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ABSTRACT

The present work is an initial investigation into a programmatic study of the personal and interpersonal consequences of emotion regulation. In the present studies, participants’ emotional response and self-presentational behaviors were assessed in response to managing their reactions to social exclusion feedback using reappraisal—a strategy in which evaluations of the relevance of events influence subsequent emotional responses. As expected, results indicated that participants who evaluated the social exclusion event as irrelevant to their selves experienced less emotional distress than participants who evaluated the event as relevant and participants assigned to the control condition. Unexpectedly, gender did not influence the emotional outcome. It was also expected that participants who reappraised the event would engage in less effective self-presentation strategies than participants that did not. This hypothesis was partially supported.
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CHAPTER I

Emotional and Social Consequences of Reappraising Social Exclusion

Emotions are an adaptive part of life. Emotions signal self-relevant changes in the environment (Lazarus, 1991a), facilitate rational decision-making (Damasio, 1994), provide internal cues about the goodness or badness of the environment (Schwartz & Clore, 1983), and coordinate thoughts (Oatley & Johnson-Laird, 1987) and behavioral responses (Frijda, 1987) to self-relevant events. In short, emotions are personally beneficial. Emotions are also an adaptive part of interpersonal or social life (see Keltner & Gross, 1999). Keltner and Haidt (2001) argued that emotions facilitate proper social interaction. Averill (1980) refers to emotions as social roles, which are used as guidelines or norms for proper social responding. Indeed, specific emotional states, such as embarrassment (Keltner & Buswell, 1997) and guilt (Tangney & Dearing, 2002), signal violations of social norms and promote proper social action.

Conversely, emotions can be and are at times maladaptive. That is, emotions are causes or contributors to self-destructive and socially inappropriate behaviors (see Baumeister, 1997). Indeed, many diagnosable mental illnesses are rooted in the experience of emotion (e.g., depression and anxiety; Barlow, 1991). Furthermore, Keltner and Kring (1998) assert that mental disorders caused by heightened or intense experiences of emotion (e.g., phobias, depression) or the absence of emotion (e.g., schizophrenia) are characterized, in part, by social dysfunction (e.g., inappropriate interactions). Therefore, emotions can also be personally and interpersonally maladaptive.
Research briefly reviewed here has implicated that the experience of emotion produces either beneficial or harmful personal and interpersonal outcomes. This review also indicates that whether individuals’ experience of emotion causes beneficial or harmful outcomes depends on the extent to which individuals manage their emotions. Accordingly, these outcomes then are influenced by the regulation of emotion as much as the experience of emotion itself (see Gross, 1999a for relevant comments). Emotion regulation researchers have traditionally focused on the personal outcomes (e.g., decreased emotional distress) of emotion regulation (see Gross, 1998a; 2002), but little research has investigated the social or interpersonal effects of emotion regulation. Therefore, this work is an initial investigation into a program of research intended to investigate the personal (i.e., subsequent experience of emotion) and social (e.g., self-presentational effects) outcomes or consequences of engaging in emotion regulation. It is reasoned that these outcomes may vary as a function of the type of relationship in which the emotion arises, the kind of stimulus that produces the experience of emotion, and the type of emotion regulation strategy employed (see Figure 1).

Specifically, the present work explored the personal and interpersonal outcomes of engaging in a particular emotion regulation strategy—reappraisal. Reappraisal is a strategy in which individuals evaluate the meaning or relevance of an event, such that threatening events can be evaluated as irrelevant to the self and, in turn, attenuate the subsequent emotional distress. Within a social context, it was expected that engaging in this regulation strategy in response to a threatening event (i.e., social exclusion) would reduce the experience of emotional distress. However, the capacity to self-regulate relies on a limited resource, such that regulating one aspect of the self (e.g., emotion regulation)
impairs subsequent regulation of other behaviors that require self-regulation (e.g., self-presentation; Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice; see Schmeichel & Baumeister, 2004 for a review). Accordingly, it was also expected that reevaluating the event with the intention of moderating subsequent emotional reactions would cause these individuals to engage in less effective self-presentation than individuals who did not reappraise the event. Across three experiments, these key hypotheses were explored. Experiments 1 and 2 investigated the effectiveness of engaging in this strategy to manage the personal emotional distress caused by social exclusion, and Experiment 3 investigated the social consequences of engaging in this strategy in the context of the social exclusion event.

*The Need to Belong*

Humankind is a social animal. Indeed, many researchers have suggested that the need to belong is a fundamental, innate need (Fromm, 1955; Horney, 1942). Bowlby’s (1960; 1973; 1980) and Harlow’s (1958; 1959) work indicated an innate need for attachment. Erikson (1975) suggested that the development of personality is influenced by individuals’ adaptation to an ever-evolving social network. Maslow (1970) asserted that the motivation to belong arises only after the motivation for physical safety and basic physiological needs have been met. Baumeister and Leary (1995) proposed that “human beings have a pervasive drive to form and maintain at least a minimum quantity of lasting, positive, and significant interpersonal relationships” (p. 497).

Empirical support for this is provided, in part, by illustrating the many positive outcomes of fulfilling this need. Belongingness is associated with physical health (Uchino, Cacioppo, & Kiecolt-Glaser, 1996) and subjective well-being (Diener & Seligman, 2004). Individuals who have social support show less impact from stress
(DeLongis, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1988) and tolerate physical pain better (Brown, Sheffield, Leary, & Robinson, 2003) than individuals without social support.

The fundamental nature of the belongingness need is also illustrated in the way individuals evaluate or perceive themselves. Cooley (1902) argued that individuals’ evaluations of themselves are a reflection of how others’ view them (also see Tice and Wallace, 2003). This suggests that individuals’ self-concepts and the evaluations of those self-concepts (i.e., self-esteem) are intimately connected to their social networks. Accordingly, Leary and Baumeister (2000) suggested that self-esteem serves as a sociometer—an internal, innate index of one’s inclusionary status. That is, individuals’ self-esteem is influenced by the perception that others view them as acceptable. To be sure, MacDonald, Saltzman, and Leary (2003) demonstrated that individuals’ trait self-esteem was dependent upon more than the perception that they possessed good qualities, but that these qualities increased the likelihood of social approval. Thus, self-feelings are highly dependent on the perception of social approval.

Furthermore, Leary, Tambor, Terdal, and Downs (1995) empirically demonstrated that when individuals’ belongingness need was threatened, they experienced less self-esteem. In this study, participants were led to believe that they would either work with other participants or work alone on an upcoming task. Furthermore, participants were led to believe that their participation status (i.e., working with others or alone) was due either to random assignment or to the other participants’ preference for working with them. When they believed their participation status was randomly assigned there was no difference in their subsequent self-esteem. However, participants who believed they would work alone because their fellow participants’ preferred not to work with them (i.e.,
socially excluded) had significantly less self-esteem than participants who believed that they would work with others because their fellow participants preferred to work with them (i.e., socially accepted). These data indicate that a threat to one’s belongingness need decreases subjective self-evaluations, but this is highly dependent upon one’s perception that it is a threat (as opposed to random assignment).

Leary and colleagues (2003) also demonstrated that threats to one’s belongingness need impacts individuals’ self-evaluations, even when they believe that their self-esteem is independent of others’ approval. Thus, how individuals’ view themselves is strongly associated with their inclusion in a social network. While all individuals’ self-esteem is dependent upon their inclusionary status, Josephs, Markus, and Tafarodi (1992) demonstrated that males and females differ in the extent to which interpersonal relationships influence self-esteem. Josephs and colleagues showed that females’ self-esteem is more dependent upon establishing interpersonal relationships than males, whose self-esteem is more dependent upon establishing independence. Therefore, individuals’ self-esteem is dependent on the extent to which social relationships are a central part of their self-concept. For females, this is particularly important, and for males, this is less important than establishing independence (see Cross & Madson, 1997). Important to the present work, this suggests that threats to one’s belongingness need could be more emotionally impactful upon females than males.

In summary, then, the need to belong is a fundamental and pervasive drive. Fulfilling this need has both physiological and psychological benefits. When this need is not met or threatened in some way, individuals will evaluate themselves more negatively
(i.e., experience lower self-esteem), but individuals’ self-esteem is not influenced by the development and maintenance of interpersonal relationships equally across gender.

Effects of Social Exclusion

A broad literature exists on social exclusion (Twenge, Catanese, & Baumeister, 2003), social rejection (Buckley, Winkel, & Leary, 2004), ostracism (Sommer, Williams, Ciarocco, & Baumeister, 2001), or relational devaluation (Leary, Springer, Negel, Ansell, & Evans, 1998). For the present work, the term social exclusion is used to encompass all of these and is defined as a threat to one’s current or future need to belong. For example, individuals who believe that they are perceived as poor potential friends would meet this definition because such feedback would indicate that they have or will have problems fulfilling this need. This broad literature typically investigates the consequences of being socially excluded, and as consistent with the theme of this work, the consequences can be classified under two broad categories—personal and interpersonal consequences. While these outcomes or effects of social exclusion can be dichotomized as falling under two categories, a common cause of these outcomes is present—a failure of self-regulation. That is, a review of the social exclusion literature indicates that social exclusion impairs self-regulatory processes. As support of this, the personal and social consequences of social exclusion will be reviewed.

Personal Consequences of Social Exclusion. Overall, the effect of social exclusion on a personal level is most clearly demonstrated in the experience of emotional distress. Baumeister and Tice (1990), in an extensive review of the literature, argued that the primary cause of anxiety is social exclusion. Social exclusion or the threat of social exclusion prompts an automatic anxious response. Furthermore, researchers (Jones, 1990;
Leary, 1990; Leary, Koch, & Hechenbleikner, 2001) assert that social exclusion results in a wide range of negative emotions, such as loneliness, jealousy, embarrassment, guilt, and shame. Leary et al., (1998) demonstrated a strong positive correlation between individuals’ *hurt feelings* and the perception that others did not value their relationship as much as they did. Long-term social exclusion results in self-imposed isolation, learned helplessness, pessimism, and depression (Williams & Zadro, 2001). Furthermore, emotional distress does not differ as a function of whether the social exclusion is extreme (i.e., “I definitely do not want to work with this person”) or moderate (“I somewhat do not want to work with this person;” Buckley, et al., 2003, p. 16).

Indeed, over a variety of experimental manipulations, social exclusion produced emotional distress. For example, Williams, Cheung, and Choi (2000) utilized a clever paradigm, in which participants engaged in a virtual ball-toss game over the internet. During the course of the game, participants were excluded from the ball toss game (i.e., the virtual ball is not tossed to them anymore). Results indicated that participants’ emotional distress increased as the number of times they were tossed the virtual ball decreased. Williams et al., (2002) demonstrated that socially excluded individuals equally experienced emotional distress when social exclusion occurred through computer mediated social interactions (e.g., chat rooms, cyber-ball, etc.) or in face-to-face encounters with others. Emotional distress occurs in ‘subtle’ social exclusion episodes in which one is ostracized from a text messaging conversation (Smith & Williams, 2004). Perhaps, most surprisingly is that participants experienced emotional distress when excluded from a virtual ball-toss game, even when they believed the number of times
they received the ball was preprogrammed and not a result of insult (Zadro, Williams, & Richardson, 2004).

Overall, the literature clearly reveals a pattern of emotional distress, but research also demonstrates that social exclusion bears other personal costs. For example, Twenge et al., (2003) demonstrated that socially excluded participants were more lethargic, had slower reaction times, were more likely to feel that life was meaningless, and perceived the passage of time to be slower than socially accepted participants. Baumeister, Twenge, and Nuss, demonstrated that socially excluded participants performed worse on an intelligence test (Experiment 1), on a difficult recall task (Experiment 2), and on a test of analytical ability (Experiment 3) than socially accepted participants. Notably, research indicates that the perception of time (Vohs & Schmeichel, 2003) and intellectual performance (Schmeichel, Vohs, & Baumeister, 2003) utilizes self-regulatory resources. Thus, poor performances here may indicate a failure in the self-regulatory process.

In a more obvious demonstration of self-regulatory failure, Twenge, Catanese, and Baumeister (2002) showed that socially excluded participants engaged in self-defeating behaviors, such as making riskier decisions, engaging in unhealthy behaviors (e.g., choosing a candy bar over a granola bar), and procrastinating in practicing math problems that were ostensibly designed to access intelligence. Also, DeWall and Baumeister (2006) demonstrated that socially excluded individuals exposed themselves to painful stimuli longer than socially accepted individuals.

Taken together, the personal outcomes of emotional distress, the misperception of time, poor intellectual performance, self-defeating behaviors, and exposure to painful stimuli all indicate a breakdown in the self-regulatory processes. That is, the literature
reviewed here suggests that when socially excluded, individuals are more likely to experience high levels of emotional distress, and engage in behavior (e.g., exposure to painful stimuli) and thought (e.g., the misperception of time) patterns that are associated with self-regulatory failure. Furthermore, a review of the interpersonal costs of social exclusion suggests the same self-regulatory failure.

Interpersonal Consequences of Social Exclusion. Beyond the negative impact on one’s emotions and other personal processes, Baumeister and Leary (1995) argued that the need to belong could be an underlying explanation for much of social behavior. Indeed, research has empirically supported the idea that social exclusion has a wide range of effects on social behavior. Perhaps, the most tragic example of inappropriate (and presumably, unregulated) behavior resulting from social exclusion is school violence. Leary, Kowalski, Smith, and Phillips (2003) identified social exclusion as one of the primary causes in many recent (i.e., 1995-2001) school shootings. In a case study investigation of these school shootings, they identified several “exclusion-like” behaviors (e.g., teasing, name-calling, etc.) present in 12 of the 16 cases. In 10 of these 12 cases, some form of explicit social exclusion (e.g., break-up, suspended, rejected by Marines) had taken place. While an archival case study is limited in its ability to make cause-and-effect conclusions, these findings are compelling testimonies of the powerful impact social exclusion could have.

