10

Self-Presentation in Sport and Exercise

James A. Dimmock, Timothy C. Howle, and Ben Jackson

The University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia

In describing humans' inherent social orientation, John Donne (1975) wrote that "no man is an island." Our orientation toward social interactions and group functioning is adaptive—it provides opportunities to manage threats, to create and exchange resources, to procreate, and to receive nurturance and care—and availability of these social and material outcomes hinges largely on how others perceive us. In this light, it is understandable that people often care about, and might attempt to control, the impressions that others make of them. Self-presentation, or impression management, refers to the processes by which people monitor and control how they are perceived and evaluated by others (Goffman, 1959; Leary, Tchividjian, & Kraxberger, 1994; Schlenker, 1980). Usually, the images people try to convey are not "falsehoods"; that is, people typically attempt to create images that are consistent with how they see themselves (Martin Ginis, Lindwall, & Prapavessis, 2007). Put differently, self-presentation typically involves the selective presentation of particular self-relevant information and the selective nondisclosure of other information, rather than attempts to convey false images (Martin Ginis et al., 2007). Acts of self-presentation are pervasive (Leary, Nezleck et al., 1994); in fact, some argue that there are few social situations in which people can afford to completely ignore or disregard others' evaluations of them (Leary, 1995). Perhaps due to the potency and prevalence of self-presentation as a tactic in social intercourse, research in this area has been prolific for decades. Self-presentation motives and behaviors have been studied in domains as varied as social media use (e.g., Fox & Rooney, 2015), academic performance (Czopp, Lasane, Sweigard, Bradshaw, & Hammer, 1998), health behavior (e.g., Leary, Tchividjian et al., 1994), sexuality (e.g., Levitt & Ippolito, 2013), crime (e.g., Sutton, Robinson, & Farrall, 2011), and workplace performance (e.g., Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009).

In the present chapter, we discuss self-presentation in sport and exercise, with a particular focus on *motivation* for self-presentation in these settings. Being categorized by others as an "athlete" or "exerciser" can offer a series of interpersonal benefits (e.g., Martin, Sinden, & Fleming, 2000; Martin Ginis, Latimer, & Jung, 2003), such as being seen as fitter, stronger, healthier, more attractive, friendlier, kinder, and more sociable than others (Martin et al., 2000), and it is plausible that self-presentation motivation in sport and exercise is based on the pursuit of these benefits. Interestingly, aside from the apparent "halo effect" of being an exerciser (i.e., the tendency for raters' positive global impressions to influence their evaluation of individual attributes), there also appears to be a "devil effect" for non-exercisers, whereby the global image that is cast when one is portrayed as a non-exerciser taints evaluations relative to control targets on discrete dimensions (Martin et al., 2000; Martin Ginis et al., 2007). On the surface, there appears to be a host of benefits to portraying an identity as an athlete (or exerciser), and the opportunity to claim these identities may constitute an important reason for sport or exercise participation among some individuals (e.g., Grove & Dodder, 1982). An interesting aspect of self-presentation motivation, however, is that it can also have a "dark side"; the desire to avoid portraying oneself as uncoordinated or unfit, for example, can deter participation in exercise (Martin, Leary, & O'Brien, 2001). In addition, evidence has accumulated to suggest that self-presentation goals are less likely to be inherently satisfying than other—especially intrinsic—goals for exercise (Sebire, Standage, & Vansteenkiste, 2009), so benefits derived from possession of self-presentation goals should be weighed against such disadvantageous outcomes. We give attention to these various issues associated with self-presentation motivation in this chapter.

The chapter is broken into four sections. The first charts the history of conceptual and empirical work on self-presentation in sport and exercise. Then, in a second section, the 2 × 2 self-presentation motivation framework (Howle, Jackson, Conroy, & Dimmock, 2015),

Handbook of Sport Psychology, Fourth Edition, Volume I. Edited by Gershon Tenenbaum and Robert C. Eklund.

which is a contemporary framework on self-presentation motivation in physical activity, is overviewed alongside a discussion of research on this framework. Third, self-presentation motivation is discussed with reference to perhaps the most ubiquitous theory in sport and exercise psychology at present—that of Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Finally, a fourth section is dedicated to practical implications from research on self-presentation in sport and exercise, together with recommendations for future research on self-presentation processes in these contexts.

