Paradoxical effects of supportive audiences on performance under pressure: The home field disadvantage in sports championships

Article *in* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology · July 1984

DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.47.1.85

CITATIONS
254

READS
2,713

2 authors, including:

Roy Baumeister
Harvard University
713 PUBLICATIONS **155,486** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
1984, Vol 47, No 1, 85-93

Paradoxical Effects of Supportive Audiences on Performance Under Pressure: The Home Field Disadvantage in Sports Championships

Roy F. Baumeister and Andrew Steinhilber
Case Western Reserve University

On the basis of recent research on *self-presentation* and *self-attention*, we predicted that the presence of supportive audiences might be detrimental to performance in some circumstances. Specifically, the imminent opportunity to claim a desired identity in front of a supportive audience might engender a state of self-attention that could interfere with the execution of skillful responses. Archival data from championship series in two major league sports supported this reasoning. In baseball's World Series, home teams tend to win early games but lose decisive (final) games. Supplementary analyses suggested that the pattern occurs when the home team has the opportunity to win the championship and that it does involve performance decrements by the home team. Similar patterns were found in semifinal and championship series in professional basketball.

The present study concerns whether the presence of supportive versus unsympathetic audiences could interact with opportunities for claiming desired identities to cause paradoxical decrements in the quality of performance. Researchers of self-presentation have used terms such as *audience* and *performance* to describe self-presentation ever since Goffman's (1959) dramaturgical analysis of behavior. Our study seeks to test self-presentational hypotheses in the context of actual professional performers and their audiences. We chose professional athletic contests because they provide circumscribed, quantifiable performances and because careful records are generally kept. Our hypotheses were derived by the three steps that follow.

Derivation of Hypotheses

Self-Presentation

Self-presentation has been described as a process of *claiming desired identities* through social, public performances (Schlenker, 1980, 1982). As the importance of a given performance increases, so may self-presentational concerns (Schlenker & Leary, 1982). Major public performances thus may constitute occasions for possible self-redefinition (see also Baumeister, 1982).

Insofar as the audience contributes to the self-redefinition (by witnessing), the audience's attitude may affect the process. Schlenker (1983) has suggested that hostile, rejecting, or unsympathetic audiences may tend not to engender self-presentational concerns. Supportive audiences, in contrast, may desire and support the favorable self-redefinition, so self-presentational concerns may be greatest in front of them.

Thus the opportunity to claim a desired identity by an important performance before a supportive audience may maximize self-presentational concerns.

Self-Awareness

Schlenker and Leary (1982) suggested that the increase in motivation for self-presentation connected with important performances before supportive audiences may cause an increase in self-focused attention. Moreover, if one expects success at claiming the desired identity (cf. Carver, 1979), one may enjoy the self-focused state and may seek to prolong it (cf. Greenberg & Musham, 1981; also Steenbarger & Aderman, 1979).

We wish to thank C. S. Carver, J. G. Hull, M. R. Leary, D. G. Schultz, G. J. Smith, and F M. Zimring for their comments.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Roy F. Baumeister, Department of Psychology, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106.

Thus the self-presentational concerns engendered by the prospect of a successful and favorable redefinition of self, by means of an important performance before a supportive audience, may maximize self-awareness.

Performance

The heightened self-attention caused by the prospect of imminent success may ironically hamper the performance that is supposed to bring about that very success. The performance decrement might derive from either of two models; the present study did not seek to differentiate between the two models (cf. Baumeister, 1984).

The first model suggests that attention to self distracts one from cues or information necessary for optimal performance. Attending to the potential new identity may detract from attending to one's immediate activity. To give a crude but relevant example, the (baseball) shortstop who is busy imagining himself celebrated as a World Series hero in a victory parade may misjudge the ball bouncing toward him and make a fielding error. A similar but more sweeping model is that any self-attention detracts from attention to the environment (cf. Duval & Wicklund, 1971).

The second model suggests that skills are well-learned or automatic-response sequences and that renewed attention to the components of these sequences may disrupt their smooth execution (Kimble & Perlmuter, 1970). Self-attention is seen as accomplishing that disruption (Baumeister, 1984). This model derives from theories that regard self-awareness as superimposed on awareness of the environment (e.g., Kant, 1787/1956). The shortstop who monitors the arm and hand muscle movements by which he throws the baseball to first base, after years of doing it automatically, may alter the skillful execution and make an error.

