

The Self Salience Model of Other-to-Self Effects: Integrating Principles of Self-Enhancement, Complementarity, and Imitation

Diederik A. Stapel and Karen I. Van der Zee
University of Groningen

In a series of studies the Self Salience Model of other-to-self effects is tested. This model posits that self-construal salience is an important determinant of whether other-to-self effects follow the principles of self-enhancement, imitation, or complementarity. Participants imagined interactions (Studies 1 and 2) or were confronted (Studies 3 to 5) with dominant, submissive, agreeable, or quarrelsome person targets. Findings support the prediction that subsequent self-evaluations (Studies 1 to 3) and behaviors (Studies 4 and 5) follow the principles of self-enhancement when the personal self is activated (contrast away from undesirable targets, assimilation toward desirable targets); the principles of complementarity when the relational self is activated (contrast on the dominant–submissive dimension, assimilation on the agreeable–quarrelsome dimension); and the principles of imitation when the collective self is activated (assimilation regardless of desirability or dimension).

Keywords: self-enhancement, imitation, complementarity, self-construal, social comparison

Jim goes to a party where he meets Wendy, an attractive woman. He has only met her once before, but he likes her and feels attracted to her. After some hesitation, he goes up to her and asks if she would like a drink. During the rest of the evening, Wendy is very talkative and dominates the conversation. The next day Jim meets up with one of his friends to talk about the previous evening. How would Jim describe himself in his interaction with Wendy?

Who we are and what we do is often determined by whom we interact with. It is therefore not surprising that within psychology there are several research traditions that have addressed the inter-relational nature of our self-evaluations and actions. Oddly enough, however, models focusing on how others affect our behaviors (e.g., Dryer & Horowitz, 1997) and self-evaluations (e.g., Stapel & Blanton, 2004; Stapel & Koomen, 2001; Van der Zee, Buunk, & Sanderman, 1998) have arrived at seemingly contradictory conclusions with regard to the impact of social interactions on self and behavior. A review of the relevant literature suggests three different answers to the question above regarding how Jim would

act and perceive himself after having met talkative, dominant Wendy.

One Question, Three Answers

The first answer to this question is given by social comparison research focusing on the question of how our self-perceptions and actions are affected by others. Within the context of this research approach, an important finding is that people often process information about others in ways that serve self-enhancement needs (e.g., Sedikides, Gaertner, & Toguchi, 2003; see Suls & Wheeler, 2000). This finding implies a tendency to assimilate information about others who exemplify positive traits or desirable futures and a tendency to contrast information about others who exemplify negative traits or undesirable futures, especially when these traits refer to highly valued or self-important characteristics (e.g., Stapel & Koomen, 2001; Van der Zee et al., 1998).

In the Western world, where dominant behavior is typically viewed as more desirable than submissive behavior, Wendy's dominant behavior would probably evoke in Jim self-views and behaviors that also reflect dominance, an assimilation effect. Had Wendy acted relatively submissively, a self-serving response for Jim would be to contrast rather than to assimilate his self-view to Wendy's behavior.

The second answer to the riddle of other-to-self effects is given by complementarity theory (e.g., Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957). Complementarity theorists have argued that interpersonal behavior evolves around two main dimensions: *control*, anchored by dominance and submissiveness, and *affiliation*, anchored by agreeableness and quarrelsomeness (see Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003). More important, these theorists make predictions about the role of both dimensions in dyadic interactions. Interpersonal interactions are assumed to be complementary. More specifically, similarity is predicted on the affiliation dimension and opposition on the control dimension. In other words, whereas agreeableness evokes agreeableness and quarrelsomeness evokes quarrelsomeness (as-

Diederik A. Stapel and Karen I. Van der Zee, Department of Social and Organizational Psychology, University of Groningen, the Netherlands.

Both authors contributed equally to this article. The research and writing were supported in part by a Pionier Grant from the Dutch Science Foundation (Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek) awarded to Diederik A. Stapel and by research grants of the Heymans Institute of the University of Groningen. We thank Miriam van den Bos, Anneke Dijkstra, Karlijn Massar, and Lennart Renkema for assisting us with the research reported here. We thank David Marx and William Ickes for commenting on an earlier version of this article. Finally, we especially thank Nils Jostmann, who pointed us to the framed line task as a good implicit and behavioral measure of dominant versus submissive behavior.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to either Diederik A. Stapel or Karen I. Van der Zee, Department of Social and Organizational Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen, the Netherlands. E-mail: d.a.stapel@rug.nl or k.i.van.oudenhoven-van.der.zee@rug.nl

simulation), dominance is typically responded to with submissiveness, and submissiveness is responded to with dominance (contrast). Patterns of complementarity have been supported in empirical studies (e.g., Dryer & Horowitz, 1997; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003).

A complementary reaction to Wendy's dominant behavior would be exemplified by a submissive self-description of Jim. It is also important to realize that this outcome is opposite what self-enhancement models predict. Moreover, it is important to note that although complementarity theory predicts contrast for the control dimension (dominant–submissive), it also predicts assimilation for the affiliation dimension (agreeable–quarrelsome).

Third and finally, imitation theorists have yet a different answer to the question of how our self-perceptions and actions are likely to be affected by others (see Bandura, 1986; Kulik & Gump, 1997). Within the context of this theoretical perspective, the focus has been on the notion that humans have a tendency to imitate the behaviors of others (e.g., Chartrand, Maddux, & Lakin, 2005). From a biological perspective, it has been argued that in humans as well as animals imitation serves a social function, because it incorporates elements of identification, empathy, and closeness (De Waal, 1982). Evidence for imitation has been demonstrated in a number of contexts and with a number of behaviors, such as foot movements, emotions, tone of voice, and facial expressions. Imitation often seems to result in greater liking, rapport, and comfort with the interaction partner. Imitation theory thus generally presumes assimilative tendencies, regardless of the behavioral dimension (as in complementarity research) or the desirability of the response (as in social comparison research).

An imitative reaction to Wendy's dominant behavior would be exemplified by dominant behaviors or self-views of Jim. Had Wendy acted relatively submissively, an imitative reaction would be exemplified by submissive self-views or behaviors. Note again that this pattern of predicted outcomes is different from what both self-enhancement and complementarity perspectives predict.

In sum, in the relevant literature, there are at least three different perspectives on other-to-self effects. Table 1 presents the outcomes predicted by the self-enhancement, complementarity, and imitation perspectives for each pole on the two interpersonal dimensions of control and affiliation. As is clear from Table 1, each perspective predicts a different pattern of results. The self-enhancement perspective predicts assimilation when the interaction partner's behavior is positive (dominant, agreeable) and contrast when the interaction partner's behavior is negative (submissive, quarrelsome). The complementarity perspective predicts assimilation for

the affiliation dimension and contrast for the control dimension. The imitation perspective predicts assimilation, independent of the dimension or the valence of the response.

The Self Salience Model

In the present article, we present and test the Self Salience Model of other-to-self effects. This model aims to integrate the self-enhancement, complementarity, and imitation perspectives into a single general framework for understanding interpersonal self-evaluation effects. The Self Salience Model posits that one important determinant of other-to-self effects is the self-construal level that is salient (personal, relational, collective) during information processing. The Self Salience Model is thus an attempt to integrate the three perspectives into a single, comprehensive framework. In the present studies, we tested the model through explicit and systematic comparison of the enhancement, complementarity, and imitation perspectives in a single, experimental paradigm.

To date, it is not entirely clear to what extent the effects predicted by each of these perspectives are paradigm contingent. It is interesting to note that although with the self-enhancement, complementarity, and imitation perspectives, other-to-self effects have been studied using a variety of measures. Each of these perspectives seems to have a specific type of measure that can be called "prototypical." Specifically, research that departs from a self-enhancement perspective has primarily focused on self-evaluation and typically pays little attention to behavior (see Wood, 1989). By contrast, modern imitation theorists focus mainly on lower level, highly automatic behaviors (e.g., foot movements) and typically pay little attention to higher level behaviors or more controlled self-evaluations (see Chartrand et al., 2005). Complementarity theorists also focus on behavior rather than self-perceptions but they generally do so by studying higher level dimensions that are explicitly interpersonal in nature (see Dryer & Horowitz, 1997). In the present studies, we compare and contrast the self-enhancement, complementarity, and imitation perspectives using evaluative as well as behavioral self-measures. This allows us to bridge the paradigmatic gap that now exists among these perspectives and that makes it almost impossible to integrate them into a comprehensive model (i.e., the Self Salience Model) that predicts outcomes independent of measurement type.

In the present research, we investigate other-to-self effects with a focus on the interpersonal dimensions of control and affiliation (rather than less interpersonal dimensions). The questions we pose are the following: What determines which of the three perspectives will provide the best description of interpersonal self-evaluation? What determines whether people's self-views are influenced by others in self-serving, interpersonally balancing, or copycat ways? What determines whether the processes of self-enhancement, complementarity, or imitation provide the best description of self-evaluative social comparison effects? According to the Self Salience Model, the answer to these questions is self-construal salience.

