stereotypes.

Together with Study 2 and Study 3a, these results suggest both motivations to disconfirm stereotypes and match one’s partner contribute to diverging impression management strategies.

**Study 4: Different Comparisons, Different Goals**

Study 4 sought to replicate diverging impression management strategies in cross-status interactions, and to examine whether participants’ goals (disconfirming versus matching) depend on the comparison direction. At the study’s end, participants rated their partner’s warmth and competence, and also rated how they thought their partner perceived them on the same dimensions. If participants report a difference between their partner’s warmth and competence, then they may have reason to try to match their partner’s traits. If, on the other hand, participants report a difference between how their partner perceives their warmth versus competence, then participants may seek to disconfirm these one-sided stereotypes about themselves.

**Method**

**Participants.** We recruited 152 participants (82 female) through Mechanical Turk.

**Procedure.** The procedure was similar to previous studies, with these changes: First, to encourage participants to immerse themselves in a real comparison, we asked them to write down the initials of an actual person in their workplace who was higher, lower, or the same as them in rank. Second, as in Studies 1b, 3a, and 3b, we used the dichotomous version of our main dependent variable, allowing participants to share 0-10 warmth traits and 0-10 competence.

---

17 For participants not currently employed in hierarchical workplaces (15, gauged by open-ended end-of-survey “occupation” responses), this status manipulation remained hypothetical. Based on related power-priming research, even hypothetical primes affect felt power (or status), and accordingly, we retain these participants in our results; for a review: Galinsky, Rucker, & Magee (2015). Importantly, including these participants should weaken the status manipulation, not strengthen it, so there was not a clear a priori reason to remove these participants from analysis.
traits about themselves.

Third, we asked participants to rate perceived warmth and competence of their interaction partner, and also how warm and how competent they thought their interaction partner would rate them (i.e., meta-perceived warmth and competence). These perceived and meta-perceived warmth and competence ratings would determine whether participants might sense a reason to disconfirm status stereotypes about the self or to match one’s interaction partner. For example, if participants rated their higher-status partner as competent but cold, that would be a basis for matching. If participants thought their higher-status interaction partner would rate them as warm but incompetent, that would be a reason to try to disconfirm stereotyped incompetence.

Fourth, we included an exploratory public and private self-consciousness measure, hypothesizing status effects on impression management might depend on individuals’ tendencies to mold to their social surroundings (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975). Last, we included a manipulation check to confirm explicit recognition of the partner’s higher, lower, or similar social status (3-point scale).

Results and Discussion

Replicating results from Studies 2, 3a, and 3b, status shifted participants’ self-promotion and ingratiation, as shown by a 3 (downward vs. upward vs. neutral) x 2 (warmth vs. competence) ANOVA yielding a significant interaction ($F(2,148) = 11.989; p < .001, \eta^2 = .14$; Figure 7). Downward comparers shared significantly more warmth ($M = 6.92, SD = 3.09$) than competence ($M = 5.23, SD = 2.98$) ($F(1,149) = 20.54, p < .001$) traits, and upward comparers shared significantly more competence ($M = 6.86, SD = 2.52$) than warmth ($M = 5.94, SD = 2.98$; $F(1,149) = 5.82, p = .02$) traits, not differentiating in neutral comparisons ($p = .25$). Confirming

---

18 Public and private self-consciousness did not affect the results described and are not discussed further.
the status manipulation ($F(2,149) = 46.97; p < .001$), downward comparers perceived targets as significantly lower ($M = 1.51, SD = .64$), and upward comparers perceived targets as significantly higher ($M = 2.63, SD = .56$) status, both compared to neutral ($M = 2.10, SD = .56$; Tukey-corrected $p$’s < .001).
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*Figure 7.* Replicating Studies 1, 3a, and 3b, downward comparers shared more warmth than competence traits and upward comparers shared more competence than warmth traits with a named coworker, with no difference in neutral comparisons.

Next, we examined whether status influenced perceived and meta-perceived warmth and competence. A 2 (partner vs. self) x 2 (warmth vs. competence) x 3 (downward vs. upward vs. neutral) ANOVA showed a significant three-way interaction ($F(2,149) = 11.40, p < .001, \eta^2 = .13$; Figure 8).

Breaking this down, for downward comparers, the two-way interaction between target
and dimension \(F(1,149) = 5.62, p = .02\) showed participants thought their partners would judge them as significantly more competent \((M = 5.58, SD = 1.28)\) than warm \((M = 4.91, SD = 1.42; F(1,149) = 12.59, p < .001)\), but did not rate their partners as differentially warm versus competent \((p = .84)\). Participants in a relatively high-status position therefore may be concerned about appearing competent but cold, a reason to disconfirm coldness stereotypes.

For upward comparers, the two-way interaction between target and dimension \(F(1,149) = 18.78, p < .001\) showed participants do not rate their partner’s perception of them as differentially warm versus competent \((p = .69)\), but participants do rate their partner as significantly more competent \((M = 5.80, SD = 1.34)\) than warm \((M = 4.69, SD = 1.39; F(1,149) = 32.80, p < .001)\). Participants in a lower-status position thus may be focused on their interaction partner’s stereotyped high competence, not their own stereotyped competence deficits, a reason to try to match their interaction partner.

Participants in the neutral condition did not show the interaction between target and dimension \((p = .71)\), instead showing a main effect of dimension: Neutral comparers rated both themselves and their partners as significantly more competent \((M_{self} = 5.52, SD_{self} = 1.05; M_{partner} = 5.88, SD_{partner} = 1.02)\) than warm \((M_{self} = 4.81, SD_{self} = 1.35; M_{partner} = 5.06, SD_{partner} = 1.39; F(1,149) = 28.58, p < .001)\); one reason may be a general emphasis on competence in the workplace. If self and partner are both more competent than warm, neutral comparers need not compensate, supported by their non-compensation in Studies 2 and 4.
Figure 8. Downward comparers may try to disconfirm competent-but-cold stereotypes, not worrying about matching their interaction partner, suggested by a difference between warmth and competence in the self but not the other. Upward comparers may try match their interaction partner, who they rate as more competent than warm, with no difference for the self.

Study 4 replicates diverging impression management strategies across status divides, and suggests participants’ goals depend on the comparison direction. Higher-status participants may focus more on what their interaction partner thinks about them, and avoid appearing competent-but-cold, while lower-status participants may try to match their (assumed) competent interaction partner, not necessarily trying to disconfirm stereotypes about themselves.
CHAPTER 4: DIVERGING STRATEGIES AND BEHAVIORS IN LIVE INTERACTIONS

Study 5: Status Divides Shift Interpersonal Behavior and Cooperation

Do impression management strategies diverge in real cross-status interactions, does verbal and nonverbal behavior reflect these differences, and what are the interpersonal consequences? If verbal and nonverbal behaviors reflect mismatched downward ingratiation and upward self-promotion strategies, this could be one reason why cross-status interactions are difficult. Additionally, impression management concerns may affect cooperative outcomes: If so, we would predict downward comparers, ingratiating themselves, would engage in more cooperative behavior, while upward comparers, self-promoting, would engage in more selfish behavior.

