

Antecedents of and Engagement in Impression Management Tactics Among College Students

Laura Valerius
University of North Texas

Mary G. Parr
Kent State University

Abstract

Despite professor's attempts to treat all students objectively, anecdotal evidence suggests that disparate treatment of students is not uncommon in academe. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which college students engage in impression management (IM) tactics and to identify antecedent variables to engagement in such behaviors. One hundred one undergraduate students at a large Midwestern university completed a self-administered, modified version of Wayne and Ferris' (1990) IM instrument to assess the extent to which they engage in various types of IM tactics. Based on Leary and Kowalski's (1990) theoretical model of impression motivation, antecedent variables related to students' engagement in IM were examined. Using correlations and regression analyses, antecedent variables employed in predicting student's impression management engagement included the importance of being known, the degree of publicity and contact with their instructor, the desire to be liked, and students' perceptions of a discrepant image. Students reported engaging most often in self-focused IM tactics such as presenting themselves as friendly persons. Results of correlations of students' engagement in three types of IM with antecedent variables, as well as regression analyses of the antecedent variables on the types of IM are presented and discussed. Students' use of IM tactics and the conditions under which students are likely to use IM are valuable in exploring the effects of such engagement and in providing instructors with information about their students that may help them treat all students equitably.

Keywords: Impression management, student behavior, impression motivation

Biographical Information

Laura Valerius is an Assistant Professor at the University of North Texas, P.O. Box 13857, Denton, Texas and Mary Parr is an Assistant Professor at Kent State University, Leisure Studies, P.O. Box 5190, Kent, Ohio 44242-0001.

Introduction

People form impressions of others based on their interactions with, and observations of them. If a professor were to walk into a university classroom and find all of the front row seats occupied by varsity football players who usually sat toward the back of the classroom, the professor might jump to the conclusion that the athletic department academic advisor had instructed the football players to sit in the front row in an attempt to portray the image of these student-athletes as attentive and interested students. This conclusion may be based upon the professor's previous experience and/or the perhaps erroneous perception of varsity athletes. In addition, if these front row students also were to make consistent eye-contact with the instructor and take thorough lecture notes, the professor would likely perceive these students to be committed to learning the material. This implies that an individual can influence the impression others form by managing their behaviors and appearance.

The use of impression management (IM), managing the impressions others form of a person, has been examined in the organizational behavior literature, specifically as it is used by employees in the work place. However, very little empirical research has documented the IM process in the educational setting (Juvonen & Murdoch, 1993). Thus, the first purpose of this study was to determine to what extent undergraduate students report engaging in behaviors that may influence teachers.

Another purpose was to assess why students engage in IM behaviors. College students may engage in very different classroom and student-role related behaviors with the outcome of being treated differently by the professor. What factors motivate a student to engage in IM? Leary and Kowalski (1990) suggest a theoretical model of impression motivation that identifies antecedent variables to engagement in IM. While this model has been applied in the workplace, in this study, a portion of the impression motivation model was used and adapted to an educational environment.

Literature Review

One area of educational research is the examination of the interactions that occur in the educational environment. Previous research has addressed the unidirectional flow of influence from teacher to students. However, mounting evidence suggests that interactions in the classroom are bi-directional and that students can, and do, influence the classroom environment (Copeland, 1980; Worrall, Worrall, & Meldrum, 1988). While research has begun to explore the bi-directionality of the classroom environment, most studies have focused on changes in teacher behavior as a result of cueing into student behavior, with teacher behavior as the dependent variable (e.g., Fiedler, 1975; Klein, 1971; Noble & Nolan, 1976; Sherman & Cormier, 1974). These investigations used an experimental design in which students behaviors were scripted to determine if deliberate changes in student behaviors resulted in a corresponding change in teachers' behaviors. For example, Klein (1971) demonstrated that students in a college class could change the verbal behavior of guest lecturers from approving statements to critical statements

by having confederate students shift from attention to non-attention on cue. Fiedler (1975) determined that "classroom events are at least partially determined by the students as well as the teacher, and that students' perceptions of classroom climate are related to student inputs as well as teacher inputs" (p. 742). While Fiedler documented that students engage in particular behaviors in order to influence teachers, the study did not directly assess variables associated with students' motivation to engage in these behaviors.