As empirical evidence of the cause-and-effect relationship between social exclusion and aggression, Twenge, Baumeister, Tice, and Stucke (2001) demonstrated that socially excluded participants engaged in more aggressive behavior than participants who were not socially excluded. Specifically, Twenge and colleagues developed a clever
paradigm where participants were led to believe that personality scales they completed could predict the quantity and quality of their future social status. Participants were told that they were likely to end up alone in the future (future-alone), end up with good relationships in the future (future-belonging), or become frequently injured in the future (future-misfortune). Participants assigned to the future-alone condition rated a fellow participant, who they believed had criticized an essay they wrote, more negatively than those assigned to the future-belonging or future-misfortune conditions (Experiment 1). Socially excluded individuals also administered higher levels of aversive noise than socially accepted participants to someone who ostensibly gave a negative evaluation of their essay, even though this person did not contribute to their social exclusion (Experiment 4). Notably, resisting aggressive behavior is a process that relies on the regulatory system (DeWall, Baumeister, Stillman, & Galliot, 2007). Twenge, Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, and Bartels (2007) also demonstrated that social exclusion causes individuals to engage in less prosocial acts of behavior.

Again, these studies indicate that social exclusion contributes to failures in self-regulation. In particular, social exclusion is linked to violence, aggression, and a decrease in prosocial responding. Together with empirical work that documents many personal costs of social exclusion (e.g., emotional distress), it is reasonable to conclude that the primary cost of social exclusion is self-regulatory failure.

To be sure, Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, and Twenge (2005) demonstrated that social exclusion impairs self-regulation. Participants who believed they would have a lonely future drank less of a bad-tasting (but healthy) drink than participants who believed they would have a socially rich future and those who believed their future would
be marred by many accidents (Experiment 1). Participants anticipating being alone were less persistent at solving a difficult puzzle than participants assigned to control conditions (Experiment 3). Only when participants were promised monetary incentive or experimentally induced to be self-aware (placed in front of a mirror) did the effect on self-regulation go away (Experiments 5 and 6).

Because social exclusion impairs self-regulation, socially excluded participants should be less able to manage their emotional distress or other aspects of the self that facilitate social acceptance (e.g., self-presentation). From an emotion regulation standpoint, strategies used to manage emotional distress vary in the degree to which they tax the regulatory system (Gross, 1998b; 2002). Therefore, the capacity or ability to manage emotional distress and other aspects of the self that are related to social acceptance may depend on the use of an efficient strategy, such as reappraisal.

Reappraisal

Reappraisal has recently received a great deal of theoretical and empirical attention in the wake of Gross’ (1999b) process model of emotion, which suggests that emotions can be managed following or prior to its experience (Gross, 1998b). He distinguished between the strategies that either follow or precede the experience of emotion, calling them response- and antecedent-focused coping options, respectively. One common response-focused coping strategy explored in this line of work is suppression, which is characterized by inhibiting emotional expressions in response to a past emotional event; whereas, one common antecedent-strategy explored in this line of work is reappraisal, where one alters the meaning of a future emotional event (Gross, 2002). As a result of a programmatic exploration of these two strategies, one common
theme is evident—suppressing one’s expressive reaction to an emotional event is costly to the regulatory system and ineffective (Gross & Levenson, 1993; 1997). Specifically, evidence from this line of work consistently demonstrates that engaging in this strategy fails to alleviate emotional distress (Gross & Levenson, 1993; 1997), inhibits cognitive processes (Richards & Gross, 2000; see also Richards, 2004 for a review), and individuals who have a preference for engaging in this strategy experience more negative and less positive emotions (Gross & John, 2003). In fact, such individuals are less clear about what they are feeling (Barrett, Gross, Christensen, & Benvenuto, 2001), and in turn, individuals who are unclear about their emotional experience are less effective at regulating their emotional experiences (see Gohm, 2000; Gohm, Corser, & Dalsky, 2005).

Suppression also carries an interpersonal cost (e.g., Richards, Butler, & Gross, 2003). In a representative demonstration of this conclusion, Butler, et al. (2003) conducted an experiment in which participants watched an emotional film, after which they were instructed to interact with a fellow participant. Specifically, participants were given instructions to either interact with their partner while suppressing their expressive reactions, while thinking about the situation in a way that makes them calm, or provided with no instruction. While not statistically significant, interaction partners indicated a lower level of social rapport with suppressors than with participants who thought about the situation in a dispassionate way (Experiment 1), and interaction partners indicated a statistically significant lower level of social rapport with suppressors than with participants who were assigned to a control condition (Experiment 2). Additionally, participants who interacted with suppressors showed increases in blood pressure,
whereas, participants who interacted with those who thought about the situation in a dispassionate way showed lower blood pressure levels than participants who interacted with controls (Experiment 1).

Thus, suppression is ineffective at dealing with emotional distress and interferes with interpersonal processes. Nevertheless, not all emotion regulation strategies have these same costs. Gross (1998a; 2002) suggests that suppression is ineffective and hinders interpersonal processes because this strategy responds to emotional processes, as opposed to altering the way individuals approach emotional events. Therefore, the implication for the present study is that dealing with the emotional impact of social exclusion after the event may be ineffective and bear personal and interpersonal consequences, regardless of the strategy employed. However, Gross (1998b; Gross & John, 2003) demonstrated that altering the way one appraises an event prior to experiencing the event is a personally and interpersonally effective. For example, Gross (1998b) demonstrated that reappraisal was effective at dealing with emotional distress. Furthermore, Gross and John (2003) demonstrated that those who have a preference for altering the meaning of an event as a way of moderating emotional experiences tend to disclose more to others and have closer relationships. To understand reappraisal processes, the literature covering the theoretical approach supporting this strategy will be reviewed.

Theoretical background of reappraisal. Recently, reappraisal has garnered much theoretical and empirical attention due to the extensive work by Gross and colleagues. However, this strategy has a long empirical history prior to Gross’ work and it is important to understand its theoretical foundation, namely in the work of Lazarus and
colleagues (Ellsworth & Smith, 1988; Lazarus, 1984; 1991a; 1991b; Smith, 1991). The construct *reappraisal* emerges from a cognitive approach to emotion (Lazarus, 1991a; 1991b). The primary assumption of this approach to emotion is that cognition precedes the emotional experience (Lazarus, 1984; 1991c). Specifically, Lazarus and Smith (1988) assert that a particular type of cognitive process must proceed the experience of an emotion—*appraisal*, which they describe as a process of evaluating an environmental encounter as personally relevant to one’s self (e.g., a threat to one’s belongingness need).

It is important and appropriate to characterize appraisal as a process (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985). Indeed, the entire *emotional episode* is a process, which may extend beyond the actual generation of the felt emotion and include action tendencies (i.e., innate behavioral reactions) that follow the experienced emotion (see Frijda, 1987; Frijda, Kuipers, & ter Schure, 1989) and options for coping with the emotional experience (Lazarus, 1993). Specifically, Lazarus (1991a) describes the generation of an emotion as a four-step process.

The initial step in the generation of an emotion is *anticipation*. Here the expectations about an upcoming event may precipitate *anticipatory coping*, allowing one to prepare for or alter their evaluation of an upcoming situation (Lazarus, 1991a; Folkman & Lazarus, 1985). While Gross (1998a; Gross & John, 2003) characterizes reappraisal as an anticipatory style of coping, *reappraisal* is not traditionally categorized as anticipatory coping. This does not mean that *appraisal* prior to an event in which one evaluates the event in a non-threatening manner is an ineffective coping method. In fact, it can be quite effective. For example, Lazarus and Alfert (1964) demonstrated that providing participants with a threat-focused or non-threat-focused statement before they
watched a disturbing film altered subsequent reactions to the film. This is similar to the way in which Gross describes reappraisal (e.g., Gross, 1998b), in which participants are given statements about an upcoming event that influence the evaluation of the event and subsequent emotional reactions. However, Lazarus and Alfert (1964) are clear that their study was “merely employing appropriate orientation statements” to explore whether this would “alter cognitive appraisal” (p. 196; italics added for emphasis). Thus, they provided an orientation, which resulted in what Lazarus (1968) refers to as a benign appraisal (i.e., non-threatening and resulting in no emotion). Consequently, Gross’ typical approach to reappraisal is inconsistent with traditional perspectives of reappraisal.

From a traditional cognitive approach, appraisal is engaged in during the second step— the *provocation*. The appraisal process involves a primary and a secondary appraisal (Lazarus, 1991a). *Primary appraisal* is the process of assessing whether an event is either harmful or beneficial to the self (Lazarus, 1991a; 1991b). During the *secondary appraisal* one evaluates whether any of the available coping options will attenuate the environmental threat or the emotional impact of the environmental threat (or benefit; Lazarus, 1991a; 1991c). The primary process “provides the emotional heat in an encounter,” while the secondary process together with the primary process produces a specific emotion (Lazarus, 1991a, p. 145).

The third stage of the generation of emotion is referred to as the *unfolding*. The cognitive approach to emotion asserts that the experience of emotion is caused by a change in the person-environment relationship. Therefore, the unfolding process simply emphasizes the fact that the person-environment relationship is dynamic, such that the person and environment (e.g., a social context) influence subsequent appraisals and
emotional responses. Indeed, there are two ways in which individuals can alter their subsequent appraisals and, in turn, emotional response to events. *Problem-focused coping* is characterized by any action taken to alter the environment in order to avoid or rid one’s self of the threat (Lazarus, 1991a; 1993; Smith, 1991). The second class of coping options is referred to as *emotion-focused coping*, where individuals attempt to change their appraisal of the event or divert their attention from the event (Lazarus, 1991a; 1993; Smith, 1991). This second type of coping alters the way we think about or pay attention to an event in order to change the emotional experience. Thus, in a person-environment encounter, problem-focused coping attempts to alter the environment, whereas, emotion-focused coping attempts to alter the person (Lazarus, 1991a). These strategies influence subsequent appraisals and emotional responses.

The final stage of the emotional episode is the *outcome* or the resulting emotion. Overall, this brief review of the emotion episode suggests that individuals can alter their appraisal of a future event and direct their emotional experience during that event. Alternatively, individuals can change subsequent reactions to an event by altering the meaning of that event (i.e., emotion-focused coping), and in turn, reappraise the event to change their emotional response to it.

Like all emotion management strategies, reappraisal relies on one’s ability or capacity to self-regulate. As noted, though, social exclusion is a threatening event that impairs individuals’ ability or capacity to self-regulate. Furthermore, it is not entirely clear the extent to which reappraisal would alter subsequent behaviors that are important for social acceptance (e.g., self-presentation). To anticipate later arguments, individuals’ ability to manage emotion often interferes with subsequent processes that require self-
regulation. Therefore, individuals’ ability to manage emotion may interfere with successive self-presentation.

*Self-regulation & Self-Presentation*

Self-regulation is a broad term that describes individuals’ exertion of control over thoughts, feelings, and behavior. Recent work in self-regulation has demonstrated that individuals’ capacity to self-regulate relies on a limited resource (Baumeister, et al., 1998; Gailliot et al., 2007; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Accordingly, the resource or capacity to self-regulate limits one’s ability to manage multiple aspects of the self (e.g., emotion, behavior, and thought) during a relatively short duration of time. Indeed, many empirical studies in this area utilize a two-regulation task paradigm in which participants engage in a form of self-regulation (or assigned to a control task), and then engage in another task that relies on self-regulatory processes. The typical pattern of results shows that those individuals who had engaged in a previous self-regulation task perform worse on a successive self-regulation task than control participants do. For example, Vohs and Heatherton (2000) demonstrated that participants who resisted a tempting snack persisted less in completing a difficult task than control participants (Experiment 2), and participants who suppressed their emotional reactions to a sad movie clip ate more ice cream than participants who did not suppress their expressive reactions to the sad movie clip (Experiment 3). Similarly, Baumeister, et al. (1998; Experiment 3) demonstrated that suppressing emotional reactions to a Robin Williams comedy routine (happy condition) or a clip of *Terms of Endearment* (sad condition) resulted in participants’ inability to perform well at unscrambling letters. Overall, then, there is clear indication that the self’s executive function is a limited resource.
Particularly relevant to the present work is individuals’ ability to manage behaviors that require (a) self-regulation and (b) are important for social acceptance. Therefore, the present work addresses the social outcome—in particularly, self-presentational cost—of reappraising social exclusion. Does self-regulation impair subsequent self-presentation? To address this question, Vohs, Baumeister, and Ciarocco (2005) had participants engage in acts requiring or relying on self-regulatory resources and then evaluated participants’ subsequent self-presentation. Results indicated that self-regulation does impair successive self-presentation. For example, participants who suppressed their thoughts about a white bear scored worse on a measure intended to access individuals’ ability to manage their self-presentation than participants who did not suppress their thoughts about a white bear (Experiment 5). Participants who were asked to suppress their emotions to a funny video clip were more likely to select topics of inappropriate intimacy (either too high or low) when engaging in a conversation with a fellow participant than participants who were not asked to suppress their emotions (Experiment 6). Participants who regulated their attention in a prior task scored lower on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) than participants who did not regulate their attention in the prior task. The MCSDS is a measure of desirable responding. Therefore, scoring lower on this measure indicates a less effective method of self-presentation.