For present purposes it does not matter which of these two models is correct. The important point is that self-attention may harm skillful performance. Thus our hypothesis is that skillful performance may deteriorate in front of supportive audiences when the performer approaches a successful redefinition of self.

Operationalization

As previously stated, we used archival data on athletic performance to test the self-presentational and self-attentional hypotheses. Audience support was easily operationalized by associating it with the home team. The visiting team is in a self-presentational dead end, for there is generally no way for them to gain the preferential esteem and affection of the home fans.

The chance to claim a desired identity is operationalized by winning a major championship. Most professional athletes take part in many victories, but few participate in winning a championship; moreover, doing so defines the athlete thereafter as a former national champion, gold medal winner, and so forth. Securing a championship is an act of self-redefinition (claiming a new identity) that fulfills the epitome of athletic aspiration. To study the effects of approaching such a self-redefinition, we compared early versus final games in championship series. Although early games are certainly important performances, they are presumably less pressured than the game that decides the championship.

Predictions

Our hypotheses take the following form in terms of sports: In a decisive contest, the home team and fans focus on winning the championship if success seems within their grasp. The impending redefinition of self (as champions), particularly in front of the home crowd, engenders self-attention, which causes performance decrements. If the home team faces defeat, self-awareness is aversive and is terminated as quickly as possible (Carver, 1979; Wicklund, 1975). Terminating self-awareness in such circumstances is facilitated by the tendency of audiences to disassociate themselves from losing teams (Cialdini, Borden, Thorne, Walker, & Freeman, 1976), and self-presentational concerns are weak before aloof audiences (Schlenker, 1983; also Brown & Garland, 1971). The visiting team will have a tendency to become self-aware when facing imminent victory, but this tendency is dampened by the presence of a hostile, rejecting audience, which subdues or removes the salient, immediate self-presentational value of

winning the championship. Therefore, performance decrements in decisive contests will be shown particularly by the home team.

Investigation 1: Baseball

Method

Selection of archives Baseball's World Series were the ideal choice for archival data because home field is scheduled without reference to the two teams' records, thereby constituting a natural experiment. The location of the first game alternates each year between the American League and National League champion's home park, with games 1, 2, 6, and 7 all played at the same location. This site selection pattern was instituted in 1924, so we began there. Earlier data are problematic because of erratic and changing championship schedule structures (e.g., some 8- and 9-game series) and because of evidence that some players intentionally lost games. It bears mention that the prestige of professional baseball was low until at least the 1930s. Insofar as the pressure and desirability of the championship derived from the league's prestige, it may have been more appropriate to begin our study during the 1930s rather than in 1924. As we note later, beginning our study in the 1930s would have made our results stronger.

If one team is drastically superior to the other, there is little room for effects such as we sought. To screen out the bulk of such mismatches, we elected to ignore all Series in which the same team won all the games. In baseball, the ten 4-game sweeps were evenly divided between those that ended with home victories and those ending with visitor victories. In basketball (Investigation 2), five of the seven sweeps ended with visitor victories. Overall, then, our results would increase in significance if these mismatched series were included.

Results and Discussion

Performance outcome. Table 1 gives the main results. As hypothesized, the home team tends to win in the first two games but lose the last game, $\chi^2(1, N = 147 \text{ games}) = 4.94$, $p < .05$. This uses the last game, whether it was game 5, 6, or 7. The reversal of the home-team advantage is apparent if the analysis is restricted to defining game 7 as the decisive game: $\chi^2(1, N = 124 \text{ games}) = 3.94$, $p < .05$.

The early years of our archival study did not show the reversal of home-field advantage in decisive games. Thus our results become much stronger if we restrict the analysis to the past 50 years, (1933–1982): $\chi^2(1, N = 129 \text{ games}) = 8.23$, $p < .005$, using all 5-, 6-, and 7-game series.

Alternative analyses. In this article we have emphasized statistics that treat the single game as the unit of analysis. Insofar as different games are not independent observations, the probabilities associated with our statistics may be distorted.

