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Abstract

Previous research suggests that the amount of food that women eat may fluctuate depending on their impression-management motivation; however, the results do not provide direct evidence supporting such an explanation. That is, no studies conducted to date have actually manipulated impression-management motivation and measured its effects on eating behavior. The present program of research aimed to confirm that eating behavior in women does, in fact, change as a result of impression-management motivation. Experiments 1, 2, and 3 tested this by manipulating impression-management motivation via direct and explicit instructions. Experiment 3 was also designed to investigate how impression-management motivation might affect eating in situations in which females are eating with a friend (as opposed to a stranger). The results demonstrate that women motivated to make a good impression on a male stranger (Experiments 1 & 2) and a female stranger (Experiments 2 & 3) eat less than do those for whom the desire to make a positive impression has been disrupted. The results also confirm previous findings showing that women eat less when eating with a male stranger than when eating with a female stranger (Experiments 1 & 2). The findings from Experiment 3 suggest that there may be a different pattern of eating associated with impression-management motivation when women eat with female friends; it was found that participants ate more with a friend when they were motivated to make a good impression compared to when this motive was not present. These results may be explained...
by impression-management theory, in combination with notions about the complexity of female friendships and female-female competition surrounding eating, dieting, weight, and appearance.
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Introduction

“That people can and do control their public images is…a basic tenet of most if not all psychological and sociological theories of the self in social interaction.”

- Mark Snyder

On my first date with my husband he took me out for a nice dinner before a fraternity semi-formal party, and I specifically remember that he ordered chicken. After getting to know him better over the years, I came to learn that he never ordered chicken at a restaurant because he thought it was “boring.” One night we were discussing our first date and I asked him why he had ordered chicken, given his feeling about ordering it in restaurants. He explained that he had ordered the chicken only because he thought it was the most “normal” item on the menu, and he did not know how I would perceive him if he ordered something more adventurous, like duck, or something more controversial, like lamb or veal. During our first date together my husband consciously chose to eat a specific type of food in order to convey a desired impression to me. Fast-forward eight years – now when we go out to dinner he orders anything from venison loin (adventurous), to Spaghetti Bolognese (messy), to Steak Frites (traditional). One plausible reason for his change in behavior is that he no longer worries about how I will perceive his food choices and the information that they might convey about him.

Conversations with friends and family provide more anecdotal evidence suggesting that our choices about what we eat and how much we eat depend on the social situation and the characteristics of the other people present. Why do we monitor our eating behavior in certain social situations but not in others? As my interpretation of my husband’s food
choices suggests, the presence (or absence) of impression-management concerns is a likely cause of people’s monitoring their eating in certain situations.

Schlenker (1980) defines impression management (also referred to in the literature as “self-presentation;” 1 see Leary & Kowalski, 1990) as the conscious or unconscious attempt to control the images that one projects. When people manage their impressions for others, they do so to with a specific objective or interpersonal motive in mind (Goffman, 1959; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Leary, 1995; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Schlenker, 1980), tailoring their self-presentation to the perceived values and preferences of the target (Leary, 1995; Leary & Kowalski, 1990). For example, if one is meeting for the first time a new colleague with whom one wants to collaborate on a project, one presumably wants to appear intelligent, competent, and likeable. Therefore, one’s beliefs about what behaviors this colleague will perceive as intelligent, competent, and likable will influence how one behaves. Controlling others’ impressions becomes a means of controlling their actions, which in turn affects one’s own outcomes socially, professionally, romantically, and in other domains (Schlenker, 1980).

People attempt to control others’ impressions of them by manipulating their verbal and nonverbal behavior, their appearance, and even their environment (Goffman, 1959; Leary, 1995; Schlenker, 1980). Verbal tactics include self-descriptions, attitude statements, and public attributions (i.e., when people explain to others why something happened to them or why they behaved the way they did), while nonverbal tactics include facial expressions of emotion, physical appearance, gestures and bodily movements, social associations, use of the physical environment/space and other behaviors (Leary, 1995). Eating is one type of nonverbal behavior that people may use in constructing their desired image.

1 Throughout this paper I have used the terms “impression management” and “self-presentation” synonymously.
Schlenker (1980) acknowledges that there are a number of specific tactics related to eating that people may apply to impression management. People can manipulate the type of food that they select to eat, the amount they eat, and where and when they will eat. Schlenker (1980) contrasts a “health food fanatic” with a “gourmet” to demonstrate how people might use food selection to create a specific identity. This example (similar to my personal example) focuses on the use of *food type* as a means of image construction; however, controlling *amount eaten* can also be used in image construction. As the research described in the following review suggests, controlling the amount of one’s intake is probably just as powerful as is monitoring the type of food one eats for purposes of impression management. This thesis will focus on controlling amount eaten as a tactic used for impression management purposes.

Past research has shown that information about how much people eat has a clear effect on the impressions that others form of them. This phenomenon is part of what is referred to as “consumption stereotypes” (see Vartanian, Herman, & Polivy, 2007 for a review). This literature explores how the amount of food eaten (as well as the type of food and other eating-related characteristics) affects observers’ perceptions of the eater. A typical study might give participants a description of a target person who eats either a small amount or a large amount, while the target’s height, weight, and activity level are held constant across conditions. Such studies have found that participants generally rate the large eater as less socially desirable in many domains (e.g., less feminine [in the case of female targets], fatter, sloppier, less attractive, less likeable, less intelligent, less conscientious, and less moral) than they rate the small eater (e.g. Bock & Kanarek, 1995; Chaiken & Pliner, 1987). In other words, people who eat a large amount of food often attract all kinds of negative
attributions, thus projecting an undesirable image. The effect of amount of food consumed on perceptions of the consumer is especially strong when people are judging women (Chaiken & Pliner, 1987; Martins, Pliner, & Lee, 2004; Mooney & Lorenz, 1997).

Because people, as perceivers, categorize and respond to others on the basis of the images that they form of them, the images conveyed can have consequences for the target (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker, 1980). It is assumed that more often than not people, as targets, want to associate themselves with desirable images and dissociate themselves from undesirable images so as to reap interpersonal and/or professional benefits. Given the findings just described from the consumption stereotypes literature and the fact that women of all ages are highly concerned about eating, body weight, and physical appearance (Pliner, Chaiken, & Flett, 1990), one would expect that women would be especially likely to use their eating behavior as a self-presentational strategy. Specifically, women might change their eating behavior (especially amount eaten) to project a specific type of impression for their audience. Therefore, in this thesis I will focus on how women in particular use eating as a means of impression management.

The consumption-stereotypes literature demonstrates that a female “light eater” is viewed positively, whereas a female “hearty eater” is viewed negatively. Related to this finding is the social-normative model of eating, which proposes that palatable food drives eating and social influence operates to determine when eating stops (Herman, Roth, & Polivy, 2003). This model proposes that in social situations there are two norms that may guide eating: 1) to avoid being seen by others as eating excessively and 2) to eat minimally. It is the presence of these social norms that promotes consumption stereotypes. Those who overeat and, therefore, do not adhere to the social norm of eating appropriately, attract
negative judgments. Those who do adhere to the social norm of either eating appropriately or eating minimally attract positive judgments. The research described thus far suggests that, in the context of a meal or another eating-related situation, women wanting to make an overall positive impression on an audience of strangers should ensure that they do not overeat; one way of doing this is to adhere to the norm of minimal eating or at least to avoid excessive eating.

Up to this point, I have focused on the role of eating in impression management. Impression management involves two components, impression construction and impression motivation. Impression construction involves choosing what type of impression to convey (e.g., to appear socially desirable) as well as deciding how one will create such an impression (e.g., by eating lightly) (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Leary and Kowalski (1990) define impression motivation as the desire to create a particular impression on others. In the literature and throughout this thesis the terms impression motivation, impression-management motivation, impression-management goals, and impression-management concerns are used interchangeably and all refer to the second component of impression management, impression motivation.

Impression-management theory supposes that impression motivation must exist in order for the impression-construction process to occur. One factor that contributes to impression motivation is the type of audience that one encounters (Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Schlenker, 1980). More specifically, people are more likely to want to make a positive impression on others who are powerful, of high status, likable, or physically attractive (Schlenker, 1980). Hence, in the case of eating, the idea is that certain characteristics of a co-eater should make people more or less motivated to make a good impression on their
audience, thereby causing them to change their eating behavior accordingly. On the basis of this reasoning, Pliner, Chaiken, and their colleague conducted a series of studies to investigate how eating might be related to impression-management concerns. In their studies they manipulated certain attributes of participants’ eating partners and examined the effect on participants’ eating behavior. It was assumed that if participants ate less in the presence of co-eaters with particular characteristics, they were doing so for self-presentational purposes.

In the first of these studies, Mori, Chaiken, and Pliner (1987) manipulated the gender and social desirability of the eating partners of male and female participants and measured the effect on amount of snack food consumed. The manipulations of partner gender and social desirability were intended to affect participants’ impression motivation. Participants were given an opportunity to snack on peanuts and M&Ms during a “get acquainted” study that was supposedly examining interactions between strangers. They engaged in a structured conversation with a confederate of either the same sex or the opposite sex whose social desirability was manipulated via a written profile. The authors expected that participants would be more highly motivated to make a good impression on a partner of the opposite sex than on one of the same sex and that participants would be more highly motivated to make a good impression on a partner who was socially desirable than on one who was not socially desirable. This differential motivation should lead them to eat less when the impression-management motivation was higher than when it was lower. Both male and female participants ate significantly less with a confederate of the opposite sex. In addition, female participants ate significantly less when the confederate was socially desirable than when he or she was socially undesirable. Females in the desirable-male-confederate condition ate less

There is an underlying assumption in this research concerning the partner-gender manipulation that participants are heterosexual.
than did participants in all other groups. Taken together, these findings were interpreted as supporting the authors’ hypotheses that people, women in particular, would eat less in order to make a good impression in a situation in which impression motivation was high.

In a similar study, Pliner and Chaiken (1990) looked at the effect of impression management on amount eaten, but manipulated only confederate gender in order to affect impression motivation. Male and female participants ate a meal in the presence of an attractive male or an attractive female confederate. Replicating the findings of Mori et al. (1987), Pliner and Chaiken found that both male and female participants ate less in the presence of a partner of the opposite sex. In addition, they measured participants’ perceptions of their partner’s social desirability by having participants complete a partner-rating scale (the scale included items tapping partner likeability and friendship desirability). They then included participants’ status as above or below the median on this variable in a separate analysis of the eating data. This internal analysis showed the same pattern found by Mori et al. (1987); females who viewed their partner as socially desirable ate less than did those who viewed their partner as socially undesirable.

In order to further understand why participants’ eating was affected this way, Pliner and Chaiken (1990) conducted a second study. They administered a questionnaire designed to discover what social motives participants reported as relevant in an interpersonal situation involving eating and how they believed amount eaten might serve each social motive. The results indicated that behaving in a socially desirable manner was a social motive that males reported would affect the amount that they would eat and both behaving in a socially desirable manner and appearing feminine were social motives that females reported would affect the amount that they would eat. The findings further revealed that participants asked to
assume that they wanted to make a good impression on their audience reported that they would do so by eating less.

In a naturalistic study looking at the effects of co-eater sex on amount eaten in a University cafeteria, Young, Mizzau, Mai, Sirisegaram, and Wilson (2009) found that females chose foods with significantly fewer calories when eating with men rather than when eating with women. Young et al. (2009) also explain their findings in impression-management terms, stating that women likely chose lower calorie foods with men in order to appear attractive.

One other study looking at the effects of partner characteristics on eating behavior comes from de Luca and Spigelman (1979). Using only female-female pairs, de Luca and Spigelman (1979) varied the weight of both participants and confederates. They found that obese participants ate much more in the presence of obese confederates than they did in the presence of normal-weight confederates, whereas the intake of normal-weight participants was not affected by confederate weight. It is possible to interpret these results from an impression-management perspective. For obese participants eating with a normal-weight partner, the situation may have activated self-presentation concerns, because they may have wanted to counteract the generally negative view that people have of obese people (that they are socially undesirable, lacking discipline, lazy, sloppy, incompetent, and so on); therefore, they ate less.

Although the results of these studies (de Luca & Spigelman, 1979; Mori et al., 1987; Pliner & Chaiken, 1990; Young et al., 2009) are consistent with the idea that amount eaten varies as a function of the strength of one’s motivation to make a good impression, they do not provide direct evidence for such an explanation. The previous research infers that people
are more strongly motivated to convey a positive impression when they are interacting with a partner of the opposite sex (assuming heterosexuality) or with a partner who is socially desirable or attractive than when they are interacting with a partner of the same sex or one who is not socially desirable or attractive. Presumably, when impression motivation is enhanced by means of the partner’s characteristics, people will search for a means of conveying a positive impression, and eating less may be one means of doing so. In other words, the previous studies assume that manipulating various characteristics of confederates affects impression motivation and that eating serves as a means of impression construction. None of the studies described have directly assessed the effect of their manipulations on impression-management motivation nor have there been studies conducted to date that have directly manipulated impression-management goals and measured the effects of such goals on eating behavior.

It is also possible that the results obtained from previous studies may be explained by another factor, namely anxiety. The effect of partner gender on eating, in particular, may have been caused by anxiety and not specifically by the desire to make a positive impression. It has been shown that nervousness inhibits eating, at least among normal-weight, non-dieting individuals (e.g., Herman, Polivy, Lank, & Heatherton, 1987; Schachter, Goldman & Gordon, 1968), and it is conceivable that women would be more nervous when interacting with a partner of the opposite sex. Mori et al. (1987) and Pliner and Chaiken (1990) report that participants’ self-ratings of nervousness did not differ as a function of condition and therefore, their results cannot be explained by anxiety. Mori et al. (1987) also analyzed their eating data controlling for nervousness and report that it did not change their results. It is probably the case anxiety did not mediate the effect of impression motivation on amount
eaten; however, given that Mori et al. (1987) and Pliner and Chaiken (1990) conducted no analyses using nervousness as a predictor of amount eaten and did not examine any possible interactions involving nervousness, it is not clear if in fact anxiety affected amount eaten.

The present program of research aimed to confirm that eating behavior does, in fact, change as a result of changes in impression-management motivation. This hypothesis was tested by manipulating impression-management motivation via direct and explicit instructions. A pilot study was conducted to gain an understanding of how exactly participants would interpret the impression instructions and to ensure that the instructions would be interpreted as intended. Experiment 1 examined the effect of directly manipulated impression-management motivation along with co-eater gender on amount eaten in female participants. Experiment 2 was designed to replicate the results of Experiment 1 and to correct some methodological shortcomings of Experiment 1. Thus, using a direct manipulation of impression motivation, Experiments 1 and 2 investigated whether women did in fact use eating as an impression-management strategy and to replicate previous findings showing an effect of co-eater gender on eating. The impression-management research reviewed above, as well as Experiments 1 and 2, examined only situations in which women were eating with strangers. Because people are most likely to eat with familiar others (i.e., friends and family), Experiment 3 investigated how impression-management goals might affect eating in situations in which females are eating with a friend (as opposed to a stranger).

Pilot Study

In order to directly manipulate impression-management motivation, I gave participants explicit instructions about behaving in accordance with specific impression-
management goals in the experiment. In the experiments that follow, female participants were instructed either to make a good impression on their partner, to act as if they did not care about making a good impression on their partner, or were given no instructions. I included the condition in which I instructed participants to act as if they did not care about making a good impression on their partner because I wanted to examine the effects of both increasing and decreasing participants’ motivation to make a good impression on eating behavior. I conducted a pilot study on a separate group of undergraduate females to gain an understanding of how participants would interpret the experimental instructions.

Method

Participants

Participants were 36 undergraduate females from the University of Toronto at Mississauga who were recruited through a paid-participant database and received $10 in compensation.

Procedure and Materials

Participants were told that we were doing some pre-testing for a future experiment and that we were interested in how they perceived the instructions that we were planning to give participants; they were instructed to imagine themselves as a participant in the study. The experimenter explained: “Upon signing up for the experiment, future participants will be informed that we are interested in the things people say when interacting with another person and, therefore, they will be meeting and having a conversation with a partner during the

---

3 Initially I planned to tell participants to try to make a “bad impression” on their partner, but given that 1) these instructions lack external validity and 2) these instructions would have probably made participants feel uncomfortable, I thought that it would be more valid and ethical to instruct them to “act as if they did not care about making a good impression on their partner.” Accordingly, these were the instructions used.
After this brief preface the experimenter continued, again instructing participants to put themselves in the place of a future participant who would hear the following instructions.

All participants heard: “In this study, we are interested in learning more about the ‘get acquainted’ process. There has been little research on how strangers interact when they first meet each other, so we want to learn more about how people act when they first meet someone new.”

Participants then received either “good-impression” or “not-good-impression” instructions. (Good-impression condition): “There are different motives operating when people are trying to get to know each other and we are interested in the kinds of things people say and do when they are trying to make a good impression on others.” (Not-good-impression condition): “There are different motives operating when people are trying to get to know each other and we are interested in the kinds of things people say and do when they are not interested in making a good impression on others.”

After the good-impression or not-good-impression instructions, all participants heard: “In this experiment you will be meeting and having a conversation with another student. As you are having a conversation with your partner your job is to: a) try and make a good impression on your partner or b) try to act as if you do not care about making a good impression on your partner.” This last part varied as a function of participants’ assigned experimental condition.

Approximately half of the participants ($N = 16$) heard the instructions given to those in the good-impression condition and the remainder ($N = 20$) heard the instructions given to those in the not-good-impression condition.
After hearing the instructions, participants completed a questionnaire containing three open-ended questions about them: 1) What, exactly, do these instructions mean to you? 2) How, exactly, do you think you should behave after hearing these instructions? and 3) In what real life situations do you think you would have a similar goal, i.e., (good-impression condition) of making a good impression or (not-good-impression condition) not caring about making a good impression? In addition, participants completed a structured questionnaire asking them to rate (using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7; 1 = not at all, 7 = a lot) how likely they would be to engage in 32 different behaviors related to impression management during the experiment after hearing the instructions. The behaviors listed included positive behaviors and the opposite negative behaviors (e.g., try to be rude vs. try to be polite; try to make my partner like me vs. try to make my partner dislike me; try to be friendly vs. try to be unfriendly), as well as a few behaviors that could be classified as behaviors demonstrating indifference (e.g., worry what my partner thought of me vs. not worry what my partner thought of me) (see Appendix A for all of the items included).

Results and Discussion

Free-Response Questionnaire

Participants responded almost identically to items 1 and 2 on the free-response questionnaire, suggesting that they did not perceive a difference between these questions; accordingly, responses to these two items were aggregated. There was no overlap in responses on either of the items between the two conditions.