In the Self Salience Model, an important determinant of whether other-to-self effects follow the principles of self-enhancement, complementarity, or imitation is self-construal salience. We predict that the applicability of each of these three principles depends on whether the personal self versus the relational self versus the

Table 1
Theoretical Predictions of Other-to-Self Effects From Self-Enhancement, Complementarity, and Imitation Perspectives

Target other variable	Perspective		
	Self-enhancement	Complementarity	Imitation
Dominant	Dominant (A)	Submissive (C)	Dominant (A)
Submissive	Dominant (C)	Dominant (C)	Submissive (A)
Agreeable	Agreeable (A)	Agreeable (A)	Agreeable (A)
Quarrelsome	Agreeable (C)	Quarrelsome (A)	Quarrelsome (A)

Note. A = assimilation; C = contrast.

collective self is most accessible during the self-impression formation process. Thus, to go back to our Jim and Wendy example, we argue that Jim's response in reaction to his interaction with Wendy is dependent on whether he views Wendy as (a) a target against which to evaluate his personal self, (b) as a relationship partner, or (c) as a representative of his peer group.

Our Self Salience Model of other-to-self effects is largely inspired by Brewer and Gardner's (1996) treatment of self-construal orientations (see also Turner, 1987). Brewer and Gardner distinguish three self-construal orientations: personal, relational, and collective.

Salience of a *personal* self-construal is associated with a conception of oneself primarily in terms of individual traits and characteristics. According to Brewer and Gardner (1996), a personal self-construal is accompanied by self-interest motivations. We therefore hypothesize that when the personal self is salient, individuals will be more inclined to perceive their social world in terms of interpersonal competition, and subsequent confrontation with a dyadic interaction will be framed accordingly. A focus on the personal self will thus be linked primarily to self-enhancement concerns. Thus, personal self salience should evoke contrastive self-descriptions and behaviors in case of a submissive and quarrelsome (negative) target and assimilative self-descriptions and behaviors in case of a dominant or an agreeable (positive) target.

Salience of a *relational* self-construal is associated with the activation of self-knowledge consisting of relationships with others. According to Brewer and Gardner (1996), salience of a relational self-construal leads individuals to evaluate themselves in terms of the adeptness with which they perform interpersonal roles. The Self Salience Model thus predicts that a relational self-construal will be associated with complementarity responses. When the relational self is activated, people should be especially concerned with the regulation and coordination of interpersonal interactions rather than self-enhancement or imitation concerns (Dryer & Horowitz, 1997; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Wiggins, 1979). In terms of the present research paradigm, this should evoke contrastive self-descriptions and behaviors on the control dimension, that is, when the target's behavior is dominant or submissive. On the other hand, assimilative self-descriptions and behaviors should occur on the affiliation dimension, that is, when the target's behavior is agreeable or quarrelsome.

Salience of a *collective* self-construal is associated with the activation of self-construal in terms of a group prototype (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Salience of a collective self-construal leads individuals to see themselves more in terms of "we-ness" than in terms of "I-ness." The social self represents those aspects of the self that reflect integration of the self in the social world. When the social self is active, being part of the social unit becomes of primary importance and under those conditions individuals tend to accentuate their similarity to others, especially other in-group members (see for empirical evidence, Gardner, Gabriel, & Hochschild, 2002; Stapel & Koomen, 2001). Thus, although in both relational and collective self-construals the self is defined in terms of its connectedness to others, when relational self-construals are salient the focus is more on dyadic, person-to-person relationships (me and you), whereas collective self-construals focus more on "large" rather than on "small" group membership and a sense of identification (we-ness) with a particular peer group (see Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Hence, the Self Salience Model predicts that a

collective self-construal orientation is associated with imitation effects. According to this prediction, assimilative self-descriptions should occur independently of dimension or valence.

Research Overview

We test our Self Salience Model of other-to-self effects in a series of studies. In all those studies, we use techniques used earlier by Brewer and Gardner (1996) and Stapel and Koomen (2001) to activate personal, relational, or collective self-construals (e.g., circling pronouns in a reading task; writing essays about "me"). In Studies 1 and 2, we also instruct participants to imagine persons who exemplified one of the four interpersonal trait anchors (dominant, submissive, agreeable, quarrelsome). Next we ask them to rate themselves on these dimensions. In Study 1, we test our hypotheses by investigating target-to-self effects on the control (dominant–submissive) dimension. In Study 2, we do the same for the affiliation dimension (agreeable–quarrelsome). In Study 3, we test our control versus affiliation hypotheses in one experimental design, thus allowing us to test the complete Self Salience Model of other-to-self effects in one experiment. Furthermore, in Study 3 participants are exposed to rather than asked to imagine (dominant or submissive, or agreeable or quarrelsome) target persons before they rate themselves on the relevant dimensions. In Studies 4 and 5, we test our model using (more implicit) behavioral rather than (more explicit) self-evaluative measures. In Study 4, we test the behavioral consequences of our model using the Framed Line Test (Kitayama, Duffy, Kawamura, & Larsen, 2003) as an implicit measure of control (dominance–submissiveness). In Study 5, we test the behavioral consequences of our model using a Money Donation Task as an implicit measure of affiliation (agreeableness–quarrelsomeness).

Study 1: Imagining Others on the Control Dimension

In Study 1, we put our Self Salience Model to a first test. In this study, we first activated (primed) personal, relational, or collective self-construals and then instructed participants to imagine persons who exemplified dominant or submissive trait anchors. Next, we asked participants to rate themselves on a number of dimensions. Thus, in Study 1, our focus was on the control (rather than on the affiliation) dimension of interpersonal behavior.

Method

Participants and Design

A total of 195 undergraduate students were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 3 (self-construal salience: personal vs. relational vs. collective) \times 2 (target: dominant vs. submissive other) design. A control condition was included in which participants did not describe a target and no self-construal was activated. All students received course credit for their participation in the study.

Materials

Self-construal salience. Self-construals were activated by asking participants to write a paragraph on a particular topic. In all conditions, participants were asked to write a story about themselves, describing themselves in neutral, descriptive terms. Furthermore, in the personal self-construal condition, they were instructed that every sentence they

wrote should include one of the following pronouns: *I, me, myself, mine*. In the collective self-construal condition, participants were asked to write a neutral story about “we.” In addition, participants were instructed to use the pronouns: *we, our, ourselves, ours* in every sentence that they wrote. Third, in the relational self-construal condition, participants were asked to write a neutral story about how they saw themselves in relationships with other people. In this condition, participants were instructed to use the words: *I, me, others, interpersonal roles*.¹ Finally, in the self-construal control condition, participants were asked to write a story on what one can do in the library using the words: *book, reading, silence*.

Target. In activating relevant information about comparison targets, we followed a procedure developed by Tiedens and Jimenez (2003). In the experimental conditions, participants were asked to describe a person whom they knew and with whom they had interacted frequently and to focus on interpersonal interactions with this person. In the control condition, participants only filled out the dependent measures. Participants in the dominant condition were instructed to think about a target that was *self-assured* and *firm*. In the submissive condition, participants were asked to imagine someone who was *self-doubting* and *timid*. Tiedens and Jimenez (2003) derived these adjectives from Wiggins (1979). For the purpose of the present study, these adjectives were pretested following the same procedure as described by Tiedens and Jimenez (2003).

Measures. Next, participants participated in an “unrelated study in which they were asked to rate themselves on Scales A (Dominant, $\alpha = .74$), I (Submissive, $\alpha = .78$), E (Quarrelsome, $\alpha = .77$), and M (Agreeable, $\alpha = .62$) of the Wiggins (1979) Interpersonal Adjective Scale (IAS). Participants rated the extent to which each of the adjectives described themselves on 7-point scales that ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*).

After these self-evaluations, participants also rated how much they liked the target they wrote about and the degree to which the target exemplified the relevant trait adjective. Both of these ratings were made on 7-point scales that ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extreme*).

Debriefing. On completion of the questionnaire, participants were carefully debriefed about the goal and purpose of the experiment. None of the participants spontaneously indicated suspicion of the actual goal of the study. After debriefing, participants were thanked and dismissed.

Results

Manipulation Checks

Participants were asked to rate to what extent the target they discussed possessed the trait adjectives that we used to indicate each pole of the control dimensions. Participant ratings were significantly above the midpoint ($M = 5.71$, $SD = 1.13$) and reached a comparable level to that reported by Tiedens and Jimenez (2003). This suggests that participants had actually been imagining someone who exemplified the intended position on the interpersonal dimension of interest. Also, target likeability ratings indicated, as expected, that participants who had written about a dominant target liked the target more ($M = 6.33$, $SD = 0.91$) than participants who had written about a submissive target ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.87$), $F(2, 159) = 275.53$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .63$. Analyses of variance revealed that target ratings were not affected by the self-construal salience manipulation ($F_s < 1$).

Main Analyses

Self-ratings of dominance. First, we tested the effects of our hypotheses on self-ratings on the Dominance scale (see Table 2). Because the design incorporated a full factorial with a control group, analyses were not straightforward. To test all relevant

hypotheses, analyses were conducted in two steps. We first tested for interactions and simple main effects in the 3 (self-construal salience) \times 2 (target) analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the type of effects self-construal salience evoked. Then, following the advice of Jaccard (1998), we conducted single degree of freedom contrasts comparing means in the factorial conditions to means in the control condition, to test whether observed effects were consistent with self-serving or non-self-serving processing.² In the first step, the ANOVA revealed the predicted interaction between self-construal salience and target, $F(2, 159) = 12.78$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .14$, and a main effect of self-construal salience, $F(2, 159) = 6.76$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$ (other main effect; $F < 1$). Simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with our predictions. In the collective condition, self-ratings on the dominance scale were higher in response to a dominant target ($M = 4.61$, $SD = 0.69$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.59$), $F(2, 159) = 10.13$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$, an assimilation effect. In the relational condition, however, this effect was reversed. In that condition, self-ratings on the dominance scale were lower in response to a dominant target ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.78$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 4.59$, $SD = 0.74$), $F(1, 159) = 10.13$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$, a contrast effect. In the personal condition, self-ratings on the dominance scale were relatively high in both the dominant target ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.90$) and the submissive target ($M = 4.69$, $SD = 0.78$) conditions ($F < 1$).