Table 1
World Series Game Results 1924–1982

Games	Winners: Home	Winners: Visitor	Home %
1 and 2	59	39	.602
Last game	20	29	.408
7	10	16	.385

Note. Tabulations exclude 10 Series in which the same team won all the games.

Independence of observations is compromised by the fact that the same two teams play all the games in a given World Series, so these different games may be considered repeated measurements. The problem is further complicated by the fact that the same franchise might appear in successive World Series but with different opponents. Additionally, some individual players have appeared in multiple World Series with different franchises. On the other hand, our practice of combining data for games 1 and 2 might be defended on the grounds that it would be unthinkable for the most important player (the starting pitcher) to perform in both games, so the team's roster is changed in at least one important way.

Two conservative statistical strategies can be used. One is to use the World Series rather than the single game as the unit of analysis. Following the procedures outlined by Darlington (1975), we counted 23 World Series since 1924 in which the home team won the first but lost the last game, and that tally is significantly greater ($p = .045$) than the number of World Series (12) in which the home team lost the first but won the last game. Moreover, restricting the analysis to the past 50 years gives tallies of 22 and 8, respectively, and $p = .008$.

The second strategy is to treat the home team's proportion of success in the early games as a fixed criterion and evaluate whether it falls within the confidence interval for the home team's proportion of success in the last game. This strategy avoids the possibility that using games 1 and 2 artificially inflated the

number of observations, but the information from those data is not lost. We constructed a 99% confidence interval (Hays, 1973) for the home team's success rate in the final game; the proportion of home team victories in the first two games was indeed outside that range. Our hypothesis of the home field disadvantage was thus supported according to these two conservative strategies.

Table 2
Fielding Errors in World Series Games

	Errors per game		Errorless games	
Games	Home	Visitor	Home	Visitor
1 and 2	0.65	1.04	33	18
7	1.31	0.81	6	12

Home Choking or Visitor Excelling?

The home field seems to be an advantage in the early games but a disadvantage in the deciding game. There are two possible explanations for the home team's poor record in the decisive game: Either the home team plays unusually badly (chokes), or the visiting team plays unusually well. For most sports statistics it is impossible to differentiate between these two explanations. For example, a low baseball score could indicate good pitching *or* poor batting.

One statistic that seems exempt from such mutual determinacy is fielding errors. Because it is not possible to learn to bat in such a way as to cause a fielding error, such errors furnish a relatively pure measure of choking. However, the home team has a strong advantage in fielding due to familiarity with the ballpark and any of its idiosyncrasies. The visiting team in the World Series has not played in that particular ballpark all season. On the basis of these considerations, and apart from any choking effects, (a) the visitors should play slightly better by the end of the series than at the beginning because playing the intervening games gives them some familiarity with the field, (b) the home team should show no change across the Series, and (c) the home team should perform consistently better than the visitor.

We restricted this analysis to 7-game series to avoid confounds due to fielding in different ballparks. (Results are quite similar if we used all 5-, 6-, and 7-game series.) Table 2 shows the results.

The home-field disadvantage for decisive contests is evidenced by the reversal of good play. The visitor makes more errors in the first two games, but the home team makes more in the 7th game, $\chi^2(1, N = 143 \text{ errors}) = 7.29$, $p < .01$. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the number of errors per game revealed a significant interaction between team and game, $F(1, 152) = 6.025$, $p < .02$.

The crucial question, however, was whether this interaction was due to improvement by the visitor or choking by the home team. Planned comparisons revealed that the visitor's improvement (by .23 errors per game) was negligible, $t < 1$, *ns*, whereas the home team's deterioration (.66 more errors in the last game than in the first or second) was significant, $t(152) = 2.55$, $p < .02$. Although this measure and analysis is crude, the evidence appears to indicate that the home-field disadvantage in the decisive game is partly attributable to choking by the home team.

A similar conclusion derives from consideration of errorless games. The home team fields flawlessly nearly twice as often as the visitor in the opening games, but the opposite occurs in the seventh game, $\chi^2(1, N = 69$ games$) = 5.33$, $p < .025$. Comparisons of the proportion of flawless games (which avoids the problems of assuming independence of observations), shows a negligible change in the visitor's performance between the first and last games, $z < 1$, *ns*, but a significant deterioration in the home teams' performance, $z = 3.36$, $p < .001$. The difference between the home and visitor is significant, $z = 3.16$, $p < .001$.