Accordingly, Study 5 included measures of verbal and nonverbal behavior and cooperative outcomes in an apparently live, video-mediated conversation to investigate whether impression management strategies extend to behavior. This study manipulated social status in the laboratory, investigating whether participants in an ostensibly live interaction with another student would show diverging impression management strategies, whether these diverging strategies would extend to cooperative versus selfish behavior in dividing a common resource, and whether participants’ verbal and nonverbal behavior in the interaction would reflect the traits they chose to share about themselves.

Method

Participants. Participants were 100 students (70 female) who were enrolled in

---

19 This research was presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology meeting in 2016.
introductory psychology courses at a prestigious university. Participants received partial course credit as compensation.

**Procedure.** The procedure was based closely on Study 3a in Bergsieker, Shelton, and Richeson (2010). Participants came to the lab to participate in an “interactive task study” in which they would complete a decision-making task with another study participant, answer questions about the task and about their partner, and answer some questions about themselves.

Upon arriving at the lab, an experimenter welcomed each participant and asked them to put their things down in an adjoining lab room, next to the coat and backpack of the ostensible other participant, who would be the participant’s partner in today’s decision making task. After being seated at a table with two chairs, the participant signed a study log next to their partner’s signature, learning that their partner had just begun Part One of the study in an adjacent lab room.

The experimenter explained that the current research was about the influence of personality traits on impression formation and performance in different forms of interpersonal interactions, extending recent research that has examined the effects of different communication media on workplace performance (for example, communicating face to face vs. videoconferencing). The participant learned that after completing a personality assessment alone on a computer (Part One), the two partners would interact either face to face in the “direct” condition or via an exchange of videos in the “remote” condition (Part Two), as determined randomly by a computer after the personality assessment. Finally, both participants would complete Part Three, the interactive decision-making task, from their individual computers in

---

20 After finding compensation effects in samples of 50 participants per between-participants cell in Studies 1b, 2, 3a, 3b, and 4, we retained this sample size standard in Study 5, which was conducted in person. Due to this high sample size standard, we did not include a “neutral” comparison condition in this study.
adjacent lab rooms. The participant then signed a consent form, and the experimenter left the room ostensibly to check on the other participant while the participant began Part One, the personality assessment (really the experimental manipulation of social status), on a computer.

**Status Manipulation.** Participants learned that they would complete a short assessment that would determine their roles for the rest of the study, followed by a direct or remote interaction with their partner, and finally the interactive decision-making task. To determine who would be responsible for what parts of the task, participants learned they (and their partners) would complete a test of numerical estimation style, a trait related to individuals’ relative strengths in team-based projects. Specifically, participants learned that numerical estimation style has been shown to predict leadership and collaboration abilities. In reality, participants were randomly assigned to receive feedback about their ostensible personality test results that informed them they were either more of an overestimator or underestimator, a result that suggested they are likely to have respectively better skills in leadership versus collaboration, as detailed in the following paragraph. This “minimal” experimental manipulation of social status was adapted loosely from a minimal group induction paradigm designed to create group-based social identities in a laboratory setting (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971).

Participants received instructions to estimate how many dots appeared on each screen, estimating as closely as possible in the short time provided. Participants estimated the dots in each of six different dot array patterns, and waited for the computer apparently to gather data from their partner’s assessment and calculate results. Participants learned their results indicated they were either an overestimator, suggesting traits associated with leadership skills and resulting in assignment to the role of *Decision Manager* (high status), or an underestimator, suggesting traits associated with collaboration skills and resulting in assignment to the role of *Decision
Responder (low status). Participants were asked to free-respond listing any observations about themselves that related to their status as either the Decision Manager or Decision Responder. Participants were prompted on the computer screen to notify the experimenter they had completed Part One. This instruction was presented on a screen that no longer stated the participant’s status, so the experimenter remained blind to condition.

Impression management goals. The experimenter informed the participant that they would now have a conversation with their partner in a semi-structured interview format in which the two participants would take turns answering questions from the experimenter. Participants learned the conversation would take place either face to face or through video-mediated communication, depending on random assignment to the direct or remote condition. The computer informed all participants of their assignment to the remote condition. The experimenter explained that in the remote condition, instead of their partner returning to the study room for the conversation, the two participants would send each other their responses in a video. The participant then recorded their answers to three “warm up” questions to get used to talking with their partner on camera (Could you please state your participant number? Can you tell me a little about your classes this semester? Can you tell me a little about the last movie you saw?). The experimenter informed the participant that after going next door to record the partner’s responses to the questions first, she would return to show the participant the partner’s videotape and record the participant’s responses.

While the experimenter was next door, the participant completed questions about the upcoming interaction, including the main impression management measure. Participants were reminded on the computer screen of their respective roles, and then learned that to inform their partner’s first impressions, they could share some personality traits about themselves with their
partner. Traits included ten warmth-related and ten competence-related words, with similar overall likeability ratings, with no limit on the number of traits chosen. The number of warmth- and competence-related traits served as the main impression management measure. Participants were also asked to list five items about themselves they wanted their partner to know. Finally, participants were asked to rate the relative importance of being seen as competent (1) versus warm (7) and also the relative importance of being liked (1) versus respected (7). After finishing these questions, the participant reviewed the list of interview questions on a sheet of paper and wrote down point-form notes on how they would answer the questions, if desired. The interview questions provided opportunities to ingratiate themselves (e.g., “Is there anything you would like to change about your social life?”) and self-promote (e.g., “Could you say a little about your career goals?”).

**Interpersonal interaction.** The experimenter returned with the ostensible other participant’s video recording, actually a gender-matched, pre-recorded confederate with standardized answers to the interview questions. After each answer given by the “partner,” the experimenter paused the partner’s video, and set the video camera to record, for the participant to answer the same question and respond to their partner. After the participant responded to all of the questions, the experimenter left, apparently to show the participant’s responses to their partner while the participant answered the post-interaction questions. These included questions about how unpleasant (1) or pleasant (7) the interaction was, how cold (1) or warm (7) their partner is, how incompetent (1) or competent (7) their partner is, how cold (1) or warm (7) their partner thinks THEY are, how incompetent (1) or competent (7) their partner thinks THEY are, and a 23-item measure of public and private self-consciousness and social anxiety (Fenigstein et
Participants were prompted on-screen to notify the experimenter they had completed Part Two.

