

17

WHY AND HOW THE
SILENT SELF SPEAKS VOLUMES*Functional Approaches to Nonverbal
Impression Management*

◆ Caroline F. Keating
Colgate University

My mother said it wasn't important to *be* confident, but it *was* important to *look* confident. Martha Stewart's mother must have told Martha the same thing. On the day the celebrity CEO appeared in court to receive a 10-month sentence for lying to federal prosecutors about a stock sale, those who watched the defendant stride into the courtroom could only imagine what Martha was feeling and thinking. To manage, perhaps, the audience's imaginings, Martha crafted an impression of herself using nonverbal signals: Her posture was erect, her walk was energetic, and she projected just enough anger to seem powerful but not out of control. Her crinkly, narrow blue eyes and firm, well-defined chin conveyed determination and toughness. But the long blond bangs that tumbled across her forehead made her look girlishly innocent, and her voice cracked with emotion. In essence, Martha presented herself as the entrepreneurial Joan of Arc, marching toward an uncertain future, affected but undaunted by her downturn in fortune.

Martha's calibrated self-presentation throughout the ordeal seems to have been effective: Her release from prison coincided with a 6% spike in the value of the Martha Stewart Company. On paper, she was estimated to be much wealthier after leaving prison than when she entered. Martha returned to a million dollar a year position in her company and set to star in two new television shows (Kaufman, 2005). Yet it is doubtful that in her heart, Martha Stewart was as sanguine about her personal fate and corporate future as she appeared to be on the day of her sentence.

What Martha Stewart's courtroom drama illustrates is that faces and bodies do not speak solely from the heart. The corpus may be moved or silenced by purpose, effort, and habit. Its signal is checked and balanced by processes that warp spontaneous expression to influence audiences strategically. In these ways, nonverbal communication is tuned to motives and orchestrated to accomplish goals. Thus, displays of anger can be used to cloak signs of guilt (Ekman, 1992), smiles can serve as a disguise for psychological pain (Bonanno et al., 2002), and "blank" looks may be enacted to convey irony or sarcasm (Attardo, Eisterhold, Hay, & Poggi, 2003). This brand of *nonverbal impression management* reflects how individuals "spin" nonlanguage cues in ways intended to project images that produce desired social outcomes.

My main objective in this chapter is to integrate functional approaches to nonverbal communication with theoretical perspectives on impression management and self-presentation. To accomplish this task, the introductory section identifies essential aspects of the relationship between nonverbal communication and impression management. The second section applies specific types of functional approaches to impression management and identifies

their distinctive and shared features. The final section exposes some of impression management's important unfinished business.

◆ *Impression Management and Nonverbal Communication*

Broadly defined, *impression management* is "the goal-directed activity of controlling information in order to influence the impressions formed by an audience" (Schlenker, 2003, p. 492). Audience impressions of people (e.g., self, family members, job and political candidates), groups (e.g., organizations, nations), objects (e.g., products, gifts), events (e.g., performances, disasters), and ideas (e.g., policies, theories) may all be managed (Schlenker, 2003). This chapter pinpoints the first category of manageable entities—people—in which individuals serve as units of analysis.

The control of information about the self is sometimes referred to as impression management and sometimes as *self-presentation* (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker & Pontari, 2000). Many researchers use these constructs interchangeably (e.g., Jones & Pittman, 1982; Leary, 1995; Vohs, Baumeister, & Ciarocco, 2005), and they are considered together here. I emphasize, however, their application to social outcomes rather than to intrapersonal consequences such as self-concept or self-regulation. In social contexts, the actor's impression management goal is not simply to wield momentary influence over others in the sense of "selling" something or getting compliance. Instead, the goal is to gain advantage by projecting an image or identity to interactants and to the *observers* of interactions (Burgoon, Buller, & Woodall, 1996; Patterson, 2001). Such nonverbal forms of self-presentation have surprising power. For

instance, whereas blatant, verbal self-promotion can create a backlash against women who use it (Rudman, 1998), nonverbal tactics such as firm handshakes can be an effective way for women to self-promote in a sexist environment (Chaplin, Phillips, Brown, Clanton, & Stein, 2000).

Functional explanations for impression management combine how individuals control the presentation of self-relevant information with how others respond to it (Schlenker, 2003; Schlenker & Pontari, 2000). As DePaulo (1992) pointed out, nonverbal cues are more accessible to audiences than to communicators, because those signaling cannot see the messages they send. Signalers are stuck relying largely on audience reactions to gauge the impressions they leave. In the end, impression management may depend as much on the audience as on the actor because it requires the dynamic interplay between the two (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker, 2003). Thus, the way to successful self-presentation is both to “Know Thy Self” and “Know Thy Audience.”

The importance of actor and audience dynamics has encouraged some researchers to analyze nonverbal interaction using dyads or groups as units of analysis (e.g., Bernieri, Gillis, & Davis, 1996). Approaches like these fuse the moment-by-moment interdependence of one person’s action with another’s reaction. However, most analyses of impression management processes have been extracted from the vantage point of the individual actor or encoder (Burgoon et al., 1996). To fortify these types of approaches, Patterson (2001; see also Patterson, this volume) hinged actor-audience dynamics together by analyzing the actors’ dual tasks as encoders of messages and decoders of audience reactions.

In her overview of nonverbal behavior and self-presentation, DePaulo (1992) articulated the special relationship nonverbal

behavior has with impression formation. She noted that the impressions nonverbal cues generate are typically “off the record” in that they are resistant to precise identification and assessment (p. 206). Nonverbal cues are like journalists’ anonymous sources: Their messages are crucial but hard to name. A literary example comes from columnist Maureen Dowd (2004), who attributed the Bush Administration’s decision to invade Iraq to “body language” that amplified verbal exchanges between the President and his advisors. In this case, the President’s nonverbal actions made his words “speak louder” by rendering images of a man whose mind was already made up. Nonverbal impression management can also distract audiences from verbal messages. Adaval and Wyers (2004) found that when memory for impressions and nonverbal actions was sharp, recall for verbal messages was dull. In this instance, actions appeared to speak louder than words, perhaps even drowning them out.