For items 1 and 2 participants reported a variety of behaviors in which they might engage after hearing the impression instructions. The most common responses for those hearing the good-impression instructions were: being polite (63% of participants listed this
behavior), showcasing one’s good qualities (56%), being friendly (38%), smiling (38%), appearing likable (31%), being outgoing (31%), being respectful (31%), and being nice (31%). Examples of other less common responses included: being positive, paying attention to one’s image, showing interest, engaging one’s partner, using good manners, being inquisitive, using positive body language, being interesting, being agreeable, and hiding one’s flaws. The most common responses for those hearing the not-good-impression instructions were: acting disinterested (70%), not engaging one’s partner (55%), expending little energy on self-presentation (45%), being rude (45%), ignoring one’s partner (35%), acting the opposite as one would when trying to make a good impression (30%), and engaging in other tasks (30%). Examples of other less common responses included: not making eye contact, interrupting one’s partner, using bad manners, insulting one’s partner, showing signs of boredom, being impolite, not smiling, being unfriendly, and not being agreeable. These findings indicate that participants in the good-impression condition believed that they should actively try to convey a positive image, whereas those in the not-good-impression condition interpreted the instructions to mean that they should actively try to avoid making a good impression. In the not-good-impression condition participants did not simply report that they would “be themselves,” but they reported that they would behave in an aloof and/or negative manner.

For item 3, participants said they would try to make a good impression in the following real-life situations: during a job interview (69%), when meeting new people (56%), when interacting with a person of higher status (e.g., boss, professor, elder) (44%), in a professional situation (31%), and when romantically interested in the other person (25%). Participants said they would try to act as if they did not care about making a good impression
in the following real-life situations: when they did not like the person with whom they were interacting (35%), when they would have no future contact with the person (20%), when they were uninterested in a potential romantic partner (15%), when they saw no benefits in having a relationship with the person (15%), and when the person looked unattractive (10%). Other less common responses included: when they were in a bad mood, when they were somewhere they did not want to be, when they were in a chat room and could not be seen, when they heard bad things about the other person, when the situation was an emergency, when they other person was a friend or family member, and when the other person was of a lower status. Thus, participants mentioned many situations in which each of the two motives would be relevant.

**Structured Questionnaire**

A principal-components factor analysis with a varimax rotation was performed on the ratings of the 32-item list of behaviors, yielding five factors. Factors 1-3 were clear and accounted for 74.71% of the variance (eigenvalues were 17.84, 3.70, and 2.37 respectively). Factors 4 and 5 were unclear and accounted for only 7.31% of the variance (eigenvalues were 1.30 and 1.04 respectively). Furthermore, only two items loaded at higher than .5 on factor 4 and only one item loaded at higher than .5 on factor 5. Accordingly, these three items were deleted and a second analysis was performed forcing three factors. I interpreted these three factors as: 1) negative self-presentation (e.g., appear disrespectful, be mean, be unfriendly), 2) positive self-presentation (e.g., appear admirable, be nice, be friendly), and 3) indifferent self-presentation (e.g., not care about the image I gave me partner, not care what my partner thought of me) (see Table 1 for factor loadings and items). Factor scores were computed by averaging participants’ ratings on items that loaded at .6 or higher on a particular factor.
Independent-samples t-tests were then performed comparing participants in the good-impression and not-good-impression conditions. There was a significant difference between the two groups on all factors: negative self-presentation, $t(34) = -6.01, p < .001$; positive self-presentation, $t(34) = 10.28, p < .001$; indifferent self-presentation, $t(34) = -4.67, p < .001$.

Participants in the not-good-impression condition had higher scores on the negative and indifferent self-presentation factors than did those in the good-impression condition, whereas the opposite was found for the positive self-presentation factor (means are reported in Table 2). As expected, then, participants reported that they would behave differently as a function of the instructions that they received.

The fact that the items that loaded on the negative self-presentation factor were all specific and purposeful negative behaviors and were more strongly endorsed by participants in the in the not-good-impression condition lends further support to the finding obtained from the free-response questionnaire which suggested that participants would actively try to avoid making a good impression. However, the findings from the indifferent self-presentation factor imply that participants hearing the not-good-impression instructions would also be likely to feel indifferent about the impression they were giving their partner. In other words, when instructed to “act as if you do not care about making a good impression” participants will actively try to avoid making a good impression by engaging in negative behaviors and also be unconcerned about the image they are conveying to their partner. Therefore, the instructions given in the not-good-impression condition essentially serve to decrease or disrupt one’s motivation to make a good impression.

Up until this point I have referred to this condition as the “not-good-impression” condition to differentiate it from the “good-impression” condition. Now that the data have
clarified exactly how participants interpret these instructions (i.e., “…act as if you do not care about making a good impression…”), it seems that a better term for this condition is the “avoid-good-impression” condition. Participants reported that they would try to seem detached and disinterested and some of the behaviors that they described were negative behaviors, such as being rude or ignoring their partner. Therefore, it is not clear that participants would simply be indifferent about the impression that they made on their partner; rather, it appears that they would actively try to avoid making a good impression on their partner.

Experiment 1

This study examined the effects of manipulated impression-management motivation on amount eaten. Female participants were instructed either to “make a good impression” on their partner, to “act as if they did not care about making a good impression” on their partner, or they were given no instructions. In order to replicate previous findings, I also manipulated the gender of participants’ eating partner. Hence, the no-instructions condition was essentially a replication of the female-participants conditions in the Pliner and Chaiken (1990) study. After receiving their impression instructions in the present study, participants engaged in a structured conversation with either a male or a female confederate. The design of this study was a 2 x 3 (confederate gender x impression instructions) factorial. Participants believed that they were participating in a “get acquainted” study in which we were interested in how people behave with another person whom they are meeting for the first time. They were offered cookies as a snack during the conversation, and the dependent variable was grams (later converted to calories) of cookies eaten.
I expected the good-impression instructions to increase participants’ impression motivation and the avoid-good-impression instructions to decrease participants’ impression motivation from the baseline no-instructions condition, thereby affecting eating. Accordingly, I predicted that participants would eat less in the good-impression condition and more in the avoid-good-impression condition than in the no-instructions (baseline) condition. I also hypothesized that participants would eat less in the presence of a male than in the presence of a female partner, as in earlier studies (Mori et al., 1987; Pliner & Chaiken, 1990; Young et al., 2009). Therefore, participants in the good-impression condition who interacted with a male partner were expected to eat the least.

In Experiment 1 I also explored the possibility that there might be individual differences in the extent to which individuals are motivated and/or capable of managing their impressions. The first individual-difference variable that I considered was self-monitoring, which is defined as the extent to which people monitor (i.e., observe, regulate, and control) the public appearances of self that they display in social situations and interpersonal relationships (Snyder, 1987). Essentially, the Self-Monitoring Scale measures the degree to which people differ in their tendency to engage in impression management (Snyder, 1974, 1987). High self-monitors monitor or control to a great extent the image of themselves that they project in social interactions. In contrast, low self-monitors value congruence between who they are and what they do; therefore, they are not as concerned with assessing their social environment and adjusting their behavior to fit it. I hypothesized that self-monitoring would moderate the effect of impression instructions on amount eaten such that high self-monitors would change their eating behavior in response to manipulated impression-management goals, whereas low self-monitors would not.
Second, I considered trait impression management, which is one’s tendency to change one’s responses and/or behaviors to fit the self-presentation demands of the immediate situation. This is particularly relevant in an experimental context. I thought that individual differences in one’s tendency to respond to situational self-presentation demands might influence participants’ responsiveness to the impression-management manipulation and moderate the effects of the impression instructions on eating, such that those high in trait impression management would change their eating in response to the impression-management manipulation whereas those low on trait impression management would not. Therefore I measured trait impression management using the Impression Management (IM) subscale of the Balanced Inventory ofDesirable Responding (BIDR) (Paulhus, 1984) because it is an indicator of sensitivity to situational self-presentation demands.

Method

Participants and Confederates

Participants were 82 female University of Toronto Mississauga students with a mean age of 19.87 (SD = 2.92). Participants were recruited either through the Introductory Psychology subject pool using standard procedures or through a paid-participant database. Students received one credit for participating, and paid participants received $10 in compensation. Four participants were excluded because they were chewing gum during the experiment which prevented eating, and an additional three participants were excluded because they reported having an aversion to chocolate or a religious dietary restriction that did not allow them to consume the cookies. Therefore 75 participants were included in all subsequent analyses.
Three male and three female undergraduate students who were blind to the experimental hypotheses and to the impression-management manipulation served as confederates. The confederates received extensive training in order to standardize their behavior during their interaction with participants. Each confederate participated in an approximately equal number of good-impression, no-instructions, and avoid-good-impression experimental sessions.

Procedure

Impression-management manipulation. The procedure for this study was based on that of Mori et al. (1987). Participants were under the impression that they were participating in a “get acquainted” study. At the time of recruitment they were told that we were interested in the things that people say when they first meet someone new; therefore, they would be meeting and having a conversation with another participant during the experiment. When participants arrived at the experiment, they were greeted by a female experimenter and told the following: “In this study, we are interested in learning more about the ‘get acquainted’ process. There has been little research on how strangers interact when they first meet each other, so we want to learn more about how people act when they first meet someone new.” At this point participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: 1) good impression, 2) avoid good impression, and 3) no instructions. In the good- and avoid-good-impression conditions, the experimenter continued, explaining that there can be different motives operating when people are trying to get to know each other and that we were interested in the kinds of things that people said when they were a) trying to make a good impression on others or b) not interested in making a good impression on others, depending on the condition to which they were assigned. They were then told that they would be
meeting and having a conversation with another student (the confederate), who was in another room, and that their job was to a) try and make a good impression on their partner or b) act as if they did not care about making a good impression on their partner. Participants were given no information about what type of impression instructions their partner received. Participants in the no-instructions condition received no information about motives operating during get-acquainted situations or instructions regarding impression-management goals. Thus, participants in the three conditions received different instructions regarding impression-management goals or no information at all. In order to assess the effect of partner gender on eating, an additional manipulation was included; participants met and conversed with either a male or a female partner. The gender of the partner was made clear during the initial instructions. All conversations were tape-recorded, allegedly so that we could analyze the conversation. Because this taping was not actually part of the study and was done only to reinforce the cover story, nothing further was done with the recorded conversations.

*Partner background questionnaire.* Before participants met their partners, they were told that both partners would complete and exchange short background questionnaires that asked them to list and describe their hobbies, interests, and career goals. The alleged purpose of these questionnaires was to enable the partners to “learn a little bit about each other before they met.” After giving the participant a few minutes to complete the questionnaire, the experimenter returned, collected it, and gave the participant her partner’s questionnaire to look over.

In actuality, the purpose of giving the participant some background information about her partner was to make the partner appear somewhat socially desirable, but generally
neutral. I did not want the confederate to appear extremely socially desirable lest this overwhelm the impression instructions. That is, if the description of the confederate had been too positive, all participants might have tried to make a good impression on their partners regardless of their assigned condition. Confederates were portrayed as someone who liked to watch TV and play with his/her dog, was interested in travel and astronomy, planned to become a veterinarian, and would describe himself/herself as quiet and creative (see Appendix B). The partner background information was consistent across conditions and gender.

The background questionnaire was devised by pre-testing a separate group of 42 undergraduate female participants to determine to what extent various characteristics and interests were socially desirable in a person. The pre-test participants rated a variety of descriptors on a 9-point Likert scale (1 = extremely undesirable, 9 = extremely desirable). Half of the participants were told that these traits described a male, whereas the other half of the participants believed that the traits described a female. Specific descriptors were chosen partially on the basis of similar desirability in describing males and females and partially on the basis of their neutrality. The mean rating of the descriptors selected was 6.37 (range 4.98 to 7.88), somewhat but not extremely above neutral.

Experimental task. Participants were told that the get-acquainted procedure required that each partner tell four anecdotes or stories, lasting a minute and a half each, about himself or herself. The experimenter acknowledged that this procedure might sound “a little weird,” but explained that we needed to be able to control their conversation for purposes of the experiment. The experimenter gave the participants a list of 12 topics to choose from and instructed the participant to choose 4 topics from the list. Examples of topics were, “my
favorite movie,” “the best vacation I’ve ever taken,” “my best subjects in school,” and “how I
got my pet.” Participants were given 5-7 minutes alone to prepare their anecdotes and were
allowed to make notes to use during the conversation. The confederate’s background
questionnaire remained with the participant while she was preparing her anecdotes, and she
was told to look it over. Before the participant met her partner, the experimenter reminded
her that her task in the experiment was to try to make a good impression on her partner or to
act as if she did not care about making a good impression on her partner. Participants in the
no-instructions condition received no such reminder.

Get-acquainted procedure and eating measure. After preparing their anecdotes,
participants were taken to another experimental room, where the confederate was waiting,
seated at a table. The participant was seated across from the confederate, at the opposite end
of the table, to ensure that she did not have easy access to the confederate’s food (see below).
The partners were instructed to take turns telling the anecdotes about themselves and were
told that a series of pre-recorded beeps would signal them when to begin and when to end
each. In the event that one of them could not finish his/her anecdote in the allotted time, they
were told “it’s not a big deal, just move on to the next person.” They were asked to refrain
from discussing any additional topics, in order to help control the experimental procedure.

The experimenter always selected the confederate to tell the first anecdote. The
confederates delivered pre-rehearsed, memorized anecdotes on four different topics: “a
recent vacation,” “what I did last summer,” “something embarrassing that happened to me,”
and “a time I was angry with my parents.” The confederate’s scripts were developed by
having fourteen separate undergraduate male and female participants write personal stories
about these four topics. Anecdotes were then selected and edited with the aim of keeping the content gender-neutral (see Appendix C).

Before the experimenter left the room, she casually said, “By the way, we have a bunch of cookies that were left over from a lab party. I’ll be right back with those in case you guys want any.” The experimenter then quickly walked out of the room and returned with two bowls, each containing a mixture of mini Oreo cookies and mini Chips Ahoy cookies, which she placed in front of the participant and the confederate. The experimenter then told them to please feel free to eat as many cookies as they liked. At this point the experimenter left the room and the get-acquainted procedure began. The interaction lasted 14 minutes.

Both the participant’s and the confederate’s bowl of cookies were pre-weighed. The amount eaten by the participant during the interaction (post-interaction minus pre-interaction bowl weight) was the study’s main dependent measure. Confederate food intake was calculated in an identical manner, in order to monitor how closely they followed their pre-rehearsed eating schedule of eating 15 cookies during the get-acquainted procedure. Confederates were also instructed to eat at regular intervals throughout the interaction.

The experimenter then returned and gave the partners a set of questionnaires to fill out independently while they remained in the room together, allowing for additional time to eat. The questionnaire packet contained a demographics questionnaire, the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974), and the IM subscale of the BIDR (Paulhus, 1984). The experimenter gave the partners six minutes to complete the questionnaires. This marked the end of the get-acquainted procedure and the concomitant presence of the confederate and of the period during which participants could eat.
At this point the experimenter returned to the room and told the partners that they would now be completing some additional questionnaires separately and then led the participant back to her initial room where she completed a final packet of questionnaires alone. The questionnaires are described in detail below and a copy of each may be found in the Appendix. Before leaving the lab, all participants were fully and carefully debriefed. Included in the debriefing was an explanation of each aspect of the deception and an extended explanation of why deception is often used in psychology experiments and specifically in this particular experiment.

Materials

Food. The cookies used in this study were Mini Oreo cookies and Mini Rainbow Chips Ahoy cookies. Each cookie weighed approximately 3.25 grams and contained about 15 calories. Each participant was offered a bowl containing approximately 200 grams of cookies. The bowl was filled to the top with cookies so that participants could feel free to eat as much as they wanted without eating all of the cookies.

Demographics. The demographics questionnaire asked participants to indicate their gender, age, race/ethnicity, and religion.

Self-Monitoring. The Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974) is a measure of the degree to which people differ in their tendency to engage in impression management (Snyder, 1974; Snyder, 1987). Participants responded to 25 true-false items (in the present experiment $\alpha = .48$). Sample items include “I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people” and “My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.”
Gangestad and Snyder (1985) report both a structural analysis and an external analysis indicating that a class model (as opposed to a continuous model) is appropriate for measuring self-monitoring propensities. Further, across a wide variety of studies involving the self-monitoring construct, the classification scheme emerging from the taxometric analyses outperformed the full self-monitoring scale treated as a continuous dimension (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). For that reason, I treated self-monitoring as a dichotomous (high vs. low self-monitors) class variable in my analyses. Participants scoring between 0 and 12 were classified as low self-monitors and those scoring between 13 and 25 were classified as high self-monitors (Snyder, 1974). In this sample, 32 participants were classified as low self-monitors and 43 participants were classified as high self-monitors.

**Impression Management.** The IM subscale of the BIDR (Paulhus, 1984) was used to measure participants’ tendency to use overly positive self-descriptions. It is also an indicator of sensitivity to situational self-presentation demands. The IM subscale of the BIDR contains 20 items (in the present experiment $\alpha = .74$), to which participants responded on a 7-point scale (1 = not true, 7 = very true). Sample items include “I sometimes tell lies if I have to” and “I never cover up my mistakes.”

**Dietary Restraint.** The Restraint Scale (Herman & Polivy, 1980) contains 10 items and measures dieting (in the present experiment, $\alpha = .80$); scores can vary from 0 to 35. Individuals who score 15 or higher are classified as restrained eaters (or dieters), whereas those scoring below 15 are classified as unrestrained eaters (or nondieters). Sample items include “How often are you dieting?” and “In a typical week, how much does your weight fluctuate?” This scale contained two additional items asking the participant to indicate her
current height and current weight; these items were used to calculate participants’ Body Mass Index (BMI). The Restraint Scale was included because participants’ dieting status might have independently affected how many cookies they ate during the experiment, and it was important to ensure that the proportion of dieters did not differ across conditions.

**Partner Reaction Questionnaire.** Participants answered five questions assessing how much they liked their partner in the study. Items asked: 1) how much did you like your partner, 2) how much did you want to get to know your partner better, 3) how much did you think your partner was interesting, 4) how much did you feel that your partner had similar interests to your own, and 5) to what extent was your partner the kind of person you would want to be close friends with. Participants rated their partner using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot). These five items were highly intercorrelated and, therefore, were averaged to produce an overall measure of partner liking in the study (α = .85).

Also included this questionnaire was the impression-management manipulation check and a question assessing how nervous participants felt. Participants reported the extent to which they tried to make a good impression on their partner using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot). Specifically, participants answered the following question: “To what extent did you try to make a good impression on your partner?” Nervousness was measured by asking participants to report how nervous they felt during the interaction using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot).

**Post-Experimental Questionnaire.** Participants also answered questions assessing how much they liked the cookies and if there had been anything preventing them from consuming the cookies. Participants reported how much they liked the cookies using a 7-
point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot). The other item, asking participants if there had been anything preventing them from eating the cookies, was a free-response question.

Results

Overview

Where all the independent variables were categorical I conducted two- or three-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs). The independent variables always included impression instructions and partner gender. Where post-hoc comparisons were performed on three groups the Least Significant Difference (LSD) method was used. Where post-hoc comparisons were performed on more than three groups the Sidak adjustment for multiple comparisons was used. Again, where simple-effects tests were performed to probe significant interaction effects the Sidak adjustment was used.

Where one or more predictor variable(s) were continuous I used hierarchical multiple regression analyses in which the dependent variable was regressed on: 1) impression instructions (dummy coded with -1 = good impression, 0 = no instructions, 1 = avoid good impression); 2) partner gender (dummy coded with 0 = male and 1 = female); 3) the standardized continuous variable; and 4) all possible interactions.