We predicted that this latter pattern of means indicates self-servingness and supports the prediction that participants in the personal condition indeed assimilated themselves toward the positive (dominant) target and contrasted themselves away from the negative (submissive) target. To test this prediction, we performed a new analysis. In this analysis, comparisons were made between the six experimental conditions and the control condition. This was done by first conducting a one-way ANOVA on the seven conditions. This yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(6, 189) =$

¹ The present study was the first study in which a relational self-construal orientation was primed successfully. In 1996, Brewer and Gardner (1996) extended social identity theory by proposing a new theoretical framework in which three fundamental levels of identification are distinguished: the personal (individual), relational (interpersonal), and collective (group) identity orientations. Although in our opinion their article made a very strong theoretical contribution to the literature on the self and social identities, no empirical research has proved the value of this extension empirically yet. The present priming method provides a starting point for further research testing the assumptions and theoretical implications of their model.

² One could argue that given our specific predictions, omnibus F tests that are followed by simple main effect analyses are not informative (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). Moreover, each individual prediction of our integrative model has received support in previous conceptually related studies (as reviewed in the introduction of this article), justifying the use of a priori contrasts in the studies reported here. For all the relevant analyses reported in the five main studies in this article, we performed F tests (main text) as well as a priori contrasts with weights that were based on our specific predictions (e.g., for the dominance self-ratings in Study 1: -2 for the control cell, $+3$ for the cells for which positive self-ratings were expected, -5 for the cells for which negative self-ratings were expected, $F(1, 189) = 6.42$, $p < .01$). For each of the five studies, these a priori contrasts reached significance ($p < .01$), thus strongly supporting the Self Salience Model of interpersonal self-evaluation effects.

Table 2
Imagining Others on the Control Dimension: Mean (and Standard Deviation) Self-Ratings as a Function of Self-Construal Salience and Target

Target self-evaluations	Self-construal salience						Control
	Personal		Relational		Collective		
	Dominant	Submissive	Dominant	Submissive	Dominant	Submissive	
Dominance	4.67 _a (0.90)	4.69 _a (0.78)	3.79 _c (0.78)	4.59 _a (0.74)	4.61 _a (0.69)	3.81 _d (0.59)	4.17 _b (0.77)
Submissiveness	3.69 _c (0.80)	3.81 _d (0.80)	4.55 _a (0.61)	3.78 _d (0.76)	3.73 _c (0.86)	4.67 _a (0.66)	4.15 _b (0.78)
Agreeableness	5.17 _b (0.60)	5.15 _b (0.82)	5.23 _b (0.62)	5.27 _b (0.72)	5.27 _b (0.59)	5.20 _b (0.49)	5.21 _b (0.55)
Quarrelsomeness	2.44 _b (0.61)	2.38 _b (0.72)	2.45 _b (0.66)	2.41 _b (0.77)	2.47 _b (0.98)	2.51 _b (0.77)	2.45 _b (0.67)

Note. For each measure, means with different subscripts (except c–d) differ significantly at $p < .05$ (a–b, a–c, a–d, b–c) or $p < .07$ (b–d).

6.95, $p < .01$. The pooled estimate of error was then used to conduct a series of eight planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental and the control conditions. Results from these analyses are shown in Table 2. The patterning of differences is consistent with the hypothesized model. In the collective and relational conditions, all means differed from the control. The only qualification to this is that the control versus collective/submissive difference was marginal, $t(189) = 1.79$, $p = .07$ (but see Footnote 2). These results suggest that self-serving processing is not operating under these conditions (see Stapel & Koomen, 2001). In contrast, results in the personal condition do suggest self-serving responding. In this condition, the dominant target led to more dominant (positive) self-ratings than the control condition (assimilation), and the submissive target led to more dominant (positive) self-ratings than the control condition (contrast).

Self-ratings of submissiveness. The pattern of findings for self-rated submissiveness perfectly mirrored the pattern of findings for self-rated dominance (see Table 2), thus again matching our predictions. To test whether this pattern of means indeed matched our hypothesis, the same analytical strategy was followed as for the dominance scale. In the first step, the Self-Construal Salience \times Target ANOVA revealed the predicted interaction between self-construal salience and target, $F(2, 159) = 14.65$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .16$, and a main effect of self-construal salience, $F(2, 159) = 6.32$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$ (other effect; $F < 1$). Simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with predictions. In the collective condition, self-ratings on the submissiveness scale were lower in response to a dominant target ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.86$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.66$), $F(1, 159) = 17.37$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$, an assimilation effect. In the relational condition, self-ratings on the submissiveness scale were higher in response to a dominant target ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.61$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 0.76$), $F(2, 159) = 8.24$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$, a contrast effect. In the personal condition, self-ratings on the dominance scale were relatively low in both the dominant target ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 0.88$) and the submissive target ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.80$) conditions ($F < 1$).

The one-way ANOVA on the seven conditions of the complete design yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(6, 189) = 7.14$, $p < .01$. The pooled estimate of error was used to conduct a series of eight planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental conditions and the control condition. Results from these analyses are shown in Table 2, where the subscripts reveal which conditions differed significantly from the control condition. The patterning of differences is consistent with the hypothesized model. In the collective and relational conditions, all means differed from the control condition. The only qualification to this is that the control versus personal/submissive difference was marginal, $t(189) = 1.81$, $p < .07$, and the control versus relational/submissive difference was marginal, $t(189) = 1.71$, $p < .07$. Again, these results suggest that self-serving processing is not operating under these conditions. In contrast, results in the personal condition do suggest responding that is self-serving. In this condition, the dominant target led to less submissive (more positive) self-ratings than the control condition (assimilation), and the submissive target led to less submissive (more positive) self-ratings than the control condition (contrast).

Self-ratings of agreeableness and quarrelsomeness. Following earlier research (Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003), we assume that the predicted effects are specific to the traits under consideration. In other words, if a person is asked to think about a dominant or a submissive other, this should not affect his or her self-ratings on agreeableness or quarrelsomeness. As predicted, our manipulations had no effect on self-ratings on this dimension (see Table 2). Self-Construal Salience \times Target ANOVAs on these two measures corroborate this conclusion (all F s < 1). Self-ratings of agreeableness and quarrelsomeness did not differ across conditions.

Study 2: Imagining Others on the Affiliation Dimension

In Study 1, we found support for the Self Salience Model in a study that focused on the control dimension to investigate the impact of self-construal salience on other-to-self effects. In Study 2, we focused on the affiliation rather than on the control dimension of interpersonal behavior. Thus, we activated personal, rela-

tional, or collective self-construals; instructed participants to imagine persons who exemplified agreeable or quarrelsome trait anchors; and asked participants to rate themselves on a number of trait dimensions.

Method

Participants and Design

A total of 173 undergraduate students were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 3 (self-construal salience: personal vs. relational vs. collective) × 2 (target: agreeable vs. quarrelsome other) design. A control condition was included in which participants did not describe a target and no self-construal was activated. All students received course credit for their participation in the study.

Materials

Self-construal salience. In Study 2, the same self-construal activation method was used as in Study 1.

Target. In evoking target descriptions, we followed the procedure used in Study 1. In the experimental condition, participants were asked to describe a person whom they knew and with whom they had interacted frequently and to focus on interpersonal interactions with this person. In the control condition, participants only filled out the dependent measures. The participants in the agreeable condition were asked to think about and describe a target that was *cordial* and *accommodating*; in the quarrelsome condition, they were asked to imagine someone who was *rude* and *discourteous*. For the purpose of the present study, these traits were pretested following the same procedure as described by Tiedens and Jimenez (2003).

Measures. Next, participants participated in an “unrelated” study in which they were asked to rate themselves on the same IAS scales as in Study 1. The reliability of the four scales varied from $\alpha = .69$ to $\alpha = .78$.

As in Study 1, after they had completed the self-ratings, participants also rated how much they liked the target they wrote about and the degree to which the target exemplified the relevant trait adjective. Both of these ratings were made on 7-point scales that ranged from (1) *not at all* to (7) *extreme*.

Debriefing. On completion of the questionnaire, participants were carefully debriefed about the goal and purpose of the experiment. None of the participants spontaneously indicated suspicion of the actual goal of the study. After debriefing, participants were thanked and dismissed.

Results

Manipulation Checks

Participants were asked to rate to what extent the target they discussed possessed the trait adjectives that we used to indicate each pole of the control dimensions. Participants’ ratings were significantly above the midpoint: $M = 5.66$, $SD = 1.01$. This suggests that participants actually had been imagining someone who exemplified the intended position on the affiliation dimension. Also, target likeability ratings indicated, as expected, that participants who had written about an agreeable target liked the target more ($M = 5.92$, $SD = 1.24$) than participants who had written about a quarrelsome target ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 1.42$), $F(1, 146) = 59.28$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .29$.