Achieving Success or Avoiding Failure?

The incentive structure of game 7 confounds achieving success with avoiding failure. Both teams confront the possibility of both final victory and final defeat. Our hypothesis is that the choking would be caused by the possibility of claiming a desired identity by achieving success. However, the data presented thus far do not rule out the alternative possibility that it is the fear of final defeat that causes choking.

Game 6 distinguishes the two potential sources of pressure. Game 6 begins with one team on the brink of victory and the other team facing defeat, because only one of the teams (whoever has already won 3) can "clinch" the championship in Game 6. We therefore turn to an examination of how the home audience affects Game 6 as a function of whether the home team faces the possibility of final victory (can clinch the championship) or final defeat (must win to "stay alive").

Table 3 provides the results. The home team tends to win when facing elimination, but loses (chokes) when facing final victory, $\chi^2(1, N = 38 \text{ games}) = 4.72$, $p < .05$. Thus the home team's decrement in the decisive game does seem to be due to the chance of achieving success, not the need to avoid failure.

Table 3
Outcome of Game 6 in World Series

	Winners		
Pressure	Home	Visitor	Home %
Home team must win	16	6	.727
Home team can clinch championship	6	10	.375

Investigation 2: Basketball

We wanted to replicate the home-field disadvantage in baseball with another sport and we chose basketball because it also has seven-game series and because it provides a performance measure (free throws or foul shots) whose physical parameters are always the same. Free throws, like fielding errors, have an additional value in that they constitute a performance measure free of mutual determinacy. Basketball, however, contains several drawbacks for archival research. The series is scheduled such that games 1, 2, 5, and 7 occur at the home of the team with the better record. Thus the home field is not randomly assigned but is assigned such that the deciding game will most often be played at the home of the better team (which obscures evidence of any choking by home teams). Additionally, the history of the National Basketball Association (NBA) is rather brief, and in the early years the list of teams and the play-off structure changed almost annually. A final problem is that when professional basketball began to stabilize and gain some national recognition, the league was dominated by one team, a situation that would again tend to override the kinds of effects we sought. (Our hypotheses are based on redefinition of self and therefore apply far less to defending champions than to first-time winners; winning one's eighth consecutive championship redefines oneself to a much lesser extent than does winning one's first.)

Method

Selection of archives For four reasons we chose to begin our investigation with the 1967 championship. (a) 1967 marked the restoration of competitive balance to the league, insofar as the team that had won the eight preceding championships was defeated in a preliminary play-off round. (b) 1967 was the year "when television and the league discovered each other" (Halberstam, 1981, p. 14). National attention and media coverge would presumably enhance both the pressure and prestige of the championship and the self-consciousness of competing for it. (c) 1967 marked the beginning of the rapid expansion of the league size that has characterized the modern NBA. The increase in the number of teams likewise increased the prestige and pressure of the championship. (d) 1967 also marked the beginning of the remarkable inflation of player salaries. Halberstam (1981) argues forcefully that the salary increases escalated the pressure on team members to play well as individuals.

Because 1967–1982 is a brief period, we included semi-final championship series in order to furnish an adequate data base To deal with the problems created by the biased scheduling (games 1, 2, 5, and 7 at the home of the more successful team), we elected to use games 1–4 as the baseline, instead of just the first two games as in the baseball investigation. By using the first four games as the baseline, we bias the data against our hypothesis, for half the first four games occur at the home of the better team, whereas more than half of the decisive games (which can be either game 5, 6, or 7) are played there. We again deleted all seven series in which the same team won all the games; five of these sweeps ended with visitor victories.

Results and Discussion

Performance outcome. Table 4 shows the results. The main result of Investigation 1 was replicated: The home team fares significantly better in the early than in the final games, $\chi^2(1, N = 205 \text{ games}) = 8.19$, $p < .005$. That the last games were won nearly equally by each team must be considered in light of the fact

that the statistically superior team is more likely to be the home team in the deciding game (as ensured by the scheduling rules). The home team thus ought to win a majority of the final games. Their failure to do so appears to be a choking effect.

The same pattern emerges if the analysis is restricted to the 13 series that lasted all seven games. The home team dominated the first four games of those series (won 37, lost 15, .711) but not the seventh games (.385), $\chi^2(1, N = 65 \text{ games}) = 4.86$, $p < .05$.