Overall, this work suggests that self-regulation is limited by one’s capacity to self-regulate. In particular, regulating one aspect of the self (e.g., emotion) impairs subsequent regulation of self-presentation. Given this line of work, it is expected that
engaging in emotion regulation will impair ensuing self-presentation, even though reappraisal is a strategy that is less taxing on self-regulatory resources.

Of course, the assumption is based on the belief that individuals would desire to create a good impression. To be sure, Maner, DeWall, Baumeister, and Schaller (2007) recently indicated that socially exclude individuals show an increased desire to form social connections and engage in behaviors that could potentially increase the chance of forming social bonds. Of importance to the present work, males and females differ in the degree to which they attempt to form social bonds after being socially excluded. Williams and Sommer (1997) demonstrated that socially excluded females engaged in less social loafing than socially excluded males. This is consistent with the previous literature reviewed, suggesting that interpersonal relationships are more central to females’ self-concept than males’ self-concept (Cross & Madson, 1997; Josephs et al., 1992).

Taken together, individuals desire to maintain social connections. Nevertheless, the limited capacity of the regulatory system impairs socially excluded individuals’ ability to manage their self-presentations after managing the emotional distress caused by social exclusion. Reappraisal is efficient and interpersonally beneficial; therefore, this strategy may effectively manage emotional distress, but it is not entirely clear the extent to which it will impair subsequent self-presentations.

Overview of the Present Work

The literature reviewed here indicates that the need to belong is a fundamental and pervasive need. Threats to this need cause emotional distress and impair self-regulatory processes. From an emotion regulation perspective, though, strategies used to manage emotion vary in the extent to which they tax the regulatory system. Reappraisal
is one such strategy that is effective at attenuating emotional distress in an efficient manner (Gross, 2002). However, even if individuals are able to manage emotional distress caused by social exclusion, the capacity to regulate other behaviors relevant to social acceptance (e.g., self-presentation) is impaired (Vohs, et al., 2005).

To address these issues, four hypotheses were proposed. First, it was expected that individuals would reappraise (i.e., reevaluate) the meaning of a social exclusion threat. Second, it was expected that individuals’ reappraisal of this event would moderate their subsequent emotional distress. Third, it was expected that reappraisal strategies used to alter the experience of emotional distress would inhibit subsequent self-presentation. Finally, it was expected that individuals’ experience of emotional distress and self-presentation behaviors would be moderated by gender. Experiments 1 and 2 addressed the emotional outcome of reappraising social exclusion. Experiment 1 explored the extent to which females were able to reappraise a social exclusion event and the extent to which reappraisal was effective at moderating emotional distress reactions. Experiment 2 addressed the effectiveness of reappraisal and the influence of gender in this process. Experiment 3 addressed the social outcome of engaging in reappraisal by identifying self-presentation behaviors that were differentially engaged in by female participants in Experiment 1 and male and female participants in Experiment 2.
CHAPTER II
Experiment 1

Reappraisal is as an efficient emotion management strategy (see Gross & John, 2003), but it relies on cognitive processes (Lazarus, 1991b; 1993). Although reappraisal is conservative in taxing cognitive energy (Richards, 2004), researchers demonstrated that social exclusion produces deficits in cognitive functioning (Baumeister, et al., 2002) and the desire to self-regulate (Baumeister, et al., 2002). Therefore, it is not entirely clear whether individuals will have the cognitive resources or motivation to regulate the emotional impact of social exclusion. Therefore, the purpose of this experiment was to explore (a) whether participants were able to reappraise a social exclusion event, and, in turn, (b) effectively moderated its emotional impact. To investigate these questions, participants engaged in a first impression interview session with an experimental confederate, purportedly designed to assess their potential as a friend or acquaintance. After the interview, they were led to believe that the confederate perceived them as a poor potential friend. Participants were randomly assigned to reappraise the first impression interview session as a valid or an invalid method for assessing the qualities of a potential friend or were assigned to a control group. After engaging in another first impression interview session with the confederate and subsequent exclusion feedback, participants completed measures of emotion and rated the extent to which they believed these first impression sessions were valid means of assessing the quality of a potential friend. It was expected that participants who reappraised the event as an invalid means of determining their potential as a friend would rate the validity of the interview session
lower and feel better (i.e., more positive emotion) than participants who reappraised the event as valid means of determining their potential as a friend and control participants.

Method

Participants

One-hundred sixteen female participants volunteered to participate for course credit. Two participants were excluded from the data analysis because they requested their data not be used, 12 participants were excluded from the data analysis because they did not follow instructions during the reappraisal task (i.e., their writing was not consistent with instructions), and 17 participants were excluded from the data analysis because they suspected that the feedback was false. Five participants were excluded because they did not follow instructions and they suspected the feedback was false. Included in the analysis were data from 80 participants (77.5% Caucasian, 18.8% African American, 2.5% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1.3% other), whose mean age was 18.65 (SD = .96).

Materials

Personality Scales. Participants completed the Trait Meta-Mood Scale (TMMS; Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey, & Palfai, 1995) and the Emotional Intensity Scale (EIS; Bachorowski & Braaten, 1994). These are self-report instruments assessing individual differences in the experience of emotion. The purpose of these instruments was to provide credibility to the cover story, where participants were led to believe that these scales would be used to measure the qualities of individuals perceived as good friends or acquaintances; however, these data were not used in the analyses and will not be discussed further.
**Relationship Closeness Induction Task.** The Relationship Closeness Induction Task (RCIT; Sedikides, Campbell, Reeder, Elliot, 1999) is used in research (e.g., Twenge et al., 2003) as an empirically validated means of inducing relationship closeness. The RCIT is a series of questions, which progress from impersonal questions (e.g., “What is your first name?”) to increasingly more personal questions (e.g., “What is one emotional experience you’ve had with a good friend?”). While only a subset of these questions were used across two interview sessions during this study (see Appendix A), the progression to more personal questions was consistent with the complete RCIT. Also, the questions asked in the first interview session were different, but comparable with those asked in the second interview session.

**Emotion Measures.** Participants’ emotional reactions to social exclusion were assessed in two ways. Participants were explicitly asked to indicate how they felt while reading the feedback. Participants responded by marking their answers on three scales ranging from 1 (very unhappy) to 9 (very happy), 1 (very unpleasant) to 9 (very pleasant), and 1 (very negative) to 9 (very positive). Reliability was high between these items before the social exclusion feedback (Cronbach’s α = .89) and after the social exclusion feedback (Cronbach’s α = .93).

Participants’ emotional reaction to social exclusion was also assessed implicitly. Specifically, participants viewed 15 neutral pictures taken from the International Affect Picture System (IAPS; Lang, Bradley, & Cuthbert, 1999) and rated their perception of the emotional valence in each of the pictures on a scale ranging from 1 (very negative) to 9 (very positive). Fifteen individual pictures were randomly presented on a standard 17” monitor for 6 s. During that time, participants viewed the picture and marked their answer.
on a rating sheet. This task was completed before and after the reappraisal task. The 15 pictures that were displayed during the first implicit measure task were different than the 15 pictures displayed during the second implicit measure task. Consistent with the affect-as-information view (e.g., Schwartz & Clore, 1983), which suggests that individuals’ affective state provides information about objects or events, it was expected that participants’ emotional reaction would influence their perception of the emotional valence of these neutral pictures. In addition, recent work by Payne, Cheng, Govorun, and Stewart (2005) empirically demonstrated that attitudes could be assessed implicitly with a similar misattribution procedure. Reliability was low to moderate for these measures prior to the exclusion feedback (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .60$) and after the exclusion feedback (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .77$).

Procedure

Female participants arrived at the lab in groups of two or three, along with a same-sex confederate, who was blind to the purpose of the study. Participants signed informed consent forms and were led to believe that the purpose of this study was to identify the characteristics or qualities of people who are perceived as good friends or acquaintances. The experimenter explained that their potential as a friend would be assessed by engaging in a “get-to-know” session with each other. During this time, one of the participants would be selected to moderate the session by asking questions provided by the experimenter to the other participants, and then they were to rate their perception of the other participants’ potential as a friend or acquaintance at the end of this session. Participants were led to believe their role in the interview (i.e., moderator or participant)
was determined by a random drawing. In reality, the confederate was always assigned as the moderator.

Before the interview, participants completed demographic information (i.e., age and race), the TMMS, and the EIS, which provided credibility to the cover story. While participants completed this task, the experimenter led the confederate to another room, ostensibly, to give instructions about her role in the interview session. After completing these scales, participants joined the confederate in the interview room. After the experimenter left the room, the confederate turned on a camera in plain view, as instructed by the experimenter. Participants then individually responded to 10 RCIT questions asked by the experimental confederate.

Following the interview, the confederate left the room, ostensibly, to complete ratings about her impression of each participant’s potential as a friend. The experimenter returned to the interview room after approximately 60 s and provided feedback sheets purportedly completed by the experimental confederate. In all cases, the rating-sheets indicated that they were considered to have little potential as a friend or acquaintance (see Appendix B). Participants were led to believe that the confederate did not know that they would see this feedback so that she would give her honest response about her impression of their potential as a friend or acquaintance; thus, they were instructed not to discuss their feedback with anyone during the study. Participants then completed the implicit measure of emotion task and the explicit measure of emotion measures.

Following the completion of these measures, participants were randomly assigned to a reappraisal task using instructions displayed on the computer monitor. Valid-reappraisal participants read that research demonstrated that these first impression
sessions are an accurate way to determine their potential as a friend. Then they were instructed to write for 5 minutes why they believed these first impression interviews make good method for predicting the quality of a potential friend. Invalid-reappraisal participants read that research demonstrated that these first impression sessions are an inaccurate way to determine their potential as a friend. Then they were instructed to write for 5 minutes why they believe these first impression interviews make a poor method for predicting the quality of a potential friend. Participants in the control condition read that another way to assess the qualities of a friend is to have them write about themselves. Then they were instructed to write for 5 minutes how they spend their time.

After completing the reappraisal task, the confederate returned to the room and participants verbally responded to an additional 10 RCIT questions asked by the confederate in a second structured, videotaped interview in the same manner as before. After the second interview was completed, participants received the social exclusion feedback in the same manner and responded to the same emotion measures as before. Finally, as a manipulation check, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed these interview sessions were a valid method for determining the quality of a potential friend by rating it on a scale from 1 (not at all valid) to 9 (very valid). Following the study, the experimenter explained the false nature of the feedback, the use of an experimental confederate, and the rationale for creating a realistic situation.

Results

Manipulation Check

It was expected that participants who reappraised the interview sessions as a valid means of determining the quality of a friend (valid-reappraisal participants) would
perceive the first impression interviews to be more valid than participants who reappraised the first impression interviews as an invalid means of determining the quality of a friend (invalid-reappraisal participants) and control participants. To investigate this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on participants’ validity ratings, revealing that participants significantly differed in their perception of the validity of the interview sessions for assessing the quality of a friend, $F(2, 76) = 6.06, p < .01$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that valid-reappraisal participants ($M = 3.95, SD = 2.09$) perceived the interview session to be more valid than invalid-reappraisal participants ($M = 2.17, SD = 1.63$), $p = .01$. The difference between valid-reappraisal and control ($M = 2.86, SD = 1.63$) participants’ perceptions of the interviews approached significance, $p = .11$. There was no difference between invalid-reappraisal and control participants’ perception of the interview, $p = .44$. These analyses demonstrated that participants differentially appraised the interviews in a manner consistent with their condition. Valid-reappraisal participants rated the interview sessions as the most valid, invalid-reappraisal participants rated the interview sessions the least valid, and control participants’ ratings were between these two extremes. Accordingly, it was expected that participants who evaluated these interviews as either threatening or non-threatening to their potential as a friend would differ in their emotional reactions.

*Emotional Reactions to Social Exclusion Before & After Reappraisal*

Participants’ emotional reactions to the social exclusion events were assessed both implicitly and explicitly before reappraising the social exclusion event and after reappraising the social exclusion events. Participants’ explicitly assessed emotional reactions were calculated by averaging the three 9-point Likert scale items that were
completed before and after the reappraisal task, respectively. Participants’ implicitly assessed emotional reactions were calculated by averaging their picture ratings that were completed before and after the reappraisal task, respectively.

It was expected that participants would not differ in their emotional reactions to the exclusion feedback before engaging in the reappraisal task. To be sure, the analysis revealed that participants did not differ in their explicitly or implicitly assessed emotional reactions to the social exclusion feedback, \( F < 1, \text{ ns} \) (see Table 1).

In order to assess whether the reappraisal strategy altered participants’ reactions to subsequent social exclusion feedback, separate one-way ANOVAs were performed on participants’ explicitly and implicitly assessed emotional reactions to the social exclusion feedback after reappraising the event. The analysis of participants’ explicitly assessed emotional reactions to the reappraised social exclusion feedback did not reveal any statistically significant difference in participants’ reactions, \( F < 1, \text{ ns} \) (see Table 1). However, participants’ implicitly assessed emotional reactions to the reappraised social exclusion feedback approached significance, \( F(2, 78) = 2.16, p = .12 \). While not statistically significant, the means were in the predicted direction, suggesting that invalid-reappraisal participants felt less negative emotion than valid-reappraisal, \( d = .21 \), and control participants, \( d = .53 \) (see Table 1).

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to explore (a) whether individuals could reappraise a social exclusion event, and (b) whether this strategy would effectively moderate its emotional impact. As indicated by their validity ratings, participants who wrote about why they believed the interview sessions were a valid method for assessing the qualities
of a friend, indicated that they believed it was a valid method. Participants who wrote about why they believed the interview sessions made an invalid method for assessing the qualities of a friend indicated that they believed it was an invalid method. Control participants’ ratings were between these two extremes. Consequently, these data indicate that the manipulation did alter participants’ perception of the social exclusion event.

