# Identity Negotiation in Roommate Relationships: The Self as Architect and Consequence of Social Reality

Shawn E. McNulty and William B. Swann, Jr.

The authors report two longitudinal studies of new college roommates (Ns = 69 and 95 pairs). In both studies, targets' initial self-views predicted changes in perceivers' appraisals of them, and perceivers' initial appraisals predicted changes in targets' self-views, although relatively few dyads displayed both effects. The perceiver-driven and target-driven effects occurred when appraisals and self-views were negative as well as positive. Implications for self-verification theory and symbolic interactionism are discussed, and a less restrictive model of how appraisals influence self-views is proposed.

Behavioral scientists have long viewed the self-concept as a dynamic construct, inextricably linked to social life and social relationships. The identity negotiation framework offers one of the most comprehensive treatments of this interplay between self-concepts and the social world (Goffman, 1959; Swann, 1987). The framework assumes that people initiate their interactions by (implicitly or explicitly) negotiating the identities that they are to assume in the relationship. Such negotiation lays the groundwork for the smooth unfolding of the relationship and, ultimately, for the fulfillment of the goals that brought the parties together (Goffman, 1959; Stryker & Statham, 1985).

Various analyses have suggested that there are two faces to the identity negotiation coin. On the one hand, the appraisals of one person (arbitrarily dubbed the "perceiver") may influence the self-concept of the other person (the "target"). At the same time, the target's self-concept may influence the perceiver's appraisal of him or her. Systematic studies of these distinctive forms of influence have spawned two independent lines of theory and research. We first consider evidence that the self is a consequence of the appraisals of perceivers and then consider evidence that the self is the architect of the appraisals of others.

We are grateful to Sherry Franklin, Brian Giesler, John Sideris, and Denise Walton for their assistance in conducting this research; to David Heise, Dave Kenny, and Scott Long for statistical advice; and to Greg Hixon, Sheldon Stryker, and several anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to William B. Swann, Jr., Department of Psychology, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712. Electronic mail may be sent to swann@psyvax.psy.utexas.edu.

# Self as Consequence of Social Reality: Reflected Appraisal and Behavioral Confirmation Processes

Earlier in this century, the symbolic interactionists (e.g., Cooley, 1902; Mead, 1934) proposed that people devise their self-concepts by internalizing the appraisals of others (Stryker, 1987). They also asserted that the link between perceivers' appraisals and targets' self-concepts is mediated by targets' perceptions of how they are viewed by others (i.e., their reflected appraisals; Kinch, 1963). Variations of the reflected-appraisal hypothesis have endured over the years and currently represent an important theme in many diverse areas, ranging from work on labeling and stigmatization (e.g., Becker, 1963) to investigations of attachment (e.g., Bowlby, 1980; Sroufe & Fleeson, 1986).

Although widely cited, the reflected-appraisal hypothesis has received surprisingly little empirical support. One of the primary sources of support has been cross-sectional research in which researchers have shown that perceivers' appraisals, reflected appraisals, and self-concepts are related (e.g., Felson, 1980, 1985; Felson & Reed, 1986; Hoelter, 1984; Lundgren, Jergens, & Gibson, 1982; Schafer & Keith, 1985; for a review of earlier research, see Shrauger & Schoeneman, 1979). A close look at this research, however, indicates that targets' reflected appraisals are more closely related to targets' self-concepts than they are to the actual appraisals of perceivers (Gecas, 1982; Shrauger & Schoeneman, 1979). By implying that reflected appraisals are merely a projection of targets' self-views, these data undermine the possibility that such reflected appraisals mediate the link between perceivers' actual appraisals and the selfconcepts of targets (or that such a link exists at all).

Undaunted, other advocates of the impact of appraisals on the self have marshaled evidence that evaluations of performance or personality can alter the self-concepts of targets in laboratory settings (e.g., Jussim, Soffin, Brown, Ley, & Kohlhepp, 1992; Shrauger & Lund, 1975; Shrauger & Schoeneman, 1979; Snyder & Swann, 1978). Critics have dismissed this research by noting that the experimenter's presence and the demand characteristics of the setting may have compelled participants to change their self-ratings.

Probably the strongest evidence that the self is influenced by

Shawn E. McNulty, Department of Sociology, Indiana University; William B. Swann, Jr., Department of Psychology, University of Texas at Austin.

This research was conducted while Shawn E. McNulty was a graduate student at the University of Texas. Data collection and the preparation of the manuscript were supported by research funds (Grant MH 37598) and a research scientist development award (Grant MH 00498) from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) to William B. Swann, Jr. and by a postdoctoral fellowship in NIMH Training Program No. PHS-T32-MH14588-15 to Shawn E. McNulty during his tenure at Indiana University.

the appraisals of others comes from longitudinal field studies. Manis (1955), for example, found that college roommates' appraisals subsequently influenced targets' self-concepts. Unfortunately, because targets were influenced only when their roommates viewed them more favorably than they viewed themselves, variables such as the quality of the relationship (rather than appraisals per se) may have mediated Manis's findings. Nevertheless, Felson (1989) provided stronger evidence when he showed that parents' appraisals predicted changes in children's self-concepts. Similarly, Cole (1991) showed that the appraisals of teachers and peers influenced the self-concepts of children.

Even the recent longitudinal field studies have not proven to be above criticism, however. Neither the Cole (1991) nor the Felson (1989) studies established that reflected appraisals mediate the effects of appraisals on self-views, nor did they show that appraisals influence the self-concepts of adults. This latter issue is particularly troublesome in light of recent contentions that adults are impervious to the influence of reflected appraisals (e.g., Kenny & DePaulo, 1993). In addition, Jussim (1991) noted that evidence of appraisal effects on the self-views of children is clouded by the potential impact of objective accuracy on the perceptions of both perceivers and targets. Conceivably, the adult perceivers may have developed objectively accurate appraisals of targets early in the relationship, and targets eventually caught on, thus creating the illusion that perceivers were influencing targets.

Of course, reflected appraisal processes are not the only mechanism through which perceivers' appraisals may influence the self-concepts of targets. One alternative is that perceivers' appraisals may influence their behavior toward targets, and targets may in turn behaviorally confirm the initial appraisals of perceivers. Such behavioral confirmation processes (e.g., Merton, 1948; Rosenthal, 1976; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Rosenthal & Rubin, 1978; Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977) may work in conjunction with self-perception processes to produce self-concept change. That is, to the extent that targets observe their own behavior and use it as a basis for inferring their self-concepts (e.g., Bem, 1972; Fazio, Effrein, & Falender, 1981; Kenny & DePaulo, 1993; Snyder & Swann, 1978), behavioral change should foster self-concept change. Although this behavioral confirmation-self-perception process is theoretically viable, there is no evidence that it occurs in naturalistic settings.

In short, the lack of definitive evidence that the appraisals of perceivers influence the self-concepts of targets in naturalistic settings has inspired suggestions that this venerable hypothesis be abandoned. One purpose of our research was to determine if such calls for abandonment are warranted.

# The Self as Architect of Social Reality: Self-Verification Processes

Self-verification theory (Swann, 1983, 1990) asserts that people want others to validate and confirm their self-concepts even when those self-concepts are negative. Such self-verification strivings are presumably motivated by a desire for coherence in mental and social life (Festinger, 1957; Lecky, 1945; Secord & Backman, 1965; Swann, 1983; Swann, Stein-Seroussi, & Giesler, 1992).

Although substantial evidence supports the contention that

people work to maintain their negative self-views as well as their positive self-views (for a review, see Swann, 1990), few studies have directly tested the prediction that targets will behave so as to bring perceivers' appraisals into harmony with their selfviews. One was an experiment by Swann and Ely (1984). Targets who were either self-perceived introverts or extroverts interacted with perceivers who had expectations of the targets that clashed with the targets' self-views. By the end of the interaction, most targets had succeeded in changing the perceivers' minds. Although this study represents a clear demonstration of self-concepts influencing appraisals in the laboratory, a field study by Felson (1989) failed to find convincing evidence that children's self-concepts predict changes in their parents' appraisals. Because this may have been due to the dearth of power that children have relative to their parents, a field study in which targets interact with perceivers of equal status is in order.