Muscling nonverbal cues into sculpted impressions is not always easy. It is particularly difficult to manage impressions that require suppressing or neutralizing spontaneous nonverbal responses (Ekman, 1992). Individuals pressured to appear invulnerable can often control verbal self-reports better than they can monitor nonverbal behavior. Gay child care workers, for example, may express little anxiety verbally when faced with stereotype threats, whereas kinesic cues belie their verbal expression of confidence by conveying tension (Bosson, Haymovitz, & Pinel, 2004). Moreover, the successful neutralization of nonverbal expression is no guarantee that a desirable image will be projected. For instance, overcontrolling nonverbal output can make others suspicious of highly motivated liars (DePaulo, Lindsay, Malone, & Muhlenbruck, 2003; see also Vrij, this volume). Lack of expressivity tends to convey disinterest, aloofness, and

coldness (Burgoon et al., 1996; Mehrabian, 1972). When it comes to the nonverbal engine that powers self-presentation, there seems to be no “neutral” gear, only “forward” and “reverse.” Cues such as mutual gaze while smiling, nodding, and forward lean generally draw approach, whereas mouth and brow frowns, gaze avoidance or aggressive stares, tense body postures, and interpersonal space violations usually propel avoidance (Burgoon et al., 1996; Mehrabian, 1972).

Managing images to regulate approach and avoidance could be considered a cross-species phenomenon. As any horse rancher knows, stallions never limp in the presence of their mares: Revealing signs of lameness telegraphs vulnerability to mates and competitors and would be a stallion’s reproductive undoing. Primate-care workers in laboratories and zoos are often amazed to discover animals that, overnight, seem to fall fatally ill and die. Sick or injured individuals apparently protect themselves from becoming the target of conspecifics’ rejection and aggression by cloaking signs of weakness up to the bitter end. The best-known human examples of this kind of impression management may come from the White House. The ability of American presidents to disguise physical and psychological illness and project false images of health and fortitude has kept many in office despite the odds (Gilbert, 1998). From a functional perspective, honesty about one’s physical condition may not always be the best policy when the social goal is to maintain power. Indeed, the difficulty in detecting pain from gestures has stymied veterinarians and physicians alike for years (e.g., Hyden & Peolsson, 2002; Leary, Tchividjian, & Kraxberger, 1994).

Individuals are proficient at “spinning” images, even in experimental settings where the image “spun” has been arbitrarily

assigned to them (Albright, Forest, & Reiseter, 2001). How can perceivers be so readily beguiled by others’ nonverbal performances? At times, perceivers may “want” to be fooled and accept impressions at face value. For example, socially anxious people are especially poor lie detectors (DePaulo & Tang, 1994) and seem to avoid gazing at emotion-laden faces presumably because they fear negative social appraisals (Mansell, Clark, Ehlers, & Chen, 1999). Women often resist probing the veracity of ingratiating comments (DePaulo, Stone, & Lassiter, 1985). Thus, accepting as well as projecting contrived images may have a lot to do with the fear of looking too closely into the proverbial social mirror (Tice & Baumeister, 2001).

There are, nevertheless, nonverbal checks and balances on human gullibility in response to others’ managed impressions. One unlikely defense against skewed nonverbal presentations is the snap judgment. Nonverbal behavior is often decoded early and quickly during interactions (DePaulo, 1992), and researchers have found, for example, that deception is best detected rapidly (Vrij, Evans, Akehurst, & Mann, 2004) before a person’s “acting” takes effect. Audiences also have defenses against bad acting: Self-presentations that do not seem genuine are not effective. So when women read a script meant to project powerful leadership, they were not nearly as effective as when they performed the identical script in a mindful way, not straying from the content but adding personal, feminine touches to the tone (Kawakami, White, & Langer, 2000). Overlearned, scripted behavior can lead to stilted performances that are not compelling, especially if the image one attempts to project does not come naturally (Schlenker & Pontari, 2000).

Nevertheless, some individuals have better self-presentational skills than others.

Researchers have attributed these differences to variations in temperament, appearance, or environment or to combinations of traits, skills, and experiences (e.g., Anderson, John, Keltner & Krings, 2001; DePaulo et al., 2003; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). Examples come from studies of leadership. Undergraduates identified by their same-sex peers as socially dominant seem to be especially good at disguising the truth (Keating & Heltman, 1994). Presenting an image of intellectual competence is just as good as the real thing (i.e., possessing intelligence) when leaders are judged for intelligence (Rubin, Bartels, & Bommer, 2002). Furthermore, charismatic nonverbal performances are contagious and enhance leadership effectiveness and liking (Cherulnick, Donely, Wiewel, & Miller, 2001). Yet deciphering exactly what these powerfully appealing nonverbal impression management skills are and teaching them has proven to be difficult (Riggio, Riggio, Salinas, & Cole, 2003).

NONVERBAL IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT: TECHNIQUES OF THE TRADE

Static Physical Appearance Cues. The sizes, shapes, qualities, and spatial relationships of static morphological cues influence how individuals are perceived (see Rhodes & Zebrowitz, 2002). Moreover, static signals can alter the interpretation of dynamic nonverbal cues: Thus, the same behavior may get a different “read” when displayed by individuals with different facial structures, body types, or genders (Keating, 2002). After all, morphological cues “arrive” first and set expectations about traits and abilities (Zebrowitz, 1997). So potent are these cues that they are difficult for perceivers to ignore even when given explicit instructions

to do so (Hassin & Trope, 2000). At the same time, perceivers are unaware that morphological cues often guide their assessment and treatment of others (Keating, Randall, & Kendrick, 1999; Keating, Randall, Kendrick, & Gutshall, 2003; Todorov, Mandisodza, Goren, & Hall, 2005).

People direct remarkable amounts of time, effort, and resources toward modifying outward appearances. Across cultures and millennia, face and body parts have been dressed, painted, pierced, shaved, plucked, injected, molded, stretched, cut, and sewn to manage images of self and identity (Guerrero & DeVito, 1999; Zebrowitz, 1997). These (pre)occupations often reflect cultural values. In parts of the West, fascination with individual physical appearance has led to the popularity of television series such as ABC's *Extreme Makeover*, which on a typical night musters an audience of over 8 million U.S. viewers, who watch as plastic surgeons, cosmetic artists, and physical trainers transform appearances (C. Whipple, personal communication, July 26, 2005; see Manusov & Jaworski, this volume).

Clothing is part of this nonverbal arsenal of impression management techniques. Women and men select clothing styles strategically to make their bodies appear to fit cultural ideals (e.g., Frith & Gleeson, 2004; see also Guerrero & DeVito, 1999). These physical ideals, and their accompanying fashions, change with the times in what could arguably be an adaptive pattern (Pettijohn & Jungeberg, 2004). Even the color of clothing can spark impressions in a big way. For example, the aggressiveness of national athletic teams has been linked to the color of their uniforms. Football and hockey teams wearing black uniforms receive disproportionately high numbers of penalties, in part because they are perceived as more aggressive; cued by their own

clothing, team members may actually behave that way (Frank & Gilovich, 1988).