Main Analyses

Self-ratings of agreeableness. First, we tested the effects of our hypotheses on self-ratings on the agreeableness scale (for means see Table 3). We followed the same analytical strategy as in Study 1. In the first step, the Self-Construal Salience × Target ANOVA revealed the predicted interaction between self-construal salience and target, $F(2, 146) = 8.25$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .10$; a main effect of self-construal salience, $F(2, 146) = 12.30$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .15$, and a main effect of target, $F(1, 146) = 29.01$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .17$. Simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with predictions. In the collective condition, self-ratings on the agreeableness scale were higher in response to an agreeable target ($M = 5.04$, $SD = 0.70$) than in response to a quarrelsome target ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.36$), $F(1, 146) = 19.94$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .12$, an assimilation effect. Similarly, in the relational condition, self-ratings on the agreeableness scale were higher in response to an agreeable target ($M = 5.04$, $SD = 0.70$) than in response to a quarrelsome target ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.52$), $F(1, 146) = 13.77$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$, an assimilation effect. In the personal condition, self-ratings on the agreeableness scale were relatively high in both the agreeable target ($M = 5.13$, $SD = 0.64$) and the quarrelsome target ($M = 5.16$, $SD = 0.69$) conditions ($F < 1$).

Table 3
Imagining Others on the Affiliation Dimension: Mean (and Standard Deviation) Self-Ratings as a Function of Self-Construal Salience and Target

Target self-evaluations	Self-construal salience						Control
	Personal		Relational		Collective		
	Agreeable	Quarrelsome	Agreeable	Quarrelsome	Agreeable	Quarrelsome	
Dominance	4.65 _b (0.91)	4.55 _b (0.91)	4.62 _b (0.76)	4.43 _b (0.82)	4.53 _b (0.69)	4.55 _b (0.69)	4.53 _b (0.80)
Submissiveness	3.87 _b (0.86)	3.83 _b (0.71)	3.88 _b (0.95)	3.96 _b (1.03)	3.89 _b (0.82)	4.01 _b (1.09)	3.95 _b (0.82)
Agreeableness	5.13 _a (0.64)	5.16 _a (0.69)	5.04 _a (0.70)	4.28 _c (0.52)	5.04 _a (0.65)	4.16 _c (0.36)	4.57 _b (0.69)
Quarrelsomeness	2.42 _a (0.60)	2.31 _a (0.79)	2.57 _a (0.72)	3.19 _d (0.69)	2.63 _a (0.80)	3.22 _c (0.60)	2.98 _b (0.53)

Note. For each measure, means with different subscripts (except c–d) differ significantly at $p < .05$ (a–b, a–c, a–d, b–c) or $p < .10$ (b–d).

The one-way ANOVA on the seven conditions of the complete design yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(6, 166) = 12.36$, $p < .01$. The pooled estimate of error was then used to conduct a series of eight planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental conditions and the control condition. Results from these analyses are shown in Table 3. The patterning of differences is consistent with the hypothesized model. In the collective and relational conditions, all means differed from the control. Again, these results suggest that self-serving processing is not operating under these conditions. In contrast, results in the personal condition do suggest responding that is self-serving. In this condition, both the agreeable target led to more agreeable (more positive) self-ratings than the control condition (assimilation), and the quarrelsome target led to more agreeable (more positive) self-ratings than in the control condition (contrast).

Self-ratings of quarrelsomeness. Next, we tested the effects of our hypotheses on self-ratings on the quarrelsomeness scale (for means see Table 3). The Self-Construal Salience \times Target ANOVA revealed the predicted interaction between self-construal salience and target, $F(2, 146) = 7.42$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$; a main effect of self-construal salience, $F(2, 146) = 9.87$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .12$; and a main effect of target, $F(1, 146) = 9.97$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$. Simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with our predictions. In the collective condition, self-ratings on the quarrelsomeness scale were lower in response to an agreeable target ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 0.80$) than in response to a quarrelsome target ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.60$), $F(1, 146) = 7.02$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$, an assimilation effect. Similarly, in the relational condition, self-ratings on the quarrelsomeness scale were lower in response to an agreeable target ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 0.72$) than in response to a quarrelsome target ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 0.69$), $F(1, 146) = 7.63$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$, an assimilation effect. In the personal condition, self-ratings on the agreeableness scale were relatively high in both the agreeable ($M = 2.42$, $SD = 0.60$) and the quarrelsome ($M = 2.31$, $SD = 0.79$) target conditions ($F < 1$).

The one-way ANOVA on the seven conditions of the complete design yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(6, 166) = 6.50$, $p < .01$. The pooled estimate of error was then used to conduct a series of eight planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental conditions and the control. Results from these analyses are shown in Table 3. The patterning of differences is consistent with the hypothesized model. The only qualification to this is that the control versus collective/agreeable difference was marginal, $t(166) = 1.20$, $p < .09$, and the control versus relational/quarrelsome difference was marginal, $t(166) = 1.81$, $p < .07$. In the collective and relational conditions, all means differed from the control. Again, these results suggest that self-serving processing is not operating under these conditions. In contrast, results in the personal condition do suggest self-serving responding. In this condition, both the agreeable target led to less quarrelsome (more positive) self-ratings than the control condition. In the former case as a result of assimilation, in the latter as a result of contrast.

Self-ratings of dominance and submissiveness. Our model assumes that the predicted effects are specific to the traits under consideration. In other words, if a person is asked to think about an agreeable or a quarrelsome other, this should not affect his or her self-ratings on dominance or submissiveness. As predicted, our manipulations had no effect on self-ratings on this dimension (see Table 3). Self-Construal Salience \times Target ANOVAs on these two

measures corroborate this conclusion (all F s < 1). Self-ratings of dominance and submissiveness did not differ across conditions.

Study 3: Confronted With Others on the Control or Affiliation Dimensions

The goal of the third study was to both replicate and extend the findings of the first two studies. In Studies 1 and 2, the Self Salience Model was tested in two separate steps: We first tested our hypotheses concerning the impact of self-construal orientation on other-to-self effects on the control dimension and then on the affiliation dimension. In Study 3, we tested our hypotheses for other-to-self effects on the control and affiliation dimensions in one experimental design, thus allowing us to test the complete Self Salience Model in one experiment. Furthermore, in the present study, participants were exposed to rather than asked to imagine (dominant or submissive or agreeable or quarrelsome) target persons before they rated themselves on the relevant dimensions.

Method

Participants and Design

A total of 325 undergraduate students were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 3 (self-construal salience: personal vs. relational vs. collective) \times 4 (target: dominant vs. submissive vs. agreeable vs. quarrelsome other) design. A control condition was included in which participants were not exposed to a target and no self-construal was activated. All students received course credit for their participation in the study.

Materials

Self-construal salience. In this study, a different self-construal activation method was used as in Studies 1 and 2. Specifically, we used a self-construal activation task that was modeled after Brewer and Gardner (1996, p. 87). Participants read a paragraph describing a trip to the city. They were instructed to carefully circle all the pronouns that appeared in the text as part of a proofreading and word search task. In the *personal self* condition, the text started with the sentence "I go to the city" and all the pronouns referred to *I* or *me* or *myself*. In the *relational self* condition, the text started with the sentence "I am with you. We are together, the two of us, you and me. I go to the city with you." The pronouns referred to *I with you*, *you and me*, *you with me*. In the *collective self* condition, the text started with "We are a group of people. We go to the city." The pronouns referred to *we* or *us* or *ourselves*. In the control condition, participants read the same text as in the personal self condition, but now all the personal pronouns were replaced by *it*, and participants were instructed to circle all instances of *it*.

In a self-construal salience pretest ($n = 36$), we tested whether this manipulation of self-construal salience indeed activated the predicted self-construal orientations. In this pretest, we first gave undergraduate students one of the three self-construal salience manipulations. Then, in an ostensibly unrelated study, we asked them to indicate, on a 7-point scale that ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*), to what extent they valued (a) being an independent, unique person; (b) being with other people in relationships; and (c) being part of a group. Next, they were asked to what extent each of the a, b, and c items represented "really me" (1 = *not at all me*, 7 = *very much me*). Finally, the participants were asked to what extent they enjoyed the state described by the a, b, and c items (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*).

Using ANOVAs, we assessed the validity of the self-construal salience manipulation on composite indices of these self value ($\alpha = .84$), relationship value ($\alpha = .81$), and group value ($\alpha = .88$) items. These analyses

showed an effect of self-construal salience on the self value measure, $F(2, 33) = 5.55, p < .01, \eta^2 = .25$. Participants valued an independent self more in the personal self condition ($M = 5.83, SD = 0.94$) than in the relational ($M = 4.83, SD = 1.12$) or the collective ($M = 4.50, SD = 1.00$) conditions ($ps < .05$). The relational and the collective conditions did not differ reliably ($F < 1$). We also found an effect of self-construal salience on the relationship value measure, $F(2, 33) = 10.97, p < .01, \eta^2 = .40$. Participants valued more in the relational self condition ($M = 5.25, SD = 0.97$) than in the collective ($M = 4.25, SD = 1.14$) or the personal ($M = 3.33, SD = 0.89$) conditions (all comparisons, $ps < .05$). We also found an effect of self-construal salience on the group value measure, $F(2, 33) = 16.40, p < .01, \eta^2 = .50$. Participants valued more in the collective self condition ($M = 5.17, SD = 0.94$) than in the relational ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.13$) or the personal ($M = 2.92, SD = 0.79$) conditions (all comparisons, $ps < .05$). These results indicate that our self-construal salience manipulation activates the intended self-construal orientations.