# Do Perceivers and Targets Resolve Disagreements Through Compromise?

Will identity negotiation typically result in a compromise between initially discrepant views, with individual dyads exhibiting both appraisal effects and self-verification effects? The norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960; Regan, 1971) would seem to suggest so, because, for example, a perceiver who revises his or her initial impression of a target by bringing it closer to the target's original self-view could be seen as making a concession that should elicit a reciprocal concession from the target. Although intuitively appealing, this reciprocal-compromise hypothesis requires that perceivers and targets be aware of their influence on one another. To the extent that this condition is not met, identity negotiation may be a largely unilateral affair, with some dyads exhibiting appraisal effects on self-views and others exhibiting self-verification.

## Study 1

Study 1 was designed to track the influence of perceivers and targets on one another. We also sought to examine the role of targets' actual traits in the identity negotiation process. As Jussim (1991) noted, apparent effects of perceivers' appraisals on targets' self-views may sometimes be due to the unmeasured influence of targets' actual traits. Similarly, an apparent selfverification effect could be due to the target's self-view being more accurate than the perceiver's appraisal and to the perceiver eventually becoming aware of this fact by observing external signs such as grades or the responses of people who have known the target for a longer period of time. To control for the influence of participants' actual abilities on the perceptions of perceivers and targets, we obtained measures of targets' actual abilities in Study 1. Finally, we examined the percentage of dyads in our sample that exhibited compromise as opposed to more unilateral negotiation outcomes.

#### Method

# **Participants**

Participants in this study were 94 same-sex pairs of college roommates from the University of Texas who were recruited to take part in a study of roommate relationships during the fall semester of 1990. At least 1 member of each pair was a student in an introductory psychology class. Participants who were enrolled in Introductory Psychology participated to fulfill a course requirement; all other participants were paid \$10 on completion of the study. Of the initial 94 pairs, 19 pairs failed to complete at least one session and were dropped from the study. This left 75 pairs in the sample. Finally, we deleted 6 of the remaining roommate pairs because they had lived together previously, leaving 69 pairs (20 male pairs and 49 female pairs) in the sample.<sup>1</sup>

#### Procedure

Participants completed questionnaires containing ratings of the abilities, personality traits, and global worth of both themselves and their roommate (as well as items pertaining to another investigation) during the second and twelfth weeks of class. After participants had completed the questionnaire at Time 1, the experimenter emphasized the importance of not discussing their responses with their roommates until the study was over. Between the second and twelfth weeks of class, each participant met once individually with an experimenter for a videotaped interview. During this interview, objective measures of abilities were administered. Participants were fully debriefed at the end of the final (twelfth week) session.

### Measures

Appraisals and self-views. Participants used 10-point, percentilebased scales to rate both themselves and their roommates relative to other college students their own age on four abilities that have been shown to be highly important to the self-concepts of undergraduates (Pelham & Swann, 1989). The four ability items were "intellectual/academic ability," "social skills/social competence," "athletic ability," and "physical attractiveness." Participants used the same 10-point scales to rate themselves and their roommates on the Big Five personality traits (McCrae & Costa, 1987): neuroticism, extraversion, openness to new experiences, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. To facilitate participants' understanding of the items, we substituted the terms *outgoing* for *extraverted* and *easy to get along with* for *agreeable* on the questionnaire. Similarly, to avoid drawing undue attention to the neuroticism item (the only socially undesirable trait in the survey), we reframed it as *emotional stability*.

Participants rated their own global worth (i.e., self-esteem) using Rosenberg's (1965) Global Self-Esteem Scale and rated their roommate's global worth using an adaptation of the Rosenberg scale created by rewording the items from the scale to refer to roommates. Items from this global worth scale included "I see my roommate as a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others," and "All in all, I'm inclined to feel that my roommate is a failure." Both the self-esteem and global worth measures were completed on 5-point scales anchored with strongly disagree and strongly agree, and both measures were internally consistent (Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for self-esteem = .89 at both Time 1 (T1) and Time 2 (T2);  $\alpha$  for global worth = .83 at T1 and .82 at T2).

Objective measures. We used participants' total Standard Achievement Test (SAT) scores as an indication of academic ability. Measures of social skills and physical attractiveness consisted of the averaged ratings of 5 female undergraduate judges who viewed videotapes of each participant being interviewed by an experimenter and rated the participant's social competence and physical attractiveness on 10-point scales identical to those used for self-ratings. The intra-class correlations were .56 for social skills and .62 for physical attractiveness. The measure of athletic ability was derived from self-reports of high school athletic activities and awards (specifically, the number of semesters they played on a school team and the number of athletic awards and scholarships they received). These three items were standardized and averaged to form an athletic ability index ( $\alpha = .59$ ). Because of the difficulty of achieving

#### Table 1

Appraisal Effects in Study 1: Time 2 Self-Views Regressed on Time 1 (T1) Self-Views and T1 Appraisals

| T1 Se      | lf-view  | T1 Ap   | opraisal  |  |  |
|------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| β<br>final | R <sup>2</sup><br>change   | β<br>final  | R <sup>2</sup><br>change  | R <sup>2</sup><br>mode                                   |  |
| .77***     | .60***   | 00  | .00   | .60  |  |
| .62***     | .44***   | .16*  | .02*  | .46  |  |
| .75***     | .70***   | .16*  | .02*  | .72  |  |
| .74***     | .59***   | .13   | .01   | .60  |  |
| 71***      | .49***   | 07  | .00   | .49  |  |
| .76***     | .63***   | .14*  | .02*  | .65  |  |
| .70***     | .51***   | .19*  | .04*  | .55  |  |
| .67***     | .45***   | .12   | .02   | .47  |  |
| .37**      | .17**  | .23*  | .05*  | .22  |  |
| .76***     | .58***   | .11   | .01   | .59  |  |
|            | $\begin{array}{c} \hline T1 Se\\ \hline \\ \beta\\ final\\ \hline .77***\\ .62***\\ .75***\\ .75***\\ .74***\\ .76***\\ .70***\\ .67***\\ .37**\\ .76***\\ .76***\\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline T1 & Self-view \\ \hline $\beta$ $R^2$ \\ \hline $final $change$ \\ \hline $ | $ \begin{array}{c c} \hline T1 \ Self-view \\ \hline \beta \\ \hline \beta \\ final \\ change \\ final \\ change \\ final \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \beta \\ \hline \beta \hline \hline \beta \\ \hline \beta \hline \hline \beta \\ \hline \beta \hline $ | $\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ |  |

Note. Each row represents a hierarchical regression model in which T1 self-view was entered on the first step, and T1 appraisal was entered on the second step. The  $\beta$  reported is the standardized regression coefficient for the final equation. The  $R^2$  change is the increment in  $R^2$  at the step on which the variable was entered. <sup>a</sup> N = 68. <sup>b</sup> N = 67.

\* p < .05, one-tailed. \*\* p < .01, one-tailed. \*\*\* p < .001, one-tailed.

consensus on what would constitute an objective measure of personality traits or global worth, we did not attempt to assess targets' actual standing on these traits.

The means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations of appraisals, self-views, and objective measures for each trait can be found in the Appendix.