History of Self-Presentation Research

Erving Goffman (1959), who wrote about the importance of impression management to social interactions and self-identity, is regarded as the first key contributor to the literature on impression management. Over the subsequent decade (i.e., the 1960s), Edward E. Jones provided a series of conceptual, methodological, and empirical contributions to the study of self-presentation, including the articulation of particular self-presentation tactics, and these contributions remained influential for the most part of the late 1900s. In relation to literature on self-presentation in sport and exercise, Leary's (1992) review was the first compelling argument that impression management could influence a series of performance, motivation, and emotional responses in athletes and exercisers. Leary's contribution whetted the appetite for researchers in sport and exercise psychology, and in the years since 1992, a steady stream of research has been undertaken on self-presentation processes in these contexts. Interestingly, this work has been undertaken in the absence of a formal, comprehensive theory of self-presentation. In fact, some 30 years ago, the impression management literature was described as immature and lacking theoretical influence (Schneider, 1981; Tetlock & Manstead, 1985), and to a large extent these criticisms remain valid to this day (Eklund & Howle, 2018). Perhaps in response to the continued absence of a well-recognized theory of self-presentation, scholars have turned to a variety of other theories in their attempts to study self-presentation in physical activity, including SDT (Brunet & Sabiston, 2009; Thogersen-Ntoumani & Ntoumanis, 2007), the Theory of Planned Behavior (Latimer & Martin Ginis, 2005), and Social Cognitive Theory (Brunet & Sabiston, 2011; Gammage, Hall, & Martin Ginis, 2004; Gammage, Martin Ginis, & Hall, 2004). Self-Determination Theory may be a particularly useful lens through which to study self-presentation, and we discuss this issue later in the chapter. For now, we turn our attention to some interesting insights that have emerged from existing research on self-presentation in sport and exercise.

In relation to *sport*, a focus has been given to the potentially deleterious influence of self-presentation concerns on affective experiences. Some of this work has been guided by Schlenker and Leary's (1982) argument that self-presentation concerns are likely to be aligned with experiences of social anxiety. Research has generally supported this premise; self-presentation concerns have been shown to undermine athletes' trait-level affective experiences (Wilson & Eklund, 1998), and athletes' state-based affect has been shown to be more negative when self-presentation concerns are high or made salient (Howle & Eklund, 2013; Podlog, Dimmock, & Miller, 2011; Podlog et al., 2013; Renfrew, Howle, & Eklund, 2017). In addition, a portion of the literature on sport-based self-presentation has focused on the nature of specific self-presentation tactics or on behavioral consequences of self-presentation concerns among athletes. In relation to the former area, a rich body of literature has developed on self-handicapping (i.e., when individuals act or choose a performance setting to enhance the opportunity to externalize failure and to internalize success; Berglas & Jones, 1978), including studies of first ("is"), second ("when"), and third ("how") generation issues on self-handicapping (see Martin Ginis et al., 2007). In relation to the latter issue, research on choking in sport (i.e., inferior performance despite striving and incentives for superior performance; Baumeister & Showers, 1986; Hill, Hanton, Matthews, & Fleming, 2010) has focused on the potential undermining effect of self-presentation concerns on performance quality (e.g., Mesagno, Harvey, & Janelle, 2011). In another line of inquiry on the latter issue, social physique anxiety (i.e., anxiety experienced in response to evaluations, or potential evaluations, of one's body by others; Hart, Leary, & Rejeski, 1989) has been shown to be associated with eating disorder tendencies among female athletes (Haase & Prapavessis, 2001) and to steroid use in male athletes (Schwerin et al., 1996).