Preliminary Analyses

Participant comparability. To ensure that there were no initial differences between participants on variables that might have affected grams of cookies eaten (the main dependent variable), I did a series of impression-instructions by confederate-gender ANOVAs on dietary restraint, BMI, self-monitoring, BIDR scores, the extent to which participants felt nervous, and how much participants liked the cookies, finding no significant effects.
In addition, I checked to make sure that there were no significant differences in the extent to which participants reported having tried to make a good impression on the various confederates (independent of impression-management condition) as well as participants’ perceptions of the various confederates, as these factors might have had an effect on the dependent variable. I compared participants’ self-reports of the extent to which they tried to make a good impression on their partners across all confederates using a one-way ANOVA, finding no significant differences. The mean partner liking reported was slightly above neutral ($M = 4.56, \text{SD} = 1.05$), which was my goal. Again, I compared partner liking across all confederates using a one-way ANOVA. There were no significant differences in the extent to which participants liked the various confederates.

**Check on the impression-management manipulation and partner liking.** The impression-management manipulation had the intended effect on participants’ impression motivation. The two-way ANOVA (impression instructions x confederate gender) revealed a main effect of impression instructions, $F_{(2, 69)} = 8.84, p < .001$. Post-hoc tests revealed that participants who received instructions to make a good impression reported trying significantly harder to impress their partner than did those in the no-instructions condition, $p < .05$, and avoid-good-impression, $p < .001$, conditions (see Table 3). On the same dependent variable, the difference between the no-instructions condition and the avoid-good-impression condition was marginally significant, $p = .07$. No other effects were significant on this measure.

With respect to partner liking, the ANOVA revealed a main effect of impression instructions, $F_{(2, 69)} = 3.28, p < .05$; post-hoc tests indicated that participants in the good-impression condition liked their partners significantly more ($M = 4.97, \text{SD} = .95$) than did
those in the avoid-good-impression condition ($M = 4.33$, $SD = .97$), $p < .05$.\(^4\) Participants in the no-instructions condition were not significantly different from those in the other two conditions on this measure ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 1.05$).

**Main Analyses: Amount Eaten**

In all cases the dependent variable was cookies eaten, measured in grams; however, in order to maintain consistency across all three experiments and to allow for comparability of results, I converted grams to calories. Therefore, data are reported in calories. An examination of a histogram of these data revealed that they were not normally distributed; rather, they were positively skewed. The skewness was 1.17 ($SE = .28$) indicating that the distribution was highly skewed.\(^5\) A log transformation produced a normal distribution, and transformed values were used in all analyses; however, means, where reported, represent untransformed data.

The confederates had been trained to eat 15 cookies (approximately 45 grams or 208 calories) during the get-acquainted procedure. Confederates’ mean cookie intake conformed to this targeted amount ($M = 206.61$ calories, $SD = 49.59$), although there was some variability. A two-way ANOVA (impression instructions x confederate gender) on amount eaten by confederates showed no significant effects, indicating that confederates ate equal amounts across conditions. Since I used six different confederates, I checked to see if the specific confederates ate different amounts and found no significant effects.

---

\(^4\) I was not expecting this effect; however, it is possible that participants thought that their partners received the same impression-management instructions as they did (even though they received no such information). If this was the case participants in the good-impression condition would have expected their partner to try to make a good impression on them and therefore, probably expected to like their partner more. The opposite would have been true for those in the avoid-good-impression condition.

\(^5\) If skewness is less than -1 or greater than +1, the distribution is said to be highly skewed (Bulmer, 1979).
Table 4 displays the mean amount eaten by participants as a function of impression instructions and confederate gender. The two-way ANOVA on these data yielded no significant effects. However the pattern of data in Table 4 is consistent with the expectation based on the hypothesized operation of the two independent variables, such that participants were expected to eat the least with a male confederate when instructed to make a good impression. Therefore, I conducted an exact test of this prediction using a planned-comparison contrast. As expected, the contrast between the good-impression/male-confederate cell and the other five cells combined was significant, $p < .05$.

*Traits as moderators of amount eaten.* I predicted that self-monitoring would moderate the effect of impression instructions on amount eaten such that high self-monitors would change their eating behavior in response to manipulated impression-management goals, whereas low self-monitors would not. The three-way ANOVA (impression instructions x confederate gender x self-monitoring) on participants’ food intake yielded only the expected impression-instructions by self-monitoring interaction, $F_{(2, 63)} = 3.54, p < .05$. Simple-effects tests showed that there was a significant effect of impression instructions on amount eaten for high self-monitors, $F_{(2, 63)} = 4.07, p < .05$, but not for low self-monitors, $F_{(2, 63)} = .92, p = ns$ (see Figure 1). Confirming my hypothesis, high self-monitors ate significantly less in the good-impression condition than they did in the avoid-good-impression condition, $p < .05$, and they ate marginally less in the good-impression condition than they did in the no-instructions condition, $p = .07$. Intake of low self-monitors did not vary as a function of impression instructions.

I also predicted that trait impression management as measured by the IM subscale of the BIDR would moderate the effects of impression instructions on amount eaten. I
conducted a multiple regression analysis to examine this possibility, finding no significant effects.

Ancillary Analyses

Partner liking. The extent to which participants liked their partner (the confederate) in the study is a factor that might influence impression motivation. Presumably, if a participant finds her partner more appealing, she should be more inclined to make a good impression, regardless of the instructions received in the study. Therefore, partner liking might have shaped impression-management goals and had an effect on intake. To examine this possibility, I first conducted a hierarchical multiple-regression analysis, in which participants’ self-report of the extent to which they tried to make a good impression on their partner was regressed on impression instructions, confederate gender, and partner liking (step 1) and their interactions (steps 2 and 3). This analysis showed that the dependent measure was significantly predicted by the regression equation (step 1), $R^2 = .28, p < .001$. There were two significant main effects; both impression instructions, $\beta = -.38, p = .001$, and partner liking, $\beta = .27, p = .01$ were significant predictors of the dependent measure. The effect of impression instructions was identical to that already reported above; participants in the good-impression condition reported trying harder to make a good impression on their partner compared to those in the avoid-good-impression and no-instructions conditions. In addition, participants reported trying harder to make a good impression as partner liking increased, independent of impression instructions.

Given the results reported above, I then assessed the relationship between partner liking and intake by first examining the correlation between partner liking and amount eaten; the two variables showed a significant negative correlation, $r = -.28, p < .05$. To explore this
association further, and to examine any potential interactions, I then conducted a regression analysis, with impression instructions, confederate gender, and partner liking (step 1) and their interactions (steps 2 and 3) as predictor variables and amount eaten as the dependent variable. Amount eaten was significantly predicted by the regression equation (step 1), $R^2 = .14, p < .05$. Partner liking was the only significant predictor, $\beta = -.27, p < .05$. The more participants liked their partner in the study, the less they ate. Confederate gender was a marginally significant predictor of amount eaten, $\beta = .21, p = .06$, such that participants tended to eat less with a male confederate.

Check on impression-management manipulation as a function of self-monitoring. It is possible that the reason that impression instructions differentially affected high and low self-monitors’ eating behavior is that low self-monitors did not follow the impression instructions given by the experimenter; that is, perhaps they did not differentially try to make a good impression. To rule out this possibility, I conducted an ANOVA (impression instructions x confederate gender x self-monitoring) on the manipulation check (self-reported extent to which participants tried to make a good impression on their partner). Arguing against this possibility, there was no main effect of self-monitoring, no significant interaction between self-monitoring and impression instructions, and no significant three-way interaction effect. There was a significant main effect of impression condition, $F_{(2, 63)} = 7.69, p = .001$, which was essentially identical to the effect already reported (see above).

Nervousness. I assessed participants’ self-reports of how nervous they felt during their interaction with the confederate to evaluate the possibility that the effect of the impression-management instructions on amount eaten might have been mediated by anxiety. The mean nervousness reported ($M = 2.59, SD = 1.60$) suggests that participants did not feel
overly nervous during their interactions, and it will be recalled that there were no impression condition or gender effects on nervousness ratings. However, given that there was variability in the nervousness ratings, and to rule out the possibility that nervousness was a factor affecting eating, I conducted a regression analysis, with impression instructions, confederate gender, and nervousness (step 1) and all of their possible interactions (steps 2 and 3) as predictors of amount eaten. Arguing against the possibility that nervousness accounted for differences in amount eaten, the regression analysis showed no significant effects.

Discussion

When the data were analyzed without including the moderating effect of self-monitoring, the results were in line with my hypotheses but somewhat weak. The experiment failed to replicate Mori et al. (1987) and Pliner and Chaiken (1990), in that I did not find a significant main effect of confederate gender on amount eaten, nor did I find a main effect of the instructions manipulation. When I did a planned comparison, I did find that the one group of participants who were expected to eat the least (those who both had a male partner and had been instructed to make a good impression), did in fact eat less than did participants in the remaining groups combined. In addition, when partner liking was taken into account, there was a main effect of partner gender that was nearly significant; participants ate less with a male confederate than with a female confederate.

The results were stronger when I added the self-monitoring variable. As hypothesized, I found a significant interaction between self-monitoring and impression instructions. High self-monitors ate significantly less in the good-impression condition than they did in the avoid-good-impression or no-instructions conditions, whereas low self-monitors ate the same amount across conditions.
Although the results obtained (collapsed across self-monitoring) showed the expected pattern, they were not as strong as I had predicted. There are a number of factors that may have contributed to the relatively weak results and a number of issues that are of concern in this experiment. The first issue is the fact that participants’ intake was generally extremely low across all conditions, regardless of experimental condition or self-monitoring. Participants ate approximately twenty-two grams of cookies, which is equivalent to about seven very small cookies. Additionally there were a number of participants who ate no cookies at all.\(^6\) The fact that participants ate relatively small amounts in the study may have obscured the experimental effects. Given that other data collected in the same laboratory show that when participants are left alone with a bowl of the same cookies, they consume approximately 15-20 cookies, my data suggest that in the current study something was suppressing participants’ eating.

In re-evaluating the experimental paradigm, I concluded that there were a number of factors that might have limited participants’ intake such as: talking, preoccupation with the anecdotes that they were required to relate to their partners, performance anxiety (although nervousness did not predict amount eaten), other forms of nonverbal involvement (e.g., eye contact, body language, smiling), simple distraction from eating, the desire to minimize any possibility of eating sloppily, and quite possibly the desire to appear polite. (Many participants indicated that they thought it was rude to eat while others were talking as well as while they themselves were talking.)\(^7\) Because the experiment was not a “meal” situation,

---

\(^6\) When the data were analyzed dropping all participants who ate no cookies, the results were almost identical to those reported in the Results section.

\(^7\) The results supported my hypothesis regarding self-monitoring and suggest that it is only high self-monitors who use eating behavior as a means of impression management. However, it should be noted that the issues discussed here may have influenced the self-monitoring results. It is possible that higher nonverbal involvement
participants may have felt that it was not as acceptable to eat in this context. Additionally, participants were not food-deprived (as eating was incidental), and I neglected to measure participants’ hunger, a variable that might have influenced amount eaten.

Second, despite my attempts to control for confederate differences by means of extensive training, confederates’ behaviors and personalities might have influenced participants’ intake. My results showed that, across all conditions, participants ate less when they liked their partner more. This association might have caused a particular problem for the avoid-good-impression condition, as high partner liking in this condition (associated with lower food intake) may have superseded the experimenter’s instructions (which were expected to increase food intake). In other words, participants in the avoid-good-impression condition may have tried to make a good impression on the confederate if they found the confederate socially desirable. Within-cell correlations show that in the avoid-good-impression condition there was a significant positive relationship between partner liking and participants’ self-reports of the extent to which they tried to make a good impression on their partner, and there was a significant negative relationship between partner liking and amount eaten. In contrast, there was no relationship among these variables in the good-impression condition. This is yet another factor that could have obscured group differences and made it difficult to find the hypothesized results.

Third, the student body at the university where the current study was conducted is very ethnically diverse. Previous research indicates that similarity predicts liking even when desirable and undesirable personality characteristics are controlled for (Tenney, Turkheimer, or an exaggerated concern about one’s manners may have accounted for decreased eating among high self-monitors in the good-impression condition, particularly since this subset of the sample was likely to be especially conscious of their nonverbal behavior and their manners.
& Oltmanns, 2009). In particular, people prefer same-race/ethnicity friendships (e.g., Graham & Cohen, 1997; Koa & Joyner, 2004; Tenney et al., 2009) as well as romantic relationships (e.g., Buss, 1985; Epstein & Guttman 1984; Luo, 2009; Watson et al., 2004). The lack of ethnic similarity between participants and their confederate partners may have limited the social appeal of those partners, thereby limiting impression-management motivation which in turn could have affected eating behavior. Thus, the ethnic diversity of both my sample and my confederates may have made it difficult for me to find the hypothesized instructions effect and to replicate the findings of Mori et al. (1987) and Pliner and Chaiken (1990), where the samples used were much more homogeneous ethnically.8

Most of the problems inherent in the experimental paradigm can be attributed to the physical presence of the confederate. In the subsequent study I changed the experimental paradigm to include a “remote” or hypothetical confederate (i.e., the participant is led to believe there is someone else participating but an actual confederate does not exist) as opposed to a live confederate. Using a remote-confederate paradigm enabled me to separate the act of eating in the presence of another person during a social interaction from the decision as to how much to eat, to eliminate the unintended effect of confederates’ personalities, and to match the participant and the confederate on ethnicity. Additionally, I created a paradigm that centered on a meal so that participants would believe that it was appropriate to eat while still behaving politely. Thus, in my next study I aimed to modify the procedure in order to remove extraneous influential factors and produce clearer results.

---

8 In Mori et al.’s (1987) first experiment, the mean liking for confederates in the high desirability condition was similar to the mean partner liking in the no-instructions condition in the present experiment. However, in Mori et al.’s (1987) second experiment, where they used male confederates only, the mean liking reported was significantly higher than the mean partner liking in the no-instructions condition. Pliner and Chaiken (1990) did not report mean ratings of partner liking.
Experiment 2

The presence of a live confederate in Experiment 1 may have had unintended consequences for eating and impression motivation. Furthermore, as discussed in the General Introduction, impression-management tactics may be verbal or nonverbal. Experiment 1 gave participants access to a variety of verbal and nonverbal tactics that could be used for impression management (e.g., smiling, eye contact, body language, self-description and other verbal tactics); therefore, food intake as a device for managing one’s impression may not have been very salient. It is also possible that participants were so busy using these other types of self-presentational strategies that they did not have adequate time to eat. Hence, the main goal of Experiment 2 was to control and intensify impression-management motivation and design a situation in which the role of eating behavior in an impression-management context would be more salient.

To accomplish this goal I modified the experimental procedure used in Experiment 1. Female participants still believed that they were participating in a “get acquainted” study, but this time I employed a paradigm in which the participant never actually interacted with the confederate and instead helped herself to as much pizza as she wanted before supposedly joining her partner for lunch. Although the live confederate was not present at the time, the participant committed herself to how much food would be on her plate when she joined her partner. Thus, I gave participants the opportunity to think about using food as an impression-management device at a time when they were not otherwise thinking about or engaged in other forms of impression management. This design separated the use of eating (or amount of food taken) from other impression-management techniques. It was clear to the participant that the amount of food that she put on her plate would be visually salient to her partner when
they met. In addition, I matched the remote confederate’s ethnic background to that of the participant to create more similarity and enhance expected liking and attractiveness. By using a remote confederate I was also able to remove any extraneous influence (e.g., personality, likeability, amount eaten) the confederate might have on the participant.

Because participants never actually met and ate with a confederate, I used amount of food taken as my dependent measure. That is, I measured the amount of food that participants put on their plates while they believed that they would be eating lunch with a partner of either the same sex or the opposite sex. It would be clear to the partner how much food the participant had taken and presumably intended to eat. Therefore, this act of taking food served as a proxy for actually eating with a partner. The eating literature recognizes amount taken to eat as a valid measure of eating behavior (e.g., Cinciripini, 1984; Krantz, 1979; Young et al., 2009). Further, Koh and Pliner (2009) measured both how much food participants served themselves and how much food they actually ate when interacting with a partner, finding that participants ate nearly all of the food that they served themselves.

Additionally, in Experiment 2 I incorporated a condition in which participants were told that they would not be meeting another participant and would be eating alone. I included this Alone condition because typically in the impression-management literature, a public/private manipulation is used as a test of self-presentational motives (Baumeister, 1982; Leary, 1995). Impression-management researchers infer that, if the public awareness produced by the presence of another person makes one change his/her behavior, it is because the person is concerned with what this behavior communicates to others (Baumeister, 1982).

In addition to self-monitoring, I included three additional individual-difference measures that are related to both dieting and self-presentational concerns and that may
therefore be important for understanding the effects of impression-management goals on eating behavior. Women with eating disorders tend to have a high need for social approval and a strong fear of rejection (Dunn & Ondercin, 1981; Katzman & Wolchik, 1984; Leary, Tchividjian, & Kraxberger, 1994b; Weinstein & Richman, 1984). Additionally, self-esteem is negatively associated with dietary restraint and the incidence of eating disorders (e.g., Garner, Olmsted, & Polivy, 1983; Gross & Rosen, 1988; Katzman & Wolchik, 1984; Polivy, Heatherton, & Herman, 1988; Ruderman & Grace, 1988). Further, all of these factors have been shown to be associated with impression-management concerns (Leary, 1983b; Leary et al., 1994b). Therefore, in this study I included measures assessing participants’ need to belong, fear of negative evaluation, and trait self-esteem. I planned to use these measures as third variables, as these individual-difference variables could moderate the extent to which participants are motivated to manage their impressions via eating.

Finally, in order to gain additional insight about what eating strategies people might deem to be effective in making a good impression on partners of the same and the opposite sex, I constructed a Social Motives questionnaire. This questionnaire (described below) asked participants to rate the extent to which they believed that a variety of different self-presentational strategies would be effective in making a good impression on a male vs. a female partner.

To summarize, female participants were instructed either to “make a good impression” on their partner or to “act as if they did not care about making a good impression” on their partner, or they were given no instructions about impression management. Participants believed that they would be having a conversation over a pizza lunch with either a male or a female partner. They were told to take pizza and that they
would be eating that pizza when they had lunch with their partner. In addition, one group of participants was under the impression that they were participating in the study alone. The design of this experiment was a 2 x 3 (partner gender x impression instructions) factorial with the additional alone condition. The effects were assessed by measuring the number of pieces of pizza taken (which was then converted to calories).

My hypotheses remained the same for Experiment 2 as they had been for Experiment 1: 1) participants would take less pizza if they expected to be eating in the presence of a male than a female partner and 2) participants would take less pizza in the good-impression condition than in the no-instructions condition, whereas they would take more pizza in the avoid-good-impression condition than in the no-instructions condition; thus, participants would also take less pizza in the good-impression condition than in the avoid-good-impression condition. Again, the purpose of the no-instructions condition was to see how much participants took naturally when given no specific instructions. I predicted that participants in the alone condition would take roughly the same amount of pizza as would those in the avoid-good-impression condition, since for participants in both of these conditions the motivation to make a good impression has been reduced, in the former case by privacy and in the latter case by the experimental instructions. Based on my results in Experiment 1, I hypothesized that there would be an interaction between self-monitoring and impression instructions, such that high self-monitors would take less pizza when instructed to make a good impression, whereas there would be no effect of impression instructions on amount of pizza taken by low self-monitors.