Of importance, it was expected that this reevaluation or reappraisal of the event would influence participants’ subsequent reaction to the event. These data do not support this hypothesis. The explicit assessment of emotion did not reveal differential reactions; although, the implicit measure of emotion task did provide—albeit, quite tentatively—some indication that their emotional state was consistent with their reappraisal of the social exclusion event. Although not statistically significant, the implicit emotion measure revealed that invalid-reappraisal participants perceived more positive emotion in neutrally valenced pictures than valid-reappraisal and control participants perceived.

Clearly, both hypotheses were not supported in Experiment 1. The data indicated that participants perceived the event in a manner consistent with their reappraisal condition; however, these differential evaluations did not influence subsequent emotional reactions. This was a novel procedure, and thus, several aspects of this present study could have contributed to the null findings regarding participants’ emotional reactions.

First, receiving feedback about ones potential as a friend from a single stranger might not be as impactful as intended. Second, the emotion measures used—particularly the explicit measure of emotion—may not have been as sensitive or sophisticated enough to detect changes in participants reappraised reactions to the social exclusion feedback. Finally, it was also of interest to expand this work by comparing gender differences in
reaction to social exclusion. As noted, the extent to which individuals’ self-evaluations are influenced by developing and maintaining interpersonal relationships is differentially experienced by males and females. Therefore, it was expected that social exclusion and subsequent reactions to the reappraised event might be more impactful for females than males. These adjustments to the present design and additional question regarding the moderating role of gender were addressed in Experiment 2.
CHAPTER III

Experiment 2

This purpose of this experiment was three-fold. First, the purpose of Experiment 2 was to replicate the findings regarding participants’ perception of the interview session as a valid method for determining their potential as a friend. Again, it was expected that valid-reappraisal participants would give the highest validity ratings, invalid-reappraisal participants would give the lowest validity ratings, and control-reappraisal participants would give validity ratings between these extremes.

Second, the purpose was to correct possible procedural and measurement weaknesses in Experiment 1. Specifically, the implication of the social exclusion feedback was changed in an attempt to make it more impactful. In Experiment 2, participants received feedback that was a reflection of how all the other participants perceived them as a potential friend, as opposed to a reflection of how a single stranger (i.e., the confederate) perceived them as a potential friend. Additionally, a presumably more cognitive-engaging reappraisal task was used. Similar to Experiment 1, participants were asked to write two or three sentences about why they believed the interview session was either a valid or an invalid method for determining the quality of a potential friend. Additionally though, participants were asked to list as many aspects as they could about the interview session that might explain why they are a good or a poor method of determining one’s potential as a friend. Control-reappraisal participants were asked to write two or three sentences about how they spend their time and were asked to list as many aspects about themselves as they could. It was reasoned that listing aspects would
require more cognitive effort than simply writing sentences. Also, a different explicit measure of emotion was used in Experiment 2. Recall, the explicit measure of emotion used in Experiment 1 was three 9-point Likert scales. The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule-Expanded Form (PANAS-X; Watson & Clark, 1994) was used in Experiment 2. This measure requires individuals to rate the extent to which they are currently experiencing 60 emotions. Therefore, it was expected that this measure would be more sensitive to detect the emotional reactions caused by a reappraised social exclusion event.

Finally, a purpose of Experiment 2 was to include male participants. It was hypothesized that females would experience more emotional distress than males after the social exclusion feedback; however, this would be qualified by an interaction with the reappraisal conditions. Specifically, it was expected that females would experience significantly more emotional distress than males in the valid-reappraisal and control-reappraisal conditions, but males and females would feel comparable levels of emotional distress in the invalid-reappraisal condition. Moreover, it was expected that both males’ and females’ experience of emotional distress would be significantly less in the invalid-reappraisal condition than in the valid-reappraisal and control-reappraisal conditions.

Method

Participants

Two-hundred and fifty-two undergraduates enrolled in psychology courses participated in exchange for partial course credit. Participants’ data was not included in the analyses if they requested their data not be used \( n = 5 \). Participants’ data were also excluded from the analyses if they did not follow instructions during the study (e.g., discussed their feedback with other participants or talked on their cellular phones; \( n = \)
11), or if they wrote inconsistent with their reappraisal condition \((n = 10)\). Seventeen participants’ data were not included because they indicated in some way that they suspected that the social exclusion feedback was part of the study and not really a reflection of the groups’ perception of them as a potential friend. During debriefing participants were asked to indicate on a 9-point scale the extent to which they believed that the feedback was part of the study. Analysis of this data revealed that those excluded from the analyses because they believed the feedback was part of the study \((M = 6.90, SD = 2.15)\) rated the social exclusion feedback significantly more fake than participants included in the analyses \((M = 3.45, SD = 2.60)\), \(F(1, 243) = 33.09, p < .001\). Other participants were excluded because they suspected that the feedback was part of the study and wrote inconsistent with their reappraisal condition \((n = 3)\), suspected the feedback was part of the study and did not follow instructions \((n = 1)\), or wrote inconsistent with their reappraisal condition and did not follow instructions \((n = 4)\). Finally, two participants were not included because of a language barrier and because she had already participated in an ongoing study with similar social exclusion feedback, respectively.

Of those included in the analysis \((N = 199)\), 129 were female. The average age of the participants included in the analysis was 19.37 \((SD = 2.02)\). Of those included in the analysis, 75.9% identified themselves as White or Caucasian, 20.6% identified themselves as Black or African American, and 3.5% identified themselves as something other than these.

**Materials**

*Personality Scales.* Participants completed the attention and clarity subscales of the TMMS (Salovey, et al., 1995) and a 20-item short version of the EIS (Bachorowski &
Braaten, 1994). As in Experiment 1, these instruments were used to provide credibility to the cover story, where participants were led to believe that these personality measures would identify the aspects of people perceived to be good friends or acquaintances. These data were not used in the analyses; therefore, they will not be discussed further.

Participants also completed a short-form version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Appendix C) at the end of the study. Items include “I like to gossip at times” (reverse coded) and “There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone” (reverse coded). This 10-item short form version of the scales was developed by Strahan and Gerbasi (1972). In a review of several short-form versions of this scale, Fischer and Fick (1993) demonstrated this to be an accurate measure of social desirability, and highly correlated with the original version of the scale. Vohs et al. (2005; Experiment 8) demonstrated that ego-depleted and non-ego-depleted participants differentially responded to these items. They found that after regulatory resources were allocated to another area (e.g., emotion regulation), individuals were less likely to endorse socially desirable responses. Therefore, the purpose of this instrument in this particular study was to measure socially desirable responding as a function of engaging in reappraisal. It was expected that participants who reappraised the social exclusion event would endorse socially desirable items less often than participants who did not reappraise the social exclusion situation.

*Relationship Closeness Induction Task* (Sedikides, et al., 1999; see Appendix A). The same questions used in Experiment 1 were used in Experiment 2. As in Experiment 1, the confederate asked each participant all the questions and participants individually responded to each question in turn.
Emotional Reaction Measures. Participants’ completed the same implicit measure of emotion task that was used in Experiment 1. The only difference was that participants viewed the pictures in the same order, as opposed to random presentation. The implicit measure of emotion task was completed before the reappraisal task (Cronbach’s α = .59) and after the reappraisal task (Cronbach’s α = .77).

Participants also completed the PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1994; Appendix D). This measure is based on Watson and Tellegen’s (1985) view of emotion, in which positive affect and negative affect are viewed as separate dimensions. According to this view, individuals can experience both positive and negative emotions simultaneously. Therefore, the PANAS-X incorporates positive and negative emotion subscales, but also includes specific emotional states, such as hostility and sadness. Separate analyses were performed on the positive (Cronbach’s α = .86) and negative (Cronbach’s α = .85) emotion subscales.

Procedure

Separate groups of male and female participants arrived at the lab in groups of two or three along with a same-sex confederate, who was blind to participants’ condition. Participants were led to believe that the purpose of this study was to identify qualities of individuals who are perceived as good friends or acquaintances. Participants were told that they were to participate in a “get-to-know” session intended to determine their potential as a friend or acquaintance, after which they will rate each other’s friend potential, and then receive feedback that indicates their rank in the group based on the group’s average potential friend rating of them. Participants were ostensibly assigned
their role in the session by a random drawing. In reality, a same-sex confederate, blind to participants’ condition, was always assigned as the moderator of the session.

Participants and the confederate completed demographic information (i.e., age, sex, and race), subscales of the TMMS, and a short version of the EIS. After completing these scales, the experimenter gave a list of questions to the confederate, instructed him or her to ask them to each of the participants, turned on a camera in plain view of the participants, and left the room. Participants individually responded to the 10 questions asked by the experimental confederate.

Following the interview, the experimenter returned to the room, handed out ratings sheets, and asked them to rate the extent to which they perceived each of their fellow participants (including the confederate) as someone who would make a good friend on a scale from 1 (poor friend) to 9 (good friend). After they completed their ratings, the experimenter collected them and explained that these scores would be averaged to give them their rank in the group based on the average rating given by their fellow group members. The experimenter left the room ostensibly to average the ratings and then returned to the room with their feedback sheets indicating their potential friend rank. Participants were told that if they received the highest average potential friend rating, they would be ranked as one; whereas, participants that received the lowest average potential friend rating, they would be ranked as three (or four, depending on the number of participants; see Appendix E). In all cases, participants’ feedback indicated that they had received the lowest rank in the group.

After receiving this feedback, participants completed the implicit measure of emotion task. Then, participants were randomly assigned to a reappraisal task through
instructions presented on a computer monitor. Valid-reappraisal participants read that these interview sessions are good ways to determine their potential as a friend. They were instructed to write two or three sentences why they thought these sessions were an accurate method for determining one’s potential as a friend and list as many aspects as they could that might explain why this is a good method for determining one’s potential as a friend. Invalid-reappraisal participants read that these interview sessions are inaccurate ways to determine their potential as a friend. They were instructed to write two or three sentences why they thought these sessions were a poor method for determining one’s potential as a friend and list as many aspects as they could that might explain why this is a poor method for determining one’s potential as a friend. Control-reappraisal participants read that another way of assessing the qualities of a friend was to have them write something about themselves. They were instructed to write two or three sentences about how they spend their time and list as many aspects as they could about themselves.

To assess whether the reappraisal of the event influenced their perception of the interview sessions and their subsequent emotional reaction to the social exclusion feedback, participants verbally responded to another 10 RCIT questions asked by the same-sex confederate in a second structured, videotaped interview. Then, they completed the same potential friend ratings of their fellow participants and confederate. Again, participants received their rankings, which indicated that they received the lowest average potential friend rating. Then, they completed the implicit measure of emotion task, the PANAS-X, and a short-form version of the MCSDS. Finally, participants indicated the extent to which they believed the interview sessions were a valid method for determining the quality of a potential friend by rating a scale from 1 (not at all valid) to 9 (very valid).
Following their ratings, participants were told that the social exclusion feedback was part of the study and indicated nothing about them as a person. The purpose and rational of the study was fully explained to them. After this, participants indicated the extent to which they believed the feedback was part of the experiment and the extent to which they were friends with their fellow group members before they participated in this study.

Results

Manipulation Checks

To investigate whether participants’ believed that the social exclusion feedback was a reflection of their fellow participants’ perception of them or was part of the study (i.e., fake), participants were asked at the end of the experimental session to rate the extent to which they believed the social exclusion feedback was part of the study. To assess whether their perception of the feedback influenced the findings, a Sex × Reappraisal Condition ANOVA was performed on these ratings. The analysis revealed no statistically significant difference in participants’ perceptions of the social exclusion feedback, regardless of their sex, reappraisal condition, or the interaction of these two variables, $F$s < 1, ns. Therefore, the emotional and social outcome of participants’ use of reappraisal was not affected by their perception that social exclusion feedback was part of the study.

To investigate whether friendship levels amongst participants influenced the outcome of the results, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they were friends with their fellow participants before they participated in the study. A Sex × Reappraisal Condition ANOVA was performed on these rankings, revealing a significant
Sex × Reappraisal Condition interaction, $F(2, 192) = 3.78, p < .05$. Notably, Levene’s test of equal variance revealed a violation of this assumption, $F(5, 186) = 4.51, p = .001$. Because of this, this analysis should be interpreted with some caution. To analyze the significant interaction, separate one-way ANOVAs were performed on the friend ratings for male and female participants, respectively. These analyses revealed that the extent to which females were friends with each other before the study was the same across conditions, $F < 1$, ns; however, there was a significant difference in males’ friendship ratings across conditions, $F(2, 67) = 3.16, p = .05$. This latter analysis violated the assumption of homogeneity, $F(2, 65) = 8.52, p = .001$. However, $t$ tests using unequal variance assumed confirmed the analysis, showing that male valid-reappraisal participants ($M = 3.41, SD = 3.08$) were closer friends than male control-reappraisal participants ($M = 1.59, SD = 1.79$), $t(33.73) = 2.39, p < .05$. There was no difference in friendship levels between male valid-reappraisal and male invalid-reappraisal participants ($M = 2.17, SD = 2.33$), $t(39.05) = 1.53, p = .13$ or between male invalid-reappraisal and male control-reappraisal participants, $t < 1$, ns. Because this difference in friendships was found amongst the male participants only, the following analyses reported were performed on males’ data with and without the friend ratings as a covariate. None of these analyses changed the interpretation of the results; therefore, no further discussion will be made about these ratings.