#### Results

# Identity Negotiation Effects

Were targets' self-views influenced by perceivers' appraisals as the semester progressed? Hierarchical regression analyses indicated that they were. For each trait, we regressed T2 self-views first on T1 self-views and then on T1 appraisals. The results of these analyses, displayed in Table 1, revealed that perceivers' appraisals reliably predicted T2 self-ratings of social skills, athletic ability, extraversion, openness to new experiences, and conscientiousness when T1 self-ratings were controlled. Because Manis (1955) found that appraisal effects occurred only when the appraisals were more positive than the initial self-concepts, we conducted follow-up analyses to determine if our effects were similarly limited to appraisals that flattered the target. For each trait for which an appraisal effect was found, we hierarchically regressed T2 self-views on T1 self-views, T1 appraisals, a dummy variable that took on a value of 1 when T1 appraisals were more positive than T1 self-views and took on a value of 0 otherwise, and the interaction of this dummy variable with T1 appraisals. If the relative positivity of perceivers' initial appraisals were a moderating variable, then these interaction terms

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Reliable gender effects were neither expected nor found in the present studies. Similarly, the identity of the experimenter had no effect on the results of either Study 1 (experimenters were two female undergraduates) or Study 2 (experimenters were two male graduate students).

| Table 2   |
|---|
| Self-Verification Effects in Study 1: Time 2 Appraisals |
| Regressed on Time 1 (T1) Appraisals and T1 Self-Views   |

|                                | T1 Ap         | praisal                  | T1 Sel     |                          |                         |  |
|--------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Traits                         | $\beta$ final | R <sup>2</sup><br>change | β<br>final | R <sup>2</sup><br>change | R <sup>2</sup><br>model |  |
| Academic ability <sup>a</sup>  | .49***        | .30***                   | .37***     | .13***                   | .43                     |  |
| Social skills <sup>a</sup>     | .54***        | .39***                   | .28**      | .07**                    | .46                     |  |
| Athletic ability <sup>a</sup>  | .46***        | .38***                   | .30**      | .07**                    | .45                     |  |
| Attractiveness <sup>a</sup>    | .69***        | .44***                   | 12         | .02                      | .46                     |  |
| Neuroticism <sup>a</sup>       | .33**         | .11**                    | .01        | .00                      | .11                     |  |
| Extraversion <sup>b</sup>      | .58***        | .42***                   | .25**      | .06**                    | .48                     |  |
| Openness <sup>a</sup>          | .79***        | .63***                   | .09        | .01                      | .64                     |  |
| Agreeableness <sup>a</sup>     | .43***        | .18***                   | 09         | .01                      | .19                     |  |
| Conscientiousness <sup>a</sup> | .50***        | .26***                   | .01        | .00                      | .26                     |  |
| Global worth <sup>c</sup>      | .52***        | .27***                   | 04         | .01                      | .28                     |  |

Note. Each row represents a hierarchical regression model in which T1 appraisal was entered on the first step and T1 self-view was entered on the second step. The  $\beta$  reported is the standardized regression coefficient for the final equation. The  $R^2$  change is the increment in  $R^2$  at the step on which the variable was entered. <sup>a</sup> N = 68. <sup>b</sup> N = 67. <sup>c</sup> N = 66.

\*\* p < .01, one-tailed. \*\*\* p < .001, one-tailed.

should reach significance (Cohen & Cohen, 1975). They did not (all ts < 1, ns), indicating that targets internalized perceivers' negative appraisals as well as their positive appraisals.

Next, to test the prediction derived from self-verification theory that targets' self-views would influence perceivers' appraisals, we regressed T2 appraisals first on T1 appraisals and then on T1 self-ratings. The results, shown in Table 2, revealed reliable self-verification effects for academic ability, social skills, athletic ability, and extraversion. Analogous to the appraisal effects, follow-up analyses that tested the interaction of T1 selfratings and a dummy variable that indexed the relative positivity of those self-ratings found no evidence that perceivers were influenced only by targets' positive self-views (all ts < 1, ns).

#### Actual Abilities

To determine if the appraisal and self-verification effects we had observed for ratings of ability could be accounted for by the impact of targets' actual abilities, we repeated the analyses reported in Tables 1 and 2 for academic ability, social skills, athletic ability, and physical attractiveness with the objective measure of each trait as an additional predictor. Actual abilities were entered on the next to last step (i.e., immediately before appraisals when testing for appraisal effects and immediately before self-ratings when testing for self-verification effects). The only reliable effect of actual ability to emerge was for physical attractiveness, where the objective measure of attractiveness predicted changes in targets' self-ratings of attractiveness ( $\beta$  final = .18,  $R^2$  change = .03, t(54) = 2.12, p < .05, one-tailed). More important, all of the previously reported identity negotiation effects remained statistically reliable when actual ability was controlled. The largest change was for the effect of appraisals of social skills on self-perceived social skills, where the beta

weight increased from .16 to .20 when actual skill was controlled.

#### Compromise?

The norm of reciprocity suggests that the outcome of identity negotiation should be compromise. That is, dyads engaged in identity negotiation should exhibit both appraisal effects (i.e., a smaller difference between T2 self-rating and T1 appraisal than between T1 self-rating and T1 appraisal) and self-verification effects (i.e., a smaller difference between T2 appraisal and T1 self-rating than between T1 appraisal and T1 self-rating). A rough sense of how many negotiations resulted in compromise can be obtained by classifying each dyad as exhibiting either an appraisal effect alone, a self-verification effect alone, both effects, or neither effect. Though purely descriptive, such a classification would shed some additional light on the types of identity negotiation found in this sample. Accordingly, we classified dyads in terms of negotiation outcome for each trait for which the regression analyses revealed evidence of identity negotiation.

Dyads were classified as exhibiting both appraisal effects and self-verification effects if the absolute value of the difference between T1 appraisal and T2 self-rating was less than the absolute value of the difference between T1 appraisal and T1 self-rating (an appraisal effect) and if the absolute value of the difference between T1 self-rating and T2 appraisal was less than the absolute value of the difference between T1 self-rating and T1 appraisal (a self-verification effect). Dyads that exhibited only one of the two types of identity negotiation effects were classified as either appraisal-effect dyads or self-verification-effect dyads. Finally, dyads that exhibited neither type of effect were divided into those for whom identity negotiation was not possible (because T1 appraisal equaled T1 self-rating) and those for whom negotiation was possible but did not occur.

The percentages of dyads that fall into each category for traits for which evidence of identity negotiation was present are displayed in Table 3. Inspection of Table 3 indicates that although some of the dyads that engaged in identity negotiation compromised, many more did not. Thus, the norm of reciprocity does not appear to have been a major determinant of the outcome of identity negotiation in this sample.

#### Discussion

In summary, the results of Study 1 provide some of the first evidence that, within naturally occurring relationships between adults, perceivers' appraisals will alter targets' self-views, and targets' self-views will influence perceivers' appraisals. Moreover, follow-up analyses found no evidence that these effects were simply due to positivity strivings on the part of targets or to the influence of targets' actual traits. Finally, individual dyads displayed a variety of identity negotiation outcomes, with the norm of reciprocity having little impact on the type of identity negotiation that took place.

Before proceeding to describe Study 2, a note on the use of causal language is in order. Although one must always be careful about making causal inferences from nonexperimental data, the panel design used in the present studies substantially re-

|                   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                   |                     | Self-                  |                 |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Traits            | No T1<br>difference                   | Neither<br>effect | Appraisal<br>effect | verification<br>effect | Both<br>effects |
| Academic ability  | 23.2                                  | 30.4              | 13.0                | 23.2                   | 10.1            |
| Social skills     | 30.4                                  | 23.2              | 18.8                | 20.3                   | 7.2             |
| Athletic ability  | 13.0                                  | 33.3              | 17.4                | 20.3                   | 15.9            |
| Extraversion      | 23.5                                  | 19.1              | 16.2                | 26.5                   | 14.7            |
| Openness          | 10.1                                  | 37.7              | 20.3                | 17.4                   | 14.5            |
| Conscientiousness | 24.6                                  | 33.3              | 21.7                | 8.7                    | 11.6            |

Table 3

Percentage of Dyads Exhibiting Appraisal Effect Only, Self-Verification Effect Only, Both Effects, and Neither Effect (Study 1)

*Note.* Numbers are the percentage of dyads in each category. Results are displayed only for those traits where identity negotiation effects were found in the regression analyses. TI = Time I.

duces the uncertainty surrounding the interpretation of regression effects. In a cross-sectional study, for example, finding that appraisals predict self-views would be ambiguous because of the possibility of reciprocal effects or correlated residuals (i.e., the regression weight could be misleading because it is picking up the causal effect of the criterion on the predictor as well as the effect of the predictor on the criterion). Use of a two-wave panel design avoids this problem because a criterion that is measured at T2 cannot possibly have a causal effect on a predictor measured at T1. Similarly, a panel design makes the task of generating alternative explanations more difficult. To explain the apparent effect of appraisals on self-views with an omitted variable, for example, would require positing a variable that not only predicted T1 appraisals and T2 self-views but also predicted the variance in T2 self-views that remains after T1 selfviews are controlled.