Method

Participants
Participants were 112 female University of Toronto at Mississauga students with a mean age of 18.70 ($SD = 2.28$). Participants were recruited through the Introductory Psychology subject pool using standard procedures. Participants received one credit for participating, as a part of their Introductory Psychology course. Participants were instructed upon signing up for the experiment that they were to refrain from eating for three hours prior to their appointment time, as they would be having lunch with a partner during the experiment. Two participants were excluded because they did not follow instructions correctly during the experiment. Therefore 110 participants were included in all subsequent analyses.

Procedure

As in Experiment 1, participants were under the impression that they were participating in a “get acquainted” study, during which they would be having a conversation with a partner over lunch. At the time of recruitment, participants were informed that we were interested in the things that people said when they first met someone new; therefore, they would be meeting and having a conversation with another participant during the experiment. When participants arrived for the experiment, they were greeted by a female experimenter and told: “In this study, we are interested in learning more about the ‘get acquainted’ process. There has been little research on how strangers interact when they first meet each other, so we want to learn more about how people act when they first meet someone new.” At this point participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: 1) good impression, 2) avoid good impression, 3) no instructions, and 4) alone (these conditions are described below). In the good-impression and avoid-good-impression conditions, the experimenter continued her description of the study, explaining that there can
be different motives operating when people are trying to get to know each other and that we were interested in the kinds of things that people say when they are either a) trying to make a good impression on others or b) not interested in making a good impression on others, depending on their condition. They were then told that they would be meeting and having a conversation with another participant who was “in another room,” and that their job was to a) try to make a good impression on their partner (good-impression condition) or b) act as if they did not care about making a good impression on their partner (avoid-good-impression condition). Participants were given no information about the impression instructions that their partner in the study had received. Participants in the no-instructions condition received no information about motives operating during get-acquainted situations or instructions regarding impression-management goals; they were simply told we were interested in learning more about the get-acquainted process. All participants were told that, since most people usually get to know each other over a meal, they would be having lunch with the other participant to simulate a “first meeting” experience. Participants in the alone condition originally believed they were participating in the study with a partner, just as in the no-instructions condition. They were told that at the last minute the other participant had cancelled and that they would not be meeting anyone but rather would be completing questionnaires and eating lunch alone so that they could still receive their course credit.

In order to accomplish the gender manipulation, participants (except for those in the alone condition) were led to believe that they were going to meet and converse with either a male or a female partner. The gender of the partner was made clear during the initial instructions. Participants were shown an audio tape-recorder and were told that all conversations would be tape-recorded so that we could analyze the conversation. This
procedure was intended to reinforce the cover story. At this point participants signed the consent form.

After signing the consent form, participants were told that, before meeting their partner who was allegedly in another room, both of them would complete and exchange background questionnaires, on which they would describe their hobbies, interests, and career goals, so that they could learn a little bit about each other before meeting. Aside from these open-ended questions, the questionnaire asked participants to indicate their gender, age, ethnicity, and religion. The open-ended responses on the “other participant’s” background questionnaire were identical to those used in Experiment 1. In addition, the experimenter matched the fictitious partner’s ethnicity and religion with that of the participant to increase perceived similarity among partners. Aside from ethnicity and religion, the background questionnaire was consistent across all impression-management conditions; reported gender varied according to the participants’ assigned gender conditions.

After looking over their partner’s background questionnaire, participants completed a Preliminary Partner Reaction questionnaire, which was used to measure their expected liking for their partner, their nervousness, and the extent to which they planned to try to make a good impression on their partner. Completing this questionnaire also helped to ensure that they read their partner’s responses. At this point, the participant was told that she would be helping herself to lunch from the kitchen and then would return with her lunch to the room she was currently in, where her partner would be waiting for her. The experimenter explained that, once she met her partner, the two participants would have their get-acquainted conversation while they were eating lunch. The participant believed that the conversation would last 20 minutes. She was also reminded at this time of her impression instructions.
(Participants in the alone and no-instructions conditions did not receive this reminder.) In order to reduce any self-consciousness about the amount of pizza taken, the experimenter left the room before the participant served herself pizza.

A small room with a one-way mirror was set up as a kitchen. The mirror was almost completely covered with a poster (except for a small slit which allowed the experimenter to observe the participant), so as to make the participant believe that she was not being observed. The experimenter led the participant to the kitchen, where there was a tray containing 24 small slices of pizza (described below) from which the participant was invited to help herself. Participants were served this particular amount of pizza because it made the tray appear full and because participants could take a relatively large amount and still leave pizza on the serving plate. The participant was also given a tray for herself with an empty dinner-sized plate (10.25 inches in diameter), a napkin, and a cup of water. The participant received no information about how much pizza her partner had taken; she was simply told that her partner has already taken pizza, so she should feel free to take as much pizza as she wanted. The experimenter observed the participant through the one-way mirror as she was serving herself to ensure that she did not eat any of the pizza before going back into the other room to meet her partner.9 The number of pieces of pizza taken by the participant was measured, converted to calories, and used as the primary dependent measure.10

Immediately after the participant returned to her original room with her lunch, the experimenter returned and informed her that she would not actually be meeting another participant for reasons that would be explained at the end of the study. Instead, she would

---

9 Only two participants ate pizza before leaving the kitchen; therefore, they were excluded from all analyses.

10 As in Experiment 1, this was done to maintain consistency throughout the experiments.
just be completing a set of questionnaires and she was free to eat her pizza. These
questionnaires may be found in the Appendix and are described below. Once the participant
finished completing the questionnaires, the experiment was over.

Before leaving the lab, all participants were fully and carefully debriefed. Included in
the debriefing was an explanation of each aspect of the deception and an extended
explanation of why deception is used in general in psychology experiments and specifically
in this particular experiment.

**Materials**

*Food.* The pizza used was commercially available McCain Deep and Delicious Three
Cheese Pizza. Participants were served four individual-sized pizzas, each of which was cut
into 6 small slices. Each slice weighed approximately 16 grams and contained about 38
calories. Participants were also given a cup of water.

*Self-Monitoring.* For a detailed description of the Self-Monitoring scale see
Experiment 1 (in the present experiment α = .62). In the Experiment 2 sample, 53
participants were classified as low self-monitors and 57 participants were classified as high
self-monitors.

*Need to Belong.* The Need to Belong scale (Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, & Schreindorfer,
2007) contains 10 items (in the present experiment α = .79), to which participants responded
using a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Sample items include “I
have a strong need to belong” and “I want other people to accept me.”

*Fear of Negative Evaluation.* The Fear of Negative Evaluation scale (Leary, 1983a)
contains 12 items (in the present experiment α = .89), to which participants responded using a
5-point scale (1 = not characteristic at all of me, 5 = extremely characteristic of me). Sample
items include “I am afraid other people will not approve of me” and “I am afraid that people will find fault with me.”

*Trait Self-Esteem.* The Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1965) was used to measure trait self-esteem. The scale consists of 10 items (in the present experiment \( \alpha = .87 \)), to which participants responded using a 4-point scale (1 = strongly agree, 4 = strongly disagree). Participants rated their agreement with statements such as “I take a positive attitude toward myself.”

*Dietary Restraint.* For a detailed description of the Restraint scale see Experiment 1 (in the present experiment \( \alpha = .79 \)).

*Preliminary Partner Reaction Questionnaire.* Participants answered seven questions assessing how much they expected to like their partner in the study. Items asked: 1) how much do you expect to like your partner, 2) how much are you looking forward to talking with your partner, 3) how much do you expect to want to get to know your partner better, 4) how interesting do you expect your partner to be, 5) how much do you think your partner will have interests similar to yours, 6) to what extent do you think that your partner will be the kind of person you would want to be close friends with, and 7) how attractive do you expect your partner to be. Participants rated their partner using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot). These seven items were highly intercorrelated and therefore were averaged to produce an overall measure of expected partner liking in the study (\( \alpha = .86 \)).

Also included in this questionnaire was a check on the impression-management manipulation and a measure assessing current nervousness. The manipulation check consisted of two items; participants reported 1) the extent to which they planned to make a good impression on their partner and 2) how important it was for them to make a good
impression on their partner. Participants responded to these items using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot). These two items were highly correlated and therefore were averaged to produce an overall measure of the motivation to present a positive impression (α = .79).

Nervousness was measured by asking participants to report how nervous they felt at that moment using the same scale.

Social Motives. Participants completed a social-motives questionnaire that asked about what types of strategies they perceived as effective in helping to make a good impression on a stranger of the same sex or of the opposite sex. Using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not effective at all, 7 = extremely effective), participants rated how effective each strategy would be for making a good impression on a stranger with whom they were having lunch for the first time. Participants completed four versions of this questionnaire. First they completed it from the perspective of women in general (a general perspective) and answered the questions in reference to a female partner and then in reference to a male partner. Second, they completed it from a personal perspective (they were asked to what extent they, personally, would use each strategy if they wanted to make a good impression) and again, answered the questions first in reference to a female partner and then in reference to a male partner. There were a total of 36 items, with five crucial items related to eating embedded in the questionnaire. These five items included: “eating a lot,” “eating more than the other person,” “eating the same amount as the other person,” “eating a small amount,” and “eating less than the other person.” These items were the only items of interest.

Post-Experimental Questionnaire. Participants also answered additional questions intended to check the effectiveness of the cover story and to ascertain how much they had expected to like the pizza, how much they had expected to enjoy their meal, and how hungry
they had been. Finally, they answered an open-ended question in which they were asked to indicate which factor(s), aside from hunger and expected liking of the pizza, had contributed to how much pizza they took. The free-response question was coded for the mention of impression-management motives as a factor contributing to how much pizza participants took. The question was coded categorically (no mention of impression-management motives, mention of decrease in amount taken because of impression-management motives, mention of increase in amount taken because of impression-management motives, mention of impression-management motives but the direction of amount taken is unclear, and mention of a change in amount taken due to table manners).

Results

Overview

Where all the independent/predictor variables were categorical, I conducted two- or three-way ANOVAs. The independent variables always included impression instructions and partner gender. Data from participants in the alone condition were not included in these analyses because of the incomplete factorial design. Dunnett’s test is specifically designed for situations where all groups are to be compared against one "reference" group or a control group (Norusis, 2005). I used Dunnett’s test in my analyses to examine any differences between participants in the alone condition and those in the other impression-management conditions. In cases where either the dependent variable or one or more independent variables were not applicable to participants in the alone condition, this condition was not included in the analysis. Where post-hoc comparisons were performed on three groups the LSD method was used. Where post-hoc comparisons were performed on more than three groups the Sidak adjustment for multiple comparisons was used. Again, where simple-
effects tests were performed to probe significant interaction effects, the Sidak adjustment was used.

Where one or more predictor variable(s) were continuous, I used hierarchical multiple-regression analyses in which the dependent variable was regressed on: 1) impression instructions (dummy coded with -1 = good impression, 0 = no instructions, 1 = avoid good impression); 2) partner gender (dummy coded with 0 = male and 1 = female); 3) the standardized continuous variable; and 4) all possible interactions.

Preliminary Analyses

Participant comparability. To ensure that there were no initial differences between participants on variables that might have affected amount of pizza taken (the main dependent variable), I did a series of 2 x 3 (partner gender x impression instructions) ANOVAs on dietary restraint, BMI, self-monitoring, self-esteem, the need to belong, fear of negative evaluation, nervousness, self-reported hunger, expected liking of the pizza, and expected enjoyment of the meal. I found no significant effects for any of these variables with the exception of nervousness.

There was a significant interaction effect on nervousness, $F_{(2, 88)} = 3.02, p = .05$ (means are displayed in Table 5). Simple-effects tests showed that there were no differences in nervousness across impression conditions for participants expecting to interact with a male partner, $F_{(2, 88)} = 1.64, p = ns$, but nervousness did marginally differ across impression condition for those expecting to interact with a female partner, $F_{(2, 88)} = 2.51, p = .09$. An examination of the means for participants expecting to interact with a female partner showed that those in the good-impression condition were somewhat more nervous than were those in the no-instructions condition. Additionally, there appeared to be a marginal effect of partner
gender on nervousness for participants in the good-impression, $F_{(1, 88)} = 2.76, p = .10$, and no-instructions conditions, $F_{(1, 88)} = 2.43, p = .12$. In the good-impression condition participants reported feeling somewhat more nervous with a female partner than with a male partner, whereas there was a trend for participants in the no-instructions condition to report feeling more nervous with a male partner than with a female partner.

Dunnett’s test showed no significant differences between participants in the alone condition and those in any of the other conditions on the variables analyzed above, again except for nervousness. Participants in the alone condition ($M = 1.69, SD = .70$) were significantly less nervous than were participants in both the good-impression/female-partner ($M = 3.81, SD = 1.68$) and the avoid-good-impression/male-partner ($M = 3.88, SD = 1.67$) conditions, both $ps < .01$. There was a marginally significant difference on nervousness between participants in the alone condition and those in the no-instructions/male-partner condition ($M = 3.13, SD = 1.73$), $p < .10$ and there was a trend for alone participants to be less nervous than those in the avoid-good-impression/female-partner ($M = 2.94, SD = 1.44$) and good-impression/male-partner ($M = 2.81, SD = 1.72$) conditions, both $ps < .20$. In other words, not surprisingly, participants in the alone condition were generally less nervous than were participants in all other conditions.

Check on the impression-management manipulation, partner liking, and the cover story. The two-way ANOVA (partner gender x impression instructions) on the impression-motivation composite measure revealed a main effect of impression instructions, $F_{(2, 88)} = 9.37, p < .001$. Post-hoc tests revealed that participants who received instructions to make a good impression and those who received no instructions reported a stronger motivation to
make a good impression than did those in the avoid-good-impression condition, \( p < .001 \) and \( p < .01 \) respectively (see Table 6). No other effects were significant on this measure.

To assess the possibility that the nature of the experimental situation may have made participants feel self-conscious and may, therefore, have affected how much pizza they took, they were asked two questions: 1) to what extent did you think the experimenter would be aware of how much pizza you took during the experiment? and 2) to what extent did you think the experimenter would be aware of how much pizza you ate during the experiment? They responded using a 7-point Likert scale (1= not at all aware, 7 = completely aware).

Although participants seemed to think that the experimenter would be aware of how much pizza they had taken (\( M = 4.57, SD = 2.18 \)) and eaten (\( M = 5.05, SD = 2.03 \)), neither of these measures was related to how much pizza they actually took, \( r = .14 \) and .12, respectively, both \( ps = ns \). The two-way (partner gender x impression instructions) ANOVAs showed no significant differences between groups on these measures either. Dunnett’s test showed that participants in the alone condition did not differ from those in any of the other conditions.

On the partner-liking composite measure, the ANOVA showed a main effect of impression instructions, \( F(2, 88) = 3.67, p < .05 \); post-hoc tests showed that participants in the good-impression condition (\( M =4.87, SD = .75 \)) expected to like their partner significantly more than did those in the no-instructions condition (\( M =4.45, SD = .95 \)) and those in the avoid-good-impression condition (\( M =4.34, SD = .79 \)), both \( ps < .05 \). There was also a significant main effect of partner gender, \( F(1, 88) = 6.11, p < .05 \); participants expected to like their partner more when they thought their partner was a female (\( M =4.76 SD = .90 \)) than when they thought their partner was a male (\( M =4.35, SD = .76 \)). The experimental manipulation did appear to have differentially influenced participants’ expected liking of
their partner. However, unlike Experiment 1, expected partner liking had no relationship to amount of pizza taken \( (r = .03) \); therefore, no further analyses were conducted involving partner liking.

Participants in all conditions except for the alone condition were asked three questions in order to determine if they believed the experimental cover story. They responded using a 7-point Likert scale \((1 = \text{did not believe at all}, \ 7 = \text{completely believed})\). Participants reported the extent to which they believed that: 1) their partner actually existed \((M = 6.40, SD = 1.15)\), 2) they were going to meet, converse with, and eat lunch with their partner \((M = 6.50, SD = 1.01)\), and 3) their partner had already taken his/her pizza \((M = 5.69, SD = 1.69)\). The means indicated that, overall, participants did believe important aspects of the cover story involving the remote confederate. The two-way (partner gender x impression instructions) ANOVAs showed no significant differences between groups on any of these measures.

*Main Analyses: Amount of Pizza Taken*

Participants almost always ate all of the pizza that they took; therefore, amount of pizza taken was a valid measure of the amount that participants intended to eat. The mean discrepancy between the amount that participants took and the amount that they ate was only 10.63 calories \( (SD = 39.34) \). In addition there was a strong positive relationship between the amount of pizza taken and the amount of pizza eaten, \( r = .87, p < .01 \). Because the amount of pizza taken was significantly positively related to hunger, \( r = .36, p < .01 \), hunger was used as a covariate in all analyses involving amount of pizza taken. Table 7 displays the mean amount of pizza taken (in calories) by participants as a function of partner gender and impression instructions. Where reported, all means are corrected for the effect of the
covariate.\textsuperscript{11} The two-way ANCOVA on these data yielded two significant main effects; a main effect of partner gender, $F_{(1, 87)} = 4.12, p < .05$, and a main effect of impression instructions, $F_{(2, 87)} = 3.33, p < .05$. Participants took less pizza when they believed they would be eating with a male partner than they took when they believed they would be eating with a female partner (see Figure 2). As for impression instructions, post-hoc tests revealed that participants in the avoid-good-impression condition took more pizza than did those in both the good-impression and no-instructions conditions, both $ps < .05$ (see Figure 2). Dunnett’s test on amount taken, including participants in the alone condition, showed no significant differences between those in the alone condition and those in any of the other experimental conditions.

\textit{Traits as moderators of amount of pizza taken.} Because the following traits were hypothesized to affect amount of pizza taken only in an impression-management context, no analyses were conducted involving participants in the alone condition. In Experiment 1, I found that the trait of self-monitoring moderated the relationship between impression instructions and amount eaten. To examine the possible moderating effect of self-monitoring here, I conducted a three-way ANCOVA (impression instructions x partner gender x self-monitoring) on the amount of pizza that participants took, finding no significant effects involving self-monitoring. Similarly, I conducted multiple regression analyses to examine possible moderating effects of the need to belong, the fear of negative evaluation, and self-esteem on amount of pizza taken, finding no significant effects.

\textit{Ancillary Analyses}

\textsuperscript{11} In all tables where corrected means are reported the standard error is reported in lieu of the standard deviation.
Social-motives questionnaires. The social-motives questionnaires were designed to learn more about what eating-related strategies participants thought would be effective in making a good impression on an unfamiliar co-eater of the same sex vs. an unfamiliar co-eater of the opposite sex. Participants’ responses to these questionnaires were analyzed to provide supporting evidence for my hypothesis and results regarding partner gender. These analyses included the entire sample since all participants completed both forms of the questionnaire (i.e., the questionnaire asking about both a male and a female partner) and they were relevant to participants in all experimental conditions, including those in the alone condition. Paired t-tests were used to compare participants’ responses about male and female strangers on the following items: “eating a lot,” “eating more than the other person,” “eating less than the other person,” “eating the same amount as the other person,” and “eating a small amount.” The tests were conducted separately for the sets of responses given from a general perspective and from a personal perspective. The results from the general perspective and personal perspective followed the identical pattern (means are presented in Table 8). Only the first 3 items listed above showed significant differences. Participants reported that the following strategies would be less effective in making a good impression on a male eating companion than on a female eating companion: 1) eating a lot (general: \( t_{(107)} = 3.48 \); personal: \( t_{(109)} = 4.76 \), both \( ps < .001 \)) and 2) eating more than the other person (general: \( t_{(107)} = 5.66 \); personal: \( t_{(109)} = 4.92 \), both \( ps < .001 \)). On the other hand, participants reported that it would be more effective to eat less than the other person with a male eating companion than with a female eating companion, (general: \( t_{(107)} = -3.41 \); personal: \( t_{(109)} = -3.86 \), both \( ps < .001 \)) if one wanted to make a good impression. As expected, these results confirmed my
findings on partner gender, which showed that participants took less pizza with a male partner than with a female partner.