Numerous factors may motivate students to attempt to influence teachers through the students' behaviors. As Wentzel (1989) found, students bring multiple goals to the classroom. Not only are students interested in learning, but they also seek to fulfill social goals of developing relationships with both classmates and teachers. Chickering (1969) and Katz (1962) demonstrated the importance of interactions and the development of relationships between students and teachers. Given that such interactions can be critical in the learning process, it is important for both students and faculty to be cognizant of the development of these relationships (Williams & Winkworth, 1974). By understanding the impetus behind students' attempting to manage the impressions their teachers form of them, educators may have more of an appreciation of their own reactions to such behaviors and to further understanding of how student-instructor relationships fulfill social, as well as academic goals.

This study used Leary and Kowalski's (1990) model of impression motivation which identifies influential behaviors as IM tactics, a form of political behavior. This model depicts naturally occurring influential behaviors and possible antecedents to engagement in this behavior, but has not been applied previously to educational settings. In contrast to studies of bi-directionality that employed teacher behaviors as dependent variables, this study used student-reported IM behaviors as dependent variables and antecedents (or motivations) to IM as independent variables.

Impression Management

The focus of much of the IM research has examined relationships between individuals with power differentials, such as those between subordinates and supervisors. A similar power differential exists between students and their instructors (Brunner, 1991), in that instructors assess performance of and provide work assignments to their students just as supervisors do with their subordinates.

The use of influence tactics are commonly observed in organizations. A variety of different types of opportunistic behaviors are used by employees within organizations to influence decision making (Pettigrew, 1973; Tushman, 1977). IM, one facet of opportunistic behaviors, is characterized by an actor's engagement in self-presentational behavior in order to manage the identities that others assign to him or her (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). While most of this research has been conducted in the workplace, Juvonen and Murdock (1993) found that even middle-school students understood the value of different presentation strategies when explaining a good or bad exam score, depending upon the audience (parents, peers, or teachers).

While such behaviors may seem flagrantly manipulative, these behaviors are frequently ingrained in the human behavior repertoire and are not necessarily used with a great deal of conscious effort. Most often, the process of assessing another's perceptions of behavior and reacting to these assessments is at a "preattentive or nonconscious level" (Leary & Kowalski, 1990, p. 36). Many of the patterns of self-presentation that people engage in are strictly of a habitual, overlearned nature (Hogan, Jones, & Cheek, 1985; Schlenker, 1980) that demand no particular conscious effort. Typically, people monitor and adapt to impressions others are forming without devoting energy to managing these impressions. Thus, students may engage in influential behaviors simply as a matter of course in their daily interactions.

However, certain situations motivate people to explicitly manage how they are being perceived. People are motivated to manage these perceptions in situations which require maximizing expected rewards and minimizing expected punishments (Juvonen & Murdoch, 1993; Schlenker, 1980). For example, a student may sit toward the front of the classroom and use nonverbal cues such as frequent eye contact with the instructor to portray attentiveness, and to gain the approbation of the professor. Similarly, a student explaining a low grade on an exam to her father may attribute her grade to the fact that this was a difficult test and explain that the entire class did poorly (Juvonen & Murdoch, 1993).

According to Wentzel (1989; 1993), students pursue both academic and nonacademic goals in the classroom. These multiple classroom goals may include learning, or skill/subject mastery-type goals; performance goals (e.g., receiving a high performance rating such as a high grade); and social goals such as making friends and earning the approval of others.

Social goals have been considered in organizational behavior research as antecedent variables to engagement in IM (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). In other words, the presence of these goals are considered to be motivators for engagement in IM. Leary and Kowalski's (1990) model specifies the antecedent variables believed to lead a person to use IM tactics, a construct they refer to as impression motivation. Leary and Kowalski's (1990) model was adapted for use in an educational setting. The adapted model included four of Leary and Kowalski's (1990) antecedent variables: importance of being known, publicity and contact, image discrepancy, and desire to be liked.