## Study 2

Given the provocative nature of the results of Study 1, we felt it was important to replicate the study's key findings. Study 2 was also designed to determine whether the effects of appraisals on self-views noted in Study 1 occurred because targets consciously recognized and internalized their roommates' appraisals, as implied by symbolic interactionism. We addressed this issue in two ways. First, we measured reflected appraisals to test the traditional reflected-appraisal hypothesis. Second, we measured targets' perceptions of how knowledgeable their roommates were about their standing on various traits. This measure allowed us to test a slightly less restrictive model of perceiver influence, in which targets make conscious decisions about which perceivers are likely to provide valuable feedback on a given trait, and these decisions moderate the impact of perceivers on targets. To make room for the additional items and items relevant to another investigation, we deleted the ratings of the Big Five personality traits.

#### Method

## **Participants**

The participants in this study were 105 same-sex pairs of college roommates from the University of Texas who were recruited to participate in a study of roommate relationships during the fall semester of 1991. At least 1 member of each pair was enrolled in Introductory Psychology. Participants enrolled in Introductory Psychology received research credit for participating; all others were paid \$10 at the end of the study. Eight pairs were dropped from the sample because of lost data, and 2 pairs were dropped because they had lived together previously. This left 95 pairs in the sample-23 pairs of men and 72 pairs of women. The average age of the sample was 18.3 years.

## Procedure

Participants completed self-ratings and roommate ratings of abilities and global worth, as well as items related to another investigation, during the second and twelfth weeks of class. In addition to these measures, the final questionnaire contained ratings of reflected appraisals and targets' perceptions of perceivers' knowledgeability about targets' traits. The order of the self-view and reflected-appraisal measures was counterbalanced across participants in the final questionnaire. None of the results to be reported were affected by the order manipulation; as a result, it will not be discussed further. Participants were urged not to discuss their responses with their roommates after the first session and were debriefed at the end of the final session.

#### Measures

Appraisals and self-views. Participants completed ratings of themselves and their roommates on the same ability and global worth measures used in Study 1. Once again, the self-esteem and global worth measures proved highly reliable at both points of measurement (selfesteem  $\alpha s = .87$  and .86; global worth  $\alpha s = .82$  and .86).

Reflected appraisals and knowledgeability estimates. We measured reflected appraisals by having targets indicate how much of each of the ability-related traits (i.e., academic ability, social skills, athletic ability, and physical attractiveness) they thought their roommates believed that they possessed on 8-point Likert scales anchored by *none at all* and *a large amount*. Targets completed a similar measure of reflected appraisals of global worth by indicating the extent to which they thought their roommates would agree that they were "a good and worthwhile person" on a 5-point scale.

Before completing each of these reflected-appraisal measures, targets indicated on 8-point scales how knowledgeable they felt their roommates were about their standing on each trait. The corresponding item for global worth differed slightly in that it asked to what extent targets' roommates were in a good position to judge their overall worth as a person, and was completed on a 5-point scale.

The means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations of ap-

|                               | T1 Se         | lf-view                  | TI Aj      |                          |                         |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Traits                        | $\beta$ final | R <sup>2</sup><br>change | β<br>final | R <sup>2</sup><br>change | R <sup>2</sup><br>model |
| Academic ability <sup>a</sup> | .59***        | .40***                   | .18*       | .03*                     | .43                     |
| Social skills <sup>b</sup>    | .65***        | .40***                   | 06         | .00                      | .40                     |
| Athletic ability <sup>a</sup> | .83***        | .66***                   | 04         | .01                      | .67                     |
| Attractiveness <sup>a</sup>   | .71***        | .49***                   | 03         | .00                      | .49                     |
| Global worth <sup>c</sup>     | .83***        | .68***                   | 17†        | .03†                     | .71                     |

Note. Each row represents a hierarchical regression model in which T1 self-view was entered on the first step and T1 appraisal was entered on the second step. The  $\beta$  reported is the standardized regression coefficient for the final equation. The  $R^2$  change is the increment in  $R^2$  at the step on which the variable was entered.

 $^{a}N = 94.$   $^{b}N = 93.$   $^{c}N = 91.$ 

\* p < .05, one-tailed. \*\*\* p < .001, one-tailed.  $\dagger p < .01$ , two-tailed.

praisals, self-views, reflected appraisals, and knowledgeability estimates for each trait can be found in the Appendix.

#### Results

## Identity Negotiation Processes

To determine if the basic identity negotiation effects noted in Study 1 were present in this sample, we performed hierarchical regressions of T2 self-views on T1 self-views and T1 appraisals and T2 appraisals on T1 appraisals and T1 self-views for each trait. The results for T2 self-views in Table 4 indicate that perceivers' appraisals influenced targets' self-perceived academic ability, whereas the results for T2 appraisals in Table 5 reveal that targets' self-views influenced perceivers' appraisals of academic ability and athletic ability.<sup>2</sup> As in Study 1, we conducted follow-up analyses in which we sought to determine if the appraisal and self-verification effects noted were driven solely by

 Table 5

 Self-Verification Effects in Study 2: Time 2 Appraisals

 Regressed on Time 1 (T1) Appraisals and T1 Self-Views

|                               | T1 Appraisal |                          | T1 Sel     |                          |                         |  |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Traits                        | β<br>final   | R <sup>2</sup><br>change | β<br>final | R <sup>2</sup><br>change | R <sup>2</sup><br>model |  |
| Academic ability <sup>a</sup> | .70***       | .53***                   | .15*       | .02*                     | .55                     |  |
| Social skills <sup>a</sup>    | .68***       | .51***                   | .11        | .01                      | .52                     |  |
| Athletic ability <sup>a</sup> | .72***       | .66***                   | .20***     | .03***                   | .69                     |  |
| Attractiveness <sup>a</sup>   | .73***       | .51***                   | 05         | .01                      | .52                     |  |
| Global worth <sup>b</sup>     | .66***       | .43***                   | 01         | .00                      | .43                     |  |

Note. Each row represents a hierarchical regression model in which T1 appraisal was entered on the first step and T1 self-view was entered on the second step. The  $\beta$  reported is the standardized regression coefficient for the final equation. The  $R^2$  change is the increment in  $R^2$  at the step on which the variable was entered. \* N = 94, b N = 92.

\* p < .05, one-tailed. \*\*\* p < .001, one-tailed.

relatively positive appraisals and self-views. Once again, this was not the case (all interaction ts < 1.32, ns).

## Compromise?

Once again we classified the dyads in our sample into those that exhibited appraisal effects only, self-verification effects only, both effects, or neither effect. The results of this classification are displayed in Table 6 for the two traits for which reliable identity negotiation effects were detected in the regression analyses. As in Study 1, only a minority of the dyads that engaged in identity negotiation compromised.

### **Reflected Appraisals as Mediators**

Did the effects of perceivers' appraisals on targets' self-views proceed through conscious internalization, or were more subtle processes, such as behavioral confirmation and self-perception, at work? Our first attempt to answer this question involved testing the mediational model proposed by symbolic interactionism. Before describing our test of the reflected-appraisal hypothesis, it is important to note that such a mediational model could be tested meaningfully only for ratings of academic ability. This is because academic ability was the only trait in the present study to show a reliable effect of appraisals on selfviews, and a statistically reliable effect of appraisals on selfviews is a necessary precondition for testing any mediational model (Judd & Kenny, 1981a, 1981b).