**Cooperation measure.** Lastly, the experimenter introduced the interactive decision-making task, explaining that the task involves both participants collecting tokens to be traded in for fun-sized candy at the end (10 tokens for one piece of candy, rounding up). The participant and their partner ostensibly played the game interactively, from their computers in adjacent study rooms. First, the computer informed participants the decision making task had two parts, and that their role as Manager or Responder would be important in the second part of the task. Participants were reminded of their respective roles, and then shown instructions for a public goods game.

Instructions and cooperation measures were based on a prior study (Rand et al., 2014). The participants and their partners were given a common pool of 40 tokens, and were instructed to decide how many tokens to take out of the pool for themselves, and how many to leave in the pool, with a maximum of 20 taken out of the pool for each participant. The tokens left in the pool would be multiplied by 1.5 and then split evenly between the two participants. So the group as a whole is best off when no one takes anything out of the pool, but individuals may be better off if they take all 20 tokens out of the pool and their partner leaves some in the pool to be multiplied and split. Participants were given comprehension measures, then chose how many tokens they would take out of the pool.

Participants completed manipulation check and demographic questions ostensibly while waiting for their partner to complete the decision-making task, and then were prompted to retrieve the experimenter. Participants were informed that the experiment was over, they could take as much or as little candy as they liked, and were thanked and debriefed.
**Behavior coding.** Two coders who were blind to experimental condition assessed each participant’s nonverbal and verbal behavior in categories related to ingratiation and self promotion (as in Bergsieker et al., 2010; coding scheme adapted from Godfrey et al., 1986). Behaviors were rated on a scale of *not at all* (0) to *extremely* (10) after listening to or watching all seven answers. Nonverbal behaviors were coded with the sound turned off, and verbal behaviors were coded with the screen turned off. Coded nonverbal behaviors included smiling, nodding, eye contact, posture, hand gestures, nonverbal confidence and engagement; verbal behaviors included humor, self-deprecation, flattery, friendliness, noting similarities, noting differences, agreeing, disagreeing, mentioning achievements, confident speaking style, confident content, and verbal engagement. Coders also rated participants’ overall goals: liking, respect, intimidation, exemplification, and supplication; their consistency between the warm-up and interaction items, and genuineness; and counted the number of direct second-person pronouns used. Behavioral engagement, both verbal and nonverbal, sometimes moderates behavioral effects in interpersonal interactions, especially in simulated and video-mediated conversations in which participants may feel more or less connected with their interaction partners (Bergsieker et al., 2010). Verbal and nonverbal engagement ratings were averaged to form a composite (α = .81).

**Results and Discussion**

**Impression-management strategies.** Replicating the previous studies, relative social status shifted participants’ impression-management strategies. Participants engaging in downward comparisons showed ingratiation strategies when sharing traits about themselves, while upward comparers did not, as shown by a marginal 2 (downward vs. upward) x 2 (warmth vs. competence traits) interaction ($F(1,98) = 3.29; p = .07; \eta^2 = .03$) (Figure 9). Downward
comparers shared significantly more warmth ($M = 4.82, SD = 2.67$) than competence ($M = 3.10, SD = 1.89$) ($F(1,50) = 16.73, p < .001$) traits, and upward comparers did not show this pattern of downward ingratiation ($p = .14$). A cautionary note about interpreting marginal findings is warranted here: Though the downward ingratiation pattern matches our past results very closely, in this study, the pattern did not fully reverse in upward status comparisons. Interpreted in light of several previous studies, one might speculate that changes in the participant population and/or the different status manipulation used here may continue to show similar effects of downward ingratiation, but not for upward self-promotion. More specifically, though participants in the “Responder” upward comparison condition were no less likely to believe the minimal status manipulation ($p = .42$), these participants, students at a high-status university, may on some level not accept the premise of being lower status than their peers. Indeed, previous research has shown that unfavorable information about the self is perceived as less accurate than unfavorable information about others (e.g., Eagly, 1967).

Figure 9. Participants engaging in downward comparisons used ingratiation strategies, sharing relatively more warmth- than competence-related traits about themselves, while upward comparers did not.
**Interpersonal cooperation.** As we predicted, conveying a tangible signal of warmth, downward-comparing Managers took significantly fewer tokens out of the common pool \((M = 3.86, SD = 6.47)\) than did upward-comparing Responders \((M = 7.22, SD = 7.67)\), indicating relative cooperation \((F(1,97) = 5.57; p = .02)\). Relative to each other, in interpersonal interactions, higher-status participants were thus more cooperative, while lower-status participants were more selfish in dividing shared resources (Figure 10).
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*Figure 10.* Relative to each other, in interpersonal interactions, higher-status participants were more cooperative while lower-status participants were more selfish in dividing shared resources.

**Verbal and nonverbal behavior.** Coders’ ratings were averaged for each participant, to create each participant’s score on each behavior. Behaviors showed an interrater correlation of \(r = .82\) and an item loading of at least \(.42\) in a varimax-rotated factor analysis. The resulting factors closely matched groups of behaviors related to ingratiation and self-promotion observed in Bergsieker et al. (2010): A resulting ingratiation factor included verbal friendliness, liking
goals, comfort, smiling, eye contact, humor, nodding, noting similarities, flattery, and intimidation (reverse); a self-promotion factor included posture, respect goals, confidence in content and style, nonverbal confidence, and mentioning achievements. Surprisingly, we did not find evidence of differing ingratiation or self-promotion behaviors by condition.\textsuperscript{21}

One speculative possibility on why verbal and nonverbal impression management behaviors did not diverge across status conditions is that if participants already conveyed their ingratiation and self-promotion goals by choosing traits to share with the other participant, they may have already alleviated an impression management goal, freeing them to interact with less such pressure. Another possibility is that ingratiation goals were generally strong in the face of a somewhat subtle, contextual status manipulation.

Study 5 replicates and extends evidence for diverging impression management strategies across status divides, using a different, contextual manipulation of relative social status, bringing interpersonal interactions into the laboratory, and showing status divides shift actual interpersonal behavioral outcomes, including the extent to which participants cooperate with each other in a public goods game. Because this study did not include a neutral comparison condition, results do not indicate whether the effect of status on cooperation is stronger for high or low status interaction partners. Future studies could investigate whether high status or low status interaction partners shift their cooperation behavior more, compared to partners in a neutral comparison.

\textsuperscript{21} As in Bergsieker et al. (2010), we also hypothesized that effects of verbal and nonverbal impression management behaviors might emerge only among highly-engaged participants. However, in the current study verbal and nonverbal ingratiation and self-promotion behaviors did not significantly diverge between status conditions when excluding participants who fell below median engagement scores from analysis.
The cooperation result has new implications for how people allocate resources in interpersonal settings, showing in direct interpersonal interactions with each other, the higher-status person gives more, and the lower-status person takes more. We suggest this pattern of downward cooperation and upward selfishness is an attempt to send interaction partners a tangible signal about themselves, proving to their partner that they are not really so selfish (Managers) or so ineffectual (Responders) as their ostensible personality test results and associated status-based stereotypes would indicate.