Free-response question. The free-response question asked participants to describe what influenced how much pizza they took other than hunger and liking for the pizza. This question was analyzed mainly to confirm my findings and to see if participants were aware that impression-management goals were affecting their eating behavior; because alone participants had no such goals, they were excluded. This item was coded as 0 (nothing affected intake other than hunger, liking, and/or dieting), 1 (took less/a small amount because of partner’s presence), 2 (took more/a large amount because of partner’s presence), 3 (mention of eating, but direction is unclear), or 4 (amount taken changed because of table manners). Since this item was coded as a nominal category item I used the chi-square statistic to look at the effect of impression instructions on participants’ reports of factors affecting how much pizza they took. When the data were separated by partner gender, the pattern was identical, so in the results reported here I have collapsed across partner gender. The overall 3 (impression instructions) x 5 (factors affecting pizza taken) chi-square was significant, $\chi^2(8) = 19.79, p < .05$. Participants in the good-impression condition mentioned taking less pizza/a small amount of pizza because of partner’s presence 37.5% of the time, whereas those in the no-instructions condition mentioned taking less/a small amount because of partner’s presence 13.3% of the time and those in the avoid-good-impression condition mentioned taking less/a small amount because of partner’s presence only 9.4% of the time. On the other hand, participants in the avoid-good-impression condition mentioned taking more pizza/a large amount of pizza because of partner’s presence 12.5% of the time, whereas none of the
participants in the other two conditions mentioned taking more/a large amount because of their partner’s presence.

The two categories that I was interested in were “ate less because of partner’s presence” and “ate more because of partner’s presence.” Therefore, to probe the overall chi-square, I isolated these two categories and looked at condition effects individually. When comparing the good-impression and avoid-good-impression conditions, the condition effect was significant for both “took less,” $X^2 (1) = 7.05, p < .01,$ and “took more,” $X^2 (1) = 4.27, p < .05.$ When comparing the no-instructions and avoid-good-impression conditions, the condition effect was significant for “took more,” $X^2 (1) = 4.01, p < .05,$ but not for “took less,” $X^2 (1) = .24, p = ns.$ When comparing the good-impression and no-instructions conditions, the condition effect was significant for “took less,” $X^2 (1) = 4.72, p < .05.$

Participants’ free responses to this question confirmed both my hypothesis and my finding that females will try to eat less when they want to make a good impression on their companion. These results also suggest that women are conscious of this behavior to some extent when impression-management goals are made salient.

**Nervousness.** As in Experiment 1, I assessed participants’ self-reports of how nervous they felt about their anticipated interaction with their partner to evaluate the possibility that the effects of the impression instructions and partner gender on amount of pizza taken might have been affected by anxiety. Participants did not seem to feel overly nervous about the interaction ($M = 3.18, SD = 1.73$). However, because there was a significant interaction between impression instructions and partner gender on self-reported nervousness (reported above), a regression analysis was conducted on amount of pizza taken including hunger as a
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12 The chi-square test could not be conducted for “ate more” since no participants in either of these conditions (i.e., good-impression and no-instructions conditions) reported eating more.
control variable (step 1), impression instructions, partner gender, nervousness (step 2), and their interactions (steps 3 and 4) as predictor variables. The overall regression equation (step 2) was a significant predictor of amount of pizza taken, $\Delta R^2 = .08, p < .05$. As predicted, there was a main effect of both impression condition ($\beta = .20, p < .05$) and partner gender ($\beta = .19, p = .05$). The directions of these main effects were identical to those previously reported from the ANCOVA.

The main effect of partner gender was qualified by a significant two-way interaction ($\Delta R^2 = .06, p = .09$) between partner gender and nervousness ($\beta = .27, p = .05$). When amount of pizza taken was regressed on partner gender at +1 and -1 standard deviations from the mean of nervousness (see Aiken & West, 1991), it appeared that the effect was driven by participants who were high on nervousness, such that participants high on nervousness took significantly less pizza when they believed they would be eating with a male partner ($M = 152.55$) than with a female partner ($M = 210.05$), $p < .01$. Participants who were low on nervousness took the same amount of pizza regardless of partner gender.

All of these effects were further qualified by a significant three-way interaction ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .05, \beta = -.30, p < .05$). When amount of pizza taken was regressed on partner gender as a function of impression instructions separately for participants who were high and low on nervousness it appeared that different patterns of pizza selection occurred for those who were high on nervousness compared to those who were low on nervousness. Participants who were high on nervousness took significantly less pizza with a male partner than with a female partner in both the good-impression and no-instructions conditions, both $ps < .05$. There was no effect of partner gender for those high on nervousness in the avoid-good-impression condition (see Figure 3). Participants who were low on nervousness took less
pizza with a female partner than with a male partner in the good-impression condition, $p < .05$, whereas the opposite effect was found for those in the avoid-good-impression condition, $p = .06$. There was no effect of partner gender for those low on nervousness in the no-instructions condition (see Figure 4).

Discussion

The results confirmed two of my hypotheses. I hypothesized and found that participants took less pizza when they believed that they would be eating with a male partner than with a female partner. The analyses of the social motives questionnaire supported these findings. Thus, in the current study, I replicated the gender effect obtained by Mori et al. (1987), Pliner and Chaiken (1990), and Young et al. (2009). I also hypothesized and found that participants took less pizza when they had been instructed to make a good impression or when given no-instructions than when they had been instructed to act as if they did not care about making a good impression on their partner. Participants’ answers to the free-response question asking about influences on amount of pizza taken is relevant for this hypothesis. That is, participants in the good-impression condition were more likely to report that they took less pizza or took a small amount of pizza for purposes of impression management than were those in the other two impression conditions. Taken together, these findings lead me to conclude that females do use eating as a means of constructing a desired impression.

Contrary to my prediction and my results from Experiment 1, those in the no-instructions condition took the same amount of pizza as those in the good-impression condition. Further, findings from the impression-management manipulation check showed that those in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions had equivalent impression motivation (i.e., participants in both conditions reported planning to try equally as hard to
make a good impression on their partner). Although these results were not in the direction that I had predicted, both the eating-behavior data and the impression-motivation data were consistent; in both cases there was no difference between the good-impression and no-instructions conditions. These data indicate that perhaps people naturally want to make a good impression when meeting someone for the first time (even if not specifically instructed to do so) and will use eating as a method of achieving this goal. A closer examination of the data from the Pilot Study revealed that participants reported that one real-life situation in which they would be motivated to make a good impression on their audience would be when meeting someone new. Taken in concert, these results suggest (at least in the context of the current experiment) that because the desire to present oneself positively is normally present and active in these types of social situations, a woman takes more food, and presumably eats more food, only when her goal is to avoid making a good impression on her audience.

The amount of pizza taken by participants in the alone condition fell between the amounts taken by those in the good-impression/no-instructions conditions and the amounts taken by those in the avoid-good-impression condition, and did not differ significantly from either.

The results did not support my hypothesis that self-monitoring would moderate the relationship between impression instructions and amount eaten. Hence, I did not replicate my finding from Experiment 1 showing that that high self-monitors, but not low self-monitors, ate less when instructed to make a good impression. It is possible that the self-monitoring effect from Experiment 1 was caused by the fact that high self-monitors were using more verbal and non-verbal behaviors than low self-monitors in the good-impression condition, which may have interfered with their eating. It is also possible that in the current
experiment the paradigm used was stronger and therefore affected everyone, masking any differences due to self-monitoring.

I found that nervousness interacted with partner gender to affect the amount of pizza taken. The findings involving nervousness are presented tentatively, since they were based on the results of an internal analysis (i.e., they were not predicted and nervousness was not manipulated). The interaction showed that nervousness moderated the effect of partner gender on eating; when women were nervous they took significantly less food when expecting to interact with a male partner than when expecting to interact with a female partner, whereas when women were not nervous partner gender did not affect amount of food taken. The data on nervousness show that expecting to eat with a male partner does not make women more nervous overall, but if they are more nervous, the expectation of eating with a male partner inhibits their eating. There was a second-order interaction that was consistent with this first-order interaction; participants who were high on nervousness took less food when expecting to interact with a male partner than when expecting to interact with a female partner in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions. In other words, when women are nervous and the motivation to make a good impression is present they take less food when they are expecting to interact with a partner of the opposite sex than when they are expecting to interact with a partner of the same sex. The data from the impression-management manipulation check indicate that partner gender did not independently affect the motivation to make a positive impression. Taken together, these findings suggest that the main effect of gender on amount of pizza taken was probably affected by both the impression-management manipulation and anxiety.
The research conducted in Experiments 1 and 2 examined the effect of impression motivation on eating only in situations involving strangers; however, impression-management goals may differentially affect females’ eating in social situations involving friends due to the different relational dynamics that exist between friends. The majority of the time people eat with familiar others (i.e., friends and family members) as opposed to strangers. Therefore, investigating eating and impression management among familiar co-eaters would further this field of study and allow for more real-world applications. In my next study I aimed to determine if the familiarity of one’s eating partner would change the pattern of results. In addition, I intended to replicate the impression-instructions effect among strangers from the current study.

Experiment 3

The previous studies looked at the effect of impression-management goals on eating behavior in social situations involving two strangers. The results from Experiment 2 demonstrated that, when the motive to make a good impression is high (as it was in both the good-impression and no-instructions conditions), women eat less than they would if this motive was weakened. It follows that that when interacting with a stranger women try to make a good impression on their partner (unless this motive is externally disrupted), and adjust their eating accordingly. But what would happen if participants believed that they would be interacting with a friend?

The literature shows that generally people care more about impressing a stranger than impressing a friend. Using week-long interaction records, Leary, Nezlek, Downs, Radford-Davenport, Martin, and McMullen (1994a) found that participants’ self-presentation motives (i.e., appearing friendly, ethical, and competent) were lower in interactions with familiar
others of their own sex than with unfamiliar others of their own sex or with others of the opposite sex regardless of familiarity. In addition, a small percentage of participants from the Pilot Study indicated that they would not be interested in making a good impression on either a friend or a family member.

Just as impression motivation differs when people are with strangers as opposed to friends, so does their eating behavior. Previous research has repeatedly shown that people eat more when they eat with friends than when they eat with strangers. De Castro (1994) collected data from a community sample of adults in the form of seven-day food diaries. Participants also recorded information detailing the number of other people present at the meal and their relationship to the participant. De Castro’s results showed that meals eaten with a spouse, family members, or friends were significantly larger than were those eaten with strangers or coworkers. A number of studies have tested this hypothesis experimentally as well by manipulating the familiarity of participants’ eating partners in both meal and snack contexts in the lab. These studies have consistently shown that both males and females of all ages eat more with same-sex friends than with strangers (Clendenen, Herman, & Polivy, 1994; Hetherington, Anderson, Norton, & Newson, 2006; Koh & Pliner, 2009; Salvy, Jarrin, Paluch, Irfan, & Pliner, 2007; Salvy et al., 2008). One reason that people eat more with friends than with strangers might be that impression-management motivation is lower with friends and people do not need to focus on what their eating behavior might convey about them. Therefore, it is possible that heightening impression-management motivation among same-sex friends would cause them to behave as they would with a stranger, thereby causing their eating to decrease.
The present study aimed to investigate how the interaction of impression-management goals and partner familiarity would affect eating behavior in females. In this experiment I tested only female-female pairs. That decision was prompted by two considerations. The data from Experiment 2 suggest that the effect of partner gender on amount of food taken may have been partially caused by anxiety and not necessarily caused by an increase in impression motivation. Further, it has been shown that impression motivation differs as a function of audience familiarity primarily when participants are interacting with others of the same sex (Leary et al., 1994a). Therefore, I did not expect that impression-management goals and familiarity would interact to affect eating with an opposite-sex partner. The design of this study was almost identical to the one used in Experiment 2. However, instead of telling participants that they would be having a conversation over lunch with either a male or a female stranger, I told them that they would be having a conversation over lunch with either a female stranger or a female friend. Hence, the design of this study was a 2 x 3 (partner familiarity x impression instructions) factorial, with the additional alone condition.

In the case of participants interacting with strangers, given the results of Experiment 2, I hypothesized they would take less food in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions than in the avoid-good-impression condition. Further, I expected that those in the no-instructions condition would behave similarly to those in the good-impression condition.  
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13 Anxiety and impression motivation are not necessarily separate factors. It is possible that increased impression motivation is related to an increase in anxiety; however, the nervousness data from Experiment 2 were not entirely clear and cannot confirm the existence of such a relationship.

14 This was not the case in Experiment 1. That is, in Experiment 1 participants in the no-instructions condition appeared to be less motivated to make a good impression on their partner than were those in the good-impression condition. It is not clear why I found this discrepancy between Experiments 1 and 2, but it is possible that this difference was caused by the change in the experimental paradigm. I assumed that the
In the case of participants interacting with friends, I expected that instructing participants to make a good impression would heighten impression-management motivation, and I predicted that those in the good-impression condition would take less food than would those in the no-instructions and the avoid-good-impression conditions. In addition, based on the literature on the friend-stranger effect, I predicted that in the no-instructions condition participants who expected to interact with a friend would take significantly more food than those expecting to interact with a stranger, whereas there would be no differences in amount taken as a function of partner familiarity in the other two impression-management conditions.\(^\text{15}\) Essentially, I predicted that disrupting the motive to make a good impression in those eating with a stranger would result in an increase in the amount of food taken, whereas heightening the impression motive in those eating with a friend would result in a decrease in the amount of food taken. Thus, participants eating with both friends and strangers should take equivalent amounts of food in the good-impression and avoid-good-impression conditions. Only in the no-instructions condition should they differ, since it would be only in this condition that their impression motivation would differ. I did not find an effect of self-monitoring in Experiment 2, but I did find that self-monitoring interacted with impression instructions in Experiment 1; therefore, I thought that it was possible that self-monitoring might moderate the effect of impression instructions on eating behavior in this experiment so I included the Self-Monitoring Scale.

\hspace{1cm}Method

\(^{15}\) Regardless of whether or not the good-impression manipulation increases impression motivation above the baseline no-instructions condition when people are with strangers (as I had conflicting results for Experiments 1 and 2), women should definitely have greater impression motivation with strangers than with friends in the absence of instructions.
Participants

Participants were 140 female University of Toronto at Mississauga students with a mean age of 18.38 (SD = 1.19). Half of the participants were recruited through the Introductory Psychology subject pool or a paid-participant database, using standard procedures. Participants received one credit for participating, as a part of their Introductory Psychology course. Paid participants received ten dollars as compensation. At the time of recruitment, participants were instructed to bring a female friend with them to participate in the experiment. All friends were offered either one course credit or ten dollars (whichever they preferred) for participating in the study. Therefore, the remaining half of the participants were friends of the initially recruited participants. Participants who appeared without a friend were not permitted to take part in the study. Participants were instructed upon signing up for the experiment that they and their friends were to refrain from eating for three hours prior to their appointment time, because they would be having a conversation over lunch during the experiment. Seven participants were eliminated because they did not follow the experimenter’s instructions; all analyses were conducted on the remaining 133 participants.

Procedure

The procedure for the current study was almost identical to the one used in Experiment 2. Again, participants were under the impression that they were participating in a “get acquainted” study. At the time of recruitment, participants were instructed to bring with them to the experiment a female friend who would be participating as well. Upon arriving at the lab, the pairs were greeted by a female experimenter and were separated, being told that they would be alone for the first part of the experiment. They were then told that we
were interested in the things people say and do when interacting with another person. At this point they were told that they had been assigned to either the “friend condition” or the “stranger condition.” Those in the friend condition were told they would be interacting with their friend, whereas those in the stranger condition were told that two other participants had arrived shortly before they had arrived and that they would be interacting with one of the other participants. Next, participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: 1) good impression, 2) avoid good impression, 3) no instructions, and 4) alone. Participants were given no information about the impression instructions that their partner had received in the study. Until participants signed the consent form, the procedure was identical to that described in Experiment 2. However, in Experiment 3 participants in the alone condition were treated identically to those in the stranger/no-instructions condition until after they had completed their background questionnaire.

After signing the consent form, participants were told that, before meeting the friend/stranger who was to be their partner, they would both complete and then exchange background questionnaires. The background questionnaires asked them to describe their hobbies, interests, and career goals, so that they could learn a little bit about each other before meeting. For participants in the friend condition, we acknowledged that they probably already knew this information about their friend, but for the sake of the experimental procedure we wanted them to complete and exchange questionnaires anyway. As in Experiment 2, participants were also asked to indicate their gender, age, ethnicity, and religion. In the friend condition, participants received their friend’s real background questionnaire. In the stranger condition, the open-ended responses on the “other participant’s” background questionnaire were identical to those used in Experiments 1 and 2,
and again the experimenter matched the fictitious partner’s ethnicity and religion with that of the participant to increase perceived similarity as in Experiment 2. In the stranger condition, aside from ethnicity and religion, the background questionnaire was consistent across all impression-management conditions. At this point, participants in the alone condition were told that only one of the participants from the other pair had shown up so that unfortunately, they would not be meeting anyone. Instead, they would just be completing questionnaires and eating lunch alone so that they could still receive their course credit or monetary compensation.

After looking over their friend/stranger’s background questionnaire, participants completed a Preliminary Friend/Partner Reaction questionnaire, which was used to measure expected friend/partner liking during the interaction, nervousness, the extent to which they planned to make a good impression on their friend/partner, and the extent to which they planned to avoid making a good impression on their friend/partner.

The procedure then became identical to that used in Experiment 2 except for one change. I decided to present participants with a more complete meal and offered them cookies as well as pizza. The rationale for providing the cookies was that it might provide participants who were not motivated to make a good impression with greater opportunity to eat—and to eat a traditionally “forbidden” dessert food. Thus, in addition to the tray with four individual McCain Deep and Delicious Three Cheese Pizzas (each cut into 6 small slices, totaling 24 pieces), there was also a bowl of Mini Chips Ahoy cookies (containing
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16 During the experiment, for participants in the stranger condition, the experimenter referred to the “other participant” as the participant’s “partner” whereas in the friend condition she referred her as her “friend.” In addition, questionnaires completed by participants in the stranger condition referred to the stranger as a “partner” and the friend as a “friend.” Accordingly, when describing parts of the procedure and parts of the results, I have referred to the stranger as a “partner” and the friend as simply a “friend.”
approximately 200 grams of cookies) available, so that participants could take dessert as well. Thus, in addition to the number of pieces of pizza taken by the participant, the grams of cookies taken were also measured, and both were used as primary dependent measures. The actual amounts of both foods eaten by participants were measured at the end of the experiment by comparing the amounts remaining with the original amounts. The amounts were then converted to calories so that the amount of pizza and cookies taken could be combined.