In addition to perceivers' appraisals predicting changes in self-views, the reflected-appraisal hypothesis requires that perceivers' appraisals predict reflected appraisals and that reflected appraisals predict self-view change when perceivers' appraisals are controlled (Judd & Kenny, 1981a, 1981b). We tested the first requirement, that actual appraisals predict reflected appraisals, by regressing T2 reflected appraisals of academic ability first on T1 self-ratings of academic ability and then on T1 appraisals of academic ability. We entered self-ratings first because of previous suggestions that reflected appraisals may be nothing more than projections of self-views (Shrauger & Schoeneman, 1979). As shown in the highlighted portion of Table 7, perceivers' appraisals of academic ability did reliably predict reflected appraisals of academic ability with initial selfviews controlled. Appraisals also reliably predicted reflected appraisals for social skills and athletic ability.

The highlighted section of Table 8, however, reveals that when actual appraisals of academic ability were controlled, reflected appraisals did not reliably predict changes in self-rated academic ability. Thus, reflected appraisals did not mediate the effect of perceivers' appraisals on self-view change in this sample.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> We also found an unexpected negative appraisal effect for global worth ( $\beta = -.17$ , t[89] = -3.05, p < .01, two-tailed). The results of follow-up analyses on global worth suggested that this effect was driven by self-esteem increases among targets who were initially appraised negatively by their roommates. The origin of this counterintuitive finding remains unclear. It should be noted that there was no sign of such an effect in Study 1.

| Traits           | No T1      | Neither | Appraisal | Self-verification | Both    |
|------------------|------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------|
|                  | difference | effect  | effect    | effect            | effects |
| Academic ability | 28.4       | 27.4    | 16.8      | 16.8              | 10.5    |
| Athletic ability | 27.4       | 31.6    | 13.7      | 17.9              | 9.5     |

Percentage of Dyads Exhibiting Appraisal Effect Only, Self-Verification Effect Only, Both Effects, and Neither Effect (Study 2)

*Note.* Numbers are the percentage of dyads in each category. Results are displayed only for those traits where identity negotiation effects were found in the regression analyses. T1 = Time 1.

# Other Effects of Reflected Appraisals on Self-Views

Table 6

Although the results of our analyses of academic ability ratings did not support the traditional mediational model of reflected appraisals, other analyses suggest that reflected appraisals do have a role to play in determining self-views. In particular, Table 8 indicates that reflected appraisals did reliably predict self-ratings of social skills, athletic ability, and physical attractiveness when actual appraisals were controlled.<sup>3</sup> What is somewhat surprising about these effects is that for none of these three traits was there any effect of actual appraisals on self-views, and that, in the case of physical attractiveness, there was not even a reliable effect of actual appraisals on reflected appraisals. These results suggest that an expanded model of the genesis of reflected appraisals and their role in determining self-views may be needed. We return to this issue in the Discussion.

## Perceived Knowledgeability

Another way of asking whether targets were aware of perceivers' appraisals and consciously used them to modify their selfviews is to determine if targets were more likely to be influenced by appraisals from roommates whom they believed to be knowledgeable about particular traits. To address this issue, for each trait we regressed T2 self-views on T1 self-views, T1 ap-

Table 7Effect of Time 1 (T1) Appraisals on Time 2 ReflectedAppraisals with T1 Self-Views Controlled (Study 2)

|                               | T1 Se  | lf-view        | TI A  |                |                |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------------|-------|----------------|----------------|
| Traits                        | β      | R <sup>2</sup> | β     | R <sup>2</sup> | R <sup>2</sup> |
|                               | final  | change         | final | change         | model          |
| Academic ability <sup>a</sup> | .31*** | .12***         | .17*  | <b>.03*</b>    | <b>.15</b>     |
| Social skills <sup>a</sup>    | 39***  | 20***          | .23** | .05**          | .25            |
| Athletic ability <sup>a</sup> | .40*** | .25***         | .22*  | .04*           | .29            |
| Attractiveness <sup>a</sup>   | .47*** | .24***         | .13   | .02            | .26            |
| Global worth <sup>b</sup>     | .30*** | .09***         | .04   | .00            | .09            |

Note. Each row represents a hierarchical regression model in which T1 self-view was entered on the first step and T1 appraisal was entered on the second step. The  $\beta$  reported is the standardized regression coefficient for the final equation. The  $R^2$  change is the increment in  $R^2$  at the step on which the variable was entered. The model relevant to the mediational argument is in boldface type.

<sup>a</sup> N = 94. <sup>b</sup> N = 92.

\* p < .05, one-tailed. \*\* p < .01, one-tailed. \*\*\* p < .001, one-tailed.

praisals, targets' ratings of perceivers' knowledgeability about their standing on the trait, and the interaction of T1 appraisals and knowledgeability estimates (in that order).

For two of the traits, the interaction of T1 appraisals and knowledgeability estimates emerged as a reliable predictor of final self-views (athletic ability:  $\beta$  final = .18,  $R^2$  change = .03, t(90) = 2.94, p < .001, and physical attractiveness:  $\beta$  final = .26,  $R^2$  change = .06, t(90) = 3.41, p < .001, one-tailed). In both cases the form of the interaction was such that targets' self-views became more positive to the extent that they were evaluated positively by a credible roommate or were evaluated negatively by a less credible roommate. Similarly, targets' self-views became more negative if they were evaluated negatively by a credible roommate or if they were evaluated positively by a less credible roommate.

#### Discussion

The data from Study 2 substantially replicated the identity negotiation effects found in Study 1. As in the previous study, both appraisal effects and self-verification effects were found in the regression analyses, and neither effect was limited to cases in which the driving force (appraisal or self-view) was positive. Also consistent with Study 1, only a small percentage of dyads displayed both identity negotiation effects.

Contrary to the traditional form of the reflected-appraisal hypothesis, reflected appraisals did not mediate the effect of actual appraisals on self-view change. Reflected appraisals did, however, have an impact on self-view change independent of perceivers' actual appraisals.

Finally, targets were more likely to be influenced by perceivers' appraisals of their traits when they believed that the perceiver was knowledgeable about their standing on those traits. This finding supports Shrauger and Schoeneman's suggestion that observer knowledgeability is an important and often overlooked variable in studies of the role of appraisals in self-view change (Shrauger & Schoeneman, 1979, p. 567; see also Rosenberg, 1973).

 $<sup>^3</sup>$  To assure ourselves that the superiority of reflected appraisals to actual appraisals for predicting these self-views was not an artifact of timing (actual appraisals were measured at T1; reflected appraisals were measured at T2), we reanalyzed the data with T2 appraisals and reflected appraisals as the predictors. Again, reflected appraisals, but not actual appraisals, predicted changes in self-rated social skills, athletic ability, and physical attractiveness.

|--|

|                               | T1 Se      | If-view                  | Tl Aı      | opraisal                 | T2 Ref<br>appra |                          |                         |
|-------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Traits                        | β<br>final | R <sup>2</sup><br>change | β<br>final | R <sup>2</sup><br>change | β<br>final      | R <sup>2</sup><br>change | R <sup>2</sup><br>model |
| Academic ability <sup>a</sup> | .57***     | .40***                   | .16*       | .03*                     | .08             | .00                      | .43                     |
| Social skills <sup>b</sup>    | .59***     | .40***                   | 10         | .00                      | .16*            | .02*                     | .42                     |
| Athletic ability <sup>a</sup> | .78***     | .66***                   | 06         | .00                      | .12*            | .02*                     | .68                     |
| Attractiveness <sup>a</sup>   | .57***     | .49***                   | 06         | .00                      | .28***          | .06***                   | .55                     |
| Global worth <sup>c</sup>     | .84***     | .68***                   | 17†        | .03†                     | 00              | .00                      | .71                     |
|                               |            |                          |            |                          |                 |                          |                         |

Effect of Time 2 (T2) Reflected Appraisals on T2 Self-Views With Time 1 (T1) Self-Views and T1 Appraisals Controlled (Study 2)

Note. Each row represents a hierarchical regression model in which T1 self-view was entered on the first step, T1 appraisal was entered on the second step, and T2 reflected appraisal was entered on the third step. The  $\beta$  reported is the standardized regression coefficient for the final equation. The  $R^2$  change is the increment in  $R^2$  at the step on which the variable was entered. The mediational model is in boldface type. <sup>a</sup> N = 94. <sup>b</sup> N = 93. <sup>c</sup> N = 91.