Finally, it was expected that participants’ reappraisal of the interview session would influence their subsequent perception of it as a valid means for determining their potential as a friend. Because gender of the participant was a key variable in the predictions regarding their emotional reaction, it was included in the analysis of the
validity ratings. Therefore, a Sex × Reappraisal Condition ANOVA was performed on participants’ validity ratings. The analysis revealed a marginally significant main effect for Sex, $F(1, 194) = 3.61, p = .06$, where males ($M = 4.22, SD = 2.07$) perceived the interview sessions as a more valid method for determining their potential as a friend than females ($M = 3.66, SD = 2.08$), $d = .27$. Importantly, the analysis also revealed a significant main effect for Reappraisal Condition, $F(2, 194) = 3.05, p = .05$. Pairwise comparisons with a Bonferroni adjustment revealed a marginally significant difference between valid-reappraisal participants’ ($M = 4.28, SD = 2.04$) and invalid-reappraisal participants’ ($M = 3.43, SD = 2.15$) perceptions of the interview session, $p = .07, d = .41$. Control-reappraisal participants ($M = 3.84, SD = 2.04$) did not differ in their perception of the interview session from valid-, $p = .67$, or invalid- reappraisal participants, $p = .75$.

Overall, these analyses replicated the results in Experiment 1. Valid-reappraisal participants gave the highest validity ratings, invalid-reappraisal participants gave the lowest validity ratings, and control-reappraisal participants gave ratings between these extremes. Interestingly, males perceived the interview session as a more valid means for determining their potential as a friend than females’ perceived. Based on these results alone, it is reasonable to predict that males would have stronger emotional reactions to the social exclusion feedback than females; although, that was not the a priori hypothesis.

*Emotional Reaction to Social Exclusion Before & After Reappraisal*

Participants’ average ratings of the neutrally valenced pictures were used as an implicit assessment of their emotional reaction before and after reappraising the social exclusion threat. It was expected that participants’ ratings of the pictures would not differ before the reappraisal task, but participants would differentially rate the pictures after
reappraising the social exclusion threat. Specifically, it was expected invalid-reappraisal participants would perceive more positive emotion reflected in the pictures following the reappraised social exclusion threat than valid-reappraisal and control participants’ would perceive in the pictures.

Analysis of these data did not support these hypotheses. A Sex × Reappraisal Condition ANOVA on the participants’ picture ratings before reappraising the social exclusion threat was performed. As expected, the analysis did not reveal any effect for Sex, $F(1, 193) = .61, p = .44$. Unexpectedly, the analysis revealed a marginally significant main effect of Reappraisal Condition, $F(2, 193) = 2.88, p = .06$; however, pairwise comparisons using Bonferroni adjustments did not reveal any statistically significant differences between conditions, $p > .17$. The pattern of means revealed that invalid-reappraisal participants perceived less positive emotion in the pictures than valid-reappraisal, $d = .28$, and control participants, $d = .33$, perceived in the pictures (see Table 2). The differences (albeit, marginal) in participants’ perception of the pictures before reappraising the social exclusion threat is inconsistent with the a priori hypothesis. Up to that point in the experiment, there was no manipulation. These differences then are probably due to chance.

Analysis of the participants’ perception of the pictures following the reappraised social exclusion event did not reveal statistically significant differences regardless of Sex, $F(1, 195) = 1.54, p = .22$, Reappraisal Condition, $F(2, 195) = 1.85, p = .16$, or their interaction, $F(2, 195) = 1.65, p = .20$ (see Table 2). Therefore, the implicit measure of emotion task was unable to detect differences in participants’ emotional reaction after
reappraising the social exclusion feedback. These data do not support the marginally significant effect of Reappraisal Condition found using this procedure in Experiment 1.

Participants’ emotional reaction to social exclusion was also assessed explicitly. After reappraising the social exclusion event as a valid or an invalid means of determining their potential as a friend or assigned to a control condition, participants received social exclusion feedback again. Following this reappraised social exclusion event, participants completed the PANAS-X. As noted, this scale has several subscales, including a positive emotion subscale and a negative emotion subscale. It was expected that participants would not significantly differ in their positive reaction to the social exclusion feedback, but invalid-reappraisal participants would feel significantly less negative emotion following the reappraised social exclusion feedback.

Analyses on these subscales confirmed these hypotheses. Participants did not significantly differ in their experience of positive emotion following social exclusion, regardless of Sex, $F < 1$, ns, Reappraisal Condition, $F(2, 199) = 2.15, p = .12$, or the interaction of the two factors, $F < 1$, ns (see Table 3). However, participants’ significantly differed in their experience of negative emotion following social exclusion as a function of Reappraisal Condition, $F(1, 196) = 4.25, p < .05$. Levene’s test of equal variance indicated a significant difference in the variance between conditions, $F(5, 190) = 4.30, p = .001$. Therefore, independent samples $t$ tests using unequal variance assumed was performed for the simple effects analyses. These analyses revealed that invalid-reappraisal participants felt significantly less negative emotion than valid-reappraisal participants, $t(101.97) = 2.52, p = .01, d = .44$, and control-reappraisal participants,
$t(118.17) = 3.50, p < .001, d = .57$. There was no difference in valid-reappraisal and control-reappraisal participants’ experience of negative emotion, $t < 1, ns$ (see Table 3).

These analyses confirmed the primary hypothesis. Reappraising an event that has implications for one’s belongingness need in a non-threatening manner significantly decreases the emotional distress experienced. Unexpectedly, there was no effect of Sex on emotional distress, $F(1, 196) = 1.15, p = .28$. While the pattern of means suggests that females experienced more emotional distress than males, these differences were not statistically significant (see Table 3).

*Social Desirability Ratings*

It was expected that participants’ reappraisal strategy would differentially influence their socially desirable responding. Specifically, it was expected that engaging in a reappraisal strategy (i.e., invalid-reappraisal or valid reappraisal) would bear a social cost on self-presentation. In order to explore this, a Sex × Reappraisal Condition ANOVA was performed on their social desirability score, revealing no main effects or interaction, $Fs < 1, ns$.

*Ancillary Analyses*

Although of secondary importance, it was of interest to explore whether reappraisal would alter participants’ subsequent potential friend ratings. Recall participants were asked to rate the extent to which their fellow group members would make good friends on two occasions. The first time participants completed the potential friend ratings was before they received social exclusion feedback. The second time participants completed the potential friend ratings was after the social exclusion feedback and the reappraisal task. A Ratings × Sex × Reappraisal Condition mixed-model
ANOVA was performed. Ratings was entered as the within-subjects variable, representing the first and second potential friend ratings. Analysis revealed main effects of Ratings, $F(1, 192) = 10.03, p < .01$, and Sex, $F(1, 192) = 9.66, p < .01$, but these were qualified by a significant three-way interaction, $F(2, 192) = 3.39, p < .05$.

To analyze this interaction, separate 2 Ratings $\times$ 3 Reappraisal Condition mixed-model ANOVAs were performed on male and female ratings, respectively. These analyses revealed that females rated each other’s potential as a friend significantly less after the social exclusion feedback and reappraisal task ($M = 7.26, SD = 1.26$) than before the social exclusion feedback and reappraisal task ($M = 7.55, SD = 1.16$), $F(1, 125) = 7.45, p < .01$. Analysis of males’ ratings also revealed a main effect of Ratings, $F(1, 67) = 3.92, p = .05$, but this was qualified by a significant Ratings $\times$ Reappraisal Condition interaction, $F(2, 67) = 4.06, p < .05$. Unlike females’ potential friend ratings, males’ potential friend ratings did not change in the valid-reappraisal and control-reappraisal conditions, $t s < 1, ns$, but males rated each other’s potential as a friend significantly less on the second potential friend rating than on the first potential friend rating in the invalid-reappraisal condition, $t(23) = 2.56, p < .05$ (see Table 4). These data suggest that females were more critical of their fellow participants than males, except in the case of the invalid-reappraisal condition. These findings indicate something about the differential reactions to social exclusion by male and female participants. Perhaps, these harsher ratings are a reflection of the covert aggression that is more typically found amongst females (Campbell, 1999).

Also, ancillary to our primary hypotheses was the number of aspects participants listed about the interview session as either a valid or an invalid means for determining
their potential as a friend. Control-condition participants listed as many aspects as they could about themselves. It was expected that control-reappraisal participants would list more aspects about themselves than participants who were instructed to list aspects that made the interview a valid or an invalid way to determine their potential as a friend. However, it was expected that participants would list the fewest things about the interview that made it a valid means of determining their potential as a friend.

A Sex × Reappraisal Condition ANOVA revealed a main effect for Reappraisal Condition, $F(2, 197) = 60.93, p < .001$. Specifically, control participants ($M = 15.75, SD = 5.98$) listed more aspects about themselves than invalid-reappraisal ($M = 6.97, SD = 3.54$), $p < .001$, and valid-reappraisal participants ($M = 7.73, SD = 3.84$), $p < .001$.

The main effect was qualified by a marginally significant Sex × Reappraisal Condition interaction, $F(2, 197) = 2.63, p < .07$. To analyze this interaction, separate independent $t$ tests were performed on the items listed for each reappraisal condition, respectively. These analyses revealed that males ($M = 8.32, SD = 4.06$) did not differ from females ($M = 7.41, SD = 3.73$) in the number of aspects listed in the valid-reappraisal condition, $t < 1, ns$. Males ($M = 6.83, SD = 3.19$) did not differ females ($M = 7.05, SD = 3.78$) in the number of aspects listed in the invalid-reappraisal condition, $t < 1, ns$. However, females ($M = 16.70, SD = 6.39$) listed marginally significantly more aspects about themselves than males ($M = 13.88, SD = 4.68$) listed about themselves in the control condition, $t(69) = 1.92, p = .06$.

Even with this interaction, the data suggests that it is more difficult for individuals to reappraise the social exclusion threat than to list aspects about themselves. The difference between males and females in the number of things listed about themselves in
the control condition may reflect females desire to present themselves in a more socially desirable way. This interpretation is consistent with Williams and Sommer’s (1997) findings that females engaged in more effort at a task than males after being ostracized. However, this interpretation is not supported by the analysis of the social desirability measure in the present experiment.

Discussion

The primary purpose of Experiment 2 was to explore whether (a) participants were able to reappraise a social exclusion threat, and in turn, (b) alter there subsequent emotional reactions to the event. Experiment 2 was also intended to (c) investigate whether gender moderated the emotional impact of social exclusion and the effectiveness of the reappraisal process. Experiment 2 did replicate the findings of Experiment 1 in regards to reappraising the event. Again, valid-reappraisal participants gave the highest average validity rating, invalid-reappraisal participants gave the lowest average validity ratings, and control participants gave validity ratings between these extremes. Across two experiments, then, results indicated that the reappraisal task altered the perception of the interview session as a valid means for determining their potential as a friend.

The emotion measures in Experiment 1 were unable to detect subsequent differences in the emotional reactions between participants that differentially reappraised the social exclusion feedback. Experiment 2 used the same implicit measure of emotion as in Experiment 1, but was unable to detect differences in emotional reactions to the social exclusion feedback. A more comprehensive explicit measure of emotion was used in Experiment 2. Analyses showed that participants did not differ in their positive reactions to reappraising the social exclusion event. This was not surprising. It was not
expected that participants would differ in their experience of positive emotion because social exclusion was not expected to induce positive emotions. However, the reappraisal task was expected to change their experience of negative emotions. Indeed, invalid-reappraisal participants experienced less emotional distress than valid-reappraisal and control-reappraisal participants experienced. Unexpectedly, this pattern was not moderated by gender.

While it was expected that reappraising the event would influence subsequent socially desirable responding, such that valid- and invalid-reappraisal participants would respond in a less socially desirable way than control-reappraisal participants, this was not found. It was reasoned that the reappraisal strategies used to alter one’s emotional state would consume more regulatory resources and cause a failure to present one’s self in a socially desirable way. Although this hypothesis was not supported, the results of Experiment 2 do support a portion of this hypothesis—reappraising the social exclusion threat was more difficult to do than not doing so (i.e., control-reappraisal). This was illustrated in that participants were able to come up with significantly more items about themselves than they could come up with aspects that made the social exclusion feedback valid and even more than the number of aspects that made the social exclusion threat invalid.

Because reappraisal is taxing, at least, to some extent, it was expected that participants’ subsequent regulation would be influenced. A primary purpose of this research was to investigate whether this strategy altered subsequent behaviors that require regulation and are important to social affiliation—namely, self-presentation. In order to explore this aspect, the videotaped interviews were used to code participants’ self-
presentation behaviors. It was expected that reappraising the threat—regardless of whether the threat was reappraised as threatening (i.e., valid-reappraisal) or as non-threatening (invalid-reappraisal)—would cause participants to engage in less effective self-presentation than not reappraising the threat (i.e., control-reappraisal).
CHAPTER IV
Experiment 3

Overall, the purpose of the present work was to investigate the emotional and social outcomes of reappraising social exclusion. Experiments’ 1 and 2 demonstrated that participants were able to reappraise the social exclusion threat. Specifically, across two experiments, participants were able to alter their perception of an event that threatened their belongingness need. While not detected in Experiment 1, Experiment 2 demonstrated that their reappraisal moderated subsequent emotional distress. Therefore, Experiments 1 and 2 addressed the emotional outcome of engaging in this strategy, but measures of social desirability were unable to detect differences in interpersonal processes as a function of their regulation strategy.