On or off the athletic field, height conveys status and power (Montepare, 1995). The taller of U.S. Presidential contenders win elections a disproportionate amount of the time (Cialdini, 2001). Moreover, adult height is correlated with salary (Collins & Zebrowitz, 1995). In China, job advertisements sometimes contain minimum height requirements, and individuals go to surprising lengths, literally, to achieve greater height. Chinese physicians have nearly perfected surgical techniques that succeed in permanently increasing adult height by as much as 5 or 6 inches. In this procedure, the legs are broken below the knee and extenders are attached to the leg bones. The patients spend months in hospital, during which time an apparatus gradually stretches the broken bones apart just enough for them to regrow in between (Gifford, 2004). Apparently, size does matter in China and elsewhere.

Physical appearance cues can also be manipulated through weight loss or gain and molded through exercise routines designed to shift distributions of fat and muscle in the body. Drugs are sometimes used to enhance these effects: In particular, the use of anabolic steroid develops muscle more quickly than weight training alone (Wroblewska, 1997). These types of practices can be carried to extremes: *Machismo nervosa* describes a psychological disorder characterized by excessive weight training, abnormal eating habits, and distorted body image (Connan, 1998). For many, morphing body parts to transform physical images is worth considerable effort and risk.

Dynamic Behavioral Cues. Nonverbal messages activated by body movements include facial expressions, gestures, postures, gaze, touch, and paralanguage. Behavioral signals may be intensified, attenuated, masked, neutralized, ritualized, or

allowed spontaneous expression in the service of self-presentation (Burgoon et al., 1996). Despite their dependence on motion, expressive behavioral cues are often indexed as if they were static entities. Only a few researchers have probed for information transmitted purely by motion (e.g., Berry, 1990; Grammer, Honda, Juette, & Schmitt, 1999).

The meaning of movements can be altered by the context of speech. Some actions regulate or complement speech (Duncan, 1972; see Bavelas & Chovil, this volume), cue speakers' or learners' memory for speech-related cognitions (e.g., Krauss, 1998; Singer & Goldin-Meadows, 2005), or serve as signs and have specific meanings in particular cultures (e.g., Birdwhistell, 1970). Paralinguistic or vocalic cues consist of dynamic information about the voice (e.g., variation in pitch, tone, timbre, loudness, and tempo) and nonlanguage characteristics of speech that find their way into conversations (e.g., pauses, silences, sighs, laughs, throat clearing) (Burgoon et al., 1996). Speakers routinely alter their voice qualities and speech characteristics to "play" to different audiences (DePaulo, 1992), and these alterations impact the impressions they leave behind. Judgments about speakers' politeness, for example, are affected by voice tone as well as language content (LaPlante & Ambady, 2003). They also happen quickly: Impressions that form in the earliest moments of interaction are largely based on nonverbal information and possess the tenacity of other types of primacy effects (e.g., Kenny, Horner, Kashy, & Chu, 1992). Perceivers tend to attribute durable character traits from initial exposures to strangers' nonverbal behavior (Gifford, 1994; Manusov & Rodriguez, 1989).

First impressions are not only both durable and influential, but tiny samples of behavior are sometimes all it takes to create them. Perceivers may draw conclusions about others based on exceedingly "thin

slices” of behavior (i.e., in a matter of 5 or 10 seconds; Ambady, Bernieri, & Richeson, 2000). Once impressions are fixed, perceivers are generally motivated to go about confirming what they already believe (e.g., Dougherty, Turban, & Callender, 1994). For instance, job applicants’ initial handshakes predict who is likely to be offered the job by the end of the interview process (Ambady et al., 2000). Whether or not these brief, initial impressions are linked to real dispositional qualities (for more on this issue, see Albright et al., 2001), interpretations of subsequent movements, gazes, vocalizations, and smiles are often guided by them.

The manipulation of the *relative* timing of body movements and expression can also leave lasting impressions. Depending on the situation, mimicry, complementarity, or synchrony of action can enhance impressions. Actors and perceivers who mimic one another’s behavior generally report greater rapport and greater mutual liking (Hess, Philippot, & Blairy, 1999; see also Lakin, this volume; Tickle-Degnen, this volume). Interactants’ motives can, however, shift this formula. For example, individuals seeking to dominate others are more favorably impressed by actors who behave in a complementary, appeasing manner than in a matching, assertive one (Tiedens & Fragale, 2003). Human courtship behavior—the successful kind, anyhow—usually has a synchrony to it, too (Grammer, Kruck, & Magnujsson, 1998). Characteristics of motion, such as the speed of offset and onset of behaviors, rather than the specific behaviors themselves, predict female interest in males (Grammer et al., 1999).

Summary. Nonverbal communication provides powerful platforms for impression management: Both static (morphological) and dynamic (behavioral) nonverbal cues can be managed to shape impressions. The next section of this chapter presents different

functional approaches to understanding why and how these platforms operate. The basic premises, promises, and shortcomings of each approach are described and illustrated. Implications of their common attributes are considered in the final section of this chapter.

◆ *Functional Approaches to Nonverbal Impression Management*

The intellectual centerpiece of functional approaches is that behavioral systems are goal directed or organized by purpose. Classic designs of what it means to engage in functional analyses are found in the writings of Darwin (1872/1991) and Brunswik (1955). These theorists fashioned natural selection and adaptation as ultimate explanations for trait development and behavior. Many current functional approaches to nonverbal impression management can be traced to the thinking of these theorists (e.g., Cunningham, Druen, & Barbee, 1997; Keating, 2002). Other kinds of functional analyses project more immediate or proximate intentions and outcomes as opposed to distal, biological adaptations (e.g., Patterson, 2001; Saarni & Weber, 1999). These models identify relatively short-term communication goals and specify the processes by which they are achieved.