Antecedents to IM

Importance of being known. Some people have a higher desire for attention than others. Several studies have found evidence to support the contention that engagement in IM may be particularly salient to those who have a high need for approval (Leary, 1983; Millham & Kellogg, 1983; Schneider & Trukat, 1975). While attention can come in many forms in the classroom, having gained the attention of the instructor may manifest itself in such ways as the instructor knowing the student's name or as the instructor paying noticeable attention to the student. A student might be more likely to engage in IM in an effort to satiate his or her desire to be known by the teacher.

Publicity and contact. Publicity of one's behavior may be an important factor in determining how relevant a person's impressions are to attaining the goals he or she desires. The probability that one's behavior will be viewed by others and the number of people who may potentially witness the person's behavior are publicity-related. Further, the extent of contact with the instructor and whether the student expects future interactions with his or her instructor may be a component in impression motivation. The more contact with and the higher the expectations of future interaction with the instructor, the more important it may be for the student to engage in IM (Schneider, 1969).

Image discrepancy. Another factor which Leary and Kowalski (1990) attributed to impression motivation is image discrepancy, or the extent of perceived discrepancy between a person's perception of his or her own ability, and the image the person believes another holds of that person. For example, a student may believe that he or she is highly competent; however, the student may believe that the instructor does not recognize the student's abilities. In several studies, subjects have been led to believe that they failed on an important task (Baumeister & Jones, 1978; Leary & Schlenker, 1980; Schlenker, 1975) or have been embarrassed in front of others (Apsler, 1975; Brown & Garland, 1971). Impression motivation increased with both failure and embarrassment due to the discrepancy between the image a person would like others to hold of him or her and the person's perception of the image currently held by others.

Desire to be liked. A fourth antecedent in IM motivation that has been shown in previous research to be an important factor in determining IM engagement is a person's desire to be liked (Valerius, 1990/1991). Numerous studies have found a desire to be liked to be highly correlated with engagement in IM (Valerius, 1990/1991; Wayne, 1987; Wayne & Kacmar, 1991). A person's need for being liked may serve as an effective goal for managing impressions either in addition to, or exclusive of, more tangible rewards such as good grades. This study was designed to determine the extent to which university students engage in IM and to identify the possible antecedents to engagement in IM in the classroom.

Method

Sample

Two-hundred twenty-four questionnaires were distributed to students during classes. One hundred one were returned, yielding a usable response rate of 45%. Prior to administering the questionnaires, it was necessary to obtain approval from the University of Illinois' Human Subjects Board. Additionally, it was necessary to obtain permission from the University's Associate and Assistant Deans in order to obtain grades of undergraduate students for courses which might fall into the sample. All Deans granted permission and a simple random sample of 35 classes listed in the schedule of classes and which were taught by one instructor (i.e., no courses were team taught by faculty, or by faculty and teaching assistants.) was selected. Instructors of each of the selected courses were asked for their permission to administer and collect the surveys in class. Only four instructors of the 35 classes in the sample acquiesced, resulting in 26 completed

instruments. To increase sample size, a convenience sample of all fourteen Leisure Studies undergraduate instructors were asked, and agreed to allow data collection in their classes. This yielded another 75 completed instruments, for a total of 101 from the eighteen classes. The unit of analysis for the study was undergraduate students in these classes.

Respondents were of traditional college age (18-22). Sixty percent of the respondents were female and 40% were male. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents were Euro-American; 7% were African-American, 2% were Latino; 2% were Asian; and 1% identified with another ethnicity. These respondents appear to reflect the demographics of undergraduates at this university. The grade distribution in this sample included 45% As, 34% Bs, 12% Cs, and 2% Es (failing). No grades of D were earned by participants in this study. The distribution of these grades was representative of the grade distribution of all students enrolled in the classes in this study.