Target. After the self-construal salience manipulation, participants read a (short) "newspaper article" describing a target person. Their task was to guess in which daily newspaper or weekly magazine the article could have been published. In this article, a day in the life of a student was described. The article consisted mainly of neutral information (e.g., names of pubs, friends, comments on the local music scene) and was designed such that the participants would feel close as well as feel different from the target. Pretest participants indicated that they saw commonalities as well as differences between themselves and the targets and indicated that they could differentiate themselves from as well as identify themselves with the protagonists in the stories.

Both in the beginning and near the end of the article, the target was described with four trait terms. In the dominant condition, these traits consisted of self-assured, determined, self-confident, and firm. In the submissive condition, these traits were self-doubting, timid, unconfident, and indecisive. In the agreeable condition, these traits were cordial, friendly, accommodating, and warm. In the quarrelsome condition, these traits were rude, offensive, discourteous, and bad-mannered. Participants in the control condition did not read the newspaper article. They went on to the next task, completing the dependent measures.

In a target pretest ($n = 63$), we tested whether target descriptions indeed led to the needed target impressions. In this pretest, we gave undergraduate students one of the four newspaper articles. Then, in an ostensibly unrelated study, participants were asked to rate themselves on the four IAS scales (reliability of the four scales varied from $\alpha = .76$ to $\alpha = .86$).

We performed ANOVAs to test the effect of target type (dominant, submissive, agreeable, quarrelsome) on each of the four scales. The results were as predicted. For each of the four scales, ANOVAs showed reliable effects ($ps < .001$). Participants judged the dominant target as more dominant ($M = 6.00, SD = 0.71$) and less submissive ($M = 2.39, SD = 0.77$) than the submissive target ($M = 2.42, SD = 0.84$, and $M = 5.90, SD = 0.66$, respectively, $ps < .01$), whereas these targets were perceived as equally agreeable and quarrelsome ($Fs < 1$). Conversely, participants judged the agreeable target as more agreeable ($M = 5.79, SD = 0.80$) and less quarrelsome ($M = 2.59, SD = 0.80$) than the quarrelsome target ($M = 2.50, SD = 0.86$, and $M = 6.12, SD = 0.78$, respectively, $ps < .01$), whereas these targets were perceived as equally dominant and submissive ($Fs < 1$). These results indicate that our target manipulation activated the intended target impressions.

Measures. After they had completed the circling task and the newspaper article classification task, participants participated in a third study in which they were asked to rate themselves on the IAS scales (reliability of the four scales varied from $\alpha = .79$ to $\alpha = .87$).

Debriefing. On completion of the questionnaire, participants were carefully debriefed about the goal and purpose of the experiment. None of the participants spontaneously indicated suspicion of the actual goal of the study. After debriefing, participants were thanked and dismissed.

Results

We tested our predictions in an ANOVA, with scale, that is, ratings on the four IAS scales (dominance, submissiveness, agreeableness, quarrelsomeness), as a within-subject variable and self-construal salience (personal, relational, collective) and target (dominant, submissive, agreeable, quarrelsome) as between-subjects variables. Thus, following the analytical strategy used previously, we did not include the control group in these first analyses. These analyses showed a main effect of scale, $F(3, 289) = 212.87, p < .01, \eta^2 = .42$, a Target \times Scale interaction, $F(3, 289) = 13.30, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12$; a Self-Construal Salience \times Scale interaction, $F(6, 289) = 5.01, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$; and the predicted Self-Construal Salience \times Target \times Scale interaction, $F(12, 289) = 12.16, p < .01, \eta^2 = .20$ (other effects, $ps > .33$). To further investigate the pattern of results (see also Table 4), and to more specifically test our hypotheses, we conducted separate analyses for each of the four rating scales, following a similar analytical strategy as before (see also Footnote 2).

Self-Ratings of Dominance

A Self-Construal Salience \times Target ANOVA revealed the predicted Self-Construal Salience \times Target interaction, $F(6, 289) = 10.66, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18$, and a main effect of self-construal salience, $F(2, 289) = 3.54, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$ (main effect of target, $F < 1$). Subsequent simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with our predictions. In the collective condition, self-ratings on the dominance scale were higher in response to a dominant target ($M = 4.98, SD = 0.64$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 3.67, SD = 0.96$), $F(1, 150) = 24.35, p < .01, \eta^2 = .14$, an assimilation effect. In the relational condition, however, this effect was reversed. In that case, self-ratings on the dominance scale were lower in response to a dominant target ($M = 3.68, SD = 0.98$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 4.75, SD = 0.67$), $F(1, 150) = 16.31, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09$, a contrast effect. In the personal condition, self-ratings on the dominance scale were relatively high in both the dominant target ($M = 4.94, SD = 0.93$) and the submissive target ($M = 4.95, SD = 0.79$) conditions ($F < 1$). Furthermore, as expected, the agreeable or the quarrelsome targets affected none of the dominance ratings. As can be seen in Table 4, in the relevant conditions, self-ratings were similar to those of the control condition.

The one-way ANOVA on the 13 conditions of the complete design yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(12, 312) = 7.94, p < .01$. As can be seen in Table 4, the planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental conditions and the control condition revealed a patterning of differences consistent with the hypothesized model (see Study 1).

Self-Ratings of Submissiveness

The pattern of findings for self-rated submissiveness perfectly mirrored the pattern of findings for self-rated dominance (see Table 4). A Self-Construal Salience \times Target ANOVA revealed the predicted Self-Construal Salience \times Target interaction, $F(6, 289) = 13.08, p < .01, \eta^2 = .32$, and a main effect of Self-Construal Salience, $F(2, 289) = 5.75, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$ (main

Table 4
Confronted With Others on The Control and Affiliation Dimension: Mean (and Standard Deviation) Self-Ratings as a Function of Self-Construal Saliency and Target

Target self-evaluations	Self-construal saliency												
	Personal				Relational				Collective				
	Dominant	Submissive	Agreeable	Quarrelsome	Dominant	Submissive	Agreeable	Quarrelsome	Quarrelsome	Dominant	Submissive	Agreeable	Quarrelsome
Dominance	4.94 _c (0.93)	4.95 _c (0.79)	4.25 _b (1.22)	4.39 _b (0.97)	3.68 _a (0.98)	4.75 _c (0.67)	4.54 _b (0.60)	4.28 _b (1.05)	4.98 _c (0.64)	3.67 _a (0.96)	4.44 _b (0.61)	4.53 _b (0.79)	4.21 _b (0.71)
Submissiveness	4.05 _a (0.89)	4.12 _a (0.82)	4.79 _b (1.10)	4.58 _b (0.72)	5.36 _c (0.85)	4.18 _a (0.79)	4.56 _b (0.75)	4.96 _b (0.91)	3.99 _b (0.88)	5.45 _c (0.76)	4.40 _b (0.70)	4.79 _b (0.86)	4.73 _b (0.80)
Agreeableness	4.86 _b (0.58)	4.71 _b (0.94)	5.45 _c (0.68)	5.46 _c (0.69)	4.89 _b (0.74)	4.74 _b (0.89)	5.37 _c (0.75)	4.16 _a (0.60)	5.16 _b (0.67)	4.97 _b (0.77)	5.80 _c (0.67)	3.88 _a (0.89)	4.88 _b (0.62)
Quarrelsomeness	3.66 _b (0.83)	3.49 _b (1.01)	2.63 _a (0.61)	2.61 _a (0.79)	3.38 _b (0.82)	3.42 _b (0.94)	2.46 _a (0.76)	3.99 _c (0.78)	3.54 _b (1.08)	3.33 _b (0.79)	2.70 _a (0.84)	3.96 _c (0.76)	3.36 _b (0.98)

Note. For each measure, means with different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .05$

effect of target, $p > .12$). Subsequent simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with predictions. In the collective condition, self-ratings on the submissiveness scale were lower in response to a dominant target ($M = 3.99, SD = 0.88$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 5.45, SD = 0.76$), $F(1, 150) = 29.95, p < .01, \eta^2 = .17$, an assimilation effect. In the relational condition, self-ratings on the submissiveness scale were higher in response to a dominant target ($M = 5.36, SD = 0.85$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 4.18, SD = 0.79$), $F(1, 150) = 19.66, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12$, a contrast effect. In the personal condition, self-ratings on the dominance scale were relatively low in both the dominant target ($M = 4.05, SD = 0.89$) and the submissive target ($M = 4.12, SD = 0.82$) conditions ($F < 1$). Furthermore, as expected, the agreeable or the quarrelsome targets affected none of the submissiveness ratings. As can be seen in Table 4, in the relevant conditions, self-ratings were similar to those of the control condition.

The one-way ANOVA conducted on the 13 conditions of the complete design yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(12, 312) = 8.09, p < .01$. As can be seen in Table 4, the planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental conditions and the control condition revealed a patterning of differences consistent with the Self Saliency Model (cf. Study 1).

Self-Ratings of Agreeableness

A Self-Construal Saliency \times Target ANOVA revealed the predicted Self-Construal Saliency \times Target interaction, $F(6, 289) = 10.51, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18$; a main effect of self-construal saliency, $F(2, 289) = 5.03, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$; and a main effect of target, $F(2, 289) = 25.69, p < .01, \eta^2 = .21$. Subsequent simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with our predictions. In the collective condition, self-ratings on the agreeableness scale were higher in response to an agreeable target ($M = 5.80, SD = 0.67$) than in response to a quarrelsome target ($M = 3.88, SD = 0.89$), $F(1, 147) = 61.68, p < .01, \eta^2 = .29$, an assimilation effect. Similarly, in the relational condition, self-ratings on the agreeableness scale were higher in response to an agreeable target ($M = 5.37, SD = 0.75$) than in response to a quarrelsome target ($M = 4.16, SD = 0.60$), $F(1, 147) = 20.22, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12$, an assimilation effect. In the personal condition, self-ratings on the agreeableness scale were relatively high in both the agreeable target ($M = 5.45, SD = 0.68$) and the quarrelsome target ($M = 5.46, SD = 0.69$) conditions ($F < 1$). Furthermore, as expected, the dominant or the submissive targets affected none of the agreeable ratings. As can be seen in Table 4, in the relevant conditions, self-ratings were similar to those of the control condition.