The theoretical approaches featured in this section are meant to represent a variety of functional perspectives on nonverbal impression management; they do not comprise an exhaustive accounting of viewpoints. Contemporary, empirically based theoretical perspectives are included that (1) are concerned directly with strategic impression management or the outcomes of self-presentation, (2) identify goal-directed functions, (3) focus on nonverbal means of crafting impressions, and (4) specify a role for audiences. Approaches meeting these

Table 17.1 Selected Functional Approaches to Nonverbal Impression Management

<i>Main Theme</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Nonverbal Cues</i>	<i>Research Examples</i>
Evolutionary	Biological fitness	Neoteny, senescence, expressive, grooming	Cunningham, Barbee, and Phillhower (2002)
		Status cues	Keating (2002) and Mueller and Mazur (1996)
		Sexual dimorphism	Perrett et al. (1998)
		Fluctuating asymmetry	Gangestad, Simpson, DiGeronimo, and Biek (1992)
Ecological	Adaptive social responding	Physiognomic maturity/immaturity	Zebrowitz (1997) and Montepare and Zebrowitz (1998)
		Gestures and body movements	Bernieri, Gillis, and Davis (1996) and Gifford (1994)
Emotional	Regulation of others' emotions	Emotional displays	Saarni and Weber (1999) and Clark, Pataki, and Carver (1996)
	Self-regulation norms		Saarni and Weber (1999)
			Ekman (1971)
Social-cognitive	Social goal attainment	Encoding and decoding	Patterson (1999, 2001)
		Courtship behaviors	Grammer, Kruck, and Magnujsson (1998)
		Thin slices	Ambady, Bernieri, and Richeson (2000)
		Deception	DePaulo, Lindsay, Malone, and Muhlenbruck (2003)

criteria were distinguishable by one of four overlapping, theoretical emphases: evolutionary, ecological, emotional, or social-cognitive. Table 17.1 outlines distinguishing features and cites research related to each.

EVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVES ON IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT

Evolutionary perspectives are perhaps best at projecting *why* individuals manage nonverbal cues to produce particular images

and *what messages* are likely to be advantageous (or disadvantageous) to impression formation (for a more general discussion of evolutionary perspectives on nonverbal communication, see Floyd, this volume). The intellectual inspiration for evolutionary approaches can be traced to Darwin (1872/1991), who applied notions of random variation and selective retention of genetically based traits to communication in animals and humans. Darwinian logic requires that genetic substrates (however direct or indirect) underlie appearances and

communication abilities. Gene-based appearances and behaviors that confer reproductive benefits to individuals and to their kin are selected for and retained in offspring.

Courtship displays in birds, piloerection in felines, play bows in canines, appeasement grimaces in primates, and neoteny in humans are all examples of cues rooted in phyletic histories. They illustrate that the essential function or “why” of signaling systems is the enhancement of *biological fitness*. Behavioral and appearance cues that signal sex and sexual interest, developmental maturity, status, health, and reproductive potential are imbued with information essential to fitness. For example, symmetrical faces and bodies look attractive presumably because symmetry reflects pathogen resistance, health, good genes, and, ultimately, reproductive potential (e.g., Gangestad, Thornhill, & Yeo, 1994), and there are image management techniques for those who do not measure up to the ideal. For instance, some believe that the disguise of body asymmetry may be accomplished through the careful design and placement of tattoos and piercings (Singh & Bronstad, 1997).

Cunningham’s multiple fitness model (Cunningham, Barbee, & Philhower, 2002; Cunningham et al., 1997) provides a relatively comprehensive approach to impression management from an evolutionary point of view. For Cunningham and his colleagues, “each face and body provides an opportunity for natural and sexual selection to increase or decrease the success of the individual conveying that appearance” (Cunningham et al., 2002, p. 109). Success is achievable physically (e.g., by developing traits that enhance health or strength) and socially (e.g., by developing traits that enhance dominance or devotion). According to the model, individuals display multiple fitness messages that function in complementary ways to influence heterosexual attractiveness and bonding. Consistent

with the idea of a multiple-message advantage, Keating and Doyle (2002) found that the physiognomies of desirable dates and mates contained mixed signals of dominance and warmth rather than strong forms of either message.

The multiple fitness model specifies five types of features that skew perceptions of faces and bodies. These include (1) the appearance of neonate features such as large eyes, small nose, and smooth skin, which signal dependence, cuteness, and vulnerability; (2) sex-linked sexual maturity features, which enhance sexual attractiveness; (3) expressive features such as large smiles, high eyebrows, and relaxed vocal tones, which invite social interchange; (4) grooming features including hairstyle, cosmetics, clothing; and (5) senescence features such as male pattern baldness, gray hair, and slow gait, which signal nurturance and appeasement (Cunningham et al., 1997, 2002). These features may be augmented, altered, or contrived to achieve desirable impressions.

Blond hair, for example, is a neonate feature that can be mimicked by adults. The offspring of European parents often signaled their ontogenetic status by remaining blond until after puberty (Cunningham et al., 1997, 2002; Guthrie, 1976). Adults who dye their hair blond can mimic, to some extent, the youthful impressions blond locks convey. So when Cunningham and his colleagues portrayed 21 women as blonds and as brunettes, trait attributions differed. As blonds, the women were perceived as more attractive, feminine, emotional, and pleasure seeking. As brunettes, they were rated as more intelligent (Cunningham et al., 1997). Though consistent with evolutionary thinking, it is impossible to tell from such data whether ultimate (evolutionary) or proximate (learned through association) mechanisms direct this perceptual bias. Much evolutionary theorizing is vulnerable to this kind of

uncertainty, because deriving testable predictions and reasonable measures of fitness is difficult. In other words, the question to be posed in this instance is not whether blonds have more fun, but whether they have more offspring and kin who themselves are reproductively successful.

ECOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT

Although displays ultimately enhance reproductive potential far downstream, proximate goals, say for social approval or financial reward, may be served in their more immediate wake. From an ecological perspective, the benefits of impression management involve *adaptive social functioning* in which the fit between signal and social context or “ecology” is imperative. The theoretical perspectives categorized as following an ecological tradition reflect the thinking of early functionalists like Brunswik (1955), who applied his ideas to perception and social perception (e.g., to face cues, nations). Brunswik argued that perceptual systems were adapted to their environments by expectancies developed through experience in a particular environment or ecology. Perception operated probabilistically, meaning that cue perception was biased toward interpretations that had worked in the past (e.g., Segall, Campbell, & Herskovitz, 1966). Because probabilistic judgments were mostly correct in specific ecologies, these perceptual habits or attunements were thought to be adaptive (McArthur & Baron, 1983). Like a Vegas gambler at the blackjack table, Brunswik (1955) reckoned that perceivers need only beat the odds some percentage of the time to come away with a winning perceptual formula. This implies that a certain degree of error is acceptable in social perception. That is, there may be some “slippage” in the matchup between cue

validity and cue utilization. It could be said that Brunswikian approaches are more generous than evolutionary ones in the degree to which they anticipate and tolerate error in the (social) perceptual system.