\* p < .05, one-tailed. \*\*\* p < .001, one-tailed.  $\dagger p < .01$ , two-tailed.

## General Discussion

Table 8

Although much remains to be learned about the process and outcome of identity negotiation, these initial studies have demonstrated that empirical research that focuses on naturally occurring relationships can lead to a productive merger of work on the social construction of the self and self-verification. The present research has not only confirmed that both perceiverdriven effects and self-driven effects are at work in the everyday life of college students, but it has also shed new light on each phenomenon.

#### Appraisal Effects

The data on appraisal effects from these studies belie concerns that such effects might be limited to laboratory settings, to appraisals that flatter the recipient, or to the malleable selfviews of children. Of course, skeptics could point out that the magnitude of our appraisal effects was small. In light of the social norms against openly communicating appraisals and the much larger knowledge base presumably supporting self-views, however, we believe that even tiny appraisal effects testify to the important impact of social feedback on self-views. This point is even more telling when one reflects on the fact that the present studies observed the influence of only one of the many prominent individuals who compose participants' social worlds—a drop in the social psychological bucket, as it were.

Both our theoretical analysis and data suggest that the reflected-appraisal hypothesis, as traditionally formulated, is too restrictive to account for the full impact of social appraisals on the self. One way to make the model less restrictive would be to broaden our understanding of what our reflected-appraisal measures are tapping. Kenny & DePaulo (1993), for example, have shown that people form relatively accurate impressions of how they are viewed by people in general, but their specific reflected appraisals are less accurate. If people typically have wellformed impressions of how they are viewed in general (i.e., general reflected appraisals) but have only sketchy impressions of how specific people view them (i.e., specific reflected appraisals), then they may respond with a general reflected appraisal when asked for a specific reflected appraisal by a researcher. If so, then a measure of reflected appraisals may predict self-view change even when the appraisal it nominally reflects does not (as in Study 2), because it serves as a proxy for the collective appraisals of the wider social community.

Another way of easing the restrictions on the explanation of appraisal effects is to consider mechanisms that do not involve the conscious internalization of reflected appraisals. The behavioral confirmation-self-perception process is one such mechanism. Alternatively, identity negotiation may proceed through subtle statements and nonverbal cues that largely bypass conscious awareness (e.g., Blumberg, 1972; Swann, Stein-Seroussi, & McNulty, 1992).

## Self-Verification

Our data provide the first nonlaboratory evidence that people self-verify by bringing others to see them as they see themselves. Taken together with earlier evidence that people are less committed to marital partners who appraise them incongruently (Swann, Hixon, & De La Ronde, 1992), these data provide evidence that people both seek and find self-verification in naturally occurring relationships. Moreover, the relative effect sizes across Studies 1 and 2 indicate that self-verification is at least an equal partner with appraisal effects in identity negotiation and may even be the stronger of the two processes. Although it is certainly too soon to conclude that self-verification processes are more powerful than appraisal effects in daily interactions, the analogous result has been demonstrated in the laboratory (Levesque & Kenny, 1994; Swann & Ely, 1984). In addition to the relative size of the self-verification effects, one should also note that they, like the appraisal effects, were driven by negative as well as positive beliefs. The evidence that people brought their relationship partners to recognize their negative self-views as well as their positive self-views casts doubt on claims that people are exclusively motivated by a desire for positive evaluations (e.g., Jones, 1973).

Certainly we do not deny the existence of a powerful desire for positivity; in fact, we have repeatedly encountered evidence of this desire in our own laboratory (e.g., Hixon & Swann, 1993; Swann, Griffin, Predmore, & Gaines, 1987; Swann, Hixon, Stein-Seroussi, & Gilbert, 1990). We suggest instead that the desire for positivity and the desire for self-verification are quite distinct from one another (e.g., Swann, 1990; Swann & Shroeder, 1994) and that it is thus inappropriate to subsume one under the other. For example, Steele, Spencer, and Lynch (1993) would suggest that our participants brought their roommates to recognize their flaws in an effort to feel morally and adaptively adequate. Similarly, Baumeister (1993) would suggest that roommates sought self-verification of negative selfviews in an effort to "protect" themselves against negative feedback they might encounter if they were to seek overly favorable evaluations. Such formulations have the appeal of being able to explain everything, including a preference for favorable evaluations, a preference for unfavorable evaluations, or no preference whatsoever. Yet these formulations are so broad that they are hardly distinguishable from reinforcement theory, which hypothesizes that people have a tendency to seek pleasure and avoid pain. Unfortunately, like reinforcement theory, these formulations are not falsifiable. We therefore remain convinced that positivity and self-verification strivings are best understood as being distinct.

Finally, we do not claim that self-verification effects are ubiquitous. Felson (1989), for example, concluded that children's self-views had little or no impact on the appraisals of their parents. Two variables may have contributed to Felson's failure to uncover evidence that children evoke self-verifying appraisals from their parents. One is that the lower status of children undermined their ability to influence their parents' appraisals of them; our data indicate that perceived knowledgeability may be an important moderator of identity negotiation processes. Alternatively, the self-views of children may be less certain than the firmly held self-views of adults and thus be less likely to inspire self-verification strivings (Swann, 1990). In either case, our findings suggest that adults are quite capable of obtaining self-verification from their relationship partners.

### Summary and Conclusion

The portrait of the self that emerges from our data is one in which the self is both an architect and consequence of others' appraisals. More specifically, just as the self-concepts of our participants were shaped by the appraisals of others, they also influenced those appraisals. Through this process, the self and the surrounding social environment are constantly attuning themselves to one another. Future research should consider what variables may lead a specific negotiation to be relatively targetdriven or perceiver-driven and should also take a fresh look at the types of mechanisms that may underlie the identity negotiation process. By attending to the power of both perceivers' appraisals and targets' self-views, such research may begin to lay bare the intricate manner in which identity negotiation is woven into the fabric of social relationships.

## References

- Baumeister, R. F. (1993). Understanding the inner nature of low selfesteem: Uncertain, fragile, protective, and conflicted. In Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard (pp. 201–218). New York: Plenum.
- Becker, H. W. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 6, 2–62.
- Blumberg, H. H. (1972). Communication of interpersonal evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 157–162.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and loss: Loss (Vol. 3). New York: Basic Books.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1975). Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cole, D. A. (1991). Change in self-perceived competence as a function of peer and teacher evaluation. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 682-688.
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Scribner's.
- Fazio, R. H., Effrein, E. A., & Falender, V. J. (1981). Self-perceptions following social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 232–242.
- Felson, R. B. (1980). Communication barriers and the reflected appraisal process. Social Psychology Quarterly, 43, 223-233.
- Felson, R. B. (1985). Reflected appraisal and the development of self. Social Psychology Quarterly, 48, 71–78.
- Felson, R. B. (1989). Parents and the reflected appraisal process: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 965–971.
- Felson, R. B., & Reed, M. (1986). The effect of parents on the selfappraisals of children. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 49, 302-308.
- Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Gecas, V. (1982). The self-concept. Annual Review of Sociology, 8, 1-33.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday-Anchor.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 25, 161–178.
- Hixon, J. G., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (1993). When does introspection bear fruit? Self-reflection, self-insight, and interpersonal choices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 35–43.
- Hoelter, J. W. (1984). Relative effects of significant others on self-evaluation. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47, 255–262.
- Jones, S. C. (1973). Self and interpersonal evaluations: Esteem theories versus consistency theories. *Psychological Bulletin*, 79, 185–199.
- Judd, C. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1981a). Estimating the effects of social interventions. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Judd, C. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1981b). Process analysis: Estimating mediation in treatment evaluations. *Evaluation Review*, 5, 602–619.
- Jussim, L. (1991). Social perception and social reality: A reflection– construction model. *Psychological Review*, 98, 54–73.
- Jussim, L., Soffin, S., Brown, R., Ley, T., & Kohlhepp, K. (1992). Understanding reactions to feedback by integrating ideas from symbolic interactionism and cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality* and Social Psychology, 62, 402-421.
- Kenny, D. A., & DePaulo, B. M. (1993). Do people know how others view them?: An empirical and theoretical account. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 145–161.
- Kinch, J. W. (1963). A formalized theory of the self-concept. American Journal of Sociology, 68, 481–486.
- Lecky, P. (1945). *Self-consistency: A theory of personality.* New York: Island Press.
- Levesque, M. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1994). Accuracy of behavioral predic-

tions at zero acquaintance: A social relations analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 1178-1187.