Before leaving the lab, all participants were fully and carefully debriefed. Included in the debriefing was an explanation of each aspect of the deception and an extended explanation of why deception is used in general in psychology experiments and specifically in this particular experiment.

**Materials**

*Food.* The pizza used was commercially available McCain Deep and Delicious Three Cheese Pizza. Participants were served four individual-sized pizzas, which were each cut into 6 small slices (each slice weighed approximately 16 grams and contained about 38 calories). The cookies used were Mini Chips Ahoy Cookies. Each participant was offered a bowl of cookies containing approximately 200 grams of cookies (one cookie weighed approximately 3.5 grams and contained about 17.5 calories). Participants were also provided with a cup of water.

*Self-Monitoring.* For a detailed description of the Self-Monitoring scale see Experiment 1 (in the present experiment $\alpha = .65$). In this sample, 65 participants were classified as low self-monitors and 68 participants were classified as high self-monitors.
Dietary Restraint. For a detailed description of the Restraint scale see Experiment 1 (in the present experiment \( \alpha = .79 \)).

Preliminary Friend/Partner Reaction Questionnaire. Participants answered seven questions assessing how much they expected to like their friend/partner in the study. All items (except for the last item) were prefaced with the phrase “during the interaction.” Items asked: 1) how much do you expect to like your partner/friend, 2) how much are you looking forward to talking with your partner/friend, 3) how much do you expect to enjoy talking with your partner/friend, 4) how interesting do you expect to find your partner/friend, 5) how similar to yourself do you expect to find your partner/friend, 6) how comfortable do you expect to feel with your partner/friend, and lastly 7) to what extent do you think that your partner will be the kind of person you would want to be close friends with/how close are you with your friend. These seven items were strongly intercorrelated (\( \alpha = .66 \)) and, therefore, were averaged to produce an overall measure of expected partner liking in the study. Participants answered these questions using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot). In addition, participants in the friend condition were asked to indicate for how long they had been friends.

Also included in the questionnaire was a check on the impression-management manipulation. Using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot), participants answered three questions pertaining to the impression-management manipulation. Participants reported: 1) the extent to which they planned to try to make a good impression on their friend/partner, 2) the extent to which they planned to try to avoid making a good impression on their friend/partner, and 3) how important it was for them to try to make a good impression on their friend/partner. These three items were averaged – item two was reverse
scored – to produce an overall measure of the motivation to present a positive impression (α = .66). Finally, participants answered a question assessing current nervousness using the same 7-point scale.

*Post-Experimental Questionnaire.* Participants also answered additional questions intended to check the effectiveness of the cover story and to ascertain how much they expected to like the pizza and the cookies, how much they expected to enjoy their meal, how hungry they were, and how much food they thought that their partner had taken in the study (i.e., number of pieces of pizza and number of cookies). Finally, they answered an open-ended question in which they were asked to indicate what factor(s), aside from hunger and expected liking of the food, contributed to how much food they took. The free-response question was coded for the mention of impression-management motives as a factor contributing to how much food participants took. The question was coded categorically (no mention of impression-management motives, mention of decrease in amount taken because of impression-management motives, mention of increase in amount taken because of impression-management motives, mention of impression-management motives but the direction of amount taken is unclear, and mention of a change in amount taken due to table manners). However, in contrast to the responses to this question in Experiment 2, responses in this study were extremely vague and nothing meaningful could be determined from this measure; accordingly, it was not analyzed further.

**Results**

*Overview*

Where all of the independent variables were categorical, I conducted two- or three-way ANOVAs. The independent variables always included impression instructions and
partner familiarity. Data from participants in the alone condition were not included in these analyses due to the incomplete factorial design. I used Dunnett’s test to examine any differences between participants in the alone condition and those in the other impression-management conditions. In cases where either the dependent variable or one or more independent variables were not applicable to participants in the alone condition, this condition was not included in the analysis. Where post-hoc comparisons were performed on three groups, the LSD method was used. Where post-hoc comparisons were performed on more than three groups, the Sidak adjustment for multiple comparisons was used. Again, where simple-effects tests were performed to probe significant interaction effects, the Sidak adjustment was used.

Where one or more predictor variable(s) were continuous, I used hierarchical multiple-regression analyses in which the dependent variable was regressed on: 1) impression instructions (dummy coded with -1 = good impression, 0 = no instructions, 1 = avoid good impression); 2) partner familiarity (dummy coded with 0 = stranger and 1 = friend); 3) the standardized continuous variable; and 4) all possible interactions.

The main dependent variable was amount of food taken. The dependent variable was operationalized as both the number of pieces of pizza taken and the amount of cookies (in grams) taken. To provide an overall measure of amount taken, the amounts of pizza and cookies taken were converted to calories so that the two could be combined. Unless otherwise noted, the amount taken refers to the total amount of food taken in calories.

Preliminary Analyses

Participant comparability. To ensure that there were no initial differences between participants on variables that might have affected amount of food taken (the main dependent
variable), I did a series of 2 x 3 (partner familiarity x impression instructions) ANOVAs on dietary restraint, BMI, self-monitoring, nervousness, self-reported hunger, expected liking of the pizza, expected liking of cookies, and expected enjoyment of the meal, finding no significant effects. Dunnett’s tests on participants in the alone condition showed no significant differences between those in the alone condition and those in any of the other conditions on the same variables analyzed above.

Participants in the friend condition reported the duration of their friendship. Since duration of friendship might have affected both impression motivation and eating behavior (i.e., those who had only been friends for a short time might have behaved more like strangers), I conducted a one-way ANOVA on duration of friendship, for friends only, to ensure that there were no differences across impression-management conditions. The mean duration of friendship was 3.84 years ($SD = 3.98$), indicating that participants had indeed been friends for a significant period of time. The ANOVA showed no significant differences in duration of friendship across impression-management conditions.

*Check on the impression-management manipulation, partner liking, and the cover story.* The impression-management manipulation had the intended effect on participants’ impression motivation. The two-way ANOVA (partner familiarity x impression instructions) on the impression-motivation composite measure showed a main effect of impression instructions, $F_{(2, 107)} = 27.92, p < .001$. As expected from the results of Experiment 2, post-hoc tests revealed that participants who received instructions to make a good impression and those who received no instructions reported a stronger motivation to make a good impression than did those in the avoid-good-impression condition, both $ps < .001$ (see Table 9). There were no other significant effects on this measure. Notably, there were no effects involving
the friend/stranger variable. I had expected that although friends and strangers would not differ in the good-impression and avoid-good-impression conditions, they would differ in the no-instructions condition.

Because the experimental nature of the situation may have made participants self-conscious and therefore affected how much food they took, they were asked two questions: 1) the extent to which they thought the experimenter would be aware of how much food they took during the experiment and 2) the extent to which they thought the experimenter would be aware of how much food they ate during the experiment. They responded using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all aware, 7 = completely aware). Although participants seemed to think that the experimenter would be somewhat aware of how much food they had taken ($M = 4.32, SD = 2.10$) and eaten ($M = 5.04, SD = 1.96$), neither of these measures was related to how much food participants actually took, $r = .15$ and $.14$ respectively, both $p$s = ns. The two-way (partner familiarity x impression instructions) ANOVAs showed no significant differences between groups on these measures. Dunnett’s test on alone participants showed no significant differences between this condition and any of the others.

On the partner-liking composite measure, the ANOVA showed a main effect of partner familiarity, $F_{(1, 107)} = 46.78, p < .001$; participants expected to like their friend ($M = 5.94, SD = 1.49$) significantly more than they expected to like a stranger ($M = 4.38, SD = .97$). This difference was not unexpected. As in Experiment 2, but unlike Experiment 1, expected partner liking had no relationship to amount of food taken, $r = .11, p = ns$; therefore, no further analyses were conducted involving this measure.

Participants in all conditions except for the alone condition were asked two questions in order to determine whether they believed the cover story. They responded using a 7-point
Likert scale (1 = did not believe at all, 7 = completely believed). Participants reported the extent to which they believed: 1) that they were going to meet, converse with, and eat lunch with their friend/stranger ($M = 6.38$, $SD = 1.33$) and 2) that their friend/stranger had already taken her food ($M = 5.73$, $SD = 1.77$). The means indicated that, overall, participants did believe the cover story. The two-way (partner familiarity x impression instructions) ANOVAs showed no significant differences between groups on either of these measures.

**Main Analyses: Amount of Food Taken**

Participants almost always ate all of the pizza that they took; therefore, amount of pizza taken was a valid measure of the amount that participants intended to eat. The mean discrepancy between the amount that participants took and the amount that they ate was only 15.85 calories ($SD = 47.91$) for pizza and 9.32 calories ($SD = 26.62$) for cookies. In addition there was a strong positive relationship between the amount of food taken and the amount of food eaten, $r_{pizza} = .87, p < .01; r_{cookies} = .90, p < .01$. Table 10 displays the mean amounts taken by participants as a function of partner familiarity and impression instructions. Tables 11 and 12 display the mean amounts of pizza and cookies taken separately. Because the amount of food taken was significantly, positively related to hunger, $r = .42, p < .01$, hunger was used as a covariate in all analyses involving amount of food taken. Further, because previous research shows that the amount of food that people eat is often dependent on how much food they believe others have eaten, at the end of the experiment I asked participants to indicate how much food they believed their partner had taken in the study (i.e., number of pieces of pizza and number of cookies). This measure was significantly related to how much food participants took, $r_{pizza} = .43, p < .01; r_{cookies} = .68, p < .01$. Therefore, this

---

17 This question was not asked of participants in Experiment 2.
measure was converted to calories and was also used as a covariate in all analyses involving amount of food taken, except when participants in the alone condition were included.\textsuperscript{18} Participants in the alone condition did not answer this question; therefore, analyses involving alone participants used only hunger as a covariate. All means reported are corrected for the effects of the covariates. The two-way ANCOVA on total amount of food taken revealed no significant effects. Dunnett’s test on alone participants showed no significant differences between those in the alone condition and those in any of the other conditions on amount taken.

Because of previous findings showing that effects of the social situation may occur only for intake of dessert foods (i.e., Clendenen et al., 1994; Hetherington et al., 2006), I conducted separate ANCOVAs on amount of pizza taken and amount of cookies taken, using hunger and participants’ estimate of their partner’s intake of the appropriate food as covariates. The two-way ANCOVA on amount of pizza taken showed no significant effects; however, the analysis on amount of cookies taken showed a significant interaction, $F_{(2,99)} = 3.63, p < .05$ (see Figure 5).

When participants’ partners were strangers, the data showed the hypothesized pattern, $F_{(2,99)} = 2.21, p = .11$; participants in the good-impression ($p = .12$) and no-instructions ($p < .05$) conditions took less than did those in the avoid-good-impression condition. Given these data and my initial hypothesis, I conducted a planned-comparison contrast involving the stranger conditions only, in which I compared the avoid-good-impression condition against the other two cells. This test of my hypothesis showed that the good-impression and no-instructions conditions were indeed significantly different from the avoid-good-impression

\textsuperscript{18} The results were generally similar with and without this covariate.
condition, $p < .05$. When participants’ partners were friends, there were no significant
differences across impression conditions, $F_{(2, 99)} = 1.53, p = ns$, although there was a trend for
participants in the avoid-good-impression condition to take fewer cookies than did those in
the no-instructions and good-impression conditions, $p = .17$ and .12 respectively. This
finding was contrary to my hypothesis; in fact, the data in the friend conditions were almost a
perfect mirror image of those in the stranger conditions.

Simple-effects tests comparing friends and strangers within impression conditions
showed that there were marginally significant effects of familiarity in both the no-
instructions condition, $F_{(1, 99)} = 2.83, p = .10$, and the avoid-good-impression condition, $F_{(1, 99)} = 2.99, p = .09$. In the no-instructions condition the results were in line with my
hypothesis; participants took more cookies when they were eating with their friend than
when they were eating with a stranger. However, in the avoid-good-impression condition the
results were not in line with my prediction; participants took fewer cookies when they were
eating with a friend than when they were eating with a stranger. In the good-impression
condition there was a trend for participants to take more cookies when they were eating with
a friend than when they were eating with a stranger, $F_{(1, 99)} = 2.01, p = .16$. Dunnett’s test on
participants in the alone condition showed no significant difference between those in the
alone condition and those in any of the other conditions on amount of pizza taken or amount
of cookies taken.

Self-monitoring as a moderator of amount of food taken. Because self-monitoring was
expected to affect amount of food taken only in an impression-management context, no
analyses were conducted involving participants in the alone condition. To examine the
possible moderating effect of self-monitoring, I conducted a three-way ANCOVA
(impression instructions x partner familiarity x self-monitoring) on total amount of food taken, amount of pizza taken, and amount of cookies taken. As in Experiment 2, I found no significant effects involving self-monitoring on any of the dependent measures.¹⁹

Ancillary Analysis

Nervousness. Given the findings from Experiment 2, I again assessed participants’ self-reports of how nervous they felt in the experiment to evaluate the possibility that the effect of the impression-management instructions on amount eaten might have interacted with anxiety. The mean nervousness reported ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 1.81$) suggests that, on average, participants did not feel overly nervous during their interaction, and it will be recalled that there were no impression condition or familiarity effects on nervousness ratings.

I conducted a multiple-regression analysis on total amount of food taken as well as on amount of pizza and cookies taken separately, including hunger and the appropriate estimate how much food (i.e., total food, pizza, or cookies) they thought their partner had taken as control variables (step 1), impression instructions, partner familiarity, nervousness (step 2), and their interactions (steps 3 and 4) as predictor variables. There were no significant effects for the total amount of food taken or the amount of pizza taken. For the amount of cookies taken, the overall regression equation (step 3) was not significant, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $p = .14$.

In order to provide a more direct comparison of the self-monitoring findings with those of Experiments 1 and 2, I conducted two-way ANCOVAs (impression instructions x self-monitoring) for participants in the stranger conditions only on total amount of food taken, amount of pizza taken, and amount of cookies taken. There were no significant effects involving self-monitoring for total food taken or cookies taken. There was a significant interaction between impression condition and self-monitoring for pizza taken, $F(2, 45) = 4.79$, $p < .05$. Unlike Experiment 1, simple-effects tests showed that there was a significant effect of impression instructions on pizza taken for low self-monitors, $F(2, 45) = 3.17$, $p = .05$, but not for high self-monitors, $F(2, 45) = 1.95$, $p = ns$. An examination of the means revealed that for low self-monitors, the only marginally significant difference was between the no-instructions and avoid-good-impression conditions; they ate significantly less in the no-instructions condition than they did in the avoid-good-impression condition, $p = .06$. Pizza taken for high self-monitors did not vary as a function of impression instructions. Because this finding was inconsistent with the results from Experiment 1, with my hypothesis, and with the self-monitoring literature, I did not interpret it as meaningful.

¹⁹In order to provide a more direct comparison of the self-monitoring findings with those of Experiments 1 and 2, I conducted two-way ANCOVAs (impression instructions x self-monitoring) for participants in the stranger conditions only on total amount of food taken, amount of pizza taken, and amount of cookies taken. There were no significant effects involving self-monitoring for total food taken or cookies taken. There was a significant interaction between impression condition and self-monitoring for pizza taken, $F(2, 45) = 4.79$, $p < .05$. Unlike Experiment 1, simple-effects tests showed that there was a significant effect of impression instructions on pizza taken for low self-monitors, $F(2, 45) = 3.17$, $p = .05$, but not for high self-monitors, $F(2, 45) = 1.95$, $p = ns$. An examination of the means revealed that for low self-monitors, the only marginally significant difference was between the no-instructions and avoid-good-impression conditions; they ate significantly less in the no-instructions condition than they did in the avoid-good-impression condition, $p = .06$. Pizza taken for high self-monitors did not vary as a function of impression instructions. Because this finding was inconsistent with the results from Experiment 1, with my hypothesis, and with the self-monitoring literature, I did not interpret it as meaningful.
However, as in the ANCOVA reported above, there was a significant interaction between impression condition and partner familiarity ($\beta = -.25, p < .05$). Arguing against the possibility that nervousness might affect eating, the regression analysis showed no other significant effects.  

Discussion

The results of Experiment 3 showed partial support for my hypotheses. I hypothesized and found that there were no differences in participants’ motivation to make a good impression as a function of partner familiarity in the good-impression and avoid-good-impression conditions; however, contrary to my hypothesis, there was also no difference in the motivation to make a good impression for friends vs. strangers in the no-instructions condition. The finding from the no-instructions condition is at odds with Leary et al.’s (1994a) finding, which shows that in general people care more about making a good impression on strangers than on same-sex friends. The fact that strangers did not report higher impression motivation than did friends in the no-instructions condition has implications for the interpretation of the results of the eating behavior data.

I found no significant effects of the independent variables or their interaction on total amount of food taken or amount of pizza taken. I did, however, find a significant interaction between impression instructions and partner familiarity on amount of cookies taken. The fact that I found an effect only on cookies is consistent with previous findings, which showed that, when both a main dish (e.g., pizza, sandwiches) and a dessert food (e.g., cookies, cakes) are offered, people appear to limit only their intake of the dessert food (Clendenen et al.,

---

20 Again, I conducted identical analyses involving nervousness on participants expecting to interact with strangers only in order to provide a more direct comparison with Experiments 1 and 2. This analysis showed no effects involving nervousness on total amount of food taken, on amount of pizza taken, or on amount of cookies taken.
This resonates with societal conventions, which deem eating dessert to be an indulgent behavior or a guilty pleasure. Taking an average amount of the main course but limiting or refraining from taking dessert may be an acceptable tactic for conveying a desirable image. For cookies, I found a marginal effect of familiarity in the no-instructions condition, which was in line with my hypothesis and the literature; participants took more cookies when they were expecting to eat with their friend than when they were expecting to eat with a stranger. Hence, I was able to replicate the friend-stranger effect. A similar effect occurred in the good-impression condition, which was contrary to my hypothesis, although the effect was not significant. In the avoid-good-impression condition, the results were not in line with my hypothesis; participants took fewer cookies when they were eating with a friend than when they were eating with a stranger.

Examining the cookie data across impression-management conditions for strangers only, the pattern of results supported my hypothesis and was consistent with the results from Experiment 2. Those in the avoid-good-impression condition took significantly more cookies than did those in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions. These results lend further support to the idea that, when a woman is interacting with an unfamiliar co-eater, she increases the amount of food she takes in order to avoid making a good impression. These findings, in conjunction with the results from the impression-management manipulation check, further indicate that when interacting with a stranger, in the absence of any externally-imposed motivation to make a good impression, women appear to be internally motivated to make a good impression in circumstances like those in this study and they use eating behavior as a means of doing so. Among participants interacting with friends, the data did not fit the hypothesized pattern. Although there were no significant
differences in amount taken between any of the impression-management conditions, there was a trend for those in the avoid-good-impression condition to take fewer cookies than did those in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions. In other words, the pattern of amount taken when participants expected to interact with friends was opposite to the pattern of amount taken when they expected to interact with strangers.

There was nothing else in the data collected (e.g., dietary restraint, BMI, self-monitoring, nervousness, expected liking of the food, differences in expectations of how much food participants thought that their partner took) that could explain the pattern of cookies taken observed among participants expecting to interact with a friend. Although the effect that I obtained was not what I had initially hypothesized, a closer evaluation of the literature suggests that these data do make sense, and they might reveal something interesting about friend-friend interactions involving eating. Although the impression instructions affected impression motivation during interactions with friends and strangers similarly, very different patterns of eating emerged in these two conditions. Thus, although in the context of the current experiment friends in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions did care about presenting a desirable image to one another, it may be a different type of image and/or one that is achieved using different tactics.