The application of Brunswik’s paradigm to nonverbal self-presentation reveals that the cues encoded by a communicator may or may not match those used (decoded) by observers to derive impressions of the communicator. Gifford (1994) noted this slippage when he adapted a Brunswikian lens model to nonverbal impression formation. He found that communicators who scored high on the measurements of warmth and agreeableness nodded their heads often during interactions. When observers judged the communicators’ traits, however, they relied on more than just the valid cue of nods; observers used a host of postural cues unassociated with the dispositions of communicators. Similarly, object manipulation predicted communicators’ scores on measurements of dominance and submissiveness, yet observers neglected to use this cue in their assessments of them. One explanation for the discrepancy may relate to perceiver’s motivation. When the dispositions judged are highly relevant to perceivers, they tend to increase their use of valid cues (Gangestad, Simpson, DiGeronimo, & Biek, 1992).

Ecological approaches relevant to impression management include research on social perception derived from static physical appearances as well as behavior. The Brunswikian idea of affordances has been championed by Zebrowitz and her colleagues (e.g., Montepare & Zebrowitz, 1998; Zebrowitz, 1997). For example, facial structures may convey affordances defined as opportunities for certain types of interactions. Sensitivity toward these signals is adaptive but can result in over-interpretation, a kind of perceptual error we may be biologically prepared to

make (Zebrowitz, 1997). Affordances proffered by “age-related physical qualities” (Montepare & Zebrowitz, 1998, p. 95) such as infantile facial cues, for example, overgeneralize when displayed by adults and influence cognitions about social traits. Hence, baby-faced adults are perceived as having characteristics associated with babies: dependent, weak, approachable, and warm (Montepare & Zebrowitz, 1998; Zebrowitz, 1997). By creating initial impressions, facial structure thus sets the stage for impression management strategies (e.g., Keating, 2002; Zebrowitz, 1997).

EMOTIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT

Humans seem hot-wired to read and write emotion-related nonverbal communication. Emotions can project from brain to body quickly with little input from higher, cortical areas of the brain (LeDoux, 1996). Emotion *decoding* can be fast, too. Brain responses to facial displays of fear, anger, happiness, sadness, disgust, and surprise register distinct patterns of processing activity that appear rapid and automatic (Batty & Taylor, 2003). But the fact that the presence of others modifies the quality and intensity of an individual’s expression (e.g., Ekman, 1971; Fridlund, 1994) indicates that humans come biologically prepared not simply to express and detect affective states but also to control their display (LeDoux, 1996). These “audience effects” are complex: Audiences and co-actors sometimes attenuate expression, sometimes amplify it, and at other times alter the type of emotion conveyed (e.g., Manstead, Fischer, & Jakobs, 1999).

When drafted into the service of impression management, emotional cues become powerful allies. In fact, both the regulation of one’s own and others’ emotions, accomplished

largely through nonverbal means, is a key component of emotional intelligence (see Bar-On & Parker, 2000). Expressions may forecast intentions and the nature of subsequent interactions (Fridlund, 1994; Fridlund & Russell, this volume). They can be contagious and used to “infect” others’ internal states and cognitions (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994). Knowing which emotions to project, to what degree, when, and with whom constitutes a form of impression management aimed at strategic emotional self-presentation. Such self-presentation may also enhance emotion regulation and coping (Holodynski, 2004; Saarni & Weber, 1999). The “bad management” of emotional displays can have dramatic—actually historic—consequences: Democratic candidate Howard Dean arguably wrecked his 2004 bid for the U.S. presidency in under 5 seconds by letting loose over the airwaves a volatile, hot-blooded, untamed scream that was captured and immortalized in the national media as the “Dean Scream” (Stolberg, 2004).

Saarni (1989; Saarni & Weber, 1999) emphasizes the self-presentational functions of managed emotional displays and identifies the proximate, social goals they serve. In her view, emotional displays are calibrated to cast desired self-images and to cope with stressful situations. Saarni distinguishes emotional display management, or what others derive about a person’s emotional experience, from emotion regulation, or a person’s internal experience of emotion. Display management involves the strategic or habitual dissembling of expressive behavior (Saarni & Weber, 1999). The expression of internal emotion states may be attenuated, exaggerated, replaced by feigned emotion, or suppressed and neutralized.

Whereas Ekman (1971) attributed behavioral modifications like these to cultural “display rules” or norms for public expressivity, Saarni (1989), a functionalist

at heart, attaches the dissembling of emotional expressivity to an individuals' social goal striving. According to Saarni, children learn to dissemble to avoid negative consequences, to craft displays so as to avoid hurting another's feelings, and to adopt social conventions for dissembling. Whether these or other lessons are part of a cross-cultural curriculum of emotional self-presentation remains to be studied (e.g., Manstead et al., 1999). But it is clear that control over emotional expression is a skill that individuals are prepared to learn and use strategically to accomplish social goals throughout their lives (Keating & Heltman, 1994; see Feldman & Tyler, this volume).

Emotional displays aimed at attaining social goals sometimes score as congruent, and at other times as incongruent, with privately held feelings. In one experiment (Pataki & Clark, 2004), men expressed happiness publicly, but not privately, just before meeting with a socially undesirable woman. Prior to meeting a socially *desirable* woman, men tended to report more happiness privately than they expressed publicly. Apparently the men's social goal-posts moved from "confident politeness" in the first instance to "don't appear too accommodating" in the second. These findings help show that emotional displays may reflect social motives and goals, acting skill, emotional intelligence, and more (e.g., Clark, Pataki, & Carver, 1996; Fernandez-Dols, 1999; Fridlund, 1994; Manstead et al., 1999).

SOCIAL-COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVES ON IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT

Functional social-cognitive approaches identify particular proximate social goals as energizing presentations of the self. Some impose single primary goals, such as interpersonal power or social attractiveness

(Tedeschi & Norman, 1985). Baumeister (1993) projected three main goals: (1) social belonging and acceptance, (2) the construction of self-identity with desirable qualities, and (3) the establishment and protection of self-esteem or positive self-images. But attempts to delineate particular social goals and images, and to prescribe the social conditions most favorable to impression management, led to specifications that clashed (see DePaulo, 1992; Schlenker, 2003; Schlenker & Pontari, 2000). For instance, emotional displays and scripted behaviors were considered "management-free" episodes by some and viewed as exemplary impression management opportunities by others. There were controversies as to whether managed self-presentations ever exposed the authentic self and whether awareness was needed to produce them.

Conceptual clashes like these could be rectified, argued Schlenker (2003), by unleashing impression management from ties to singular social goals frozen in time. Schlenker and his colleagues (e.g., Schlenker & Pontari, 2000) made the case for broadening the conceptualization of impression management. In essence, they argued that impression management comprises a dynamic process serving a hierarchy of goals and that it glides continually between the cognitive fore and aft of interactions depending on the resources individuals direct toward it. Resource allocation depends on many things, including the relative importance of the goals served, the effort needed to perform goal-relevant behavior, competition from additional tasks at hand, features of the audience such as their expertise or attractiveness, and the skills and personality characteristics of the actor.