Alternate analyses. We conducted alternate analyses similar to those reported in Investigation 1 to avoid the problems arising from nonindependence of observations. The home team won the first game and lost the last game in 16 basketball series, but the reverse occurred only 8 times. The difference is marginally significant, $p = .076$.[1] We again constructed the 99% confidence interval for the home team's proportion of success in the final game (Hays, 1973), and this interval did not encompass the home teams' observed success rate in the first four games. The hypothesis thus received support by the second strategy and marginal support by the first strategy.

Individual Performance

As mentioned, we chose basketball because free throws constitute a task that provides a performance measure that is (a) contingent on a player's individual performance, instead of jointly determined, and (b) the same task every time in terms of physical and muscular execution. With regard to the physical execution, however, home spectators often seek to distract or hamper opponents' (visitors') foul shooting by waving and shouting, and it is plausible that these spectators try especially hard in important games. Thus the task may not be always exactly the same in terms of extraneous (distracting) physical stimuli.

Table 4
NBA Championship and Semifinal Series Results 1967–1982

	Winners		
Games	Home	Visitor	Home %
1–4	115	49	.701
Last game	19	22	.463
7	5	8	.385

Table 5
Free-Throw Performance

Performance	Home	Visitor
Games 1–4		
Success (scored)	3368	3412
Failure (missed)	1303	1266
Scoring %	.72	.73
Last game		
Success	873	937
Failure	391	328
Scoring %	.69	.74

The results are shown in Table 5. Home and visiting teams perform about equally well during the first four games, $\chi^2(1, N = 9349 \text{ attempts}) = 0.94$, *ns*, but the visitor performs significantly better than the home team in the final game, $\chi^2(1, N = 2529 \text{ attempts}) = 7.78$, $p < .01$. Moreover, the visitor seems to perform at the same level early and late in the Series, $\chi^2(1, N = 5943 \text{ attempts}) = 0.65$, *ns*, whereas the home team performs worse in the last game than in the first four games, $\chi^2(1, N = 5935 \text{ attempts}) = 4.31$, $p < .05$. On the basis of data from free throws, it appears that the home team does tend to choke in the decisive game.

Inspection of the data revealed one other result. The foul-shooting performance during game 1 resembled that of the last game more than that of the games 2–4. (In game 1, the home team averages only 70.1% success with free throws.) Our model could easily be extended to cover self-attention caused by having just claimed a new identity (championship finalist) and performing in front of a supportive audience, who after all expects the home team to win the championship by the following week. However, it is probably best not to place much interpretive weight on this post hoc ob-

[1] The inclusion of data from the 1983 championships, which occurred during this writing, reduces the probability for this comparison to .054.

servation until more extensive data are available.

General Discussion

Archival studies almost inevitably lack manipulation checks to verify hypothesized mediating variables, so it may be especially important to distinguish carefully between obtained results and hypothesized processes. The present investigation was conducted in the context of the authors' interest in self-presentation and self-attention, but there is no direct evidence that such variables mediated the results. It does seem clear, however, that there is a tendency for the performers to do worse when they are performing in front of a supportive audience and they have the chance to secure the desired identity (i.e., when they have the chance to win the final, decisive contest and are competing at home). We verified this home-field disadvantage by using the records of two major league sports, and it appears to reflect actual performance decrements (choking) by the home team rather than improved performance by the visitor opponent.

The salience of the audience's preferential support seems undeniable and makes a self-attentional (and self-presentational) interpretation quite plausible. Sports audiences clap, shout, and moan in immediate response to breaks and exploits of the home team with sufficient regularity that the players probably can anticipate these responses. The visitor's exploits are met either with relative silence or (occasionally) with expressions of frustration. Because of this differential contingency of audience response, it seems likely that the home players are much more aware than the visitors are of being watched. (Indeed, the audience probably does watch the home players more than the visitors.) This awareness does generate self-attention (Carver & Scheier, 1978; Wicklund, 1975). Moreover, the contingency between audience response and home team's play probably increases the salience of self-evaluation performance implications for the home team. The home team may be more self-conscious than the visitor owing to the greater abundance of self-relevant cues (cf. Hull & Levy, 1979; also Scheier, Fenigstein, & Buss, 1974).