- Lundgren, D. C., Jergens, V. H., & Gibson, J. L. (1982). Marital power, roles, and solidarity and husbands' and wives' appraisals of self and other. *Sociological Inquiry*, 52, 33-52.
- Manis, M. (1955). Social interaction and the self-concept. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, 362-370.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81–90.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Merton, R. K. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy. Antioch Review, 8, 193-210.
- Pelham, B. W., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (1989). From self-conceptions to self-worth: On the sources and structure of global self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 672–680.
- Regan, D. T. (1971). Effects of a favor and liking on compliance. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7, 627–639.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1973). Which significant others? American Behavioral Scientist, 16, 829–860.
- Rosenthal, R. (1976). *Experimenter effects in behavioral research*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalian in the classroom: Teacher expectation and the pupils' intellectual development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1978). Interpersonal expectancy effects: The first 345 studies. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *3*, 377–386.
- Schafer, R. B., & Keith, P. M. (1985). A causal model approach to the symbolic interactionist view of the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 963–969.
- Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. (1965). An interpersonal approach to personality. In B. Maher (Ed.), *Progress in experimental personality research* (Vol. 2, pp. 91–125). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Shrauger, J. S., & Lund, A. (1975). Self-evaluation and reactions to evaluations from others. *Journal of Personality*, 43, 94–108.
- Shrauger, J. S., & Schoeneman, T. J. (1979). Symbolic interactionist view of self-concept: Through the looking glass darkly. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 549-573.
- Snyder, M., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (1978). Behavioral confirmation in social interaction: From social perception to social reality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 14, 148–162.

Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and

interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 656–666.

- Sroufe, L. A., & Fleeson, J. (1986). Attachment and the construction of relationships. In W. Hartup & Z. Rubin (Eds.), *Relationships and development* (pp. 51-71). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Lynch, M. (1993). Self-image resilience and dissonance: The role of affirmational resources. *Journal of Per*sonality and Social Psychology, 64, 885–896.
- Stryker, S. (1987). The vitalization of symbolic interactionism. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50, 83–94.
- Stryker, S., & Statham, A. (1985). Symbolic interaction and role theory. In G. Lindzay & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 311–378). New York: Random House.
- Swann, W. B., Jr. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony with the self. In J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 2, pp. 33–66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Swann, W. B., Jr. (1987). Identity negotiation: Where two roads meet. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 1038-1051.
- Swann, W. B., Jr. (1990). To be adored or to be known: The interplay of self-enhancement and self-verification. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations* of social behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 408–448). New York: Guilford Press.
- Swann, W. B., Jr., & Ely, R. J. (1984). A battle of wills: Self-verification versus behavioral confirmation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1287–1302.
- Swann, W. B., Jr., Griffin, J. J., Predmore, S., & Gaines, B. (1987). The cognitive-affective crossfire: When self-consistency confronts self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 881– 889.
- Swann, W. B., Jr., Hixon, J. G., & De La Ronde, C. (1992). Embracing the bitter "truth": Negative self-concepts and marital commitment. *Psychological Science*, 3, 118–121.
- Swann, W. B., Jr., Hixon, J. G., Stein-Seroussi, A., & Gilbert, D. T. (1990). The fleeting gleam of praise: Behavioral reactions to self-relevant feedback. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 17– 26.
- Swann, W. B., Jr., & Shroeder, D. G. (1994). The search for beauty and truth: A framework for understanding reactions to evaluative feedback. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Swann, W. B., Jr., Stein-Seroussi, A., & Giesler, B. (1992). Why people self-verify. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 392-401.
- Swann, W. B., Jr., Stein-Seroussi, A., & McNulty, S. E. (1992). Outcasts in a white lie society: The enigmatic worlds of people with negative self-conceptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 618–624.

# Appendix

|                                       |          |        |     |      | Zero    | -order correl | ations |      |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--------|-----|------|---------|---------------|--------|------|
| Variable                              | М        | SD     | Ν   | 1    | 2       | 3             | 4      | 5    |
| Academic ability                      |          |        |     |      |         |               |        |      |
| T1 Self-view                          | 6.13     | 1.17   | 69  | 1.00 | .13     | .77           | .44    | .35  |
| T1 Appraisal                          | 6.23     | 1.14   | 69  | _    | 1.00    | .10           | .54    | .20  |
| T2 Self-view                          | 5.97     | 1.20   | 69  |      |         | 1.00          | .43    | .34  |
| T2 Appraisal                          | 5.93     | 1.17   | 69  | _    |         |               | 1.00   | .36  |
| Actual trait (SAT)                    | 1,026.06 | 152.31 | 66  |      |         |               | _      | 1.00 |
| Social skills                         |          |        |     |      |         |               |        |      |
| T1 Self-view                          | 6.03     | 1.40   | 69  | 1.00 | .30     | .66           | .44    | 16   |
| T1 Appraisal                          | 5.64     | 1.45   | 69  |      | 1.00    | .34           | .63    | 07   |
| T2 Self-view                          | 5.94     | 1.45   | 69  |      |         | 1.00          | .49    | 05   |
| T2 Appraisal                          | 5.26     | 1.44   | 69  |      |         | _             | 1.00   | 22   |
| Actual trait <sup>a</sup>             | 5.07     | 1.05   | 58  |      |         |               |        | 1.00 |
| Athletic ability                      |          |        | ••• |      |         |               |        |      |
| T1 Self-view                          | 4.67     | 1.81   | 69  | 1.00 | 54      | .83           | .55    | .49  |
| TI Appraisal                          | 4 97     | 1 78   | 69  |      | 1.00    | 57            | 62     | 37   |
| T2 Self-view                          | 4 71     | 1.87   | 69  |      |         | 1.00          | 63     | 45   |
| T2 Annraisal                          | 4 74     | 1.50   | 69  |      | <u></u> |               | 1.00   | 38   |
| Actual trait (high school activities) | 0.00     | 0.71   | 68  | _    |         |               | 1.00   | 1.00 |
| Attractiveness                        | 0.00     | 0.71   | 00  |      | ,       |               |        | 1.00 |
| T1 Self-view                          | 5 71     | 1 36   | 69  | 1.00 | 20      | 77            | 01     | - 01 |
| TI Appraisal                          | 5.62     | 1.30   | 69  | 1.00 | 1.00    | 27            | .01    | - 03 |
| T2 Self view                          | 5.02     | 1.35   | 69  |      | 1.00    | 1.00          | .07    | .03  |
| T2 Appraisal                          | 5.57     | 1.29   | 69  |      | _       | 1.00          | 1.00   | - 11 |
| A stual trait <sup>a</sup>            | 5.52     | 1.17   | 58  |      |         | _             | 1.00   | 1.00 |
| Nouroticiamb                          | 5.44     | 1.20   | 50  |      |         | _             | _      | 1.00 |
| T1 Solf view                          | 6 71     | 1 74   | 60  | 1.00 | 22      | 70            | 00     |      |
| T1 Approisel                          | 6.03     | 1.74   | 60  | 1.00 | 1.00    | .70           | .07    |      |
| TO Solf view                          | 6.72     | 1.74   | 60  |      | 1.00    | 1.00          | .33    |      |
| T2 Approved                           | 0.72     | 1./1   | 60  | _    |         | 1.00          | 1.00   |      |
| 12 Appraisai                          | 5.72     | 1.43   | 09  | _    |         |               | 1.00   |      |
| Extraversion                          | £ 00     | 1 70   | 60  | 1.00 | 24      | 70            | 20     |      |
| T i Self-view                         | 5.88     | 1.70   | 09  | 1.00 | .24     | ./9           | .39    |      |
| T Appraisai                           | 5.54     | 1.78   | 69  |      | 1.00    | .32           | .03    |      |
| 12 Self-view                          | 5.91     | 1.79   | 69  |      |         | 1.00          | .51    |      |
| 12 Appraisal                          | 5.38     | 1.61   | 68  |      |         |               | 1.00   |      |
| Openness                              | ( 22     |        | 60  | 1.00 | 00      | 7.1           |        |      |
| T1 Self-view                          | 6.22     | 1.51   | 69  | 1.00 | .09     | ./1           | .16    |      |
| T1 Appraisal                          | 5.48     | 1.76   | 69  |      | 1.00    | .25           | .80    |      |
| 12 Self-view                          | 6.32     | 1.50   | 69  | _    |         | 1.00          | .28    |      |
| 12 Appraisal                          | 5.28     | 1.88   | 69  |      |         |               | 1.00   |      |
| Agreeableness                         |          |        | (0) |      | 0.2     | <b>(7</b>     | 00     |      |
| T1 Self-view                          | 7.06     | 1.56   | 69  | 1.00 | .02     | .67           | 08     |      |
| T1 Appraisal                          | 6.87     | 1.29   | 69  |      | 1.00    | .14           | .42    |      |
| T2 Self-view                          | 6.93     | 1.61   | 69  |      |         | 1.00          | .10    |      |
| T2 Appraisal                          | 6.25     | 1.64   | 69  |      |         |               | 1.00   |      |
| Conscientiousness                     |          |        |     |      |         |               |        |      |
| T1 Self-view                          | 6.68     | 1.62   | 69  | 1.00 | .19     | .41           | .11    |      |
| TI Appraisal                          | 6.28     | 1.43   | 69  |      | 1.00    | .30           | .51    |      |
| T2 Self-view                          | 6.42     | 1.58   | 69  |      |         | 1.00          | .32    |      |
| T2 Appraisal                          | 5.78     | 1.63   | 69  |      |         |               | 1.00   |      |
| Global worth                          |          |        |     |      |         |               |        |      |
| T1 Self-view                          | 31.45    | 7.05   | 69  | 1.00 | .06     | .76           | 02     |      |
| T1 Appraisal                          | 35.74    | 4.16   | 69  |      | 1.00    | .15           | .52    |      |
| T2 Self-view                          | 31.50    | 7.45   | 68  | —    |         | 1.00          | .04    |      |
| T2 Appraisal                          | 34.42    | 4.58   | 67  |      |         | _             | 1.00   |      |