These ideas help explain how signals from our body and face sometimes undermine us just when we need them the most: when managing impressions to look

credible. Situations in which communicators have a large personal stake in being believed may be made tense by that fact alone (DePaulo et al., 2003; Ekman, 1992). Add to this factor certain characteristics of the communicator (e.g., low confidence) plus features of the audience (e.g., suspiciousness) and competition for attentional resources (e.g., impressing cohorts), and the derived formula predicts either an unsuccessful bid for a date or a collapsed courtroom testimony, each undermined by nonverbal tension leakage and untrustworthy appearances.

This way of thinking about impression management highlights important issues for nonverbal communication processes. First, neither goals nor the situations that trigger them need be conscious to produce nonverbal impression management strategies (e.g., Cheng & Chartrand, 2003; see Lakin, this volume). Second, resource availability and allocation may influence the success of presentations (e.g., Vohs et al., 2005).

These two key elements of impression management are contained in the parallel process model of nonverbal communication presented by Patterson (2001; see also Patterson, this volume). According to Patterson, processes at or below the level of consciousness can launch the dynamics of sending and receiving nonverbal messages. Patterson's parallel process model could be helpful in determining how cognitive and affective mediators or filters operate differently for individuals high and low in traits such as social anxiety or self-monitoring. Parts of the model could also be used to predict when and how cognitive resources would be redirected, for example, under different status conditions (e.g., Snodgrass, 1992) or for different age groups or in different cultures. To date, components of the parallel processing model have heuristic value, but specific hypotheses are yet to be formulated and tested.

Summary of Approaches. The variety of approaches presented in this section reveal three tasks of nonverbal impression management: the enhancement of biological fitness, the production of adaptive social responses, and the pursuit of social goals. The ultimate and proximate functions they comprise are interwoven into the fabric of human life history and fashion two important qualities of nonverbal impression management.

The first quality is that nonverbal impression management may be performed without awareness. This is despite the fact that its operation is described typically as "strategic," thereby implying conscious processes and control (Burgoon et al., 1996; DePaulo, 1992). Implicitly or explicitly, functional approaches accept that nonverbal impression management may result from either conscious or nonconscious (automatic) processes. Second, functional approaches treat the integrity of the nonverbal signal as relatively arbitrary: imposters, self-deceivers, honest signalers, and the misread attract equal attention on the impression management runway. These two qualities have important implications for understanding impression management and are the focus of this chapter's final section.

◆ *The Unfinished Business of Nonverbal Impression Management*

Connie, a young graduate student who showed up at class each day wearing jeans and a tee shirt, charged her professor with sexual harassment. But as the professor saw it, Connie was the one behaving in sexually provocative ways. The professor claimed that Connie flirted with him regularly by smiling and gazing at him with open legs as she sat around the conference table in the

graduate seminar classroom. Connie was stunned by this accusation; she did not feel sexually attracted to her professor. What kind of impression management was this? Or was it? And whose was it? Maybe Connie's nonverbal behavior expressed an attraction toward her professor that she was unaware of and Connie was simply self-deceptive. Alternatively, the professor was perhaps motivated to misread Connie's body cues and perceive messages that were not really there. But either way, could the professor defend himself by claiming that he was victimized by Connie's nonconscious goal of seduction played out on a nonverbal stage? Is Connie responsible? Is her professor responsible?

This example highlights the fact that nonconscious goal activation and its intersection with deceptive and self-deceptive cognitive processes have potentially important practical consequences for the performers and audiences of nonverbal impression management. At the same time, they present conceptual and measurement challenges for researchers studying impression management. These conceptual and measurement issues are intertwined. Given that nonverbal impression management can be driven by nonconscious goals and stimulated by nonconscious processes (e.g., Cheng & Chartrand, 2003), nonverbal behavior may be the best—or only—way to track their operation. These measurements will have especially complex iterations in “live” impression management situations where nonconscious processes simultaneously energize actors, audiences, and their relationships. Teasing nonverbal communicative processes apart as well as pasting them together will be necessary to elucidate how nonverbal impression management is orchestrated between actors and audiences.

Previous conceptualizations of impression management characterized it as a Machiavellian enterprise of strategy and manipulation in which the “mini-Mach”

within us sought to control our social world (see Leary, 1995; Schlenker & Pontari, 2003, for discussions). Contemporary evolutionary and ecological perspectives give impression management, especially its nonverbal forms, a place in the larger scheme of adaptive social behavior. New knowledge about connections between emotion and cognition offers fresh insights into nonverbal emotional self-presentation, self-regulation, and social context. Contemporary social-cognitive approaches put conscious and nonconscious processes within the boundaries of nonverbal impression management frameworks and highlight the importance of nonverbal measurement techniques.

At the same time, these new insights have a troubling side. Freed from the imposition of conscious control, where is the “management” in nonverbal impression management? How is successful nonverbal impression management different from just getting lucky in the context of impression formation? Is impression management simply the mirror image of person perception, a contest for best performance of expressive scripts, or a relatively honest form of deception? The usefulness of the impression management concept may lie in a renewed emphasis on its most unique aspect: the interdependence of actor-audience psychologies (Goffman, 1959; Patterson, 2001). Those who invest in future research on nonverbal impression management must give due diligence by distinguishing its functions and effects from those of other social influence processes, testing them in an orderly way, and revealing their superior predictive validity.

◆ *References*

- Adaval, R., & Wyers, R. S. (2004). Communicating about a social interaction: Effects on member for protagonists' statement and nonverbal behaviors. *Journal*