Tice, Butler, Muraven, and Stillwell (1995) showed that in the absence of external instructions, people use different self-presentation strategies when interacting with strangers and friends; self-presentation is more modest (i.e., moderate and non-boastful) with friends and more self-enhancing with strangers. A modest self-presentation is not necessarily less favorable, and it is not the same as a negative self-presentation. A modest self-presentation may also be considered a more realistic self-portrayal. A realistic self-presentation is
specifically desired when the audience already has information about the target, as is the case with a friend, because the target probably fears being judged as inconsistent or hypocritical (Baumeister, 1982; Baumeister & Jones, 1978). In the case of eating, then, a woman who wants to make a good impression on her friend (as participants in both the good-impression and no-instructions conditions presumably did) might aim to eat a “normal” amount, i.e., the amount her friend would expect her to eat. The eating data from the current study indicate that women interacting with a friend take the same amount of food when instructed to make a good impression as they do when given no instructions. Tice et al.’s (1995) findings may explain why participants eat more when eating with friends than they do when eating with strangers in both the good-impression and no-instructions conditions.

Given that Tice et al. (1995) have established that people use different strategies for making a good impression when interacting with friends (vs. strangers), it is conceivable that people might also use different strategies when trying to avoid making a good impression when interacting with friends (vs. strangers). When they are interacting with strangers, people might behave in a way that makes themselves look undesirable, which would be highly effective since the audience does not know them. In contrast, when they are interacting with a friend, people might behave in a way that makes their friend look undesirable, which would in turn cause the friend to feel angry or upset and would make the friend become unhappy with them. This method would be more effective with friends because friends already know and like the person for who s/he is, making it difficult to avoid making a good impression on a friend by simply making oneself look bad.

Applied to eating behavior in females, this line of argument would predict that, when eating with strangers, in accordance with the consumption-stereotypes literature, women
would eat more to make themselves look bad. In contrast, when eating with friends, women might eat less in order to make their friend feel bad and/or become angry with them. Research has shown women report lower liking for a female confederate who has eaten less than they have eaten because the confederate’s “lighter” eating has rendered their own eating inappropriate and excessive (Leone, Herman, & Pliner, 2008; Pliner et al., 2009). Furthermore, women feel worse about themselves after learning that their partner has eaten less than they have eaten (Pliner et al., 2009). These feelings probably stem from the underlying competition that exists among women regarding dieting, body weight, and appearance (e.g., Bellew, Gilbert, Mills, McEwan, & Gale, 2006; Rodin, Silberstein, & Striegel-Moore, 1984; Schutz, Paxton, & Wertheim, 2002; Wertheim, Paxton, Schutz, & Muir, 1997); therefore, eating less than one’s friend does cause a negative reaction on the friend’s part. This form of competition may be especially strong among female friends, where the relationship is more complex (Hutchinson & Rapee, 2007; Matsumoto, Kumano, & Sakano, 1999). Among friends, eating takes on a greater significance and becomes a type of social currency, whereas with strangers this competition and tendency to engage in meaningful social comparison are not as strong. It should be noted that the results for friends in the present study were unexpected and only marginally significant; therefore, the explanation provided is speculative and should be accepted with caution.

In the alone condition, as in Experiment 2, the amount of food taken by participants did not differ from the amount taken in any of the other conditions. This was true for total food as well as for pizza and for cookies separately. The results from the current study as well as the results from Experiment 2 lead me to conclude that in the domain of eating a simple private/public manipulation does not reveal effects of impression-management
concerns on behavior. In fact, there is a large literature indicating that under some circumstances individuals eat less when they are eating alone than when they are in a group (e.g., De Castro, 1994; Hetherington et al., 2006; Salvy, Vartanian, Coelho, Jarrin, & Pliner, 2008). There are many explanations for this so-called social-facilitation effect and it is possible that different factors operate in different situations. In the present study it seems likely that those expecting to eat alone may have been anticipating a less pleasurable experience and may have felt uncomfortable eating in a lab setting. They may, therefore, have taken less food in order to speed up the experimental session (not because their eating was otherwise inhibited), whereas this was not an option for participants expecting to eat with a partner, as they were told that they would have to have lunch and converse with their partner for twenty minutes.

General Discussion

The consumption-stereotypes literature clearly shows that people, particularly women, who eat lightly, are viewed more positively by those evaluating them than are those who eat heartily (see Vartanian et al., 2007). These findings suggest that women wanting to make a positive impression on their audience might limit their intake. Previous research was interpreted to indicate that women do decrease their intake when their motivation to make a good impression is high (Mori et al., 1987; Pliner & Chaiken, 1990); however, this research was based on the assumption that altering various characteristics of participants’ co-eaters (i.e., gender and social desirability) would be a sufficient means of manipulating impression motivation. The earlier studies provided no evidence that their manipulations actually affected participants’ motive to make a good impression. Further, it is possible that the earlier findings were mediated, at least in part, by anxiety. Since the previous research did
not directly manipulate participants’ motivation to manage their impressions, did not measure impression-management motivation, and did not present specific anxiety data, the evidence is indirect and interpretations of prior results are questionable.

The current program of research set out to manipulate impression-management motives through the use of clear instructions, in order to confirm that impression-management concerns do, in fact, affect eating behavior. In general, the present results support and extend previous research, indicating that impression-management goals do indeed affect eating behavior in women. The results also show that the effect of impression-management goals on eating behavior is probably not moderated by personality differences, with the possible exception of trait of self-monitoring.²¹

Eating and Impression Management among Strangers

I predicted and found that females motivated to make a positive impression on a male stranger (Experiments 1 & 2) and a female stranger (Experiments 2 & 3) ate/took less food than did those motivated to avoid making a positive impression. In Experiments 2 and 3, participants in both the good-impression condition and the no-instructions condition took less food than did those in the avoid-good-impression condition. These findings indicate that even in the absence of any externally imposed impression-management goals, women want to make a good impression on strangers and will eat accordingly (i.e., they report trying equally hard to impress their partner and eat similar amounts in the no-instructions condition

²¹ The self-monitoring finding from Experiment 1 was not replicated in Experiments 2 and 3 and no other individual-difference variables (i.e., trait impression management as measured by the BIDR, the need to belong, the fear of negative evaluation, self-esteem, dietary restraint) significantly moderated the relationship between impression instructions and amount eaten. It is not clear why I did not replicate the self-monitoring effect; it is possible that the paradigm used in Experiments 2 and 3 was stronger and therefore affected everyone, masking any differences based on self-monitoring. It is also possible that the self-monitoring finding from Experiment 1 was an artifact of the paradigm used in that study.
as in the good-impression condition). Thus, it is not that women eat less than at baseline (i.e., the no-instructions condition) when a positive self-presentation motive is heightened, but they eat more than at baseline when the motive to avoid making a good impression is activated (Experiments 2 & 3).

The avoid-good-impression condition was crucial for illuminating the effects of impression-management motives on eating, given that the results generally show women are normally motivated to make a good impression when interacting with strangers, even without instructions to that effect. In the current program of research, participants in the avoid-good-impression condition were instructed to “act as if they did not care about making a good impression” on the partner. By referring to this condition as the “avoid-good-impression” condition throughout the paper, I have implied that participants in this condition clearly did not aim to convey a positive image; however, they may not have necessarily been trying to create an overtly negative image. The results from the Pilot Study support this idea in that the data show that participants receiving these instructions reported that they would try to appear indifferent about their image and also engage in negative behaviors. These data also indicate that the use of negative behaviors may have been directed at appearing aloof and disinterested. Thus, the eating behavior observed in the avoid-good-impression condition was probably a manifestation of individuals’ desire to appear socially undesirable to some extent.

---

22 I initially predicted that instructing participants to make a good impression on their partner would increase impression motivation from the baseline no-instructions condition and found this in Experiment 1. However, in Experiments 2 and 3, where findings were clearer and procedural issues were resolved, I consistently found that impression motivation (as well as eating behavior) was similar in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions. It is possible that the change in the experimental paradigm may account for the differences in findings between Experiment 1 and Experiments 2 and 3.
The inclusion of the avoid-good-impression condition and the findings associated with it are novel in and of themselves, given that no previous study has considered this as an impression-management goal, or more importantly, as a comparative group. It could be argued that the avoid-good-impression condition lacks external validity; however, there are certainly times when people might not want to make a “good” impression on their audience. In the Pilot Study there were a number of real-life situations in which participants reported that they would not care about making a good impression (e.g., when they do not like someone, when they are trying to repel a potential yet undesirable romantic partner, when they do not foresee reaping any benefits from a relationship, or when they expect that they will never have contact with the other person again [e.g., a store clerk or a bus driver]). Although it is undeniably important that the avoid-good-impression condition be applicable to the real world, what is more crucial about the avoid-good-impression condition in the context of eating and impression management is its utility for more clearly showcasing a naturally occurring phenomenon. In other words, by demonstrating the effects of reduced impression motivation on eating in one situation, I have highlighted the effects of its presence on eating in most other situations.

The present findings also have implications for the interpretation of results from previous research looking at eating and impression management. The fact that instructing participants to make a good impression on their partner did little to change participants’

---

23 Expecting to never have contact with someone again is not the same as meeting a stranger for the first time, even in an experimental context. Participants in these experiments expected to meet with another student from their university; therefore, it is likely that they expected that they might well interact with that person again. Furthermore, since most participants were students in an Introductory Psychology class, they probably thought that their partner was going to be one of their classmates. When people think they might interact with someone again they generally want to make a good impression so that the other person will like them and they will reap personal and/or professional benefits.
behavior in Experiments 2 and 3 suggests that Mori et al. (1987, Experiment 1) may not have actually increased participants’ motivation to make a good impression by describing the confederate as highly socially desirable. In reality, when the confederate was described as extremely undesirable, the researchers may have instilled the desire to avoid making a good impression, or at least created a feeling of indifference in their participants about the image that they were projecting. In support of this conjecture, participants in the Pilot Study reported that, if they did not expect to like the person with whom they would be interacting, (as might be the case with someone of low social desirability) they would act as if they did not care about making a good impression on that person.

**Eating, Impression Management, and the Gender Effect**

Experiment 2 (and to a lesser extent Experiment 1) replicated the finding from previous research (Mori et al., 1987; Pliner & Chaiken, 1990; Young et al., 2009) showing that the gender of a woman’s co-eater affects eating behavior; women ate significantly less with an unfamiliar male partner than with an unfamiliar female partner. The earlier studies assumed that manipulating co-eater gender increased the motivation to make a positive impression and that eating decreased as a result. In the current experiments, partner gender independently predicted amount eaten (Experiment 2) and was not related to impression motivation24 (Experiments 1 & 2). These findings suggest that there may be one or more other factors, aside from or in addition to the desire to “make a good impression,” influencing the relationship between eating behavior and co-eater gender.

In Experiment 2, anxiety appeared to moderate the effect of partner gender on amount eaten; participants who were high on nervousness took significantly less pizza when they

---

24 Gender was not related to impression motivation at least as it was measured by the manipulation checks used.
were expecting to interact with a male partner than when they were expecting to interact with a female partner (at least when impression motivation was high, as in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions), whereas there was no effect of partner gender on amount taken for those who were low on nervousness. Expecting to eat with an opposite-sex partner did not cause women to feel more nervous overall; however, when they *did* feel nervous and when they were motivated to make a good impression, partner gender affected how much food they took to eat. Therefore, it seems that for women, feeling at least somewhat nervous may be a necessary precondition for the gender effect. This finding helps to explain, in part, why partner gender affected amount of food taken in the absence of any effect of partner gender on impression motivation.²⁵

It is possible that another factor, aside from anxiety, may have influenced the gender effect as well. The current program of research did not examine any specific motives that might contribute to the general desire to make an overall positive impression. However, the desire to appear feminine (one possible aspect of a positive image for women) specifically influences the relationship between eating behavior and partner gender in females (Mori et al., 1987, Experiment 2; Pliner & Chaiken, 1990, Experiment 2); women eat less with a male partner at least in part because of the desire to appear feminine. When eating with a female partner, the importance of appearing feminine is significantly diminished (Pliner & Chaiken, 1990, Experiment 2). In addition, on the basis of the consumption-stereotypes literature,

²⁵ I did not find any affect of anxiety in Experiment 1, and the earlier studies (i.e. Mori et al., 1987; Pliner & Chaiken, 1990) claim that anxiety could not account for their gender findings either. The measure of anxiety used in Experiment 2 was slightly different than the measures used in Experiment 1 and in previous studies. In Experiment 2 participants were asked to indicate how nervous they felt before meeting their partner, whereas the other studies asked participants to indicate retrospectively how nervous they were during their interaction with their partner. Further, participants in Experiment 2 never actually interacted and ate with a partner; therefore, the differences in the measurements and paradigms used could account for the different findings.
Young et al. (2009) argue that it may also be a stronger desire to appear physically attractive with male eating companions that accounts for the effect of co-eater gender on eating. This interpretation suggests that women believe that male and female audiences value different traits; that is, women believe that males place more importance on a feminine and/or attractive image than do females. Zanna and colleagues have shown that women change their behavior to conform to the expected values of a desirable audience (Baeyer, Sherk, & Zanna, 1981; Zanna & Pack, 1975).

Applied to eating, this difference in value perception (specifically in reference to femininity and physical attractiveness) might dictate which norm(s) women will use to guide their eating. Recall that the social-normative model of eating proposed by Herman et al. (2003) suggests that in social situations there are two norms that may guide how much people eat: 1) to avoid eating excessively and 2) to eat minimally. The first of these dictates not eating “too much” while the second dictates eating a very small amount. The data imply that, when eating with males, women (at least those who are nervous) adhere to the norm of minimal eating (Experiment 2). The desire to appear feminine and attractive may specifically trigger the minimal-eating norm. On the other hand, when eating with other females, women might monitor their eating so as not to eat excessively (i.e., they will try to eat roughly the same amount as their eating companion[s] do), but they will not necessarily try to eat minimally. Supporting evidence for this supposition comes from the social-motives questionnaire (Experiment 2), which shows that women believe that eating less than their companion would be a more effective way of making a good impression on a male than on a female.
Thus, it seems that it is not necessarily the case that women will always adhere to the norm of minimal eating when wanting to make a good impression. Now, because participants in Experiment 2 did not receive any information about how much their partner had taken to eat, my data cannot directly speak to this hypothesis. However, it is clear that a manipulation of co-eater gender is not necessarily equivalent to a manipulation of impression-management goals, especially given the potential role of anxiety.

_Eating and Impression Management among Friends_

All of the past research studying eating and impression management, as well as the bulk of the present research, has focused on interactions among strangers. In Experiment 3, I aimed to investigate how impression-management concerns would influence eating among friends, because most of our food-centered interactions occur with familiar others. Initially, I expected that I would be able to demonstrate decreased eating among friends if I heightened participants’ desire to make a positive impression. However, as was the case with strangers (Experiments 2 & 3), it appeared that friends normally want to make a good impression on each other in the absence of any instructions to that effect; impression motivation did not differ in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions. Further, participants’ impression motivation did not differ as a function of partner familiarity as I had expected. Thus even though friends and strangers had similar impression motivation, the eating strategy used to convey their desired image took on a different form. When women were eating with female friends, there was a pattern of eating associated with impression motivation that was different from what I had hypothesized; participants in the avoid-good-impression condition ate less than did those in the good-impression and no-instructions conditions.
conditions. Although this finding was not predicted and was not significant, it may suggest something interesting about the dynamics of female-female friendships.

My tentative interpretation of these data is that when females are eating with same-sex friends and are motivated to avoid making a good impression, they eat less in order to make their friend feel bad and/or become dissatisfied with them. Eating less than one’s friend could cause the friend to experience feelings of unhappiness, inferiority, irritation, etc., largely as a result of the competition surrounding dieting, weight, and appearance among women (e.g., Bellew et al., 2006; Rodin et al., 1984; Schutz et al., 2002; Wertheim et al., 1997) specifically within the context of female friendships (Hutchinson & Rapee, 2007; Matsumoto, et al., 1999). This interpretation points to the existence of different factors as potential mediators of the relationship between general impression instructions and eating with friends vs. strangers.

Limitations and Implications for Future Directions

The present research has several limitations that should be discussed if findings are to be interpreted in their proper context. First, the impression instructions given to participants were general; thus, it would be informative to learn if more specific types of impression motives (e.g., those set forth by Jones & Pittman, 1982) would differentially affect eating behavior.

Second, this research measured eating behavior only in terms of amount eaten. However, it seems likely that people might also use type of food eaten to manage the impression they project to others (e.g., Schlenker, 1980). The consumption-stereotypes literature shows that type of food affects people’s judgments of targets; targets eating

---

26 This was essentially opposite to the pattern of eating observed among strangers.
unhealthy meals (e.g., hamburger, fries, and a cola) are generally rated more negatively than are those eating healthy meals (e.g., soup, salad, and water) even when amount eaten is held constant (Mooney, DeTore, & Malloy, 1994; Mooney & Lorenz, 1997). There is also a subset of the studies in the consumption-stereotypes literature showing that sometimes people do attribute negative characteristics to healthy eaters (e.g., serious, high-strung, less social) and positive characteristics to unhealthy eaters (e.g., happy, fun-loving, more social) (Barker, Tandy, & Stookey, 1999; Fries & Croyles, 1993; Mooney & Amico, 2000; Oakes & Slotterback, 2004-2005). Given these findings, predictions regarding the effect impression motivation on food-type chosen would be more complicated. In particular, it is likely that different audiences value different traits. For example, an audience of friends or peers might value happiness and sociality, whereas an audience of elders or superiors might value intelligence and conscientiousness. Therefore, future research examining the effect of impression motivation on food-type chosen should pay particular attention to the audience whom the target is trying to impress.

Future research should also consider the possibility that food type and amount eaten could interact, as the current research used foods that would be considered unhealthy (i.e., pizza and cookies). Women may limit their intake of unhealthy foods when they want to make a good impression but pay less attention to amount eaten when eating healthy foods, since eating a healthy food may be a sufficient means of conveying a desirable impression.

Along similar lines, when both a main dish and a dessert food were offered (as in Experiment 3), the fact that I found an effect of impression instructions only on the amount of dessert food taken indicates that there may be something particular about eating dessert foods that women associate with impression construction. Previous research has also found
that when both a main dish and a dessert food are offered, people appear to limit only their intake of the dessert food (Clendenen et al., 1994; Hetherington et al., 2006). Society tells us that dessert foods are indulgent and sinful, two undesirable traits. Thus, the negative characteristics associated with dessert foods are likely to make women more conscious of their intake of these particular foods. Future studies should aim to target exactly what it is about dessert foods that give them this special status. Interestingly, when only a main course food is offered, without dessert, people limit their intake of the main-course food (Experiment 2; Koh & Pliner, 2009). In addition, although I was able to replicate the friend-stranger effect when participants were taking cookies in Experiment 3 (i.e., friends took more cookies than did strangers in the no-instructions condition), future research should try to replicate this finding, as well as the finding concerning impression instructions among friends, when only main-course foods are served.