Means, Standard Deviations, Ns, and Zero-Order Correlations (With Pairwise Deletion of Missing Data) by Trait for the Variables Measured in Study 1

*Note.* T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2; SAT = Standard Achievement Test. <sup>a</sup> Judged by raters. <sup>b</sup> This item was presented as emotional stability, so that higher numbers reflect *less* neuroticism.

Table A1

| 140101114 | Ta | b | le | A | 2 |
|-----------|----|---|----|---|---|
|-----------|----|---|----|---|---|

| Variable               |       | SD   | N  | Zero-order correlations |      |      |      |      |      |
|------------------------|-------|------|----|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                        | М     |      |    | 1                       | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
| Academic ability       |       |      |    |                         |      |      |      |      |      |
| T1 Self-view           | 6.05  | 1.17 | 95 | 1.00                    | .21  | .63  | .30  | .35  | .17  |
| T1 Appraisal           | 6.06  | 1.14 | 95 | _                       | 1.00 | .30  | .73  | .23  | .33  |
| T2 Self-view           | 5.87  | 1.29 | 95 |                         |      | 1.00 | .38  | .31  | .05  |
| T2 Appraisal           | 5.97  | 1.14 | 95 |                         |      | _    | 1.00 | .32  | 35   |
| T2 Reflected appraisal | 5.01  | 1.08 | 95 | _                       | _    |      |      | 1.00 | 55   |
| T2 Knowledgeability    | 4.88  | 1.51 | 95 |                         | _    |      |      |      | 1.00 |
| Social skills          |       |      |    |                         |      |      |      |      | 1.00 |
| T1 Self-view           | 6.16  | 1.41 | 95 | 1.00                    | .25  | 63   | 28   | 45   | 31   |
| T1 Appraisal           | 5.84  | 1.47 | 95 | _                       | 1.00 | 11   | 71   | 33   | 30   |
| T2 Self-view           | 6.18  | 1.35 | 94 | _                       |      | 1.00 | 12   | 39   | 22   |
| T2 Appraisal           | 5.74  | 1.54 | 95 | _                       | _    |      | 1.00 | 46   | 50   |
| T2 Reflected appraisal | 4.92  | 1.40 | 95 | _                       |      |      |      | 1.00 | 60   |
| T2 Knowledgeability    | 4.92  | 1.63 | 95 |                         |      |      |      | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Athletic ability       |       |      |    |                         |      |      |      |      | 1.00 |
| T1 Self-view           | 4.74  | 1.76 | 95 | 1.00                    | 48   | 82   | 55   | 50   | - 01 |
| T1 Appraisal           | 4.42  | 1.72 | 95 |                         | 1.00 | 37   | 81   | 41   | .01  |
| T2 Self-view           | 4.91  | 1.68 | 95 |                         |      | 1.00 | 44   | 40   | 00   |
| T2 Appraisal           | 4.67  | 1.75 | 95 | _                       | _    |      | 1.00 | 50   | .00  |
| T2 Reflected appraisal | 4.01  | 1.67 | 95 | _                       | _    |      |      | 1.00 | 17   |
| T2 Knowledgeability    | 4.63  | 1.74 | 95 |                         |      |      |      | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Attractiveness         |       |      |    |                         |      |      |      |      | 1.00 |
| T1 Self-view           | 5.63  | 1.32 | 95 | 1.00                    | .20  | 70   | 10   | 40   | 32   |
| T1 Appraisal           | 5.62  | 1.26 | 95 |                         | 1.00 | 11   | 72   | 27   | .52  |
| T2 Self-view           | 5.65  | 1.18 | 95 | _                       |      | 1.00 | .72  | .22  | .20  |
| T2 Appraisal           | 5.52  | 1.26 | 95 | _                       | _    |      | 1.00 | 15   | .24  |
| T2 Reflected appraisal | 4.51  | 1.26 | 95 |                         |      |      | 1.00 | 1.00 | .20  |
| T2 Knowledgeability    | 5.08  | 1.40 | 95 |                         |      | -    |      | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Global worth           |       |      |    |                         |      |      |      | _    | 1.00 |
| T1 Self-view           | 32.31 | 6.08 | 95 | 1.00                    | 05   | 83   | 07   | 31   | _ 19 |
| T1 Appraisal           | 34.37 | 5.43 | 94 |                         | 1.00 | - 12 | .07  | .51  | 10   |
| T2 Self-view           | 33.01 | 6.38 | 93 |                         | 1.00 | 1 00 | .00  | .00  | 10   |
| T2 Appraisal           | 32.83 | 6.32 | 94 |                         |      |      | 1.00 | .25  | 21   |
| T2 Reflected appraisal | 2.99  | 1.12 | 94 |                         |      | _    | 1.00 | 1.00 | - 29 |
| T2 Knowledgeability    | 1.53  | 1.19 | 94 |                         | _    |      |      |      | 1.00 |

Means, Standard Deviations, Ns, and Zero-Order Correlations (With Pairwise Deletion of Missing Data) by Trait for the Variables Measured in Study 2

Note. T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2.

Received January 12, 1993

Revision received April 18, 1994

Accepted April 22, 1994