Associations between identity and self-presentation motives have also been investigated in sport-based research on self-presentation. Sport involvement can cast a strong and coherent image to others about one's self (Sadalla, Linder, & Jenkins, 1988), and many individuals seem to be motivated to participate in certain sports due to their (the individuals') desire to create or manage image concerns (Nicholas, Dimmock, Donnelly, Alderson, & Jackson, 2018). Similar identity-related processes have been examined among sport fans; Wann, Royalty, and Roberts (2000), for example, discovered that sport fans were more likely to disclose their fandom to a rival fan (i.e., engage in self-presentation behavior) if they were highly identified with the team, and fans who

were higher in self-esteem were more likely to mention their fandom sooner. Also, highly identified sport fans have been found to engage more in acts of self-presentation to display their team identification after a win (i.e., basking in reflected glory), and engage less in acts to protect their team identification after a loss (i.e., cutting off reflected failure; Trail et al., 2012).

Research on self-presentation in *exercise* has sometimes been framed by Leary and Kowalski's (1990) model of impression management, in which two discrete processes of self-presentation are identified: impression motivation and impression construction (see Leary, 1992). Impression motivation reflects the extent to which individuals are motivated to control how others perceive them, and can be understood as a function of goal relevance of the impression, the value of the desired outcome, and the discrepancy between one's current and desired image (Leary, 1995). In other words, impression motivation is high when a particular impression services a desired goal (e.g., has the potential to affect important material or social outcomes, self-esteem, or identity) and when there is a large disparity between current perceptions and desired perceptions in relation to the desired goal. For example, an exerciser would be expected to possess high impression motivation during an exercise session with a personal trainer to the extent that the exerciser perceives the session to be important for projecting a positive impression, that a positive impression is deemed to be important for obtaining a desired outcome (e.g., perceptions of attractiveness), and to the extent that the exerciser thinks that the personal trainer has not already developed a firm impression on relevant dimensions (e.g., attractiveness). Impression construction involves decisions around particular strategies to achieve a desired impression, as well as implicit or explicit engagement in those strategies (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Five factors were proposed by Leary and Kowalski to influence impression construction: the individual's self-concept (i.e., how he/she sees him/herself), desired and undesired identity images (i.e., how he/she wants and does not want to be seen), values of the self-presentation target (i.e., expectations and desires of the individual receiving the self-presentation communication), constraints related to the individual's present role (i.e., norms and standards of behavior), and the individual's perceptions of his/her current and potential image. As a consequence of these factors, individuals who are motivated to manage their image may engage in different acts of self-presentation to achieve their goal.

Despite the fact that a measure of impression motivation and impression construction has been developed for researchers of self-presentation in exercise (Self-Presentation in Exercise Questionnaire; SPEQ; Conroy, Motl, & Hall, 2000), use of this scale has not been as forthcoming as one might expect. Some criticisms of the measure have been made, including arguments that the impression construction subscale assesses only a single impression construction strategy (see Martin Ginis et al., 2007), and that the impression motivation subscale may also under-represent categories of impression motivation (Howle, Jackson, et al., 2015). These criticisms may have played a role in subduing enthusiasm for use of the scale, but the small volume of research on impression motivation and impression construction in exercise is still surprising. Of the relatively few studies that have directly utilized Leary and Kowalski's (1990) framework in exercise, both impression motivation and impression construction have often been shown to positively predict physical activity. Conroy et al. (2000) and Lindwall (2005), for instance, found that exercise frequency and duration were positively associated with both impression motivation and impression construction, and Brunet and Sabiston (2011) found that impression motivation was predictive of moderate and vigorous physical activity in breast cancer survivors. In other work on breast cancer patients (Brunet, Sabiston, & Gaudreau, 2014), impression motivation was associated with moderate and vigorous physical activity at a between-person level, and impression construction was associated with moderate and vigorous physical activity at the between- and within-person levels. Notwithstanding these significant findings, it is noteworthy that findings across (and even within) studies on exercise and self-presentation have sometimes been inconsistent. For example, in Conroy et al.'s (2000) study, impression motivation was found to be positively associated with the number of days of exercise per week, but not the amount of hours spent exercising or the percentage of leisure time spent exercising. Further, Gammage et al. (2004) reported no significant difference in impression motivation between high- and low-frequency exercisers.