- of *Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 450–465.
- Albright, L., Forest, C., & Reiserer, K. (2001). Acting, behaving, and the selfless basis of metaperception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 910–921.
- Ambady, N., Bernieri, F. J., & Richeson, J. A. (2000). Toward a histology of social behavior: Judgmental accuracy from thin slices of the behavioral stream. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 32, pp. 201–271). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Anderson, C., John, O. P., Keltner, D., & Krings, A. M. (2001). Who attains social status? Effects of personality and physical attractiveness in social groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 116–132.
- Attardo, S., Eisterhold, J., Hay, J., & Poggi, I. (2003). Multimodal markers of irony and sarcasm. *International Journal of Humor Research*, 16, 243–260.
- Bar-On, R., & Parker, J. D. A. (2000). *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Batty, M., & Taylor, M. J. (2003). Early processing of the six basic facial emotional expressions. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 17, 613–620.
- Baumeister, R. (1993). Self-presentation: Motivational, cognitive, and interpersonal patterns. In G. van Heck, P. Bonaiuto, I. J. Deary, & W. Nowack (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe* (Vol. 4, pp. 257–280). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Bernieri, F. J., Gillis, J. S., & Davis, J. M. (1996). Dyad rapport and the accuracy of its judgment across situations: A lens model analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 110–129.
- Berry, D. S. (1990). What can a moving face tell us? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 1004–1014.
- Birdwhistell, R. (1970). *Kinesics and context: Essays on body motion communication*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bonanno, G. A., Keltner, D., Noll, J. G., Putnam, F. W., Trickett, P. K., LeJeune, J., et al. (2002). When the face reveals what words do not: facial expressions of emotion, smiling, and the willingness to disclose childhood sexual abuse. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 94–110.
- Bosson, J. K., Haymovitz, E. L., & Pinel, E. C. (2004). When saying and doing diverge: The effects of stereotype threat on self-reported versus nonverbal anxiety. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 247–255.
- Brunswik, E. (1955). Representative design and probabilistic theory in a functional theory. *Psychological Review*, 62, 193–217.
- Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., & Woodall, W. G. (1996). *Nonverbal communication* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Chaplin, W. F., Phillips, J. B., Brown, J. D., Clanton, N.R., & Stein, J. L. (2000). Handshaking, gender, personality, and first impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 110–117.
- Cheng, C. M., & Chartrand, T. L. (2003). Self-monitoring without awareness: Using mimicry as a nonconscious affiliation strategy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 1170–1179.
- Cherulnick, P. D., Donely, K. A., Wiewel, T. S. R., & Miller, S. R. (2001). Charisma is contagious: The effect of leaders' charisma on observers' affect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 2149–2159.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and practice* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Clark, M. S., Pataki, S. P., & Carver, V. H. (1996). Some thoughts and findings on self-presentation of emotions in relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher & J. Fitness (Eds.), *Knowledge structures in close relationship: A social psychological approach* (pp. 247–274). Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.
- Collins, M. A., & Zebrowitz, L. A. (1995). The contributions of appearance to occupational outcomes in civilian and military settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 129–163.
- Connan, F. (1998). Machismo nervosa: An ominous variant of bulimia nervosa. *European Eating Disorders Review*, 6, 154–159.
- Cunningham, M. R., Barbee, A. P., & Phillhower, C. L. (2002). Dimensions of

- facial physical attractiveness: The intersection of biology and culture. In G. Rhodes & L. A. Zebrowitz (Eds.), *Facial attractiveness: Evolutionary, cognitive, and social perspectives* (pp. 193–238). Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Cunningham, M. R., Druen, P. B., & Barbee, A. P. (1997). Angels, mentors, and friends: Trade-offs among evolutionary, social, and individual variables in physical appearance. In J. A. Simpson & D. T. Kendrick (Eds.), *Evolutionary social psychology* (pp. 109–140). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Darwin, C. (1991). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. London: John Murray. (Original work published 1872)
- DePaulo, B. M. (1992). Nonverbal behavior and self-presentation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*, 203–243.
- DePaulo, B. M., Lindsay, J. J., Malone, B. E., & Muhlenbruck, L. (2003). Cues to deception. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 74–118.
- DePaulo, B. M., Stone, J. I., & Lassiter, G. D. (1985). Telling ingratiating lies: Effects of target sex and target attractiveness on verbal and nonverbal deceptive success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *48*, 1191–1203.
- DePaulo, B. M., & Tang, J. (1994). Social anxiety and social judgment: The example of detecting deception. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *28*, 142–153.
- Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Callender, J. C. (1994). Confirming first impression in the employment interview: A field study of interviewer behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*, 659–665.
- Dowd, M. (2004, April 22). The body politic. *New York Times*. Retrieved April 22, 2004, from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Duncan, S. D., Jr. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *23*, 283–292.
- Ekman, P. (1971). Universal and cultural differences in facial expressions of emotion. In J. K. Coles (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 207–283). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ekman, P. (1992). *Telling lies*. New York: Norton. (Original work published 1985)
- Fernandez-Dols, J. (1999). Facial expression and emotion: A situationist view. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman, & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 242–261). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Frank, M. G., & Gilovich, T. (1988). The dark side of self- and social perception: Black uniforms and aggression in professional sports. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 74–85.
- Fridlund, A. J. (1994). *Human facial expression: An evolutionary view*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Frith, H., & Gleeson, K. (2004). Clothing and embodiment: Men managing body image and appearance. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, *5*, 40–48.
- Gangestad, S. W., Simpson, J. A., DiGeronimo, K., & Biek, M. (1992). Differential accuracy in person perception across traits: Examination of a functional hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *62*, 688–698.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 530–555.
- Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R., & Yeo, R. A. (1994). Facial attractiveness, developmental stability, and fluctuating asymmetry. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *15*, 73–85.
- Gifford, R. (1994). A lens-mapping framework for understanding the encoding and decoding of interpersonal dispositions in nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*, 398–412.
- Gifford, R. (2004, December 5). *Weekend edition* [Radio broadcast]. Washington, DC: National Public Radio.
- Gilbert, R. E. (1998). *The mortal presidency: Illness and anguish in the White House*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Grammer, K., Honda, M., Juette, A., & Schmitt, A. (1999). Fuzziness of nonverbal courtship communication unblurred by motion energy detection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 487–508.
- Grammer, K., Kruck, K. B., & Magnijsson, M. S. (1998). The courtship dance: Patterns