We have emphasized that winning a championship entails a major redefinition of self, in the sense of publicly claiming a desired identity (Schlenker, 1980). That the redefinition attaches more to winning than to losing is supported by Goode's (1978) analysis of prestige and social structure. Goode observed that at the top levels, increments in prestige are radically disproportionate to increments in performance, such that a huge difference in prestige parallels a miniscule difference in performance. Performers' self-presentational goals presumably underscore the asymmetry of winning and losing. Despite the momentary disappointment, losing the championship contest is no disgrace. Gaining entry into the championship series is already prestigious, and the home spectators will continue to love their favorites after a championship loss. Winning the championship, however, denotes a substantial increment in prestige and probably increases the fans' affection for their favorites (cf. Cialdini et al., 1976). Once the championship is imminent, therefore, failing to win it may be doubly disappointing if the failure occurs in front of the home (supportive) audience. To put it another way, it is plausible that the presence of a supportive audience increases the cost of not winning when one is expected to win.

Expectancies

The preceding remarks raise the issue of confounding expectancy and desire in the supportive audience's feelings. This confound may be common in everyday life. Indeed, the term *favorite* is used to denote both the audience's preference and the experts' prediction. The fact that the home team chokes when on the verge of winning but not when on the verge of losing seems consistent with the hypothesis that expectancy effects may contribute to the home-field disadvantage in decisive games, although discussion of expectancies must be recognized as largely conjectural in relation to our investigation.

Expectancy research has produced findings that parallel our own. Among students in a summer enrichment program, Zanna, Sheras, Cooper, and Shaw (1975) found that students show substantial improvement over the summer if either the student or the teacher expected

it but not if both expected it. These authors suggest that pressure may have caused the performance decrements in the mutual-expectancy condition. That interpretation, however, must be clarified. First, students (in the teacher-expectancy condition) were not informed that their teachers expected them to do well. It seems likely, therefore, that the effects of teacher expectancies on student performance had to do with the attentions paid by the teacher to the student. Second, teachers presumably wanted their students to do well, *perhaps especially* the ones tagged as likely "bloomers." (Again, the audience's expectancy and desire for improved performance are hard to separate.) Third, a summer enrichment program undertakes to teach students to succeed where they previously have failed and thus involves a redefinition of self. In that field study, then, the teachers may have constituted an attentive and supportive audience for a performance aimed at self-redefinition, and the result was performance decrements (choking) if the student also expected success.

Qualifications and Conclusion

Two qualifications of the present results should be kept in mind. First, as we noted previously, direct evidence of mediation of effects by self-presentation and self-attention processes is lacking. Second, the home team's tendency to choke in the decisive game seemed absent in the earliest years of either of the leagues we studied (although data are inadequate to prove a change or reversal). This may be because the prestige and importance of a championship depend on the prestige and longevity of the league's reputation. By the same token, the importance of becoming champion has increased over time owing to increasing national attention (which enhances the celebrity status of the star athletes) and increased financial incentives. On the other hand, this could signify a limitation in the effect's generality or a change in the psychological constitution of the players.

We hope that our findings can be applied to performances outside of sports. It seems plausible that supportive audiences can engender performance pressure and self-attention, for example, among students whose parents want them to get top grades, among lovers who feel pressured to meet certain standards of sexual performance, and among lawyers whose firms want and expect courtroom success. Although self-presentation research has investigated the effects of performing in front of neutral audiences (e.g., Baumeister, Cooper, & Skib, 1979; Schlenker, 1975) and critical or evaluative audiences (e.g., Arkin, Appelman & Burger, 1980; Brown, 1968; Henchy & Glass, 1968; Sigall & Gould, 1977), more research is needed on the effects of supportive audiences. Indeed, our results suggest that the presence of supportive others can sometimes be harmful to performance rather than helpful.

References

Arkin, R., Appelman, A., & Burger, J. (1980). Social anxiety, self-presentation, and the self-serving bias in causal attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38,* 23–35.

Baumeister, R. F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin, 91,* 3–26.

Baumeister, R. F. (1984). Choking under pressure: Self-consciousness and paradoxical effects of incentives on skillful performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 610–620.