The one-way ANOVA on the 13 conditions of the complete design yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(12, 312) = 13.12, p < .01$. As can be seen in Table 4, the planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental conditions and the control condition revealed a patterning of differences consistent with the hypothesized model (see Study 2).

Self-Ratings of Quarrelsomeness

A Self-Construal Saliency \times Target ANOVA revealed the predicted Self-Construal Saliency \times Target interaction, $F(6, 289) = 6.82, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12$; a main effect of self-construal saliency,

$F(2, 289) = 3.17, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$; and a main effect of target, $F(2, 289) = 21.29, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18$. Subsequent simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with our predictions. In the collective condition, self-ratings on the quarrelsomeness scale were lower in response to an agreeable target ($M = 2.70, SD = 0.84$) than in response to a quarrelsome target ($M = 3.96, SD = 0.76$), $F(1, 147) = 37.51, p < .01, \eta^2 = .20$, an assimilation effect. Similarly, in the relational condition, self-ratings on the quarrelsomeness scale were lower in response to an agreeable target ($M = 2.46, SD = 0.76$) than in response to a quarrelsome target ($M = 3.99, SD = 0.78$), $F(1, 147) = 22.27, p < .01, \eta^2 = .13$, an assimilation effect. In the personal condition, self-ratings on the agreeableness scale were relatively high in both the agreeable ($M = 2.63, SD = 0.61$) and the quarrelsome ($M = 2.61, SD = 0.79$) target conditions ($F < 1$). Furthermore, as expected, the dominant or the submissive targets affected none of the agreeable ratings. As can be seen in Table 4, in the relevant conditions, self-ratings were similar to those of the control condition.

The one-way ANOVA conducted on the 13 conditions of the complete design yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(12, 305) = 8.99, p < .01$. As can be seen in Table 4, the planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental conditions and the control condition revealed a patterning of differences consistent with the Self Salience Model (cf. Study 2).

Study 4: Confronted With Others and Behavior on the Control Dimension

In Studies 1 to 3, we firmly established evidence for the Self Salience Model of other-to-self effects in the context of interpersonal self-evaluations. The aim of Studies 4 and 5 is to examine to what extent our model applies not only to explicit self-evaluative measures but also to more implicit and subtle behavioral indices. Demonstrating such effects would enhance the generalizability of the current perspective considerably. In Study 4, we investigated the validity of the Self Salience Model on behavior that is related to the control dimension. In Study 5, we do the same for behavior that is related to the affiliation dimension.

In the current study, we measure control-related behavior by investigating the extent to which people are independent and can ignore contextual information when instructed to do so. Previous research has shown that dominant, powerful people are more capable of thinking and acting in context-independent ways, whereas submissive people have more trouble thinking independently and act in more context-dependent, normative, complying ways (see Kitayama et al., 2003; Leary, 1957; Nisbett, 2003). Thus the extent to which one is context-dependent (in the broadest sense of the word) can be seen as a proxy for the extent to which one is, or acts, submissive rather than dominant.

How can the extent to which someone is context-dependent be measured? Kitayama et al. (2003) recently devised a test, called the framed-line test (FLT), that can be used to assess the ability to use or ignore contextual information on a very basic (i.e., perceptual, nonsocial) level. In our adapted version of this test, an FLT trial takes the following form: Participants are presented with a square frame, within which is printed a vertical line. Next, participants are presented with another (smaller or larger), square frame and are asked to draw a line that is identical to the first line in absolute length. Thus, in this task, participants must ignore both

the first frame (when assessing the length of the line) and the second frame (when reproducing the line). Thus, they will do well (exactly copy the framed line) when they can do so context independently. Hence, dominant (independent) people should perform better than submissive (dependent) people on this task.

In terms of the current concerns (see, e.g., Table 1), we thus expected the following: When the personal self is salient, FLT results should show a self-enhancement pattern such that exposure to a dominant as well as submissive target should lead to fewer FLT errors (indicating more independent or dominant behavior). When the relational self is salient, FLT results should show a complementarity pattern, such that exposure to a dominant target should lead to more FLT errors, and exposure to a submissive target should lead to fewer FLT errors. When the collective self is salient, FLT results should show an imitative pattern such that exposure to a dominant target should lead to fewer FLT errors and exposure to a submissive target should lead to more FLT errors.

Method

Participants and Design

A total of 75 undergraduate students were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 3 (self-construal salience: personal vs. relational vs. collective) \times 2 (target: dominant vs. submissive other) design. A control condition was included in which participants were not exposed to a target and no self-construal was activated. All students received course credit for their participation in the study.

Materials

Self-construal salience and target information. In this study we used the self-construal activation method that was used as in Study 3 (i.e., circling pronouns in a text). The target manipulation was also identical to the one used in Study 3 (i.e., reading a newspaper article about either a dominant or submissive target).

Measure and debriefing. After they had completed the circling task and the newspaper article classification task, participants participated in "a simple cognitive task." This task consisted of six FLT trials, modeled after Kitayama et al. (2003, p. 202). In each of these trials, participants were first shown a square frame, within which a vertical line was printed. Then, they were shown a second square frame that was either larger or smaller than the first frame. The task was to draw a line in the second frame that was the same absolute length as the line in the first frame. When participants had completed this task, they were debriefed (no participant showed suspicion of the goal of the study) and thanked. Next, the lines drawn by each participant were measured and the absolute differences between these lines and the correct lines were calculated. Averaging these differences resulted in a mean error score (in millimeters).

In an FLT and dominance–submissiveness pretest ($n = 30$), we tested to what extent this FLT measure is indeed related to self-ratings of dominance and submissiveness. In this pretest, we gave undergraduate students an "organizational setting imagination exercise." Half of the participants were asked to imagine that they were the chief executive officer (CEO) of a large company ("powerful, you have to motivate people, give them a sense of direction"). The other half of the participants were asked to imagine that they were the assistant to the CEO of a large company ("no power, you do what you are told"). After this imagination exercise, participants were asked two bogus questions (how easy and how strange this exercise was). Next, participants were given another, ostensibly unrelated task, the FLT. Finally, they were asked some "background questions": Participants were asked to rate themselves on the four IAS scales (reliability of the four scales varied from $\alpha = .72$ to $\alpha = .76$).

We performed ANOVAs to test the effect of the imagination exercise (boss, assistant) on FLT scores and on each of the four IAS scales. The results were as predicted. Bosses made fewer FLT errors ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 1.35$) than assistants ($M = 6.07$, $SD = 1.67$), $F(1, 28) = 7.00$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .20$. Moreover, bosses rated themselves as more dominant ($M = 5.27$, $SD = 0.88$) than did assistants ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 0.94$), $F(1, 28) = 54.76$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .66$. Additionally, bosses rated themselves as less submissive ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 0.94$) than did assistants ($M = 5.82$, $SD = 0.86$), $F(1, 28) = 30.58$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .50$. Correlational analyses showed that scores on the FLT correlated negatively with dominance ratings ($-.41$, $p < .05$) and positively with submissiveness ratings ($.43$, $p < .05$). No effects of the manipulations were found for the agreeableness and quarrelsomeness scales ($F_s < 1$). Further, ratings on these scales did not correlate reliably with FLT scores ($p_s > .24$). Together, these results suggest that FLT score is a good proxy for behavior on the control (dominant–submissive) dimension.

Results

We used the same analytical strategy as before to analyze the results of this study. A Self-Construal Salience \times Target ANOVA revealed the predicted Self-Construal Salience \times Target interaction, $F(2, 69) = 22.80$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .17$, and a main effect of self-construal salience, $F(2, 69) = 7.07$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .17$ (main effect of target, $F < 1$). Subsequent simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with our predictions. In the collective condition, FLT errors were smaller in response to a dominant target ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 0.98$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 5.93$, $SD = 1.33$), $F(1, 69) = 15.72$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .18$, an assimilation effect. In the relational condition, more FLT errors were made in response to a dominant target ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 1.21$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.17$), $F(1, 69) = 15.98$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .18$, a contrast effect. In the personal condition, FLT errors were relatively few in both the dominant target ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.24$) and the submissive target ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.22$) conditions ($F < 1$).

The one-way ANOVA conducted on the seven conditions of the complete design yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(6, 81) = 9.89$, $p < .01$. As can be seen in Table 5, planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental conditions and the control condition revealed a patterning of differences consistent with the Self Salience Model.

Study 5: Confronted With Others and Behavior on the Affiliation Dimension

In Study 4, we investigated the validity of our perspective on behavior that is related to the control dimension. In the current study, we do the same for behavior that is related to the affiliation dimension. We measured affiliation-related behavior by investigating the extent to which people are willing to donate money to Amnesty International (for a similar measure, see Holland, 2003). Although there may be a number of variables determining whether people donate money to a specific cause (e.g., empathy, political attitude), we reasoned that one may assume that people who are agreeable and friendly would be relatively likely to donate money to Amnesty International, whereas quarrelsome, confrontational people would be more likely to keep their money for themselves. Indeed, studies in the Social Value \times Social Dilemma tradition show such correlations between personality styles and prosocial versus egocentric economic behavior (e.g., Kuhlman & Wimberly, 1976).