- of nonverbal synchronization in opposite-sex encounters. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 22, 3–29.
- Guerrero, L. K., & DeVito, J. A. (Eds.). (1999). *Nonverbal communication reader: Appearance and adornment cues*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Guthrie, R. D. (1976). *Body hotspots*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Hassin, R., & Trope, Y. (2000). Facing faces: Studies on the cognitive aspects of physiognomy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 837–852.
- Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. (1994). *Emotional contagion*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hess, U., Philippot, P., & Blairy, S. (1999). Mimicry: Facts and fiction. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman, & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 213–241). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Holodynski, M. (2004). The miniaturization of expression in the development of emotional self-regulation. *Developmental Psychology*, 40, 16–28.
- Hyden, L., & Peolsson, M. (2002). Pain gestures: The orchestration of speech and body gestures. *Health*, 6, 325–345.
- Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1, pp. 231–263). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kaufman, W. (2005, March 3). *All things considered* [Radio broadcast]. Washington, DC: National Public Radio.
- Kawakami, C., White, J. B., & Langer, E. J. (2000). Mindful and masculine: Freeing women leaders from the constraints of gender roles. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 49–63.
- Keating, C. F. (2002). Charismatic faces: Social status cues put face appeal in context. In G. Rhodes & L. A. Zebrowitz (Eds.), *Facial attractiveness: Evolutionary, cognitive, and social perspectives* (pp. 153–192). Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Keating, C. F., & Doyle, J. (2002). The faces of desirable mates and dates contain mixed social status cues. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 414–424.
- Keating, C. F., & Heltman, K. R. (1994). Dominance and deception in children and adults: Are leaders the best misleaders? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 312–321.
- Keating, C. F., Randall, D. W., & Kendrick, T. (1999). Presidential physiognomies: Altered images, altered perceptions. *Political Psychology*, 20, 593–610.
- Keating, C. F., Randall, D., Kendrick, T., & Gutshall, K. A. (2003). Do babyfaced adults receive more help? The (cross-cultural) case of the lost resume. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 27, 89–109.
- Kenny, R. D., Horner, C., Kashy, D. A., & Chu, L. (1992). Consensus at zero acquaintance: Replication, behavioral cues, and stability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 88–97.
- Krauss, R. M. (1998). Why do we gesture when we speak? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 7, 54–60.
- LaPlante, D., & Ambady, N. (2003). On how things are said: Voice tone, voice intensity, verbal content, and perceptions of politeness. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 22, 434–441.
- Leary, M. R. (1995). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior*. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.
- Leary, M. R., Tchividjian, L. R., & Kraxberger, B. E. (1994). Self-presentation can be hazardous to your health: Impression management and health risk. *Health Psychology*, 13, 461–470.
- LeDoux, J. (1996). *The emotional brain*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Mansell, W., Clark, D. M., Ehlers, A., & Chen, Y. (1999). Social anxiety and attention away from emotional faces. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13, 673–690.
- Manstead, A. S. R., Fischer, A. H., & Jakobs, E. B. (1999). The social and emotional functions of facial displays. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman, & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 287–316). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Manusov, V., & Rodriguez, J. S. (1989). Intentionality behind nonverbal messages:

- A perceiver's perspective. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 13, 15–24.
- McArthur, L. Z., & Baron, R. M. (1983). Toward an ecological theory of social perception. *Psychological Review*, 90, 215–238.
- Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
- Montepare, J. M. (1995). The impact of variations in height on young children's impressions of men and women. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 19, 31–47.
- Montepare, J. M., & Zebrowitz, L. A. (1998). Person perception comes of age: The salience and significance of age in social judgments. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 93–161.
- Mueller, U., & Mazur, A. C. (1996). Facial dominance in *Homo sapiens* as honest signaling of male quality. *Behavioral Ecology*, 8, 569–579.
- Pataki, S. P., & Clark, M. S. (2004). Self-presentations of happiness: Sincere, polite, or cautious? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 905–914.
- Patterson, M. L. (1999). The evolution of a parallel process model of nonverbal communication. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman, & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 317–347). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Patterson, M. L. (2001). Toward a comprehensive model of non-verbal communication. In W. P. Robinson & H. Giles (Eds.), *The new handbook of language and social psychology* (pp. 159–176). New York: Wiley.
- Perrett, D. I., Lee, K. J., Penton-Voak, I., Rowland, D., Yoshikawa, S., Burt, D. M., et al. (1998). Effects of sexual dimorphism on facial attractiveness. *Nature*, 394, 884–887.
- Pettijohn, T. E., III, & Jungeberg, B. J. (2004). Playmate curves: Changes in facial and body feature preferences across social and economic conditions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1186–1197.
- Rhodes, G., & Zebrowitz, L. A. (2002). (Eds.). *Facial attractiveness: Evolutionary, cognitive, and social perspectives*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Riggio, R., Riggio, H. R., Salinas, C., & Cole, E. J. (2003). The role of social and emotional communication skills in leaders emergence and effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7, 83–103.
- Rubin, R. S., Bartels, L. K., & Bommer, W. H. (2002). Are leaders smarter or do they just seem that way? Exploring perceived intellectual competence and leadership emergence. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 30, 105–118.
- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 629–645.
- Sarni, C. (1989). Children's understanding of strategic control of emotional expression in social transactions. In C. Sarni & P. Harris (Eds.), *Children's understanding of emotion* (pp. 181–208). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sarni, C., & Weber, H. (1999). Emotional displays and dissemblance in childhood: implications for self-presentation. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman, & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 317–347). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlenker, B. R. (2003). Self-presentation. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 462–518). New York: Guilford Press.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Pontari, B. A. (2000). The strategic control of information: Impression management and self-presentational in daily life. In A. Tesser, R. Felson, & J. Suits (Eds.), *Perspective on self and identity* (pp. 199–232). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Segall, M. H., Campbell, D. T., & Herskovitz, M. J. (1966). *The influence of culture on visual perception*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs Merrill.
- Singer, M. A., & Goldin-Meadows, S. (2005). Children learn when their teacher's gestures and speech differ. *Psychological Science*, 16, 85–89.
- Singh, D., & Bronstad, P. M. (1997). Sex differences in the anatomical locations of

- human body scarification and tattooing as a function of pathogen prevalence. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 18, 403–416.
- Snodgrass, S. E. (1992). Further effects of role versus gender on interpersonal sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 154–158.
- Stolberg, S. G. (2004, January 25). Whoop, oops and the state of the political slip. *New York Times Week in Review*, sec. 4, pp. 1, 3.
- Tedeschi, J. T., & Norman, N. (1985). Social power, self-presentation, and the self. In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self in social life* (pp. 293–321). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tice, D. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2001). The primacy of the interpersonal self. In C. Sedikides & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Individual self, relational self, collective self* (pp. 71–88). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- 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.
- Todorov, A., Mandisodza, A. N., Goren, A., & Hall, C. C. (2005). Inferences of competence from faces predict election outcomes. *Science*, 308, 1623–1626.
- Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., & Ciarocco, N. J. (2005). Self-regulation and self-presentation: Regulatory resource depletion impairs impression management and effortful self-presentation depletes regulatory resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 632–657.
- Vrij, A., Evans, H., Akehurst, L., & Mann, M. (2004). Rapid judgements in assessing verbal and nonverbal cues: Their potential for deception researches and lie detection. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 18, 283–296.
- Wroblewska, A. M. (1997). Androgen-anabolic steroids and body dysmorphia in young men. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 42, 225–234.
- Zebrowitz, L. A. (1997). *Reading faces: Window to the soul?* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