Data Collection

The instructors of the identified courses were contacted prior to the data collection process and all agreed to allow questionnaires to be distributed and returned during class time. Self-administered questionnaires were distributed by the researchers during the regularly scheduled class periods. Students were instructed to complete the questionnaire in only one class and were asked to bring the completed questionnaires back to class the next time the class met. During the next class period, the researchers collected completed questionnaires. It is assumed that respondents completed their own questionnaires honestly. The researchers also disseminated questionnaires to those not in attendance at the previous class period and to those who had misplaced the original form. Students receiving questionnaires at the second class were asked to return them via campus mail, although none were received.

Measures

Impression Management

Wayne and Ferris' (1990) 24-item IM instrument was modified to be appropriate for undergraduate students rather than employees, and was used to assess students' perceptions of their engagement in IM. Wayne and Ferris' original IM scale was subjected to Principal Components Analysis and three factors emerged: job-focused IM, supervisor-focused IM, and self-focused IM. Ferris, Russ, and Fandt (1988), Valerius (1990/1991), Valerius and McKinney (1991), and Wayne and Liden (1995) also found similar factors, or sub-scales, using Wayne and Ferris' (1990) instrument. Alpha reliability estimates for Wayne and Ferris' sub-scales are as follows: job-focused = .87, supervisor-focused = .78, self-focused = .71. In order to reflect the educational environment, two of the sub-scales, job-focused and supervisor-focused, were renamed student-role focused and instructor-focused, respectively. Student-role focused IM tactics reflect behaviors that highlight what a good student a person is, contrasted with self-focused IM tactics which emphasize the individual as a good person. Therefore, student-role focused items reflect behaviors that are positively associated with the "student role," such as letting the instructor

know of the student's involvement in course-related activities beyond course requirement and arriving at class early in order to look good in front of the instructor. Self-focused IM tactics emphasize the student as a nice, friendly person. Students were asked to consider their behavior in this particular class and to rate, on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, and 7 = always), the frequency with which they engaged in these behaviors.

Since the purpose of this study was to examine antecedents to IM engagement by students, these three IM sub-scales (job-, supervisor-, and self-focused IM) were used as dependent variables. Leary and Kowalski's (1990) impression motivation variables were considered antecedents and served as independent variables in regression models.

Importance of Being Known

The construct "importance of being known" was measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = very unimportant, and 7 = extremely important). The importance and likelihood of the teacher's knowing the student's name and of receiving personal attention from the instructor was assessed. The alpha reliability coefficient of this construct was .80 for this study; however, coefficients for this measure were not reported in previous research.

Publicity and Contact

Publicity and contact measures were obtained using 7-point Likert-type scales (1 = disagree strongly, and 7 = agree strongly) and indicated the student's agreement with statements measuring the extent to which the student spoke or corresponded with the instructor outside of class, the frequency with which the instructor was exposed to the student's work, and the frequency of contact with the instructor (through such mediums as phone, notes, or in person). The alpha reliability coefficient of .71 found in this study is similar to .73 found in previous research (Valerius, 1990/1991).

Desire to Be Liked

A student's desire to be liked was measured by respondents indicating on Likert-type scales (1 = disagree strongly, and 7 = agree strongly) the degree to which they agreed with such statements as: "I always try to ensure that my instructor likes me" and "It bothers me when others do not like me." An alpha reliability estimate of .45 was found which is consistent with the estimate of .46 reported by Valerius (1990/1991).

Image Discrepancy

A measure for the discrepancy between the image students thought their instructors held of them and of the image they wanted the instructor to have of them was developed for this study. The discrepancy between the current and perceived images was assessed by such questions as "There is no discrepancy between how competent I would like my instructor to see me and how competent I feel I am" and "I am more competent than my instructor thinks I am." Students responded to these questions using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = disagree strongly, and 7 = agree strongly). The construct, image discrepancy, had an alpha reliability of .12.

Grades

Two performance-related measures were obtained. First, students were asked to rate, on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1=extremely unimportant, and 7=extremely important), how important it was for the student to earn a high grade in this class. In addition, the final course letter grade of each respondent was acquired with permission from College Deans.