Table 5

Confronted With Others and Behavior on the Control Dimension: Mean (and Standard Deviation) Error (in Millimeters) in the Framed Line Test as a Function of Self-Construal Salience and Target

Target	Self-construal salience		
	Personal	Relational	Collective
Dominant	3.42 _a (1.24)	6.00 _c (1.21)	3.54 _a (0.98)
Submissive	3.58 _a (1.22)	3.42 _a (1.17)	5.93 _c (1.33)

Note. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .05$. In the control condition, the mean error was 4.53_b (1.31).

In the current experiment, we treated the amount of money people donated to Amnesty International as a proxy for friendliness. We predicted the following: When the personal self is salient, the amount of money donated should show a self-enhancement pattern such that exposure to an agreeable as well as a quarrelsome person should lead to donating relatively more money (indicating that “I am a good, friendly person”). When the relational self is salient, a complementarity pattern should be apparent such that exposure to an agreeable target would lead to more money donated and exposure to a quarrelsome target would lead to less money donated. When the collective self is salient, the money donation measure would show an imitative pattern such that exposure to an agreeable target would lead to more money donated and exposure to a quarrelsome target would lead to less money donated.

Method

Participants and Design

A total of 95 undergraduate students were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 3 (self-construal salience: personal vs. relational vs. collective) \times 2 (target: agreeable vs. quarrelsome other) design. A control condition was included in which participants were not exposed to a target and no self-construal was activated. All students received 4 Euros (approximately \$5) for their participation in the study.

Materials

Self-construal salience and target information. In this study we used the self-construal activation method that was used in Studies 3 and 4 (i.e., circling pronouns in a text). The target manipulation was also identical to the one used in Study 3 (i.e., reading a newspaper article about either an agreeable or a quarrelsome target).

Measure and debriefing. After they had completed the circling task and the newspaper article classification task, participants were told that the experiment was over. The experimenters then told them that because it was nearing the end of the fiscal year and the research budget had to be spent, they were able to pay participants more money: 8 euros (approximately \$10) instead of 4 euros (about \$5). Participants were then paid. Next, they were given a final questionnaire where participants were told that they had the opportunity to donate (a part of) the money they had just earned to Amnesty International if they would like to do so. The first item on the questionnaire asked participants to indicate how much money (in single euro units ranging from 0–8) that they would like to donate to Amnesty International. The rest of the questionnaire consisted of the IAS scales we

used in the previous studies. When participants had completed this questionnaire, they were debriefed thoroughly (because in actuality there was no "extra" research money that needed to be spent), were paid (4 euros), and were thanked for their participation. Again, no participant showed suspicion of the goal of the study. All participants thought that they had been participating in a number of unrelated studies.

In a money donation and agreeableness–quarrelsomeness pretest ($n = 30$), we tested the extent to which this charity measure was related to self-ratings of agreeableness and quarrelsomeness. In the pretest, we gave undergraduate students a relationship setting imagination exercise. Half of the participants were asked to imagine that their romantic partner came home from work angry and irritated and were told, "you know that what he or she really needs is that you console him/her. Even though he or she is being overly dramatic, you know you have to be friendly and comforting." The other half of the participants were asked to imagine that their romantic partner came home from work and were told, "you are angry and irritated at him/her because you have a vague sense he or she has been lying to you. Even though you know you are probably wrong, you cannot help yourself and you are irritable and grouchy." After this imagination exercise, participants were asked two bogus questions (how easy and how strange this exercise was). Next, participants were given the opportunity to donate money to Amnesty International. Finally, participants were asked some "background questions": Participants were asked to rate themselves on the four IAS scales (reliability of the four scales varied from $\alpha = .71$ to $\alpha = .79$).

We performed ANOVAs to assess the effect of the imagination exercise (friendly, irritable) on the scores reflecting the amount of money given to charity and each of the four IAS scales. The results were as predicted. "Friendly" people donated more money ($M = 5.40$, $SD = 1.50$) than "irritable" people ($M = 3.87$, $SD = 1.77$), $F(1, 28) = 6.55$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .19$. Moreover, friendly people rated themselves as more agreeable ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 1.01$) than did irritable people ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 0.94$), $F(1, 28) = 24.91$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .47$. In addition, friendly people rated themselves as less quarrelsome ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.12$) than did irritable people ($M = 5.13$, $SD = 1.41$), $F(1, 28) = 13.92$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .33$. Correlational analyses showed that the money measure correlated positively with agreeableness ratings ($.63$, $p < .05$) and negatively with quarrelsomeness ratings ($-.43$, $p < .05$). This suggests that even though donating to Amnesty International may be determined by a number of variables (e.g., political attitudes, empathy, altruism), it is positively correlated with friendliness ratings and negatively correlated with quarrelsomeness ratings, which suggests that it can indeed be used as a proxy measure for behavior on the affiliation (agreeable–quarrelsome) dimension. Moreover, no effects of the manipulations in our money donation pretest were found for the dominance or the submissiveness scales ($F_s < 1$). Ratings on these scales did not correlate reliably with the money measure ($p_s > .48$).

Results

We used the same analytical strategy as in the previous studies to analyze the results of this study. A Self-Construal Salience \times Target ANOVA revealed the predicted Self-Construal Salience \times Target interaction, $F(2, 75) = 4.67$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .11$, a main effect of target, $F(1, 75) = 24.76$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .25$ (main effect of target, $p > .22$). Subsequent simple main effects analysis revealed a pattern of means consistent with our predictions. In the collective condition, more money was donated in response to an agreeable target ($M = 5.88$, $SD = 1.54$) than in response to a quarrelsome target ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.34$), $F(1, 75) = 8.47$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .10$, an assimilation effect. Similarly, in the relational condition, more money was donated in response to an agreeable target ($M = 6.64$, $SD = 1.78$) than in response to a submissive target ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.67$), $F(1, 75) = 19.83$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .20$, also an assimilation effect. In the personal condition, relatively

high amounts of money were donated in the agreeable ($M = 5.77$, $SD = 1.79$) as well as in the quarrelsome target ($M = 5.46$, $SD = 1.39$) condition ($F < 1$).

The one-way ANOVA on the seven conditions of the complete design yielded a significant effect of condition, $F(6, 88) = 6.97$, $p < .01$. As can be seen in Table 6, planned comparisons testing for differences between the experimental conditions and the control condition revealed a patterning of differences consistent with the Self Salience Model.

General Discussion

Remember Jim and Wendy? They met at a party, and Wendy was very talkative and domineering. The question was how Wendy's behavior would affect Jim's self-views and behaviors. Phrased in more general terms: What determines the impact of social interactions on self-evaluations and actions? A review of relevant studies suggested that there are at least three different answers to this question (see Table 1).

First, within social comparison research the typical finding is that people process information about others in ways that serve *self-enhancement* needs. Thus, people assimilate information about positive comparison targets and contrast information about negative comparison targets. Second, *complementarity* theorists predict that whether assimilation or contrast occurs depends on the dimension that is at stake. Assimilation is predicted on the affiliation dimension (agreeableness, quarrelsomeness) and opposition or contrast is predicted on the control dimension (dominance, submissiveness). Third and finally, within the *imitation* perspective, the focus has been on the notion that humans have a tendency to imitate the behaviors of others. The imitation perspective thus predicts assimilation, regardless of behavioral dimension (as in complementarity research) or desirability of the response (as in social comparison research).

The main motivation behind the present research was to trim down these three answers into one, that is, to integrate these three different perspectives on the impact of social interactions on self and behavior into a new, comprehensive model: the Self Salience Model of other-to-self effects. The Self Salience Model posits that whether the enhancement, complementarity, or imitation model is best equipped to describe other-to-self effects in a given situation depends on which self-construal orientation (individual, interpersonal, or collective) the situation makes salient.

Table 6
Confronted with Others and Behavior on the Affiliation Dimension: Mean (and Standard Deviations) Donations to Amnesty International (in Euros) as a Function of Self-Construal Salience and Target

Target	Self-construal salience		
	Personal	Relational	Collective
Dominant	5.77 _c (1.79)	6.64 _c (1.78)	5.88 _c (1.54)
Submissive	5.46 _c (1.39)	3.67 _a (1.67)	3.85 _a (1.34)

Note. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .05$. In the control condition, the mean donation was 4.64_b ($SD = 1.08$). One euro \cong \$1.20.

Across five studies, we found strong support for the Self Salience Model. We found that self-construal orientation determines whether other-to-self effects follow the principles of self-enhancement, complementarity, or imitation. Interpersonal self-evaluation effects reveal (a) a self-enhancement pattern when the personal self is activated, (b) a complementarity pattern when the relational self is activated, and (c) an imitation pattern when the collective self is activated.