Inconsistencies in results from studies on self-presentation in exercise have been commonplace, and such inconsistency is evident in perhaps the most widely studied area of self-presentation in sport and exercise psychology—that of social physique anxiety. In research on exercise, much of the focus on social physique anxiety has involved an examination of its relationship as a trait variable with exercise behavior. When conceptualized as a trait variable, social physique anxiety reflects people's tendencies to become anxious when others observe or evaluate their physique (Hart et al., 1989). Some of these studies have shown a positive relationship between these variables; other studies have shown a negative relationship, and others have revealed no relationship. A few attempts have been made to understand these inconsistent results, primarily by examining possible moderator variables (e.g., Lantz, Hardy, & Ainsworth, 1997;

Treasure, Lox, & Lawton, 1998; Woodgate, Martin Ginis, & Sinden, 2003), but more work is needed to elucidate the role of social physique anxiety on exercise, as well as to investigate the possible influence of exercise on social physique anxiety (Martin Ginis et al., 2007).

The 2 × 2 Framework for Self-Presentation Motivation for Physical Activity

The two-component model outlining impression motivation and impression construction has offered valuable insights into self-presentation processes, antecedents, and outcomes in sport and exercise. Nonetheless, one of the limitations of the use of this model in these contexts is the way that impression motivation has been quantified. In the SPEQ (Conroy et al., 2000), impression motivation is measured as individuals' desire to impress others with reference to their physical abilities. Unfortunately, such a method of assessment is limited because it fails to capture avoidance-based motives for self-presentation, and it also fails to capture other types of images (i.e., beyond physical ability) that individuals may wish to convey. Leary and Kowalski (1990) recognized that acts of self-presentation could be grounded in both approach-oriented motives (e.g., the desire to appear fit) as well as avoidance-oriented motives (e.g., the desire to avoid appearing unfit). In addition, the type of image individuals wish to present extends beyond physical competence (e.g., at times, exercisers might wish to self-present to appear friendly). The Impression Motivation in Sport Questionnaire—Team (IMSQ-T) (Payne, Hudson, Akehurst, & Ntoumanis, 2013) is a recent addition to the literature that addresses this limitation by taking account of various motivations for self-presentation (i.e., self-development, social identity development, avoidance of negative outcomes, and avoidance of damaging impressions). Although the IMSQ-T is a useful measure due to its multi-dimensionality, it is limited in terms of its scope of use (i.e., athletes in sport teams). Also, despite the potential for situational factors to influence self-presentation motives (Howle, Dimmock, Whipp, & Jackson, 2015a), both the SPEQ and IMSQ-T orient the responder to consider their general motive strength. Recently, in order to overcome these limitations in conceptualization and measurement of impression motivation, a new framework (and measure) for self-presentation motivation in physical activity has been advanced.

The 2 × 2 framework for self-presentation motives in physical activity, developed by Howle and colleagues (Howle, Jackson, et al., 2015), was derived by integrating the agency/communion (Bakan, 1966) and approach/avoidance (Elliot, 2008) motivation paradigms. That is, motives in the 2 × 2 framework are categorized according to (a) their focus on physical qualities and task ability (i.e., "agentic") or interpersonal qualities (i.e., "communal"), and (b) their focus on seeking social approval (i.e., "acquisitive") or avoiding social disapproval (i.e., "protective"). As a consequence of the merging of the two well-established motivation paradigms, four specific self-presentation motivations are proposed in the 2 × 2 framework: acquisitive-communal, protective-communal, acquisitive-agentic, and protective-agentic. Definitions of the four different motives are provided in Figure 10.1.