Data Analysis

The extent to which students engaged in each of the three types of IM tactics was calculated using descriptive statistics. Correlations between each of the independent variables and each of the sub-scales were also calculated. In addition, the proposed models of IM antecedents were tested by regression analyses which enabled the researchers to analyze the variability of a dependent variable (i.e., each of the three IM sub-scales) as a result of observed changes in the independent variables.

Results

Engagement in Impression Management

As indicated in Table 1, students were most likely to report engaging in behaviors designed to highlight their accomplishments and efforts (self-focused IM tactics) as opposed to engaging in either instructor-focused or student role-focused IM tactics. Specifically, 80% of the students indicated they engaged in these behaviors at least sometimes or more frequently, compared to their use of instructor-focused (18%) or student role-focused (21%) IM. Conversely, more students reported very infrequently or never engaging in instructor-focused (39%) or student role-focused (36%) IM; whereas, fewer than 2% reported having very infrequently or never used self-focused IM tactics.

TABLE 1

Percentage of Students Engaging in IM Sub-scales by Level of Engagement

Response	% of Student Role-Focused IM	% of Instructor-Focused IM	% of Self Focused IM
Never	4.0	1.0	0.0
Very Infrequently	31.7	37.6	2.0
Infrequently	43.6	43.6	17.8
Sometimes	17.9	10.9	38.6
Frequently	2.0	6.9	29.7
Very Frequently	1.0	0.0	8.9
Always	0.0	0.0	3.0

Notes: n=101

*Antecedents to Engagement in IM*Correlations

Social goals. The correlations presented in Table 2 indicate that students who reported frequent contact with their instructor and whose work was seen often by the instructor were more likely to engage in student role-focused, instructor-focused, and self-focused IM tactics than those students who did not report such publicity and contact. Being known by their instructor was also positively correlated with each of the IM sub-scales. Those who had a high desire to be liked were more likely to report engaging in student role-focused and self-focused IM tactics than those to whom being liked was not as important.

Performance goals. Neither the actual course grade nor the perceived importance of a high grade were correlated with any of the three IM sub-scales. These results are also presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Correlation of Antecedents with IM Sub-scales

Antecedents	IM Subscales		
	Student Role-Focused IM	Instructor-Focused IM	Self-Focused IM
Importance of Being Known	.23*	.25*	.22*
Publicity & Contact	.50***	.60***	.45***
Desire to Be Liked	.23*	.02	.25*
Discrepancy of Image	-.01	-.01	-.09
Course Grade	.00	-.11	-.06
Importance of High Grade	.04	.02	.04

Notes: * $P < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Regressions

Table 3 shows the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis in which each of the four antecedent variables was used to predict student's level of engagement in self-focused IM. In this model, 26% of the variance was explained, $F(4, 96) = 8.42$, $p = .000$, suggesting that these variables may be motivating factors in students' use of IM tactics related to enhancing themselves in the eyes of others. The primary contributing antecedents in this model were the degree of a student's publicity and contact, and the student's desire to be liked. Neither the extent of the student's perception of a discrepant image nor their desire to be known by the instructor proved very important in predicting the student's reported use of self-focused IM.

Table 3 also illustrates the results of the analysis regressing the antecedent motivation factors on the dependent variable, student role-focused IM. This hierarchical multiple regression equation explains 32% of the variance, $F(4, 96) = 11.13, p = .000$. Knowing the students' level of concern for publicity and contact and their desire to be liked offers the ability to predict their extent of engagement in student role-focused IM. Their desire to be known by the instructor and their degree of image discrepancy did not appear to significantly contribute to students' use of student role-focused IM.

The results of the regression of the antecedents on instructor-focused IM are also presented in Table 3, with 41% of the variance in the hierarchical regression model explained by the antecedents, $F(4, 96) = 16.75, p = .000$. The degree of publicity and contact a student has with his or her instructor and the extent of the discrepancy between the student's desired and perceived image are the two critical variables in predicting their level of engagement in instructor-focused IM. In this model, neither the students' desire to be liked nor the extent to which it was important for the instructor to know them emerged as important variables.