Testing whether relative status would indeed shift interpersonal cooperation behavior, the current paradigm used a one-shot public goods game to see whether participants would use relative cooperation as a signal to their interaction partners. However, the typical paradigm used in the cooperation literature—an iterated or repeated game—might play out differently, and future research would need to investigate what cooperative dynamics might evolve in repeated trials between players of different social status. As one possibility, after sending a signal to their partner to disconfirm their coldness or incompetence in the first few trials, players might eventually converge on a more mutually beneficial (i.e. cooperative) division of collective resources. However, this possibility is speculative, and future experiments would need to test how repeated trials between relatively higher- and lower-status participants would affect the results found here.

Bringing these results into conversation with an emerging literature on status and cooperation, our results show that in apparent interpersonal interactions in which people care about their partner's impression of them, they might actually use relative cooperation vs. selfishness as a signal of their own (non-stereotypical) intentions. This downward cooperation result serves as an exception to past findings that higher social class individuals are relatively
less generous and engage in more unethical behavior (Piff et al., 2010; Piff, Stancato, Côté, Mendoza-Denton, & Keltner, 2012). At the interpersonal level, status may determine mismatched allocation preferences in a way that’s different from the abstract, macro level. Specifically, higher status people may be aware of their reputed lack of generosity, and in an interpersonal setting may try to make up for it. Combined with participants’ verbal and nonverbal behavior in interpersonal interactions across status divides, these mismatched cooperation outcomes show another marker of why people may find it difficult to interact with others who are higher or lower in status.
CHAPTER 5: GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary

The current research shows different impression-management strategies arise from downward versus upward status comparisons. Relatively higher-status participants ingratiate themselves by downplaying their own competence to emphasize their own warmth, and relatively lower-status participants self-promote, downplaying their own warmth to emphasize their own competence. Participants showed affiliation motives toward both lower- and higher-status targets, concealing higher- and lower-status identities to avoid standing out (Study 1a), and compensated between warmth and competence to fulfill ingratiation versus self-promotion goals in a workplace setting (Study 1b). These diverging ingratiation versus self-promotion strategies arose from mere status comparisons, absent specific group-based stereotypes or prompts to try to appear warm or competent (Study 2), and were moderated by counter-stereotypical information about targets’ actual warmth and competence (Studies 3a and 3b). Participants’ goals may differ depending on the comparison direction, with higher-status participants disconfirming their own stereotyped coldness, and lower-status participants matching their partners’ stereotyped competence (Study 4). In other words, divergent impression management strategies may happen for diverging reasons. Just as in scenarios involving work colleagues, diverging impression management strategies also emerged from ostensible live cross-status interactions in the laboratory, with relative downward cooperation in sharing material resources as a concrete behavioral outcome (Study 5).

In all cases, participants seek to minimize perceived gaps in warmth and competence assumed from status differences, whether the focus is on disconfirming stereotypes about the

---

22 Parts of this chapter are published in (Swencionis & Fiske, 2016).
self, trying to be more like their interaction partner, or a combination of both, and in imagined interactions between students at higher- or lower-ranked universities, colleagues who rank higher or lower in the workplace, and minimal status role assignments in in-person interactions.

**Contribution**

A central new contribution of this work is evidence that social inequality at the interpersonal level raises particular interpersonal concerns. Specifically, a simple cue about whether an interaction partner is higher or lower in rank produces a goal to appear more competent or warmer. The current experiments accomplish this contribution to the literature on the interpersonal consequences of inequality in two separate pieces.

First, these studies advance research about social compensation in impression management, showing compensation effects emerge not only when people are tasked with explicit social goals to appear more competent or warmer (Holoien & Fiske, 2013), but also spontaneously from hierarchical social contexts. In other words, a mere difference in social status is sufficient to raise impression management goals to selectively self-promote or ingratiate oneself to an interaction partner.

As the second piece, these studies also expand research on goals to disconfirm group-based stereotypes: Extending work on Whites’ ingratiation versus racial minorities’ self-promotion goals in interracial interactions (Bergsieker et al., 2010; Dupree & Fiske, under review), the current studies show diverging impression-management goals extend to a broader set of cross-status interactions, even without specific racial categories. This extension to a broader set of interpersonal interactions advances the literature beyond past research on both compensatory impression management and group-based stereotypes, showing these two critical dimensions in impression formation are strategically deployed across a broader set of cross-
status interpersonal interactions.

Additionally, while past research has detailed how upward comparison targets can motivate self-promotion, much less has been devoted to a potential role of downward ingratiating. In fact, as previously described, when not involved in face-to-face interactions in which they care about their interaction partner or the relationship, higher-status individuals tend to behave less generously and less ethically than their lower-status counterparts (Piff et al., 2010, 2012). However, along with recent work showing high-status individuals are motivated to deny the relative advantages they have received, downplaying the role played by privilege in having reached their current high-status position (Phillips & Lowery, 2015), the current work shows that when interacting with a lower-status person, relatively higher-status individuals do sometimes seem to care about appearing likable and acting more generously.

**Future Directions**

Though the current evidence advances our understanding of impression management across status divides, it does have limitations that future research can help address. First, future work should further disentangle matching and disconfirming accounts of impression management in social comparisons. Beginning to investigate disconfirming versus matching, Studies 3a and 3b show participants do not simply match targets’ warmth and competence when their traits go against stereotypes, and Study 3 shows individuals’ disconfirming versus matching goals may depend on the comparison direction; future work may distinguish further between these two explanations.

Status comparisons could also drive impression management for reasons other than matching and disconfirming. Various motivations could direct higher- or lower-status interaction partners to try to appear more warm versus competent, and more direct evidence is needed about
why people use these specific impression management strategies. Individuals might have expectations about the type of interaction that might occur with a higher- or lower-status other, for example trying to adhere to different social norms, or trying to reach social goals unrelated to managing stereotypes. Pursuing one possible reason for different strategies, Studies 1-2 measured emotions felt in different comparisons; however, these emotions as measured did not differ by condition, nor did they influence participants’ status-based impression management strategies. Other potential approaches include measuring expectations about the interaction, measuring activation of stereotypes about one’s group that might predict disconfirmation attempts, or measuring traits such as belonging needs (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), which could relate to the extent to which individuals try to fit in with the comparison target. Evidence that status comparisons activate particular motive(s), which in turn predict impression management, would further explain diverging strategies.

In addition to uncovering mechanisms for status-based compensation in impression management, future research may also identify additional boundary conditions beyond those identified here. For example, when faced with positive stereotypes about their groups (e.g., academics or athletics), individuals sometimes embrace these by claiming them as strengths (Oldmeadow & Fiske, 2010). What determines whether someone downplays a stereotyped trait (as in the current research) or claims it with pride? One obvious possibility is how favorable the stereotype; other possibilities include how abstract or concrete the stereotype, how changeable the trait, or how permeable the identity – these possible moderators would need to be tested.