When communion is focused upon, individuals value affiliation and social connections (Moskowitz, 2005) and set goals based on a desire to feel close to, and be liked by, others (Ojanen, Sijtsema, & Rambaran, 2013). These goals are predictive of agreeable, benevolent, and empathetic acts, and such communal behavior has been proposed to influence the extent to which an individual is liked by others and feels connected to them (Locke & Nekich, 2000; Wojciszke, Abele, & Baryla, 2009). When concerned with agency, individuals value achievement, mastery, power, and competence (Moskowitz, 2005; Trapnell & Paulhus, 2012; Wiggins, 1991), and agency-driven behavior is thought to determine the extent to which an individual is respected by others (Wojciszke et al., 2009). It is noteworthy that physical activity provides bountiful opportunities for the satisfaction of both communal and acquisitive drives. That is, in various sport and exercise contexts, individuals may interact to form social connections, and/or they may undertake physical tasks to demonstrate competence and mastery.

The acquisitive-protective distinction in the 2 × 2 framework is derived from the approach/avoidance paradigm that has permeated many fields of psychology (Elliot, 2005). It has long been recognized that alongside approaching pleasant stimuli, individuals can be motivated to avoid unpleasant stimuli (Elliot, 1999, 2008), and in some cases, avoiding negative outcomes is a more powerful motivation than approaching positive outcomes

	Protective	Acquisitive
Agentic	Avoiding disapproval from others in terms of one's physical qualities and task ability.	Obtaining approval from others in terms of one's physical qualities and task ability.
Communal	Avoiding disapproval from others about one's interpersonal qualities.	Gaining approval from others about one's interpersonal qualities.

Figure 10.1 2 × 2 framework for self-presentation motives.

(Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001). In relation to self-presentation, the desire to present oneself in a way that will avoid disapproval is referred to as protective motivation, and the desire to present oneself in a way to obtain approval is referred to as acquisitive motivation (Arkin, 1981). Individuals with an acquisitive motive are expected to display approach-oriented interpersonal behavior, such as being socially proactive, taking social risks, being assertive with self-presentation behaviors, using coping styles characterized by persistence and a focus on success, and at times, using offensive tactics such as undermining others to promote their own standing (Arkin, 1981; Arkin & Sheppard, 1990; Howle, Jackson, et al., 2015; Renner, Laux, Schutz, & Tedeschi, 2004; Schutz, 1998). Acquisitive self-presentation motivation is also expected to align positively with participation in physical activity participation and effort. When driven by protective motives, individuals are likely to be hesitant in engaging in social action and are more likely to use coping strategies involving escape and avoidance (Arkin, 1981; Howle, Jackson, et al., 2015; Renner et al., 2004). Individuals with strong protective self-presentation motives are likely to avoid public attention, use excuses and concessions, use passive engagement strategies, and report social worry and fear of failure (Nikitin & Freund, 2010; Shin & Ryan, 2012). Sport team participants with a protective motive may avoid taking shots or penalties, and exercisers with this type of motive may avoid group-based classes or position themselves at the back of classes or some other location where they are less likely to be noticed (Brewer, Diehl, Cornelius, Joshua, & Van Raalte, 2004; Bushman & Brandenburg, 2009).

When originally proposing the 2 × 2 framework, Howle, Jackson, et al. (2015) indicated that the four self-presentation motives are not mutually exclusive; individuals can endorse all motives in any given physical activity context (e.g., an individual might wish to self-present to gain social approval, and at the same time, self-present to avoid social disapproval). Also, Howle, Jackson, et al. (2015) specified that individuals *endorse* or *adopt* these motives rather than possess them as a disposition. Although it is possible that self-presentation motivation can remain relatively stable over time, research indicates that situational elements can lead to within-person changes in these constructs (Jones, Gergen, & Jones, 1963; Leary, Robertson, Barnes, & Miller, 1986; Schneider, 1969; Tice, Butler, Muraven, & Stillwell, 1995). Finally, soon after introducing the 2 × 2 framework to scholars in sport and exercise psychology, Howle and colleagues (Howle, Dimmock, Whipp, & Jackson, 2015b) published a self-report measure of acquisitive-communal, acquisitive-agentic, protective-communal, and protective-agentic self-presentation motives in physical activity. This measure, called the Self-presentation Motives in Physical Activity Questionnaire (SMPAQ), has since been used to investigate predictors and outcomes of the motives, and we discuss this research, as well as other research guided by the 2 × 2 framework, in the next section.