TABLE 3

Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Antecedents on IM Sub-scales

Independent Variables	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	Beta
<u>Self-Focused IM</u>			
Intercept	1.69	0.66	--
Publicity & Contact	0.30	0.07	0.42
Desire to Be Liked	0.26	0.11	0.22
Importance of Being Known	0.07	0.07	0.09
Image Discrepancy	0.03	0.08	0.04
<u>Student Role-Focused IM</u>			
Intercept	0.23	0.52	--
Publicity & Contact	0.30	0.06	0.52
Desire to Be Liked	0.18	0.08	0.18
Importance of Being Known	0.05	0.05	0.08
Image Discrepancy	0.11	0.06	0.16
<u>Instructor-Focused IM</u>			
Intercept	0.66	0.51	--
Publicity & Contact	0.40	0.05	0.66
Desire to Be Liked	-0.04	0.08	-0.04
Importance of Being Known	0.04	0.05	0.07
Image Discrepancy	0.17	0.06	0.22

Discussion

The results of this investigation suggest that students do report engaging in IM tactics, particularly in self-focused behaviors such as presenting themselves as nice, polite people, acting as “model” students, and letting instructors know they are working hard. This is consistent with findings in the organizational behavior literature which suggest that employees engage frequently in self-focused IM (Valerius, 1990/1991; Wayne, 1987).

The finding that just over three-quarters of the students reported only infrequent use of instructor-focused IM tactics may be attributable to students' being wary of their behaviors backfiring. As described by Rosenfeld, Giacalone, and Riordan (1995), backfiring (the potential consequence of being seen in a negative light by the person one is trying to impress if the other-enhancement is not successful) is a possible deterrent to engagement in other-enhancing IM. Thus, this fear of backfiring may have served as a deterrent in the use of instructor-focused IM for these students.

The antecedents identified in Leary and Kowalski's (1990) adapted impression motivation model were supported for the most part in this study. The finding that the discrepant image variable was not correlated with any of the IM sub-scales is consistent with previous use of this measure. Valerius (1990/1991) found that the discrepancy variable was not correlated with any of the IM sub-scales; yet, as found in this study, it was useful in the regression models in predicting IM. Perhaps further investigation into the measurement and construction of this variable is needed since the inclusion of this factor in the model appears to have strong face validity.

The strongest regression model involved predicting instructor-focused IM by use of the antecedent variables. Although statistically significant, the regression of the antecedent variables on the self-focused IM sub-scale yielded the lowest R^2 of the three sub-scales. This might be improved by accounting for and considering the two styles of self-focused IM suggested by Arkin and Sheppard (1991) who propose that self-promotion can be broken into two styles. One style involves a person's working toward restoring his or her position within an organization (i.e. self-protection). The other style, self-promotion, focuses on one's attempts to advance his or her position within the organization. It may be helpful in further research to ferret out the distinction between the two types of self-focused IM. Perhaps this lack of distinction confounded the construct of self-focused IM sought in this research.

Another possibility is that the self-focused tactics are the more ingrained, automatic behaviors as discussed earlier, while instructor-focused behaviors may be associated more with gaining some reward. Supporting this is the finding that the discrepant image variable was a significant predictor of instructor-focused IM behaviors, but not of self-focused or student role-focused IM tactics. If students feel the instructor's image of them is discrepant from images students hold of themselves, they may be motivated to try and change the instructor's opinions by engaging in behaviors directly targeted toward the instructor.

The finding that engagement in IM was not associated with performance goals (i.e., grade and importance of a high grade) supports Wentzel's (1989) finding that students seek to achieve multiple goals in the classroom. Students may use IM geared toward their instructor in an effort to attain the more social goal of having the instructor know their names and of obtaining some personal attention from the teacher. The lack of association among the IM sub-scales and actual grades may indicate that teachers are able to effectively distinguish between managed behaviors and actual performance. If reported use of IM tactics had been positively associated with the importance of receiving a high grade, then this interpretation would be all the more plausible. However, since the importance of a high grade was not associated with engagement in IM, this contributes support to the interpretation that students may use IM tactics to obtain social goals rather than performance goals.