As one important set of moderators, individuals’ identities are rarely as uncomplicated as mere hierarchical rank. The experiments described here focus on relative status in work and school settings, to the exclusion of race, gender, age, and many other identities, which also
combine to form intersectional identities. Previous research has shown similar patterns of diverging interpersonal strategies in cross-race interactions (Bergsieker et al., 2010; Dupree & Fiske, under review), and parallel logic might predict gender effects, but experimental predictions become less clear when it comes to intersectional identities that are simultaneously high and low status, such as an interaction between a Black superior and White subordinate. When considering multiple identities and their accompanying stereotypes, interaction partners may have more complex goals, and future studies would need to investigate how people navigate them.

More broadly, different kinds of cross-status interactions may define when individuals care about appearing warm or competent, and when they abandon those impression management goals altogether. Higher-status individuals may not always (or even usually) feel uncomfortable with others thinking they are cold. The current studies showed compensation both upward and downward, but superiors may not always care about subordinates’ impressions of them. For example, superiors in toughness-oriented hierarchies, such as military, police, or athletic teams, may be less concerned with disconfirming coldness. When not in direct face-to-face interactions that engender impression-management concerns, high-status individuals have been shown to be less generous and cheat more than low-status individuals do (Piff, 2014; Piff et al., 2010). In these situations and others, higher-status individuals may abandon their ingratiation goals.

On the other side of a cross-status interaction, lower-status individuals may not always be able to self-promote, and they may have to abandon their impression management goals. While the current studies showed subordinates downplaying their own warmth to appear more competent to their superiors, in many situations, subordinates may not even have contact with their superiors, or may not be empowered enough to speak up and convey their competence. If
the higher-status person is not listening, the lower-status person’s self-promotion attempts may be futile.

Moreover, the current superior-subordinate roles in the workplace domain and leadership-collaboration roles in a school environment draw on hierarchies that link status and competence; while this link holds in many social domains including work and school, there must be exceptions. For example, in social gatherings as opposed to workplace settings, status may be less tightly linked with perceived competence, and as a result, diverging impression management strategies may not emerge across status divides in such purely social settings. In these settings, status may be linked with other assumed characteristics, such as social skills or extraversion, rather than competence; additionally, status may operate relatively more independently from power in non-workplace hierarchies. For these reasons, future studies should investigate additional moderators, and extend to different kinds of hierarchies.

Investigating whether diverging impression management goals and strategies perpetuate discomfort in cross-status interactions, future experiments should also address how both parties feel after an interaction: Does focusing on warmth or competence when an interaction partner is doing the opposite actually worsen cross-status interactions, as in interracial interactions (Bergsieker et al., 2010)? If supported in future studies, mismatched impression management behavior could drive continued difficulty and avoidance in cross-status interactions.

Last but not least, future research could investigate what can be done to reduce the effect of relative status comparisons on impression management goals and behavior. Though the current research shows that diverging strategies attenuate in comparisons to a target with similar status, this is by no means a reasonable goal in a world where inequality is increasing, and relative status comparisons are becoming more, not less, abundant. While difficulty in
interpersonal interactions as evidenced by the current research adds one more example to the long list of negative consequences from inequality, in the meantime there may be ways to reframe the stereotyped strengths (and weaknesses) of different status groups, thus reducing pressure to disconfirm stereotypes, to create common, inclusive identities that reduce the threat posed by comparison, or to facilitate cross-status interactions in situations in which individuals’ outcomes depend on each other.

All future directions should maintain awareness of status versus power effects. While the current status manipulations attempt to isolate status from power effects by specifying non-interdependence, power is not completely ruled out. Though no power relationship exists between the two partners, higher/lower-status individuals may consider their different levels of power within their respective divisions at work. To further isolate mere status, future studies could manipulate both status and power and observe the resulting impression management strategies, or investigate impression management strategies in hierarchies with weaker power dynamics.

Conclusion

The current research contributes to literature on the psychology of social status and interpersonal interactions, showing people use different impression management strategies to cope with interactions across status divides: emphasizing their own warmth while downplaying competence in downward comparisons, and emphasizing their own competence while downplaying warmth in upward comparisons. These strategies arose in situations in which people cared about what the downward or upward comparison target thought of them (Study 1a), showed evidence of diverging impression management strategies from relative status comparisons that were not tied to specific group-based stereotypes (Study 2), in addition to
arising from specified self-presentational goals (Study 1b), and from a combination of stereotype-disconfirming and target-matching strategies, moderated by counter-stereotypical information about targets’ actual warmth and competence (Studies 3a and 3b). Participants’ motives may differ depending on the comparison direction, with upward comparers focusing on matching their partners’ stereotyped high competence, and downward comparers attempting to disconfirm their own stereotyped coldness (Study 4). Diverging impression management strategies extended to interpersonal behavior in live interactions across status divides, in a minimal experimental manipulation of social status (Study 5).

Exclusively exaggerating one’s own warmth or competence while interacting with someone pursuing an opposite strategy may lead to increased frustration and misunderstanding, further complicating cross-status interactions. Beyond their effects on interpersonal attitudes and behavior, unequal status hierarchies show wide-ranging negative effects on health, motivation, and well being (Oishi et al., 2011; Oishi & Kesebir, 2015; Smeeding, 2005; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009). Though most Americans believe that society should be less unequal than it is (e.g., Norton & Ariely, 2011), diverging impression management strategies and behavior in interpersonal interactions across status divides may serve as part of a reinforcing loop in which inequality strengthens status-based stereotypes, and stereotypes legitimize inequality (Durante et al., 2013; Friesen, Kay, Eibach, & Galinsky, 2014; Jost et al., 2015; Oldmeadow & Fiske, 2007). With income inequality at record levels and rising around the world, it may be more important than ever to consider not only the societal but the interpersonal consequences of interpersonal stratification. More equal societies may be a distant possible future, but if individuals began to experience cross-status interactions as less difficult, they might learn from each other and reduce the influence of status-based stereotypes in the meantime.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Study 1a Materials

Think back to a specific time when you introduced yourself to someone else as a [HIGH STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME] student. Whom were you talking to? What was the situation like?

When you introduced yourself as a [HIGH STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME] student, did you feel: (1: Not at all to 5: Extremely; order randomized)

Emotion items:
alienated
annoyed
anxious
apprehensive
ashamed
awkward
comfortable
concerned
confident
content
embarrassed
frustrated
happy
humble
irritated
modest
pretentious
proud
sad
secure
self-conscious
stressed

Think back to a specific time when you introduced yourself to someone, but did not mention your [HIGH STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME] identity (for example, “I go to college in [LOW STATUS STATE].”) Whom were you talking to? What was the situation like?