Research on the 2 × 2 Framework

The 2 × 2 framework has only recently been developed, but a series of interesting findings has emerged from the handful of studies that have been undertaken on it (see Table 10.1). In general, empirical support for the framework has been forthcoming. Howle, Jackson, and Dimmock (2016), for instance, found that individuals' adoption of acquisitive-communal self-presentation motives positively predicted more favorable communal evaluations from sport teammates, and adoption of a protective-communal motive was negatively associated with teammates' communal evaluations. In a separate study, individuals' endorsement of acquisitive-agentic motives was positively associated with exercise task persistence, whereas endorsement of protective-agentic motives was negatively associated with persistence (Howle, Dimmock, & Jackson, 2016).

In relation to possible antecedents to the motives in the 2 × 2 framework, Howle, Dimmock, et al. (2016) discovered that, in support of their hypotheses, individuals who were more confident in their task ability (i.e., possessed high task self-efficacy) and their ability to create a desired impression (i.e., possessed high self-presentation efficacy) were more likely to endorse acquisitive-agentic motives for the exercise. In other work on antecedents to the 2 × 2 motives, trait agency was predictive of agentic motive endorsement whereas trait communion was predictive of communal motive endorsement, and individuals who possessed greater confidence in their ability to create a desired impression (i.e., in relation to physical appearance and exercise) or who were confident in their ability to initiate and maintain relationships (i.e., social self-efficacy) also reported stronger motive endorsement related to acquisition of these attributes (i.e., acquisitive agency and acquisitive communion, respectively; Howle et al., 2015a). Finally, recent work has uncovered relationships between narcissism—which reflects a preoccupation with the self—and a variety of self-presentation tactics (Hart, Adams, Burton, & Tortoriello, 2017). In this study, grandiose narcissism (i.e., associated with self-assuredness, extraversion, and social competence; Miller, Hoffman, Gaughan, Gentile, Maples, & Campbell, 2011) was shown to be aligned with heightened use of acquisitive but not protective self-presentation tactics, whereas vulnerable narcissism (i.e., associated with shyness, neuroticism, introversion after first encounters, but arrogance and conceitedness after longer encounters;

Table 10.1 Published studies using the 2 x 2 framework of self-presentation motives.