This research was conducted using a convenience sample. The extent to which the results of this research can be generalized to students at other institutions is not known. Although acceptable reliability estimates were found, further testing of these modified instruments is needed for the application to systems in higher education. As is always a concern in self-reported methods of data collection, the accuracy of these self-reported behaviors is uncertain. However, as in previous IM research, there did appear to be a reasonable range in responses, indicating a willingness to report data not necessarily favorable to their image.

The implications of this research for educators are numerous. These findings suggest that students engage in IM behaviors in an effort to obtain recognition and personal contact with the instructor. Do instructors recognize this social goal of students and, if so, do they create opportunities for the students' social goals to be met? Encouraging students to meet with the instructor during office hours, or before or after class might help students meet some of their social goals. Since instructors may also seek connections with their students for their own social support, might educators feel more comfortable providing positive and/or constructive advice to those students with whom they have developed more individualistic relationships, and, if so, is the instructor not providing as much support to those students with whom they have minimal interaction?

Given that students indicate that they use IM tactics to establish themselves as competent in the eyes of their instructor and fellow students, educators might pay more attention to how they manage their classes. Where feasible, do students have the opportunity through discussions, written exercises, or other avenues to exhibit their competence as it relates to the subject matter? In addition, instructors might be more cognizant of which students they chose to engage in classroom discussions. Does an instructor tend to lapse into interaction primarily with students who exhibit such IM behaviors as making consistent eye-contact or taking copious notes and does the instructor tend to pass over students who are less obviously engaged in IM behaviors?

Students appear to have multiple goals related to their academic engagement. Educators may believe that the students' primary motive in class is to learn course-

related material; however, the results of this study suggest that students also seek to fulfill social goals which the educator may be in a position to facilitate.

As these findings indicate, the educational environment is complex. Clearly, the complexities of the nature of student-instructor relationships in colleges and universities provides ample opportunity for IM engagement by students. Student development research suggests that interaction between students and faculty beyond the classroom greatly enhances the students' experiences (Lampert, 1993; Noel & Smith, 1996). The recent "Student Learning Imperative" adopted by the American College Personnel Association (1994) identifies the responsibility of student development personnel in "fostering learning and personal development" (p. 2) in an effort to meet their college or university's mission of academic achievement (Terenzini, Pacarella, & Blimling, 1996). By working with students to identify their salient personal, educational, and professional goals, and to enhance their IM, skills faculty and student development professionals may be able to assist students in their personal and educational development.

References

American College Personnel Association (1994). *The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs*. Washington, DC: Author.

Apsler, R. (1975). Effects of embarrassment on behavior toward others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 145-153.

Arkin, R., & Sheppard, J. (1989). Self-presentation styles in organizations. In R. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 125-139). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baumeister, R. F., & Jones, E. E. (1978). When self-presentation is constrained by the target's knowledge: Consistency and compensation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 608-618.

Brown, B., & Garland, H. (1971). The effects of incompetency, audience acquaintanceship, and anticipated evaluative feedback of face-saving behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 7, 490-502.

Brunner, D. D. (1991). Who owns this work? The question of authorship in professional/academic writing. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 5, 393-411.

Chickering, A. W. (1969, June). Student-faculty relationships: Bedrock for college governance. Revised version of paper read at 15th Annual Institute on College and University Administration, University of Michigan.

Copeland, W. D. (1980). Teaching-learning behaviors and the demands of the classroom environment. *The Elementary School Journal*, 80, 163-177.

Ferris, G. R., Russ, G. S., & Fandt, P. M. (1989). Politics in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld, (Ed.), *Impression Management in the Organization* (pp. 143-170). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fiedler, M. L. (1975). Bidirectionality of influence in classroom interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology, *67*, 735-744.