When you introduced yourself as a college student in [LOW STATUS STATE], did you feel:

[same emotion items as above]

Imagine you are meeting a student from another college (you're not sure which college).

How comfortable are you bringing up your [HIGH STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME] identity?
How comfortable are you bringing up your [LOW STATUS STATE] identity?

How comfortable are you bringing up other information about yourself (like your favorite sport)?

How comfortable would you feel if your friend (who was standing next to you) mentioned that you were a [HIGH STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME] student?

How comfortable would you feel if your friend (who was standing next to you) mentioned that you were a college student in [LOW STATUS STATE]?

Imagine you are meeting a college student who goes to [HIGHER STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME].

How comfortable are you bringing up your [HIGH STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME] identity?

How comfortable are you bringing up your [LOW STATUS STATE] identity?

How comfortable are you bringing up other information about yourself (like your favorite sport)?

How comfortable would you feel if your friend (who was standing next to you) mentioned that you were a [HIGH STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME] student?

How comfortable would you feel if your friend (who was standing next to you) mentioned that you were a college student in [LOW STATUS STATE]?

Imagine you are meeting a college student who goes to [LOWER STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME].

How comfortable are you bringing up your [HIGH STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME] identity?

How comfortable are you bringing up your [LOW STATUS STATE] identity?

How comfortable are you bringing up other information about yourself (like your favorite sport)?
Very uncomfortable (1) to Very comfortable (5)

How comfortable would you feel if your friend (who was standing next to you) mentioned that you were a [HIGH STATUS UNIVERSITY NAME] student?

Very uncomfortable (1) to Very comfortable (5)

How comfortable would you feel if your friend (who was standing next to you) mentioned that you were a college student in [LOW STATUS STATE]?

Very uncomfortable (1) to Very comfortable (5)

I have a high self-esteem. (1: not very true of me to 5: very true of me)

SOCIAL COMPARISON ORIENTATION: Most people compare themselves from time to time with others. For example, they may compare the way they feel, their opinions, their abilities, and/or their situation with those of other people. There is nothing particularly 'good' or 'bad' about this type of comparison, and some people do it more than others. We would like to find out how often you compare yourself with other people. To do that we would like to ask you to indicate how much you agree with each statement below, by using the following scale. (1: Strongly disagree to 5: strongly agree)

I often compare how my loved ones (boy or girlfriend, family members, etc.) are doing with how others are doing
I always pay a lot of attention to how I do things compared with how others do things
If I want to find out how well I have done something, I compare what I have done with how others have done
I often compare how I am doing socially (e.g., social skills, popularity) with other people
I am not the type of person who compares often with others
I often compare myself with others with respect to what I have accomplished in life
I often like to talk with others about mutual opinions and experiences
I often try to find out what others think who face similar problems as I face
I always like to know what others in a similar situation would do
If I want to learn more about something, I try to find out what others think about it
I never consider my situation in life relative to that of other people
Appendix B: Study 1b Materials

In this study, we are conducting preliminary research on interpersonal communication in different types of interview settings. This research involves asking how people present information about themselves to an interviewer. In this particular study, we will be asking you to imagine describing different events that have happened to you. If an event has never happened to you, please just imagine what it would be like and how you would describe it to an interviewer. Before we begin, please rate yourself on how well these traits describe you (1: not at all like me to 7: just like me) (order randomized):

Trait items:
ambitious
capable
clever
considerate
cooperative
courteous
creative
forgiving
generous
independent
intelligent
kind
logical
patient
responsible
self-reliant
sincere
talented
trustworthy
understanding

Please wait to be assigned an interview scenario.

You have been assigned to an interviewer who cares [most about whether you are an efficient worker with a strong work ethic / most about whether you are a team player with strong social skills / equally about whether you are an efficient worker with a strong work ethic, and whether you are a team player with strong social skills / - ]. Imagine how you would share information about yourself with this type of interviewer.

[POSITIVE EVENTS CONDITION] Please imagine that the events below have happened to you. Which events would you tell the interviewer about?

Developed a complex filing system for your company
Did all of the repair work on your own car
Were consulted by a local company for your ideas on a project
Were in your school's honor society
Were voted most likely to succeed by members of your class
Read several classic novels every summer
Fixed a friend's broken typewriter
Turned the lights off in a friend's parked car
Write poetry in your spare time
Subscribe to several technical journals

[NEGATIVE EVENTS CONDITION] Please imagine that the events below have happened to you. Which events would you tell the interviewer about?

Left your windows open while washing your car
Rode your bicycle through broken glass and got a flat tire
Went swimming in 30-degree weather
Forgot to turn the stove off before going on a trip
Kept the windows open while running the air conditioner
Accidentally wore your bedroom slippers to work
Forgot to set your alarm to wake up
Left the freezer door open for the entire night
Ran into a pole because you were not watching where you were going
Failed to follow the maintenance schedule on your car

Which traits about yourself would you share with this interviewer? (order randomized) (same 20 traits as above)

What else about yourself would you share with this interviewer? List five items about yourself.

How would you feel talking to this interviewer about yourself? (1: not at all to 5: extremely) (same emotion items as in Study 1a)

I have a high self-esteem. (1: not very true of me to 5: very true of me)

[Social Comparison Orientation items same as in Study 1a]
Appendix C: Study 2 Materials

In this study, we are conducting research on interpersonal communication in different types of interactions. On the next page, you will read a scenario about an interaction with another person. Please imagine what this interaction would be like and how you would get along with the other person.

Imagine that your workplace has organized a new initiative. In this program, each employee will be paired randomly with another employee, but from divisions that usually do not overlap. You have been paired with an employee whom you have not previously met, and who is in a [higher-ranked] [lower-ranked] position than yours [position with the same rank as yours]. Because this person is in a different division, [you do not report to this person] [this person does not report to you] [you are not connected to this person in any way].

What do you think your interactions would be like? What kinds of expectations or concerns might you have about how you would get along with or be seen by your interaction partner?

When getting to know this person, how much do you want them to know that you possess the traits below? (Same trait list as Study 1b)

If you had to choose between being liked and being respected by this person, which would you regard as more important? (1-7)

If you had to choose between being seen as competent and being seen as warm by this person, which would you regard as more important? (1-7)

What else about yourself would you share with this person? List five items about yourself.

How would you feel talking to this person about yourself? (Same emotion items as above, except omitted “stressed” and added “humiliated”)

Gender:
Racial/ethnic background (check all that apply):
What is your job title or occupation?
In what year were you born?
Were you born in the United States?
Appendix D: Study 3a and 3b Materials

(Study introduction same as Study 2)

Imagine that your workplace has organized a new initiative. In this program, each employee is paired randomly with another employee, but from divisions that usually do not overlap. You have been paired with an employee who is in a [higher-ranked position] [lower-ranked position] than yours. Because this person is in a different division, [you do not report to this person] [this person does not report to you]. The two of you have not met before, but you hear from a co-worker that this person is [very] [not very] [3a: friendly] [3b: intelligent].