Baumeister, R. F., Cooper, J., & Skib, B. A. (1979). Inferior performance as a selective response to expectancy: Taking a dive to make a point. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 424–432.

Brown, B. (1968). The effects of need to maintain face in interpersonal bargaining. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 4,* 107–122.

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

Carver, C. S. (1979). A cybernetic model of self-attention processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 1251–1281.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1978). Self-focusing effects of dispositional self-consciousness, mirror presence, and audience presence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36,* 324–332.

Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R., Thorne, A., Walker, M., & Freeman, S. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34,* 366–375.

Darlington, R. B. (1975). *Radicals and squares.* Ithaca, NY: Logan Hill Press.

Duval, S., & Wicklund, R. A. (1971). *A theory of objective self-awareness.* New York: Academic Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Goode, W. J. (1978). *The celebration of heroes: Prestige as a social control system.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Greenberg, J., & Musham, C. (1981). Avoiding and seeking self-focused attention. *Journal of Research in Personality, 15,* 191–200.

Halberstam, D. (1981). *The breaks of the game.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Hays, W. L. (1973). *Statistics for the social sciences* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Henchy, T., & Glass, D. (1968). Evaluation apprehension and the social facilitation of dominant and subordinate responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10,* 446–454.

Hull, J. G., & Levy, A. S. (1979). The organizational functions of the self: An alternative to the Duval and Wicklund model of self-awareness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 756–768.

Kant, I. (1956). *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* [Critique of Pure Reason]. Hamburg: Meiner (Original work published 1787)

Kimble, G., & Perlmuter, L. (1970) The problem of volition. *Psychological Review, 77,* 361–384.

Scheier, M. F., Fenigstein, A., & Buss, A. H. (1974). Self-awareness and physical aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10,* 264–273.

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* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schlenker, B R. (1982). Translating actions into attitudes: An identity-analytic approach to the explanation of social conduct. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 15, pp. 194–247). New York: Academic Press.

Schlenker, B. R. (in press). Identities, identifications, and relationships. In V. Derlega (Ed.), *Communication, intimacy, and close relationships.* New York: Academic Press.

Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M R. (1982). Social anxiety and self-presentation: A conceptualization and model. *Psychological Bulletin, 92,* 641–669.

Sigall, H., & Gould, R. (1977). The effects of self-esteem and evaluator demandingness on effort expenditure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35,* 12–20.

Steenbarger, B. N., & Aderman, D. (1979). Objective self-awareness as a nonaversive state: Effect of anticipating discrepancy reduction. *Journal of Personality, 47,* 330–339.

Wicklund, R. A. (1975). Objective self-awareness In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 233–275). New York: Academic Press.

Zanna, M. P., Sheras, P. L., Cooper, J., & Shaw, C. (1975). Pygmalion and Galatea: The interactive effect of teacher and students expectancies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11,* 279–287.

Received August 3, 1983
Revision received December 19, 1983 ■

Manuscripts Accepted for Publication in the Section Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes

Assumed Similarity and Opinion Certainty R. Holtz and N. Miller (University of Southern California, Social Science Research Institute, Los Angeles, California 90007)

The Influence of Voice Satisfaction on Satisfaction With Leaders: Exploring the Meaning of Process Control. T. Tyler (Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60201), K. Rasinski, and N. Spodick.

Content-Free Measures of Speech: Some Methodological Considerations. P. G. Swingle (School of Psychology, University of Ottawa, 651 Cumberland, K1N 6N5 Canada).

What You Say and How You Say It: The Contribution of Speech Content and Voice Quality to Judgments of Others. M. O'Sullivan (Human Interaction Laboratory, University of California, San Francisco, California 94143), P. Ekman, W. Friesen, and K. Scherer.

Number of Coalitions and Resources as Sources of Power in Coalition Bargaining. D. Kravitz (Department of Psychology, Kastle Hall, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0044) and J. Iwaniszek.

Sex Differences in Group Interaction and Task Performance. W. Wood (Department of Psychology, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas 77843-4235), D. Polek, and C. Aiken.

Ethnocentrism and Causal Attribution in Southeast Asia. M. Hewstone (Universitaet Tuebingen Psychologisches Institut, Friedrichstrasse 21, 7400 Tuebingen 1, West Germany) and C. Ward.