Hogan, R., Jones, W. H., & Cheek, J. M. (1985). Socioanalytic theory: An alternative to armadillo psychology. In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 5, pp. 141-197). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Juvonen, J., & Murdock, T. (1993). How to promote social approval: Effects of audience and achievement outcome on publicity communicated through attributions. Journal of Educational Psychology, *85*(2), 365-376.

Katz, J. (1962). Personality and interpersonal relations in the college classroom. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college (pp. 365-395). New York: Wiley.

Klein, S. S. (1971). Student influence on teacher behavior. American Educational Research Journal, *8*, 403-421.

Lamport, M. A. (1993). Student-faculty informal interaction and the effect on college student outcomes: A review of the literature. Adolescence, *28*, 971-990.

Leary, M. R. (1983). Understanding social anxiety. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. Psychological Bulletin, *107*(1), 34-47.

Leary, M. R., & Schlenker, B. R. (1980). The social psychology of shyness: A self-presentation model. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Impression management theory and social psychological research. New York: Academic Press.

Millham, J., & Kellogg, R. W. (1983). Need for social approval: Impression management or self-deception? Journal of Research in Personality, *14*, 445-457.

Noel, R. C., & Smith, S. S. (1996). Self-disclosure of college students to faculty: The influence of ethnicity. Journal of College Student Development, *37*, 88-94.

Noble, C. G., & Nolan, J. D. (1976). Effect of student verbal behavior on classroom teacher behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology, *68*, 342-246.

Pettigrew, A. (1973). The Politics of Organizational Decision Making. London: Tavistock.

Rosenfeld, P., Giacalone, R., & Riordan, C. (1995). Impression management in organizations: Theory, measurement, practice. New York: Routledge.

Schlenker, B. R. (1975). Self-presentation: Managing the impression of consistency when reality interferes with self-enhancement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *32*, 1030-1037.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schneider, D. (1969). Tactical self-presentation after success and failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, 262-268.

Schneider, D. J., & Trukat, D. (1975). Self-presentation following success and failure: Defensive self-esteem models. Journal of Personality, 43, 127-135.

Sherman, T. M., & Cormier, W. H. (1974). An investigation of the influence of student behavior on teacher behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 7, 11-21.

Tedeschi, J. T., & Melburg, V. (1984). Impression management and influence in the organization. In S. B. Bacharach & E. J. Lawler (Eds.), Research in the sociology of organizations (Vol. 3, pp. 31-58). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1996). Students' out-of-class-experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. Journal of College Student Development, 37, 149-162.

Tushman, M. (1977). A political approach to organizations: A review and rationale. Academy of Management Review, 2, 206-216.

Valerius, L. (1991). Antecedents of impression management and effects on performance appraisal (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 226A.

Valerius, L., & McKinney, W. R. (1991). Effects of impression management on upper-level leisure service personnel performance appraisal. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 9(4), 59-70.

Wayne, S. J. (1987). An Investigation of the Determinants of Exchange Quality in Supervisor-Subordinate Relationships. Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A&M University.

Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 487-499.

Wayne, S. J., & Kacmar, K. M. (1991). The effects of impression management on the performance appraisal process. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 48, 70-88.

Wayne, S. J., & Liden, R. C. (1995). Effects of impression management on performance ratings: A longitudinal study. Academy of Management Journal, 38(1), 232-260.

Wentzel, K. (1989). Adolescent classroom goals, standards for performance, and Academic Achievement: An interactionist perspective. Journal of Educational Psychology, 81(2), 131-142.

Wentzel, K. (1993). Does being good make the grade? Social behavior and academic competence in middle school. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85(2), 357-364.

Williams, V. G., & Winkworth, J. M. (1974). The faculty looks at student behavior. Journal of College Student Personnel, 15(4), 305-310.

Worrall, N., Worrall, C., & Meldrum, C. (1988). Children's reciprocations of teacher evaluations. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 58, 78-88.

Author Note

Both authors were at the University of Illinois-Urbana, Department of Leisure Studies at the time these data were collected.