Topic Area	Study	Participants	Methods	Primary Findings
Physical education classes	Verma et al. (2019)	273 adolescent girls from Scotland; years S1 to S3 (i.e., the first three years of high school). S1 mean age = 11.75; S2 mean age = 12.71; S3 mean age = 13.64)	Self-report questionnaire at time 1 and time 2 (one week apart) for all participants. A subset of participants (n = 33) also wore accelerometers to collect more objective physical activity data.	Significant positive indirect effects from acquisitive motives to class engagement via physical activity identity. Acquisitive motives mediated the positive and significant pathway between transformational teaching and physical activity behavior.
	Howle, Dimmock, Whipp, & Jackson (2015a)	Study 1 involved 445 PE students (mean age 13.64; n_{male}=202; n_{female} =234) from an Australian high school. Study 2 involved 301 PE students (mean age 14.15; n_{male}=152; n_{female} =143) from another Australian high school.	Single period self-report questionnaire for study 1 and study 2. Study 1 used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Study 2 used cluster analysis.	Significant predictors of 2 x 2 motives included fear of negative evaluation, trait agency and communion, self-presentational efficacy, and social self-efficacy. Around half of the students could be classified into a high motive endorsement cluster and the other half into a low motive endorsement cluster.
Sport	Howle, Jackson, & Dimmock (2016)	112 Australian undergraduate students (mean age = 20.43; n_{male}=53; n_{female} =58).	2 x 2 self-presentation motives measured prior to a basketball game; task behavior during the game recorded and later coded; teammate evaluations measured after the game.	SEM revealed positive pathways from an acquisitive-agentic motive to task behavior, and from acquisitive-agentic and -communal motives to favorable evaluations. Negative pathways were observed from the protective-communal motive to task behavior and others' evaluations.
	Hill, Carvell, Matthews, Weston, & Thelwell (2017)	9 elite athletes (mean age 27.14; n_{male}=6; n_{female} =3).	Participants were purposefully selected for their experiences with choking and/or clutch performance. In-depth phenomenological interviews were conducted.	Participants' reports indicated that immediately prior to choking they tended to endorse protective-agentic motives, whereas acquisitive-agentic motives tended to be endorsed immediately prior to clutch performance.
Exercise and physical activity	Howle, Dimmock, & Jackson (2016)	Study 1 involved 133 Australian undergraduate students (mean age = 20.89; n_{male}=62; n_{female} =70). Study 2 involved 150 Australian undergraduate students (mean age = 20.23; n_{male}=74; n_{female} =74).	Self-report questionnaire prior to completing an endurance-based physical activity task (wall-sit or bridge).	Indirect pathways were observed from agentic self-presentation motives to task performance via personal task goals. Acquisitive agency had a positive indirect effect, and an indirect negative effect was observed for protective agency.
Measure development	Howle, Dimmock, Whipp, & Jackson (2015b)	Study 1 involved six expert reviewers. Study 2 involved 206 group exercise class attendees in Australia (mean age = 34.23; n_{male}=36; n_{female} =170). Study 3 involved 463 Australian high school PE class students (mean age = 13.28; n_{male}=230; n_{female} =210)	Study 1: Development of an item pool Subsequent item culling and refinement based on expert feedback provided via quantitative survey and written comments. Studies 2 and 3: Self-report questionnaire prior to or following the class.	Support for the 2 × 2 factor structure, evidence of construct validity and the motives aligning with impression motivation and construction, social anxiety, social and achievement goals, efficacy beliefs, and class engagement.

Miller et al., 2011; Wink, 1991) was associated with heightened use of both acquisitive and protective self-presentation tactics.

Although many hypothesized relationships involving the 2 × 2 motives (i.e., involving predictors and outcomes) have been supported in empirical research, support for the model has not always been forthcoming, either because of non-significant findings or because statistical significance has been obtained for unexpected relationships. For instance, in a study of antecedents to the 2 × 2 motives (Howle et al., 2015a), only 8 of the 11 predictions regarding pathways from predictors to motives were supported. Not only were some predicted pathways non-significant in this study (e.g., physical education self-efficacy did not predict acquisitive agency), but some significant pathways were contrary to predictions (e.g., fear of negative evaluation was positively related to acquisitive agency). These inconsistent results have not been limited to the study of antecedents to the self-presentation motives. For instance, unexpected findings were reported across the two studies by Howle, Dimmock, et al. (2016), inasmuch as significant (negative) direct and indirect effects were reported between protective agency and personal task goals in one study, whereas these effects were not significant in the other study. Clearly, more work is needed to elucidate the nature, predictors, and outcomes of the 2 × 2 motives, and we recommend continued investigation in this area.