What do you think your interactions would be like? What kinds of expectations or concerns might you have about how you would get along with or be seen by your interaction partner?

When getting to know this person, which traits about yourself would you share with them? (Same trait items and dependent variables as Study 2, except participants choose whether or not to convey each trait, instead of rating each trait on a scale)

(Same demographics as Study 1)
Appendix E: Study 4 Materials

(Same introduction and comparison prompt as Study 2: down/up/neutral)

Please take a moment to think of a specific person in your own workplace who fits this description as closely as possible. Write this person's first and last initials in the box below.

(Same trait item dependent variables as Studies 1b, 3a and 3b)

Please complete the following questionnaire about yourself (SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS: 1: strongly disagree to 7: strongly agree):
I'm always trying to figure myself out.
Generally, I'm not very aware of myself.
I reflect about myself a lot.
I'm often the subject of my own fantasies.
I never scrutinize myself.
I'm generally attentive to my inner feelings.
I'm constantly examining my motives.
I sometimes have the feeling that I'm off somewhere watching myself.
I'm alert to changes in my mood.
I'm aware of the way my mind works when I work through a problem.
I'm concerned about my style of doing things.
I'm concerned about the way I present myself.
I'm self-conscious about the way I look.
I usually worry about making a good impression.
One of the last things I do before I leave my house is look in the mirror.
I'm concerned about what other people think of me.
I'm usually aware of my appearance.
It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations.
I have trouble working when someone is watching me.
I get embarrassed very easily.
I don't find it hard to talk to strangers.
I feel anxious when I speak in front of a group.
Large groups make me nervous.

How competent or incompetent would you say [TARGET'S INITIALS] tends to be? (1-7)
How warm or cold would you say [TARGET’S INITIALS] tends to be? (1-7)
If you had to guess, how competent or incompetent does [TARGET’S INITIALS] think YOU are? (1-7)
If you had to guess, how warm or cold does [TARGET’S INITIALS] think YOU are? (1-7)
How would you rate [TARGET’S INITIALS]'s level of social status?
Higher status than me / Lower status than me / About the same status as me

(Same demographics as Studies 2, 3a, and 3b)
Appendix F: Study 5 Materials

Please type in your participant number.

Today's experiment will have three parts. In the first part, you and your partner will take an assessment of numerical estimation style that will determine your roles for the rest of the study. In the second part, the two of you will be randomly assigned to communicate through either a direct (face-to-face) or remote (video-mediated) interaction. In the third part, you will work on a joint decision making task with your partner. Click the arrow to begin.

Before you and your partner begin the decision making task, we need to assign your job titles, in other words who will be responsible for what parts of the task. To determine these roles, you will both complete a test of numerical estimation style, a trait related to individuals’ relative strengths in team-based projects. Specifically, numerical estimation style has been shown to predict leadership and collaboration abilities. Click the arrow to begin the assessment.

Welcome to the Dot Estimation Task. You will see a random pattern of dots flash on the screen. After each pattern, you will estimate how many dots you just saw. Please try to estimate as closely as possible. Do not try to count the dots. They will disappear too quickly. You will receive feedback at the end of the task. Click the arrow to begin.

[Computer presents several dot arrays and asks following each one: “Please type in your estimate of how many dots you saw.”]

Please wait while your partner completes the Dot Estimation Task. . . . .

Assessment completed. Computing results. . 

Dot Estimation Task Results: Your score on the task indicates that you are an [Overestimator/Underestimator]. As an [Overestimator/Underestimator], research suggests you are likely to have traits associated with [leadership/collaboration] skills. Due to these strengths, you are assigned to the role of [Decision Manager/Decision Responder] in the decision making task. Your partner's score indicates they are an [Underestimator/Overestimator], a trait associated with [collaboration/leadership] skills. Due to these strengths, your partner is assigned to the role of [Decision Responder/Decision Manager].

Please write down any observations about yourself that relate to your status as the [Decision Manager/Decision Responder].

You have completed Part One. Stop here and open the door so that the experimenter knows you are ready to continue.

Before the decision making task, you and your partner will get to know each other a little bit. Your pair has been randomly assigned to the remote (video-mediated) condition, so you will communicate with your partner through an exchange of videos. To keep the introductions consistent, the experimenter will facilitate the video exchange using a semi-structured interview.
While the experimenter is interviewing your partner, please complete the following measures. Decision Making Task Roles: You have been assigned the role of: [Decision Manager/Decision Responder]. Your partner has been assigned the role of: [Decision Responder/Decision Manager].

To help inform your partner's first impressions of you, you may share some of the following traits about yourself with your partner. Choose as few or as many traits as you'd like to share with your partner, by dragging the traits on the left into the boxes on the right. [Same trait items as Studies 2, 3A, and 3B]

What else about yourself would you like to share with your partner? List five items about yourself.

If you had to choose between being seen as competent and being seen as warm by your partner, which would you regard as more important? (1-7)
If you had to choose between being liked and being respected by your partner, which would you regard as more important? (1-7)

Please stop here and wait for the experimenter to return with your partner's video. If you have time, you may flip over the list of interview questions and think about how you might answer them.

[Interview questions are listed on paper:]

1. I understand you’re a student at Princeton—do you like living here?
2. What do you think of the university itself?
3. How would you describe your social experiences on campus so far?
4. Is there anything you would like to change about your social life?
5. Could you say a little about your career goals?
6. How do you spend your time when you’re not studying or socializing?
7. Overall, would you say that you’re happy here?

While the experimenter takes your video to your partner, please answer the following questions about your interaction and your partner, before beginning the decision making task.

How would you rate the quality of your interaction with your partner? Extremely unpleasant (1) to Extremely pleasant (7)  
How warm or cold would you say your partner is? Extremely cold (1) to Extremely warm (7)  
How competent or incompetent would you say your partner is? Extremely incompetent (1) to Extremely competent (7)  
If you had to guess, how warm or cold would you say your partner thinks YOU are? Extremely cold (1) to Extremely warm (7)  
If you had to guess, how competent or incompetent would you say your partner thinks YOU are? Extremely incompetent (1) to Extremely competent (7)
Please complete the following questionnaire about yourself (Self-consciousness items same as in Study 4)

Please stop here and open the door to let the experimenter know you are ready to begin Part Three.

Next, you and your partner will both continue on to the joint decision making task, which has two parts. Your roles will be relevant in the second part of the task.

Decision Making Task Roles: You have been assigned the role of: [Decision Manager/Decision Responder]. Your partner has been assigned the role of: [Decision Responder/Decision Manager].