Accordingly, the purpose of Experiment 3 was to explore, using a different method, the social outcome of reappraising social exclusion. Judges who were blind to participants’ reappraisal condition coded specified behaviors across the two interview sessions. Overall, it was expected that valid- and invalid-reappraisal participants would engage in less effective self-presentation than control participants.

Method

Participants

Participants’ behaviors were coded if they were included in the analyses in Experiments 1 and 2 and if they had two complete interview sessions. That is, participants were included in this analysis if they met the criteria for inclusion in the first
two experiments and if there was no equipment or experimenter error that prevented their behaviors from being coded.

The data was analyzed as two separate samples from Experiments 1 and 2, respectively. In the first sample, coded participants \((N = 58)\) were distributed relatively evenly across reappraisal conditions (valid-reappraisal: \(n = 16\), invalid-reappraisal: \(n = 20\), control-reappraisal: \(n = 22\)). Participants included in the analysis had an average age of 18.72 \((SD = 3.53)\) and identified themselves as Caucasian (75.9%), African-American (19%), Asian/Pacific Islander (3.4%) or other (1.7%).

In the second sample, participants \((N = 157)\) that met the criteria for inclusion were, again, relatively evenly distributed across reappraisal conditions (valid-reappraisal: \(n = 57\), invalid-reappraisal: \(n = 57\), control-reappraisal: \(n = 65\)). The average age of participants was 19.37 \((SD = 2.01; n = 1\) did not report age), and they identified themselves as Caucasian (76%), African-America (20.7%), Asian/Pacific Islander (1.7%), or as Hispanic/Latino or other (1.7%).

**Procedure**

Two judges, who were blind to participants’ condition, independently identified the presence of six specified behaviors (i.e., crossing arms, looking away from confederate, smiling, laughing, gesturing and fidgeting) during the last eight questions of each first impression interview (see Table 5 for operational definitions of each). Recall, participants were asked 10 questions derived from the R CIT, which progressed from impersonal (e.g., “what is your first name?”) to personal (e.g., “what is one recent accomplishment that you are proud of?”). It was reasoned that participants’ answers would be longer during these last questions than the first two because they usually require
more than one-word answers; thus, this would give judges adequate time to identify the presence of these behaviors.

Specifically, judges coded the participants as if they were the only one in the room and only during their answer to each of the eight questions. Once the participant completed his or her answer, the judge would record the presence of the specified behaviors in which the participants engaged and then would code the other participants’ behavior during the same question. This process was done for each of the eight questions across both experiments, such that a participant could have not engaged in a particular behavior or engaged in a particular behavior eight times.

Results

Data Reduction

Participants’ were given a score for each behavior by summing the number of times they engaged in one of these behaviors for the first interview session and the second interview session, respectively. These scores were then dived by eight—the total number times participants could have possibly engaged in these behaviors. Therefore, these scores were converted to proportions for ease of interpretation, such that a participants’ score represented the proportion of times they engaged in one of the behaviors during a particular interview session (i.e., the number of times they engaged in the behavior divided by eight). Inter-rater reliability was calculated for each behavior in each interview session respectively (see Tables 6 and 7). Elmes, Kantowitz, and Roediger III (2003) indicate that high inter-rater reliability exceeds $r = .70$. As can be seen in Tables 6 and 7, inter-rater reliability was adequate for all the behaviors, except on two occasions. For that reason, interpreting results for those behaviors were done so with
caution. Because inter-rater reliability was good for these behaviors, a composite score was created for each behavior in each interview by averaging the proportion scores from each judge.

Sample 1 Analyses

For each of the following analyses, a mixed-model ANOVA was used to analyze the data. Interview Sessions was the within-subjects factor, representing the behavior of participants in the first interview and the second interview, and the between-subjects factor was the Reappraisal Condition (see Table 8 for cell means and standard deviations). Overall, analyses revealed no significant main effects or interactions in the proportion of times participants smiled or laughed, $F$s < 2.52, $ps > .11$. However, there were significant differences in the proportion of times participants looked away, gestured, crossed their arms, and fidgeted.

For both the proportion of times participants looked away and gestured, the pattern of results was the same. In both cases, participants’ behavior changed across interviews, but was unaffected by their reappraisal condition. Specifically, there was a main effect of Interview Sessions for the proportion of times participants’ looked away, $F(1, 53) = 13.75$, $p = .001$, revealing that the proportion of times participants looked away in the second interview ($M = .91$, $SD = .15$) was significantly more than the proportion of times participants looked away in the first interview ($M = .84$, $SD = .18$). There was no main effect of Reappraisal Condition or interaction, $F$s < 1.96, $ps > .15$. It should be noted that the inter-rater reliability for the proportion of times participants looked away in the second interview was below an acceptable level (see Table 6). Thus,
these differences should be interpreted with caution, unless this effect replicates in the second sample, which would provide reasonable confidence in its interpretation.

Similarly, there was a main effect of Interview Sessions for the proportion of times participants gestured, $F(1, 55) = 13.47, p = .001$, revealing that the proportion of times participants gestured in the second interview ($M = .45, SD = .29$) was significantly more than the proportion of times participants gestured in the first interview ($M = .33, SD = .28$). There was no main effect of Reappraisal Condition or interaction, $Fs < 1.69, ps > .19$.

The differences in participants’ looking and gesturing behavior between interview sessions do not support the primary hypothesis that participants who reappraised the interview sessions as either a valid or an invalid means of determining one’s potential as a friend will behave differently than those in the control condition. However, they do suggest that the social exclusion feedback altered their behavior. Thus, these data provide some support for the effectiveness of the social exclusion feedback. The latter two analyses on the proportion of times participants crossed their arms and fidgeted showed that the reappraisal condition differentially influenced their behavior.

Analysis of the proportion of times participants crossed their arms revealed a main effect for Reappraisal Condition, $F(2, 53) = 3.49, p < .05$, but this was qualified by a significant Reappraisal Condition × Interview Sessions interaction, $F(2, 53) = 5.46, p < .01$. One-way ANOVAs were performed on the proportion of times participants crossed their arms as a function of Reappraisal Condition in the first and second interviews, respectively. These analyses revealed that there was no difference in the proportion of times participants crossed their arms in the first interview, $F(2, 57) = 1.31, p = .28$. 
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However, there was a significant difference in the number of times participants crossed their arms in the second interview, $F(2, 55) = 8.23, p = .001$. Levene’s test of equal variance revealed a violation of this assumption for the proportion of times participants crossed their arms in the second interview, $F(2, 53) = 34.52, p < .001$. Therefore, $t$ tests using equal variance not assumed revealed that control-reappraisal participants crossed their arms more times than valid-, $t(21.11) = 3.82, p = .001$, and invalid-reappraisal participants, $t(26.06) = 2.83, p < .01$, during the second interview. Invalid-reappraisal participants crossed their arms more than valid-reappraisal participants, $t(18.73) = 2.31, p < .05$ (see Table 8).

Notably, the analysis of the proportion of times participants fidgeted showed a reverse pattern of the proportion of times participants crossed their arms. Specifically, there was a main effect of Interview Sessions, $F(1, 55) = 7.26, p < .01$, qualified by a significant Reappraisal Condition × Interview Sessions interaction, $F(2, 55) = 3.59, p < .05$. Analysis of this interaction was performed by using paired-samples $t$ tests on the Interview Sessions variable for each of the reappraisal conditions, respectively. These analyses revealed that there was a marginally significant increase in the amount of fidgeting amongst the valid-reappraisal participants from the first interview to the second interview, $t(15) = 1.85, p = .08$. Likewise, the proportion of times invalid-reappraisal participants fidgeted from the first interview session to the second interview session significantly increased, $t(19) = 3.36, p < .01$. However, control-reappraisal participants did not differ in the proportion of times they fidgeted across reappraisal conditions, $t < 1$, ns (see Table 8).
These latter two analyses demonstrate that the participants who reappraised the validity of the interview session, regardless of whether they reappraised the interview as valid or invalid, behaved differently than participants that did not reappraise the interview session (i.e., control-reappraisal participants). Specifically, valid- and invalid-reappraisal participants engaged in more fidgeting than control-reappraisal participants during the second interview; whereas, control-reappraisal participants crossed their arms more than valid- and invalid-reappraisal participants during the second interview. While it could be argued that engaging in one of these behaviors (e.g., fidgeting) would inhibit the other behavior (e.g., crossing arms), analysis did not reveal a significant inverse relationship between these variables ($r = -.18$, $p = .18$). Overall, this pattern found in the latter two analyses supports the overall hypothesis in Experiment 3.

*Sample 2 Analyses*

Unlike Sample 1, Sample 2 had both male and female participants. It was expected that males and females would respond differently to the social exclusion feedback from each other, and thus, it was expected that there would be self-presentational differences between genders. As with Sample 1, the primary hypothesis was that participants’ reappraisal of the validity of the interview sessions would cause differential self-presentational patterns. Specifically, it was expected that valid-reappraisal and invalid-reappraisal participants would engage in less effective self-presentational strategies than control participants would. However, it was expected that this pattern would interact with participants’ gender, such that the effect would be seen more in females than in males.
To investigate this, mixed-model ANOVAs were performed on each of the six coded behaviors. Again, the within-subjects variable was the Interview Sessions, representing the proportion of times participants engaged in a particular behavior in the first and second interviews. The between-subjects variables in this sample were Reappraisal Condition and Gender (see Table 9 for descriptive statistics).

Unlike Sample 1, analysis of participants’ fidgeting behavior revealed no statistically significant main effects or interactions, $F_s < 2.20, ps > .11$. However, participants’ looking away and gesturing behaviors changed from the first interview session to the second interview session, without interacting with Reappraisal Condition, as in Sample 1. Specifically, analysis of participants’ looking away behavior revealed a significant main effect of Interview Sessions, $F(1, 166) = 16.25, p < .001$, indicating that participants looked away significantly more after the social exclusion feedback ($M = .95$, $SD = .10$) than before the social exclusion feedback ($M = .91$, $SD = .14$). Interestingly, this effect was qualified by a marginally significant Interview Sessions × Gender interaction, $F(1, 166) = 3.41, p = .07$. Two repeated measures ANOVAs were performed on participants looking away behavior across interview sessions for male and female participants, respectively. These analyses revealed that there was no change in the proportion of times males looked away from the first interview ($M = .91$, $SD = .14$) to the second interview ($M = .93$, $SD = .11$), $F(1, 56) = 1.57, p = .22$. However, females significantly increased the proportion of times they looked away in the first interview ($M = .90$, $SD = .13$) to the second interview ($M = .96$, $SD = .09$), $F(1, 114) = 27.46, p < .001$. Together, these analyses replicate the findings in Sample 1, showing that participants looked away more after hearing the social exclusion feedback, although, this was
primarily true for females, rather than males. This is particularly important to replicate because the looking away behavior in Sample 1 was accompanied by low inter-rater reliability.

Analysis of the proportion of times participants gestured, also revealed a main effect for Interview Sessions, showing that participants gestured significantly less after hearing the social exclusion feedback ($M = .41, SD = .25$) than before hearing the social exclusion feedback ($M = .47, SD = .26$), $F(1, 173) = 13.34, p < .001$. While this analysis indicates that participants changed their gesturing behavior after hearing the social exclusion feedback, as found in the analysis of Sample 1, the direction of the effect was opposite. That is, Sample 1 analysis revealed that gesturing increased after the social exclusion feedback; whereas this Sample 2 analysis revealed that gesturing decreased after the social exclusion feedback. It is tempting to infer that this change in direction has to do with the inclusion of male participants; however, there was no significant interaction with Gender to indicate this, $F < 1, ns$.

Together the analyses for participants’ looking and gesturing behavior replicated the findings in Sample 1. That is, across both samples, participants changed these behaviors from the first interview to the second interview. Participants’ looking away behavior showed the same pattern of change across samples, but participants’ gesturing behavior showed the opposite pattern. Clearly, this makes the interpretation for both samples more complicated, but simply stated, the same behavior changed across both samples, suggesting that the social exclusion feedback influenced these behaviors.

Analysis of the proportion of times participants crossed their arms, revealed that females ($M = .12, SD = .29$) crossed their arms significantly more than males ($M = .09,$
$SD = .14$), across interview sessions, and reappraisal conditions, $F(1, 167) = 5.50, p < .05$.

Analysis of the proportion of times participants laughed, revealed a marginally significant main effect of Interview Sessions, $F(1, 172) = 2.83, p = .09$, indicating that participants laughed less after receiving the social exclusion feedback ($M = .19, SD = .18$) than before receiving the social exclusion feedback ($M = .22, SD = .21$). Also, consistent with the proportion of times participants crossed their arms analysis, females ($M = .27, SD = .20$) laughed more often than males ($M = .08, SD = .11$), $F(1,172) = 63.07, p < .001$, but this was qualified by a significant Gender × Reappraisal Condition interaction, $F(2, 172) = 3.82, p < .05$. To analyze this between-subjects interaction for participants’ laughing behavior across interviews, a new variable was computed by averaging the proportion of times participants laughed in the first interview and the second interview. Using this new variable as the dependent measure, a between-subjects ANOVA was computed, revealing a significant Gender × Reappraisal Condition interaction, $F(2, 179) = 3.21, p < .05$. One-way ANOVAs were computed on participants’ average proportion of laughing across interviews for male and female participants, respectively. There was no difference in males’ laughing behavior across conditions, $F < 1$, ns. However, there was a significant difference in females laughing behavior across conditions, $F(2, 118) = 4.85, p < .01$. Valid-reappraisal female participants ($M = .26, SD = .18$) laughed the same amount as invalid-reappraisal female participants ($M = .34, SD = .17$), $p = .14$, and control-reappraisal female participants ($M = .22, SD = .17$), $p = 1.00$. Although, female participants laughed more in the invalid-reappraisal condition than in the control-reappraisal condition across interviews, $p < .01$. Ultimately, this interaction does not
support our hypothesis or inform us about how gender or reappraisal influences behavior because there was no interaction across interview sessions. Recall that participants did not reappraise the interviews until after the first interview. Therefore, any differences between conditions found in the first interview are due to chance, rather than the manipulation. Thus, because females behaved differently between reappraisal conditions across interviews indicates nothing about how their reappraisal of the social exclusion event changed their behavior.