It is important to note that in the current studies the effects of self-construal orientation and target condition on self-evaluations were dimension specific. They only occurred on dimensions that were descriptively related to the comparison target's behavior. In other words, the effects we reported here were caused by the specific behavior of the target rather than by the general evaluative tone of this behavior. Targets exemplifying behavior on the control dimension affected self-evaluations and behaviors on the control but not on the affiliation dimension. In contrast, targets exemplifying behavior on the affiliation dimension affected self-evaluations on the affiliation but not on the control dimension. We would like to note that the specificity of the current results should not be taken to mean that other-to-self effects will never show global, more affect-driven effects. It is important to remember that the stimulus materials used in the current sets of studies were especially designed to test for specificity. It goes without saying that when target behaviors are less specific and more affect based, effects on self-views and behaviors are likely to be more affect driven and thus less dimension specific. When this is the case, the distinctions between the patterns of results that are typically associated with self-enhancement, complementarity, and imitation perspectives are likely to become more blurry. Moreover, because the complementarity perspective is very specific when it concerns the type of effect to be expected from the type of dimension (control or affiliation), a fair test and integration of the three perspectives focuses on these specific dimensions rather than on other dimensions (see Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003).

To our knowledge, the Self Salience Model and the present studies constitute the first explicit attempt to integrate the divergent perspectives on the impact of social interactions on self-views and behaviors. To date, the three perspectives that take center stage here—self-enhancement, complementarity, and imitation—have lived separate lives mainly because each of these perspectives had its own paradigm and was interested in its own specific questions.

The present research shows that these divergent paradigms and perspectives can be brought together in the Self Salience Model and that the effects that researchers working within these different perspectives have reported are not necessarily paradigm contingent. In the current studies, we used diverse research paradigms. Specifically, in Studies 1 and 2 participants construed target others, whereas in Studies 3 through 5 participants were confronted with target others. In Studies 1 through 3 our dependent measures consisted of well-known, relatively explicit self-ratings, whereas in Studies 4 and 5 we used newly developed, more implicit behavioral measures to test our model. The results of those studies show strong support for the Self Salience Model independent of the paradigm we used. That is, we found that self salience predicted whether other-self effects showed enhancement, complementarity, or imitation patterns on self-ratings and behaviors and when participants had construed person targets as well as when they were confronted with such targets.

It is also important to note that there have been some earlier attempts to integrate the three perspectives. However, these attempts have only addressed parts of the Self Salience Model, contrasting either a self-enhancement with an imitation perspective (Brewer & Weber, 1994; Stapel & Koomen, 2001; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003) or a self-enhancement with a complementarity perspective (Tiedens & Fragale, 2003). Moreover, on the whole, these attempts do not provide a comprehensive explanation of the conditions under which the predictions made by each perspective hold. For example, Tiedens and Jimenez (2003) argued that complementarity patterns in self-evaluations on both interpersonal dimensions are restricted to familiar targets and that assimilation is more likely to occur in social situations, whereas contrast is more likely to occur in task situations. When attempting to explain such self-evaluation effects in terms of the specific characteristics of the context of the interaction (social vs. task, familiar vs. unfamiliar), one is required to re-specify one's predictions each time the basic characteristics of the context shift. We believe that the Self Salience Model, with its focus on self-construal orientation as a main determinant of the direction of interpersonal self-evaluation effects, may explain the Tiedens and Jimenez (2003) findings in a more parsimonious manner. In terms of the Self Salience Model, it is simply the relational aspect of the self that becomes more accessible when thinking about social (rather than task) situations or familiar (rather than unfamiliar) targets that is responsible for these findings.

The Self Salience Model and its self-construal perspective on the outcome of social comparison effects may also be applied to further our understanding of studies that have found strong, assimilative identification effects in situations in which such identification is difficult to understand from a self-enhancement perspective because it is likely to be associated with pain. For example, Taylor's research among cancer patients suggests that in some conditions, cancer patients strongly identify themselves with others who are worse off than they are, for example in the waiting room (see Taylor, Aspinwall, Guiliano, Dakof, & Reardon, 1993). Such assimilation tendencies are clearly dysfunctional from a self-enhancement perspective. In order to explain their results, Taylor and Lobel (1989) pointed to the importance of the nature of the confrontation. They argued that whereas individuals may contrast their situation against abstract others ("all those other women with breast cancer. . .") actual confrontations with fellow patients may evoke strong identification and thereby assimilation tendencies. Again, we believe that the current self-construal perspective provides a more comprehensive and general explanation of the findings of Taylor and her colleagues. This perspective allows for a broader range of situational, cultural, and dispositional factors that may result in the same outcomes. To illustrate this, we ask the reader to consider the following situations: a cancer patient who has a strong personal self-construal orientation may not identify with his or her fellow patients in the waiting room and may display evidence of contrast, whereas a patient from China who is culturally primed with a strongly developed collective self may highly identify himself or herself even through just thinking about the bad fortune of a fellow patient.

The present research thus suggests that self-construal salience is an important determinant of whether social comparison shows self-enhancement, complementarity, or imitation patterns. When do these different levels of self-construal rule human behavior in

normal everyday life? Although some authors have claimed either primacy of the individual self or primacy of the collective self (see Gaertner, Sedikides, & Graetz, 1999; Sedikides et al., 2003; Turner, 1987), we believe that there is a strong influence of context and culture on which part of the self is salient (see also Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Turner, 1987). Of course, there are other, perhaps more stable and chronic factors determining whether the most salient self-construal orientation is personal, relational, or collective. However, the present set of studies focused on situation-related rather than on personality-related determinants of self-salience. These studies suggest that the impact of others on our self-views and behaviors is perhaps less stable than people sometimes think. This contextual and cultural dependence of interpersonal self-construals implies that the implications of confrontations with others for the way in which we perceive ourselves may depend on what self-construal is salient at a given point in time. Being confronted with a colleague at a psychology conference who acts hostile and impolite at the conference dinner can at one moment be a source of comfort (personal self-construal: "I am much nicer") and then suddenly become annoying when the local mayor comes in and addresses you as a group of psychologists (social self-construal: "we are not nice") or evoke negative memories of yourself when you suddenly remember interacting with this person when he was behaving in a similar way at a previous conference (relational self-construal: "I was very unfriendly"). The self seems to engage in a continuous balancing between strivings to be superior and to be unique (personal self salience), to engage in meaningful relations with others (relational self salience), and to belong to social entities (collective self salience). The three principles of self-enhancement, complementarity, and imitation, as discussed in the present article are each necessary to serve these needs. It is the balance in each of these three universal strivings that seems to determine which of these mechanisms is in charge.

References

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 83–93.
- Brewer, M. B., & Weber, J. G. (1994). Self-evaluation effects of interpersonal versus intergroup social comparison. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 268–275.
- Chartrand, T. L., Maddux, W. W., & Lakin, J. L. (2005). Beyond the perception-behavior link: The ubiquitous utility and motivational moderators of nonconscious mimicry. In R. Hassin, J. Uleman, & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The new unconscious* (pp. 334–361). New York: Oxford University Press.
- De Waal, F. (1982). *Chimpanzee politics: Sex and power among apes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dryer, D. C., & Horowitz, L. M. (1997). When do opposites attract? Interpersonal complementarity versus similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 592–603.
- Gaertner, L., Sedikides, C., & Graetz, K. (1999). Motivational primacy of the individual self, motivational primacy of the collective self, or contextual primacy? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 5–18.
- Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S., & Hochschild, L. (2002). When you and I are "we," you are not threatening: The role of self-expansion in social comparison. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 239–251.
- Holland, R. (2003). *On the structure and consequences of attitude strength*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands.
- Jaccard, J. (1998). *Interaction effects in factorial analysis of variance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kiesler, D. J. (1983). The 1982 interpersonal circle: A taxonomy for complementarity in human transactions. *Psychological Review, 90*, 185–214.
- Kitayama, S., Duffy, S., Kawamura, T., & Larsen, J. T. (2003). Perceiving an object and its context in different cultures. *Psychological Science, 14*, 201–207.
- Kuhlman, D. M., & Wimberley, D. C. (1976). Expectation of choice behavior held by cooperators, competitors, and individualists across four classes of experimental games. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*, 69–81.
- Kulik, J. A., & Gump, B. B. (1997). Affective reactions to social comparison: The effects of relative performance and related attributes information about another person. *Personality and Social Psychology, 23*, 452–468.
- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224–253.
- Nisbett, R. E. (2003). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently . . . and why*. New York: Free Press.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1991), *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sedikides, C., Gaertner, L., & Toguchi, Y. (2003). Pancultural self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 60–79.
- Stapel, D. A., & Blanton, H. (2004). From seeing to being: Subliminal social comparison effects on implicit and explicit self-evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 468–481.
- Stapel, D. A., & Koomen, W. (2001). I, we, and the effects of others on me: How self-construal level moderates social comparison effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 766–781.
- Suls, J., & Wheeler, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Taylor, S. E., Aspinwall, L., Guiliano, T. A., Dakof, G. A., & Reardon, K. K. (1993). Storytelling and coping with stressful events. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23*, 703–733.
- Taylor, S. E., & Lobel, M. (1989). Social comparison activity under threat: Downward evaluation and upward contacts. *Psychological Review, 96*, 569–575.
- Tiedens, L. Z., & Fragale, A. R. (2003). Power moves: Complementarity in dominant and submissive nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 558–568.
- Tiedens, L. Z., & Jimenez, M. C. (2003). Assimilation for affiliation and contrast for control: Complementary self-construals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 1049–1061.
- Turner, J. C. (1987). (Ed.). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Van der Zee, K. I., Buunk, B. P., & Sanderman, R. (1998). Neuroticism and reactions to social comparison information among cancer patients. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 801–810.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1979). A psychological taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: The interpersonal domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 395–412.
- Wood, J. V. (1989). Theory and research concerning social comparisons of personal attributes. *Psychological Bulletin, 106*, 231–248.

Received December 23, 2004

Revision received June 6, 2005

Accepted June 8, 2005 ■