In general, more research needs to be conducted looking at the effect of impression-management concerns on eating among familiar eaters, given that the findings from Experiment 3 did not support my hypothesis and were weak. Specifically, it appears that the instructions to “make a good impression” and to “act as if you do not care about making a good impression” may take on a different meaning depending on the familiarity of one’s audience. It would be helpful to pin-point exactly how participants’ interpretations of impression instructions are related to the type of audience that they are aiming to impress (or not impress). Furthermore, this research cannot speak to the effect of impression-management goals on eating behavior when females are eating with male friends, romantic partners, or family members.
Lastly, the paradigm used in Experiments 2 and 3 did not give participants information about how much their partner had taken to eat. This was deliberate, because I did not want any potential modeling effects to overwhelm impression-management effects on eating. However, because participants had no information about their partner’s eating, we do not know what type of norm participants were using to govern their own eating (avoiding eating excessively or eating minimally) and if the norm used differed as a function of co-eater gender or co-eater familiarity. People often anchor their own intake to that of their co-eaters (Conger, Conger, Costanzo, Wright, & Matter, 1980; Goldman, Herman, & Polivy, 1991; Herman et al., 2003; Nisbett & Storms, 1974; Polivy, Herman, Younger, & Erskine, 1979; Rosenthal & Marx, 1979; Rosenthal & McSweeny, 1979), and if participants eat the same amount as their co-eater, perhaps they are following the norm of avoiding excessive eating, whereas if they eat significantly less than their co-eater does, perhaps they are following the norm of minimal eating. A replication of Experiments 2 and 3 with the addition of information about the partner’s intake could determine how the normative model of eating specifically applies to impression management and further the study of impression management and eating.
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Table 1.

*Pilot Study - Principal components analysis with varimax rotation: Pattern matrix of factor loadings.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Factor 1: Negative Self-Presentation</th>
<th>Factor 2: Positive Self-Presentation</th>
<th>Factor 3: Indifferent Self-Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appear disrespectful</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear dishonorable</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make myself look bad</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be mean</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively make a bad impression</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my partner dislike me</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my partner look bad</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear stupid</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be rude</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be respectful</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my partner feel bad</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be unfriendly</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear admirable</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear intelligent</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively make a good impression</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my partner like me</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear friendly</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be nice</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear similar to my partner</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make myself look good</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my partner look good</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act as if I cared what my partner thought</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my partner feel good</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry what my partner thought of me</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be polite</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care about the image I gave my partner</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not care about the image I gave my partner</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act like I don’t care what my partner thought of me</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not worry about what my partner thought of me</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

*Pilot Study – Means, standard deviations, and number of participants for scores on the three self-presentation factors as a function of impression instructions (scores ranged from 1 to 7).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good Impression</th>
<th>Not-Good Impression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Self-Presentation</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Self-Presentation</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent Self-Presentation</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

*Experiment 1 – Means, standard deviations, and number of participants for responses to the impression management manipulation check. Using a scale of 1-7 (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot) participants rated the extent to which they tried to make a good impression on their partner.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Confederate</th>
<th>Male Confederate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Impression</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Instructions</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid Good Impression</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.

Experiment 1 – Means, standard deviations, and number of participants for amount of cookies eaten (in calories) as a function of impression instructions and confederate gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Confederate</th>
<th>Male Confederate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>106.92</td>
<td>56.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120.73</td>
<td>48.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Instructions</strong></td>
<td>113.72</td>
<td>121.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.26</td>
<td>109.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoid Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>134.34</td>
<td>89.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.40</td>
<td>82.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.

*Experiment 2 – Means, standard deviations, and number of participants for self-report of nervousness as a function of impression instructions and partner gender. Participants responded using a scale of 1-7 (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Partner</th>
<th>Male Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Impression</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Instructions</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid Good Impression</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.

*Experiment 2 – Means, standard deviations, and number of participants for responses to the impression-management manipulation check, i.e., the strength of participants’ motivation to make a good impression on their partner. Participants responded using a scale of 1-7 (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Partner</th>
<th>Male Partner</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Impression</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Instructions</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid Good Impression</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.

*Experiment 2 – Means, standard errors, and number of participants for amount of pizza taken (in calories) as a function of impression instructions and partner sex.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Partner</th>
<th>Male Partner</th>
<th>Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>165.47</td>
<td>167.29</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.78 16</td>
<td>17.74 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Instructions</strong></td>
<td>187.22 15</td>
<td>136.51</td>
<td>171.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.62 15</td>
<td>18.32 15</td>
<td>17.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoid Good</strong></td>
<td>226.411 16</td>
<td>183.01</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impression</strong></td>
<td>17.76 16</td>
<td>17.74 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.

Experiment 2 – Means, standard deviations, and number of participants for responses to the social-motives questionnaire. Participants indicated which eating-related strategies would be effective in making a good impression on a male and female companion using a scale of 1-7 (1 = not at all effective, 7 = extremely effective) from both a personal perspective and a general perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Perspective</th>
<th>Personal Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating a lot*</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating more than the other person*</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating the same amount as the other person</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating less than the other person*</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating a small amount</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses for these items differed significantly as a function of companion gender, \( p < .001 \).
Table 9.

**Experiment 3 – Means, standard deviations, and number of participants for responses to the impression-management manipulation check, i.e., the strength of participants’ motivation to make a good impression on their partner. Participants responded using a scale of 1-7 (1 = not at all, 7 = a lot).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Instructions</strong></td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoid Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.

*Experiment 3 – Means, standard errors, and number of participants for total calories taken as a function of impression instructions and partner familiarity.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>318.30</td>
<td>309.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Instructions</strong></td>
<td>330.30</td>
<td>295.58</td>
<td>274.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>24.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoid Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>307.01</td>
<td>336.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.

*Experiment 3 – Means, standard errors, and number of participants for calories taken from pizza as a function of impression instructions and partner familiarity.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>211.48</td>
<td>224.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Instructions</strong></td>
<td>215.66</td>
<td>197.25</td>
<td>178.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>17.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoid Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>210.64</td>
<td>215.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.

*Experiment 3 – Means, standard errors, and number of participants for calories taken from cookies as a function of impression instructions and partner familiarity.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>94.21</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Instructions</strong></td>
<td>112.45</td>
<td>88.45</td>
<td>96.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoid Good Impression</strong></td>
<td>92.85</td>
<td>117.03</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.

*Experiment 1 - The relationship between amount eaten and self-monitoring as a function of impression instructions.*
Figure 2.

Experiment 2 – Mean amount of pizza taken (in calories) as a function of impression instructions and partner gender.
Figure 3.

Experiment 2 - Amount of pizza taken (in calories) for participants high on nervousness as a function of impression instructions and partner gender.
Figure 4.

Experiment 2 - Amount of pizza taken (in calories) for participants low on nervousness as a function of impression instructions and partner gender.
Experiment 3 - Mean amount of cookies taken (in calories) as a function of impression instructions and partner familiarity.

Figure 5.
APPENDIX A

Pilot Study – Structured Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions using the scale below to indicate how you would behave after hearing these instructions. Write the number that best corresponds with your feeling about each statement on the line next to the item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After hearing these instructions I would. . .

1. actively try to make a good impression on my partner.
2. be worried about what my partner thought of me.
3. try to make my partner like me.
4. try to make my partner look good.
5. try to be rude.
6. try to appear similar to my partner
7. **not** care about the image I was giving to my partner.
8. actively try to make a bad impression on my partner.
9. try to appear superior to my partner.
10. try to make myself look good.
11. try to be polite.
12. try to be unfriendly.
13. try to appear admirable.
14. try to make my partner feel bad.
15. try to appear inferior to my partner.
16. try to be respectful.
17. try to appear dishonorable.
18. care about the image I was giving to my partner.
19. try to appear intelligent.
20. try to make my partner dislike me.
21. try to be disrespectful.
22. try to be nice.
23. try to make myself look bad.
24. try to be friendly.
25. try to act as if I did **not** care what my partner thought of me.
26. try to appear different from my partner.
27. try to make my partner feel good.
28. try to be mean.
29. try to appear stupid.
30. try to make my partner look bad.
31. try to act as if I cared what my partner thought of me.
32. **not** be worried about what my partner thought of me.
APPENDIX B

Background Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions about yourself in the spaces provided below.

1. Gender (please circle): Female Male

2. Age ________

c. Hispanic/Latino d. Middle Eastern e. Native American f. South Asian/Indian g. White
h. Other____________________

e. Jewish f. Muslim g. Non-Catholic Christian (e.g. Lutheran, Methodist, Baptist, Unitarian, Presbyterian, Anglican)
h. Other __________________________

5. What do you like to do in your spare time?

   During my spare time, I often watch TV and I like to play with/walk my dog.

6. What are your interests/hobbies?

   I really like to travel. I am also interested in astronomy.

7. What are your career goals/plans for after you graduate from university?

   After I graduate I would like to become a vet.

8. If you had to use two words to describe yourself what would they be?

   If I had to use two words to describe myself I guess they would be quiet and creative.
First I’ll tell you about a recent vacation that I went on. Last February, my senior class and I went to a Graduation trip to Southern Thailand, Phuket and Koh Samui. Since we were traveling on our own, we had to take care of everything, all of our luggage, the hotel, and the transportation. As you can imagine, we weren’t used to having to take care of all the details. Although it was a hassle booking flights and making the hotel reservations, the trip turned out to be great!

As soon as we arrived at the airport in Thailand, we were greeted by our guide for the trip and picked up by the hotel shuttle bus. After checking in at the hotel and taking all of our luggage to our rooms, my friend and I got so excited to hit the beach. All of us met up in the lobby and headed to the beach. Later that day our guide took us to a local restaurant for Thai cuisine. Then, later at night, we went to some parties at the clubs that were along the street where our hotel was.

We were only in Thailand for 5 days, but after the first day, we became very interested learning more about Thailand. So we decided to visit temples, which we had not originally planned on doing. I’m so glad we did decide to visit the temples because it made the trip so much more interesting. This was definitely the best vacation ever. We all had a great time.
NOW I’m going to tell you about what I did last summer. Last summer cousins came to Canada to visit my family, and it was lots of fun! Since they were visitors to our great city, my family and I decided to show them all around. I remember the first stop we made was Downtown Toronto, where we walked down Yonge St., which is the longest street in the entire world! They thought that was pretty cool. After that, we went to Toronto’s most popular Mall, the Eaton Centre. Last, we went up to the CN Tower to look out over the whole city. It was such a great view!

After our “Downtown” trip, we decided to go to New York since it is not too far and it considered one of the most famous cities in the world. None of us had ever been to New York before, so it was really exciting for all of us. It was amazing. I never imagined how crowded the streets would be during rush hour! There are thousands of people on the street! While we were there, my cousins really liked the shopping. They managed to buy a lot of new things to take home with them.

It was pretty fun to have my cousins come visit, because we got to go to a lot of fun places and see different famous buildings. I hope that they’ll come to visit again the next summer so that we can go to more fun places.
SOMETHING EMBARRASSING

Ok, so this time, I’m going to talk about something embarrassing that happened to me. This incident happened a while ago and it involved a huge clumsy fall. I was in a hurry to get to the bus stop, as I was a bit late. So I tried to run down the building staircase, but I lost my footing and I fell, more like skidded all the way down the stairs. One of my legs got trapped between the railings of the staircase and my other leg went flying with the rest of my body.

I was wearing sandals and when my one foot got caught my sandals cut me pretty badly. They cut right through the skin between my toes, leaving a gaping wide hole in my foot. As I hobbled up and tried to collect my stuff, I thought that I would be okay as people came to help me up. But as I began walking, I left a trail of blood oozing out of my cut and I had to be taken to the hospital to get stitched up.

Ooops, I guess that wasn’t long enough. I guess I’ll tell you about another time I was really embarrassed. So, this is a good example of one of the negative consequences of repetition. I used to work at a grocery store behind the meat counter. Anyways, I would also say “may I help you” or something along those lines. One day, I was out doing deliveries for the store and I had worked an overtime shift the night before, so I was really tired. I knocked on one of the customer’s door and guess what I said when the lady opened the door? “May I help you…?” She was like “may I help you?!” It was pretty funny but embarrassing at the same time.
A TIME I WAS ANGRY WITH MY PARENTS

So for my last story, I’m going to tell you about a time that I was angry with my parents. The one time I can remember when I was really angry with my parents was when they were late picking me up from the library. On that day, my friends and I had a group project to work on together. So we all met up to work on it at the library. I had told my parents to pick me up at 3:00pm but they never showed up. All of my friends were gone, because their parents had come to pick them up on time. I was the only one left waiting outside for my parents. I was really frustrated and tired from standing and waiting for my mom and dad to pick me up. Plus, I was pretty tired from working on my project. They ended up picking me up at 4:00pm, one hour late. My dad’s excuse was that they were stuck in traffic. Yah right. I knew he was lying and that he had probably just forgotten or had lost track of the time. When I got into the car, I started yelling at them because I wasted an hour of my time just standing there and waiting outside. I was so annoyed!
APPENDIX D

Experiment 1 – Partner Reaction Questionnaire

To what extent did you try to make a good impression on your partner? (please circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all a lot

How nervous were you during your interaction with your partner in the study? (please circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not nervous extremely at all nervous

How much did you like your partner? (please circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all a lot

How much did you want to get to know your partner better? (please circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all a lot

How much did you think your partner was interesting? (please circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all a lot

How much did you feel that your partner had similar interests to your own? (please circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all a lot

To what extent was your partner the kind of person you would want to be close friends with? (please circle)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all a lot
APPENDIX E

Experiment 2 – Preliminary Partner Reaction Questionnaire

To what extent do you plan to try to make a good impression on your partner?

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not at all              a lot

How important is it for you to try to make a good impression on your partner?

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not at all              a lot

How nervous do you feel at this moment?

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not nervous                           extremely nervous
not at all                           nervous

How much are you looking forward to talking with your partner?

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not at all              a lot

Please base your answers to the next few questions on the background information you received about your partner.

How much do you expect to like your partner?

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not at all              a lot

How much do you expect to want to get to know your partner better?

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not at all              a lot

How much do you think your partner will be interesting?

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not at all              a lot

How much do you feel that your partner will have similar interests to your own?

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not at all              a lot

To what extent do you think your partner will be the kind of person you will want to be close friends with?

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not at all              a lot

How attractive do you expect your partner to be? (please circle)

1                2                3                4                5                6                7
not at all              very attractive
APPENDIX F

Experiment 2 – Social Motives Scale

Below is a list of strategies women may use when they want to make a good impression on a person of the **SAME SEX** who they are meeting for the first time. For the purpose of this questionnaire, assume two women are having lunch together for the first time.

Using the scale below indicate how effective you think each strategy would be for a woman wanting to make a good impression on another **woman**. Write the number on the line next to each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all effective</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>smiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>laughing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making eye contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>telling interesting stories about herself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not looking bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not interrupting the other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not ignoring the other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telling positive stories about herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eating less than the other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relating to the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appearing genuine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talking only about herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not fidgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating more than the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>being polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being a good listener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not talking with her mouth full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating quietly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>telling negative stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not using swear words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>being friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating a small amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>being quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving compliments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not being curt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appearing nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dressing nicely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eating the same amount as the other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearing interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>having good table manners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearing relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a list of strategies women may use when they want to make a good impression on a person of the **OPPOSITE SEX** who they are meeting for the first time. For the purpose of this questionnaire, assume a woman and a man are having lunch together for the first time.

Using the scale below indicate how effective you think each strategy would be for a **woman** wanting to make a good impression on a **man**. Write the number on the line next to each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>laughing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making eye contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>telling interesting stories about herself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not interrupting the other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not looking bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not ignoring the other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eating less than the other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telling positive stories about herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appearing genuine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relating to the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not fidgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talking only about herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>being polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating more than the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not talking with her mouth full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being a good listener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>telling negative stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating quietly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>being friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not using swear words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>being quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating a small amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving compliments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appearing nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not being curt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eating the same amount as the other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dressing nicely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>having good table manners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearing interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearing relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent would **YOU** use each of the following strategies if you wanted to make a good impression on a stranger of the **SAME SEX**? For the purpose of this questionnaire, assume that you are having lunch together with another **female** for the first time.

Using the scale below indicate likely **YOU** would be to use each strategy if you wanted to make a good impression on a **female**. Write the number on the line next to each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- _____ smiling
- _____ making eye contact
- _____ eating a lot
- _____ not looking bored
- _____ looking serious
- _____ telling positive stories about herself
- _____ relating to the other person
- _____ talking only about herself
- _____ eating more than the other person
- _____ being a good listener
- _____ eating quietly
- _____ not using swear words
- _____ eating a small amount
- _____ giving compliments
- _____ not being curt
- _____ dressing nicely
- _____ appearing interested
- _____ appearing relaxed
- _____ laughing
- _____ making conversation
- _____ telling interesting stories about herself
- _____ not interrupting the other person
- _____ not ignoring the other person
- _____ eating less than the other person
- _____ appearing genuine
- _____ not fidgeting
- _____ being polite
- _____ not talking with her mouth full
- _____ telling negative stories
- _____ being friendly
- _____ being quiet
- _____ asking questions
- _____ appearing nervous
- _____ eating the same amount as the other person
- _____ having good table manners
To what extent would **YOU** use each of the following strategies if you wanted to make a good impression on a stranger of the **OPPOSITE SEX**? For the purpose of this questionnaire, assume that you are having lunch together with a **male** for the first time.

Using the scale below indicate likely **YOU** would be to use each strategy if you wanted to make a good impression on a **male**. Write the number on the line next to each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Never</th>
<th>2 Sometimes</th>
<th>3 Sometimes</th>
<th>4 Smartly</th>
<th>5 Always</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>smiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making eye contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not looking bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telling positive stories about herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relating to the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talking only about herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating more than the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being a good listener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating quietly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not using swear words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating a small amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving compliments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not being curt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dressing nicely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearing interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearing relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laughing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telling interesting stories about herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not interrupting the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not ignoring the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating less than the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearing genuine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not fidgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being polite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not talking with her mouth full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telling negative stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being quiet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asking questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearing nervous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating the same amount as the other person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having good table manners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Experiment 3 – Preliminary Friend/Partner Reaction Questionnaire

To what extent do you plan to try to make a good impression on your friend/partner?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not at all  a lot

To what extent do you plan to try to avoid making a good impression on your friend/partner?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not at all  a lot

How important is it for you to try to make a good impression on your friend/partner?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not at all  a lot

How nervous do you feel at this moment?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not nervous at all  extremely nervous

During the interaction, how much are you looking forward to talking with your friend/partner?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not at all  a lot

During the interaction, how much do you expect to enjoy talking with your friend/partner?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not at all  a lot

During the interaction, how much do you expect to like your friend/partner?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not at all  a lot

During the interaction, how comfortable do you expect to feel with your friend/partner?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not at all  a lot

During the interaction, how interesting do you expect to find your friend/partner?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not at all  a lot

During the interaction, how similar to yourself do you expect to find your friend/partner?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not at all  a lot

How close are you with your friend? To what extent do you think your partner will be the kind of person you will want to be close friends with?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
not close at all  extremely close

Friends only: How long have you been friends? _________________(specify weeks/months/years)