Analysis for the proportion of times participants’ smiled revealed a main effect of Interview Session $F(1, 173) = 43.67, p < .001$, and Gender, $F(1, 173) = 40.47, p < .001$, but these were qualified by significant Interview Sessions $\times$ Reappraisal Condition, $F(2, 173) = 3.74, p < .05$, and Reappraisal Condition $\times$ Gender, $F(1, 173) = 5.96, p < .05$, interactions. These were qualified by a significant Interview Sessions $\times$ Reappraisal Condition $\times$ Gender interaction, $F(2, 173) = 5.60, p < .01$.

Because there was a main effect of Gender, which indicated that females ($M = .63, SD = .23$) smiled more than males ($M = .40, SD = .28$), two mixed-model ANOVAs were performed with Interview Sessions as the within-subjects variable and Reappraisal Condition as the between-subjects variable for male and female participants, respectively. These analyses revealed that female participants smiled less after hearing the social exclusion feedback ($M = .57, SD = .24$) than before hearing the social exclusion feedback ($M = .70, SD = .23$), $F(1, 116) = 70.15, p < .001$. Contrary to the hypothesis that participants’ reappraisal condition would influence their subsequent behavior, there was no interaction with Reappraisal Condition, $F < 1, ns$. Likewise, there was a significant main effect of Interview Sessions for males, $F(1, 57) = 5.16, p < .05$, indicating that
males smiled less after receiving the social exclusion feedback \((M = .37, SD = .28)\) than before receiving the social exclusion feedback \((M = .43, SD = .29)\). This was qualified by a significant Interview Sessions × Reappraisal Condition Interaction, \(F(2, 57) = 5.44, p < .01\). Paired-sampled \(t\) tests on the proportion of smiling engaged in during the first interview session and the second interview session for each reappraisal condition were conducted. These analyses revealed that males did not change in the amount of smiling they did after receiving the social exclusion feedback in the valid condition, \(t(19) = 1.29, p = .21\). However, males smiled less after the social exclusion feedback in the invalid-reappraisal condition, \(t(18) = 2.90, p = .01\), and the control-reappraisal condition, \(t(20) = 2.31, p < .05\) (see Table 9). While this analysis does indicate that participants’ reappraisal strategy influenced their subsequent behavior, it does not support the primary hypothesis that reappraising the event as valid or invalid would influence participants’ behavior in a different way from control-reappraisal participants.

Overall, analyses of this Sample 2 data did not support our hypothesis that reappraising the social exclusion event would lead to different behavioral patterns than not reappraising the social exclusion event (i.e., control-reappraisal). There were two predominant patterns in these analyses.

First, the social exclusion feedback influenced participants to change their behavior. Participants looked away more after receiving the social exclusion feedback, but gestured and laughed less after receiving the social exclusion feedback. Female participants smiled less after receiving social exclusion feedback in all conditions, and males smiled less in the valid-reappraisal and control conditions, but not in the invalid-reappraisal condition.
A second pattern in these analyses indicates that males and females behaved differently in these interview sessions; although, there was little evidence that differences in their behavior interacted with their reappraisal condition or their response to social exclusion. For example, females crossed their arms more than males, but this did not interact with condition. Also, females looked away more after receiving the social exclusion feedback; whereas, males looking behavior did not change across interview sessions.

The only expected three-way interaction occurred in participants smiling behavior, but this was not consistent with our hypothesis. Females smiled less after social exclusion, but this did not interact with their reappraisal condition; whereas, males smiled less in all conditions, except in the invalid-reappraisal condition.

Discussion

Our hypothesis was that participants who actively reappraised the interview sessions as either a valid means or as an invalid means for determining their potential as a friend would engage in different self-presentational patterns of behavior than participants who did not reappraise the interview sessions (i.e., control-reappraisal participants). To address this hypothesis, judges identified the presence of six specified behaviors across two interview sessions (before and after receiving the social exclusion feedback).

In the first sample, participants looked away more from the confederate asking the questions and gestured more after the social exclusion feedback than they did before the social exclusion feedback. Speculatively, these data indicate that the female participants were less comfortable looking at someone who they believed perceived them as a poor
friend, but they also attempted to make a better impression by gesturing more while they talked.

As support for our primary hypothesis, participants who either reappraised the interview sessions as valid or invalid means of determining one’s potential as a friend fidgeted more and crossed their arms less than participants that did not reappraise the interview sessions as a means of determining their potential as a friend. Thus, these data support the primary hypothesis to the extent that it illustrates differential behavioral patterns as a function of their reappraisal condition.

In the second sample, the pattern of results did not support our primary hypothesis. These data did indicate that males and females engaged in different behavioral patterns. Although, there was not a consistent pattern in the data showing that the reappraisal condition interacted with their gender after receiving social exclusion feedback. Additionally, there was not a consistent pattern in the data where one or more reappraisal conditions caused differential behavioral patterns from the other reappraisal conditions, as seen with Sample 1. Unfortunately, because the pattern seen in Sample 1 was not replicated here in Sample 2, it is not entirely clear the extent to which reappraisal influences self-presentational patterns as indicated by this approach.
CHAPTER V
General Discussion

The present work was an initial investigation exploring the emotional and social outcomes of engaging in emotion regulation (see Figure 1). The present work specifically focused on the outcomes of engaging in reappraisal—a strategy in which individuals’ appraisals of self-relevant events influences their emotional reactions. More specifically, the present work attempted to address these outcomes in the context of a social exclusion event. One reason for exploring these questions in the context of social exclusion was because the need to belong is a fundamental and pervasive drive, such that it influences both personal (i.e., emotional) and interpersonal processes (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Therefore, it was expected that regulating emotional responses to threats to the belongingness need would influence these emotional and social outcomes. Importantly, the need to belong is prevalent in all humans, but research indicates that the development of interpersonal relationships may be of more central importance to females than males (Cross & Madson, 1997; Josephs et al., 1992). Accordingly, gender would presumably influence the emotional and social outcomes of regulating emotional responses to social exclusion.

Another reason for exploring the emotional and social outcomes of reappraisal in the context of social exclusion was because the literature indicated that social exclusion impairs self-regulatory processes. Therefore, socially excluded individuals should be unable to manage their distress. Nevertheless, reappraisal is an effective strategy and
utilizes regulatory resources efficiently, and thus, it was reasoned that this was a good strategy to deal with the distress caused by social exclusion.

Taken together, several questions arose from this literature. One question was whether individuals can manage emotional distress caused by social exclusion, given that social exclusion impairs self-regulation. A second question in the present work arises from research showing that the capacity to self-regulate is limited, such that regulating one behavior impairs subsequent regulation of another behavior requiring regulation processes (Baumeister et al., 1998; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Therefore, it was expected that if individuals could manage their emotional distress, they would be unable to manage subsequent self-presentation strategies (Vohs, et al., 2005). The third question regarded the extent to which gender would influence the experience of emotional distress and subsequent self-presentation behaviors, given gender differences in the importance of interpersonal relationships.

From these questions, four hypotheses were made. First, it was expected that individuals would be able to reappraise (i.e., alter the meaning or implications) of a social exclusion event. Second, it was expected that their reappraisal of the event would moderate the subsequent experience of emotional distress. Third, it was expected that individuals who reappraised the event in a manner that was intended to alter their experience of emotional distress would engage in less effective self-presentation strategies. Finally, it was expected that gender would influence the experience of emotional distress and self-presentation behaviors.

Across three experiments, these hypotheses were explored. Experiments 1 and 2 supported the first hypothesis. In both of these experiments, participants were asked to
rate the extent to which they believed the interview sessions were valid methods for determining their potential as a friend. Results indicated that valid-reappraisal participants gave the highest validity ratings, invalid-reappraisal participants gave the lowest validity ratings, and control reappraisal participants gave validity ratings between these extremes. These data indicate that manipulating participants’ evaluations of these events influenced their perception of the events’ relevance to their potential as a friend. Therefore, our first hypothesis was supported.

A related hypothesis predicted that individuals’ reappraisal of these events would alter subsequent emotional reactions. Experiments 1 and 2 addressed this hypothesis by assessing participants’ emotional reactions to the social exclusion event after engaging in a reappraisal strategy. Unexpectedly, Experiment 1 did not detect any statistically significant differences in participants’ emotional reactions after engaging in reappraisal. An implicit measure of their emotional reactions to reappraising the social exclusion feedback did approach significance ($p = .12$), and inspection of the means showed that they were in the predicted direction (see Table 1). Specifically, invalid-reappraisal participants perceived more positive emotion reflected in the emotionally neutral pictures than valid-reappraisal and control-reappraisal participants did. Clearly, these data do not provide strong evidence for the effectiveness of managing the emotional distress caused by social exclusion. However, a presumably more engaging reappraisal task and a more established measure of emotion were utilized in Experiment 2. These results indicated that invalid-reappraisal participants experienced significantly less emotional distress than both valid-reappraisal and control participants, providing strong evidence for the effectiveness of reappraisal. Unexpectedly, the pattern of data was not replicated in the
implicit measure of emotion. Overall, the second hypothesis was supported. Certainly, the lack of replication raises some concern, but Experiment 1 included measurement and methodological weaknesses that Experiment 2 did not. Experiment 1 measured participants’ emotional reactions using a less sophisticated method than used in Experiment 2. Additionally, the social exclusion feedback in Experiment 1 was a reflection of one person’s perception of their potential as a friend, as opposed to multiple people’s perception of their potential as a friend in Experiment 2. Therefore, differences in emotional reactions may not have been detected in Experiment 1 because the event was simply not emotionally powerful enough.

In the third hypothesis, the prediction was that reappraising the social exclusion feedback as valid or as invalid would cause individuals to engage in less effective self-presentation strategies. This was based on the limited capacity view of self-regulation (Gailliot, et al., 2007). This hypothesis was addressed in Experiment 3, where participants’ from Experiments 1 and 2 self-presentation behaviors (e.g., arm crossing, gestures, and fidgeting) were analyzed. Across both samples, there was no clear pattern in all six behaviors. Looking at each sample separately, though, does indicate some general trends.

Analysis of Sample 1 provides support for the primary hypothesis. Valid- and invalid-reappraisal participants engaged in more fidgeting than control participants; whereas, control participants crossed their arms more than valid- and invalid-reappraisal participants. These data clearly indicate that there was a differential effect on self-presentation as a function of whether the social exclusion feedback was reappraised or not. This pattern was not replicated in Sample 2, however. In fact, analysis of Sample 2
revealed little to no information regarding the influence of reappraisal on self-presentation.

Overall, the third hypothesis was partially supported. Sample 1 provides a tentative conclusion regarding the differential effect of either reappraising or not self-relevant events. This is tentative in that the effects were not replicated in Sample 2. Also, the hypothesis is only partially supported because these data are restricted to conclusions regarding differential behaviors, instead of making conclusions regarding the effectiveness of these self-presentation strategies. Initially, the approach to analyzing the self-presentation behaviors was to rate individuals’ perceptions of participants’ self-presentation style (e.g., the extent to which they were engaged, presented themselves as likeable, etc.). Unfortunately, this approach was limited by poor inter-rater reliability. Therefore, judges rated objective behaviors that may have implications for self-presentational styles. What was gained in objectively identifiable behaviors was lost in making conclusions regarding the effectiveness of these strategies. Therefore, the third hypothesis found partial support from Sample 1, but not Sample 2.

In the fourth hypothesis, predictions were made regarding the influence of gender on emotional distress and self-presentation behaviors. Experiments 2 and 3 (Sample 2) addressed this hypothesis. In particular regards to participants’ experience of emotional distress, there was no support for this hypothesis. The hypothesis was that females would experience more emotional distress than males in the valid-reappraisal and control conditions, but there would be no significant differences in their experience of emotional distress when reappraising the event as irrelevant to their potential as a friend. Experiment 2 demonstrated that invalid-reappraisal participants experienced less
emotional distress than valid-reappraisal and control participants, but these reappraisal strategies did not interact with gender. While analyses did not reveal this predicted interaction, inspection of the means does indicate that females were experiencing more emotional distress than males across reappraisal conditions (see Table 3). Again, these differences were not statistically significant, and perhaps, this finding implies that social exclusion is an emotionally powerful event, regardless of gender, and reappraisal is effective at attenuating these responses, regardless of gender.

In particular regards to the influence of gender on self-presentation behaviors, Sample 2 indicated that males and females differed in their approach to events that have implications for their interpersonal success and their reactions to a threat to their interpersonal success. For example, the results indicated that females looked away more after receiving the social exclusion feedback than before receiving the social exclusion feedback; whereas, males looking behavior did not change before and after the social exclusion event. It is tempting to conclude that this indicates that females were more impacted by the feedback than males, but again, conclusions are unable to be drawn from the data regarding the effectiveness or meaning underlying these behaviors.

Overall, the fourth hypothesis found partial support in that males and females behaved differently in events with interpersonal implications, but little evidence indicates that their reactions to the social exclusion event or their reappraisal of the event influenced their behavior. Additionally, there was no evidence that gender influenced emotional reactions to the social exclusion event.