Please wait while your partner completes the interaction ratings.

Decision Making Task Instructions: You and your partner will both receive this same set of instructions. In this task, you have the chance to collect tokens. At the end of the study, tokens may be exchanged for fun size candy. For every 10 tokens you collect, you receive 1 piece of candy. You and your partner have a common pool, which contains 40 tokens. The tokens are shown below:

You and your partner must each decide how many tokens to take out of the pool for yourselves, and how many tokens (if any) to leave in the pool. Each person can take out a maximum of 20 tokens. All the tokens left in the pool get multiplied by 1.5, and then split evenly between you and your partner. Thus, for every 4 tokens left in the pool, you each receive 3 tokens.

Examples:
* If you both take the maximum 20 tokens out of the pool, the pool is empty and each of you will end up with 20 tokens.
* If no one takes any tokens out of the pool, the 40 tokens left in the pool are multiplied by 1.5 and split evenly, so each of you will end up with 30 tokens. So the group as a whole is best off when no one takes anything out of the pool.
* But if your partner takes nothing out of the pool, while you take 20 tokens out of the pool, you will end up with 35 tokens while your partner will end up with only 15 tokens. That is because for every 4 tokens you leave in the pool, you personally only get 3 tokens back. Thus you personally lose tokens by leaving tokens in the pool, no matter what your partner chooses.

Once you and your partner have chosen how many tokens to take out, this task is over. Neither you nor your partner will have any chance to affect each other's tokens after this one decision.

Comprehension questions: Before choosing, you must answer these questions to make sure you understand the task. You must answer correctly to receive any candy. You and your partner must both complete the comprehension questions before choosing how many tokens you will take out.

How many tokens should you take out of the pool in order for you to earn the most candy possible?
How many tokens should you take out of the pool in order for the group as a whole to earn the most candy possible?

Please wait while your partner completes the comprehension questions. . .

Please choose the number of tokens you will take out of the pool. (0 to 20)

As you wait for the results of the first part of the decision making task, please complete the following about your partner, yourself and about the study so far.

How would you rate your partner's current level of social status? (Higher status than me / Lower status than me / About the same status as me)

In today's task, I was assigned the role of: (Decision Manager / Decision Responder / not sure)

Your gender:
Racial/ethnic background (Check all that apply):
What is your age?

Have you ever participated in a study similar to this one? If so, please describe it.
Were the instructions and questions clear? If not, then what was unclear?
Did anything about the study seem confusing or strange?
Were you suspicious about any parts of the study? If so, which ones? Please be specific.
Do you have any thoughts on what the study might be about? Please be specific.
How confident (as a %) were you that your numerical estimation style assessment score was accurate?
How confident (as a %) were you that your partner would view your video?
If you have any other thoughts or comments you would like to share, please write them here.
Please get the experimenter to finish today's experiment.
Appendix G: Study 5 Behavior Coding Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Guidelines: Video-Mediated Interaction Study – 06/25/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) At start of P’s clip, record participant number and gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Watch and listen to the warm-up questions. Time both of the responses (t_class and t_movie).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Turn off sound. View the interaction and then code nonverbal items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Turn off screen. Listen to the interaction, then code verbal, goal, and overall items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Watch and listen to interaction to complete quantitative items. Record any comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Use separate video files for each response to record t_living, t_univer, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For rating items, use this scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</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>2</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>3</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>4</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>5</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>6</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>7</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>8</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>9</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>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(High scores indicate frequency, intensity, or both; also, the ratings are inherently somewhat relative, i.e., to each other, rather than absolute.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p_num</th>
<th>Participant number in ###B format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>Participant gender 0 = female, 1 = male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t_class</td>
<td>Time of Q1 (classes) speech duration from mouth open to mouth shut (m:ss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t_movie</td>
<td>t_living, t_univer, t_social, t_change, t_career, t_time, t_happy same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smiling</td>
<td>Smiling, grinning, laughing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nodding</td>
<td>Nodding (up-and-down movement, especially when emphatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye_cont</td>
<td>Eye contact (eye-contact (looking toward camera when talking))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>Comfortable, ease/comfort/relaxation as opposed to anxiousness/nervousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posture</td>
<td>Posture (upright)/formal/consistent posture (not slouching, fidgeting, moving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gesture</td>
<td>Gesturing, expressive hand gestures while talking (especially large/long ones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confi_nv</td>
<td>Confidence (nonverbal) self-assurance, poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engag_nv</td>
<td>Engagement (nonverbal) interest and (especially) effort in interaction (not bored/apathetic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humor</td>
<td>Humor (attempted) humorous/non-serious comments, teasing self/others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self_dep</td>
<td>Self-deprecation deliberately showing one’s own weakness, humbling self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flattry</td>
<td>Flattery, complimenting partner on some quality/activity/etc. of theirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>Friendliness, appearance and (especially) attempts to seem friendly, nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note_sim</td>
<td>Noting similarities (behavioral) cites similarities (referencing partner, not just echoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note_diff</td>
<td>Noting differences (behavioral) cites differences (referencing partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>Agreeing, (attitudinal) agreeing with partner’s opinion (referencing partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>Disagreeing (attitudinal) disagreeing with partner’s opinion (referencing partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve</td>
<td>Achievements, mentioning achievements, selective memberships, difficult activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confid_s</td>
<td>Confidence (style) confident tone, pitch, pace, volume, articulateness of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confid_c</td>
<td>Confidence (content) expressions of certainty (vs. doubt), lack of repetition or qualifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engage_v</td>
<td>Engagement (verbal) interest and (especially) effort in interaction (not bored/apathetic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g_liking</td>
<td>Liking goal attempts to elicit liking, establish friendly rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g_respec</td>
<td>Respect goal attempts to elicit respect (as competent/intelligent/accomplished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g_intimid</td>
<td>Intimidation goal attempts to elicit fear, convey volatility/potential for strong reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g_exempl</td>
<td>Exemplification goal attempts to elicit admiration (as moral/self-sacrificing person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g_supplic</td>
<td>Supplication goal attempts to elicit helping, pity, sympathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistn</td>
<td>Consistency constancy between interaction speaking and listening and warm-up negativity (0) / positivity (10) of shift from warm-up to interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>val_chan</td>
<td>Valence change sincerity, authenticity, lack of deliberate fakeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genuine</td>
<td>Genuineness tally “you” variants (or collective “we”) directly referring to partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_your</td>
<td>Direct 2nd person tally “he” or “she” variants referring to partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he_she</td>
<td>Indirect 3rd person tally “he” or “she” variants referring to partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race_rel</td>
<td>Race related content tally race-related content and write phrase in “comments”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments</td>
<td>Your comments note prior acquaintance or oddities (posture, ticks, confusions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

adapted from Bergsieker et al., 2010