Across all four hypotheses, either full or partial support was found. In summary, participants were able to reappraise social exclusion events, despite social exclusion’s
effect on self-regulation (Baumeister et al., 2005) and cognitive processes (Baumeister et al., 2002). The reappraisal of this event was effective at attenuating the emotional distress. In regards to the effect reappraisal strategy had on subsequent self-presentation, analysis of sample 1 indicated that reappraisal hampered subsequent self-presentation, but this was not found in Sample 2. Additionally, gender did not influence emotional reactions, but males and females do differ in their approach to interpersonal events.

Implications for the Relevant Literature

Personal consequences. Overall, the results of this study are consistent with past research in the area of social exclusion, emotion, and emotion regulation. Where these data are inconsistent with past research is in regards to the management of the emotional distress caused by social exclusion. Recall, the primary cost of social exclusion was impaired self-regulation. Therefore, individuals should be less likely to manage subsequent distress. This work indicated that socially excluded individuals were able to manage their emotional distress. Two explanations can be offered for this discrepancy. First, social exclusion impairs self-regulation. Social exclusion does not prevent self-regulation. To be sure, Baumeister et al. (2005; Experiments 5 and 6) demonstrated that socially excluded individuals could self-regulate when self-awareness was increased or provided an incentive. Therefore, individuals are able to exert self-control following social exclusion to the extent that they are motivated to do so. Furthermore, research indicates that when threatened, individuals are motivated to exert control over their emotions rather than exert control over other behaviors requiring self-regulation (Leith & Baumeister, 1996; Tice, Bratslavsky, & Baumeister, 2001; also see Baumeister & Scher, 1988 for a review). Indeed, in Baumeister and colleagues’ (2005) empirical
demonstration of impaired self-regulation, participants did not manage behaviors unrelated to emotion (e.g., resisting cookies), but there were weak or no effects on emotional distress. Given the limited capacity to self-regulate (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000), socially excluded individuals are forced to choose to manage their emotional response or regulate other behaviors. Taken together, Baumeister et al.’s (2005) findings may be more of an indication that participants managed their emotional response and were consequently less able to exert control over the number of cookies they ate, for example.

In summary, one explanation for why individuals were able to manage their emotional distress was because social exclusion impairs self-regulation and does not prevent it. Therefore, socially excluded individuals were able to manage their emotional distress because (a) individuals are motivated to manage emotional distress, which leads to subsequent regulation deficits illustrated in the literature.

A second explanation for why socially excluded participants in the present work were able to manage their emotional distress is because reappraisal does not tax the regulatory resource as much as other strategies; thus, individuals are able to manage the distress despite impaired regulation. Additionally, reappraisal by definition can “defuse” emotional responses. Recall, appraisal processes facilitate emotional responses, but only to the extent that the event is self-relevant (Lazarus, 1991a). By instructing participants to write that the event was irrelevant to their potential as a friend, the event was no longer self-relevant. In turn, participants did not experience the emotional distress that was experienced prior to reappraising the event.
In summary, the primary contribution of this work to the literature is that individuals can manage the emotional distress caused by social exclusion. To address the inconsistency in the literature showing impaired self-regulation after social exclusion, two explanations were proposed. First, a closer inspection of the literature illustrates that self-regulatory processes are impaired, but can be overcome if the motivation is present. Indeed, individuals are motivated to manage their distress, which often leads to a subsequent pattern of unregulated behaviors (see Baumeister & Scher, 1988). Second, the effectiveness of reappraisal overcomes the self-regulation impairment because it is (a) efficient and (b) it effectively ‘defuses’ any emotional response.

**Interpersonal outcome.** To address the social or interpersonal outcomes, participants’ self-presentation behaviors were analyzed. Results of this analysis were inconsistent, and in turn, conclusions drawn from these results are limited and tentative. Specifically, the results did not clearly indicate the extent to which the strategies were effective. However, the results were consistent with research indicating differences in males and females self-presentation styles (Leary, Robertson, Barnes, & Miller, 1986), and in particular, their effort used to gain social approval after being socially excluded (Williams & Sommer, 1997). Results of Sample 1 also indicated that engaging or not engaging in self-regulation differentially caused participants to engage in different kinds of behaviors (Vohs et al., 2005).

**Future Work**

Three areas should be addressed directly extending from this present work. First, a comparison of emotion regulation strategies should be studied. The purpose of the present work was to initiate a programmatic study of the consequences of various
emotion regulation strategies. This work focused on reappraisal, but the obvious next step is to compare the personal and interpersonal outcomes of this strategy with others.

Second and related to the first, future work should address the social outcome of emotion regulation in a different way than in the present work. Clearly, the social outcome analysis in this work is limited in the conclusions that can be drawn. Several self-presentation measures are used in other work (e.g., Baumeister & Cairns, 1992; Leary, et al., 1994; Vohs et al., 2005). Analysis of the videotaped interview sessions seemed like a reasonable approach given the context of what was taking place in the present work; however, other, more reliable measures should be employed to compliment the work completed here.

Finally, one alternative explanation in the present work is demand effects. Because participants were required to write about the validity of the interview session, they may have reported their emotional responses in a manner consistent with what was expected. While several studies (e.g., Twenge et al., 2003) show that participants do not report emotional reactions in a manner consistent with their feedback (i.e., acceptance vs. exclusion feedback), other measures should be taken to ensure that participants response is representative of their emotional state and not demand. In the present work, an attempt was made to do this by using an implicit measure of emotion, but the results were inconsistent. Future work would benefit from reliable, indirect measures of emotion.

Conclusions

This work was an initial investigation of the emotional and social consequences of engaging in emotion regulation. Specifically, the present work demonstrated that reappraisal was an effective method for dealing with emotional distress elicited by social
exclusion. Because the need to belong is a fundamental and pervasive drive, individuals’ effective use of self-presentation was explored. Results indicated that males and females differed in their self-presentational patterns in response to social exclusion and engaging in reappraisal moderated subsequent self-presentation behaviors.
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TABLES
Table 1

*Participants’ Mean (SD) Explicitly and Implicitly Assessed Positive Emotional Reactions to Social Exclusion Feedback Before and After Reappraisal in Experiment 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Reaction</th>
<th>Reappraisal Conditions</th>
<th>Before Reappraisal</th>
<th>After Reappraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly Measured</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24 (2.02)</td>
<td>4.26 (1.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly Measured</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.99 (.80)</td>
<td>4.97 (.63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Male and Female Participants’ Mean (SD) Implicitly Assessed Emotional Reactions to Social Exclusion Feedback Before and After Engaging in Reappraisal in Experiment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Reappraisal Conditions</th>
<th>Before Reappraisal</th>
<th>After Reappraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.16 (.63)</td>
<td>4.77 (.59)</td>
<td>5.15 (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.95 (.54)</td>
<td>4.92 (.52)</td>
<td>5.01 (.55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Male and Female Participants’ Mean (SD) Explicitly Assessed Emotional Reactions to Social Exclusion Feedback Before and After Engaging in Reappraisal in Experiment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PANAS-X Subscale</th>
<th>Reappraisal Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid-Reappraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Emotion</td>
<td>2.77 (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.71 (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.73 (.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotion</td>
<td>1.34 (.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.59 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.50 (.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.50 (.55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Male and Female Participants’ Mean (SD) Potential Friend Ratings Before and After the Social Exclusion Feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Reappraisal Conditions</th>
<th>Before Reappraisal</th>
<th>After Reappraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.65 (1.05)</td>
<td>7.34 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.61 (1.24)</td>
<td>7.48 (.97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

*Operational Definition of Coded Behaviors in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arms Crossed</td>
<td>Identified when participant has both arms crossed, such that their hands are at the elbow of the opposite arm. This behavior was not coded when participants had their hands or arms folded in their lap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look Away</td>
<td>Identified when a participant does not make eye contact with interviewer/confederate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>Identified when a participant smiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laugh</td>
<td>Identified when a participant laughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>Identified as any movements that are used as expression (i.e., hand gestures, head–nods, shoulder shrugs, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidget</td>
<td>Identified as any extraneous movements not used as expression. These movements included hand-ringing, rubbing arms or legs, playing with pen, paper, touching face or hair. Swinging legs or tapping foot was not counted because not all videotapes captured the full-body image of participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All behaviors were coded while participant was answering confederate’s questions or just after.
Table 6

*Inter-rater Reliability for the First and Second First Impression Interview Sessions for Sample 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Coded</th>
<th>Interview 1 Reliability</th>
<th>Interview 2 Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arms Crossed</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look Away</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laugh</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidget</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7  

*Inter-rater Reliability for the First and Second First Impression Interview Sessions for Sample 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Coded</th>
<th>Interview 1 Reliability</th>
<th>Interview 2 Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arms Crossed</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look Away</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laugh</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidget</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Mean (SD) Proportion of Behaviors Present During the First and Second First Impression Interview Sessions in Each Reappraisal Condition for Sample 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>First Impression Interviews</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms Crossed</td>
<td>.07 (.26)</td>
<td>.19 (.32)</td>
<td>.14 (.27)</td>
<td>.00 (.02)</td>
<td>.07 (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look Away</td>
<td>.79 (.23)</td>
<td>.86 (.16)</td>
<td>.87 (.14)</td>
<td>.86 (.21)</td>
<td>.88 (.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>.60 (.31)</td>
<td>.59 (.35)</td>
<td>.63 (.30)</td>
<td>.50 (.35)</td>
<td>.62 (.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laugh</td>
<td>.21 (.22)</td>
<td>.13 (.14)</td>
<td>.21 (.20)</td>
<td>.20 (.21)</td>
<td>.14 (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>.20 (.24)</td>
<td>.38 (.31)</td>
<td>.38 (.27)</td>
<td>.38 (.31)</td>
<td>.50 (.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidget</td>
<td>.62 (.30)</td>
<td>.46 (.27)</td>
<td>.63 (.35)</td>
<td>.79 (.20)</td>
<td>.69 (.28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Mean (SD) Proportion of Behaviors Present During the First and Second First Impression Interview Sessions in Each Reappraisal Condition for Sample 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>First Impression Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms Crossed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.05 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.19 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look Away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.89 (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.90 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.40 (.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.71 (.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>First Impression Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laugh</td>
<td>.08 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.26 (.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>.43 (.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.45 (.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidget</td>
<td>.50 (.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.56 (.29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX A

Relationship Induction Closeness Task Questions
Interview Session I

1. What is your first name?
2. What year are you at the University of Mississippi?
3. What made you come to the University of Mississippi?
4. What would be the perfect lifestyle for you?
5. If you could travel anywhere in the world, where would you go and why?
6. Do you miss your family?
7. Describe the last time you felt lonely.
8. What is one of your biggest fears?
9. What is your happiest early childhood memory?
10. What is one recent accomplishment that you are proud of?

Interview Session II

1. How old are you?
2. Where are you from?
3. What do you think you might major in? Why?
4. What would you like to do after graduating from the University of Mississippi?
5. What is something you have always wanted to do but probably never will be able to do?
6. If you could change one thing about yourself, what would that be?
7. What is one habit you’d like to break?
8. Is it difficult or easy for you to meet people? Why?
9. What is one emotional experience you’ve had with a good friend?
10. What is one thing about yourself that most people would consider surprising?
APPENDIX B

Social Exclusion Feedback: Experiment 1
RATINGS SHEET

Participant # ________________

☐ This person appears to have great potential as a friend or acquaintance. She is very personable and likeable, and I could consider this person as a friend or acquaintance.

☐ This person appears to have moderate potential as a friend or acquaintance. She is only moderately personable and likeable, but I could consider this person as a friend or acquaintance.

☑ This person appears to have little potential as a friend or acquaintance. She is not very personable and likeable, and I could not consider this person as a friend or acquaintance.
APPENDIX C

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Short Form
Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to your personality.

1. I like to gossip at times.
2. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
3. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
4. I always try to practice what I preach.
5. I sometimes try to get even rather than to forgive and forget.
6. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
7. There have been occasions when I have felt like smashing things.
8. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
9. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
10. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.
APPENDIX D

Positive and Negative Affect Scale—Expanded Form (PANAS-X)
This scale consists of a number of words and phrases that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you are feel the following Use the following scale to record your answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Slightly or Not at All</td>
<td>A Little</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Quite A bit</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| _____ cheerful | _____ sad | _____ active | _____ angry at self |
| _____ disgusted | _____ calm | _____ guilty | _____ enthusiastic |
| _____ attentive | _____ afraid | _____ joyful | _____ downhearted |
| _____ bashful | _____ tired | _____ nervous | _____ sheepish |
| _____ sluggish | _____ amazed | _____ lonely | _____ distressed |
| _____ daring | _____ shaky | _____ sleepy | _____ blameworthy |
| _____ surprised | _____ happy | _____ excited | _____ determined |
| _____ strong | _____ timid | _____ hostile | _____ frightened |
| _____ scornful | _____ alone | _____ proud | _____ astonished |
| _____ relaxed | _____ alert | _____ jittery | _____ interested |
| _____ irritable | _____ upset | _____ lively | _____ loathing |
| _____ delighted | _____ angry | _____ ashamed | _____ confident |
| _____ inspired | _____ bold | _____ at ease | _____ energetic |
| _____ fearless | _____ blue | _____ scared | _____ concentrating |
| _____ disgusted with self | _____ shy | _____ drowsy | _____ dissatisfied with self |
APPENDIX E

Social Exclusion Feedback: Experiment 2
The numbers below represent each member of your group.

The circle indicates where you ranked based on the group’s average rating of you as a potential friend or acquaintance.

1

2

3

4
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