For different reasons, two recent studies that have been based at least partly on the 2 × 2 framework have highlighted the dark side of self-presentation motives in physical activity. The first—undertaken by Hill and colleagues (Hill, Carvell, Matthews, Weston, & Thelwell, 2017)—focused on relationships between self-presentation motives and choking in a variety of sports. Findings from this study revealed that although the possession of acquisitive-agentic self-presentation motivation might facilitate clutch performance under pressure, another self-presentation motive—protective agency—may be associated with choking. This study highlights that a focus on the presentation of the self can have deleterious or maladaptive consequences (especially when this focus is expressed through an avoidance orientation), an issue to which we return in the next section. Another recent study has brought to light differences between motives for agency and communion versus motives to *portray images* for agency and communion. Obviously, the 2 × 2 framework is centered on impression motivation—the desire to portray an image to others—in physical activity settings. However, the agency and communion constructs that are integral to the 2 × 2 model can be pursued for reasons other than self-presentation, and Howle et al. (2017) explored the relative merits of exercise advertising in which agency or communion (rather than self-presentation based on agency and communion) is emphasized. These authors reported a communion-over-agency effect, which supported their hypotheses, in which participants who received a communal-oriented message reported greater exercise task self-efficacy and more positive affective attitudes relative to those who received an agentic-oriented message. Communal, relative to agentic, messages were also indirectly predictive of greater intentions to attend the class. Howle et al. (2017) discussed a variety of possible reasons for their findings, but irrespective of the underlying mechanisms for the results, consideration of the study by Howle et al. (2017) alongside the 2 × 2 framework brings into sharp focus the differences between undertaking exercise to achieve competence (i.e., agentic motive), to achieve social connections (i.e., communal motive), or to *self-present* as being agentic or communal. In the next section, we shed more light on the distinction between these motives, and we use SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985) to argue that motives to *present as* agentic or communal are less desirable than motives to *be* agentic or communal.

Self-Presentation Motives and SDT

The 2 × 2 self-presentation framework offers a coherent picture of impression motivation in physical activity contexts. What is perhaps lacking at present is a contextualization of the framework alongside other motivation frameworks that are popular in the exercise psychology literature. This goal—of positioning the framework alongside others—is important in determining the potential of the 2 × 2 framework in offering novel predictive insights. This is an opportune time to discuss the 2 × 2 framework alongside perhaps the most popular theory of motivation in the field of exercise psychology at present—that of SDT—because self-presentation is integral to discussions in Goal Contents Theory (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2000; Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006), which is a new sub-theory within SDT. We start this section by providing a very brief overview of SDT (for more details on the theory, please see Chapter 3 in this volume), and then discuss implications of research on, and theorizing in, SDT for self-presentation in sport and exercise.

In SDT, three basic psychological needs are articulated as influencing motivation, well-being, growth, and performance. These needs—for autonomy (i.e., self-initiation and feeling ownership over decisions and behaviors), competence (i.e., feeling proficient to successfully carry out pursuits), and relatedness (i.e., feeling understood by, cared for, and connected to important others)—are thought to be intertwined with motivation in a reciprocal manner. That is, not only is need satis-

faction expected to influence motivation, but the experience of motivation is also expected to influence satisfaction of the psychological needs (e.g., Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Also at the heart of SDT is the premise that motivation is multifaceted, and that motives differ in the extent to which they are self-determined (i.e., reflect a sense of volition as opposed to pressure; Ryan & Deci, 2000). The least self-determined—or most controlled—form of motivation is termed *external regulation*, and is characterized by pursuit of an activity in response to external rewards and punishments. *Introjected regulation*—the pursuit of an activity due to internal pressures (e.g., to avoid guilt)—is considered more self-determined than external regulation, although it is still characterized by the experience of pressure and is positioned alongside external regulation in the self-determination continuum. Next in the continuum is *identified regulation*, which reflects motivation to obtain valued or personally important outcomes from the activity, and then *integrated regulation,* in which individuals pursue activities due to their alignment with other values and identity. Finally, the most self-determined (autonomous) form of motivation is termed *intrinsic motivation,* which is characterized by behavior due to pleasure and satisfaction that is experienced inherently in the activity.

Intuitively, one might assume that self-presentation motives reflect the lower quality, or controlled, forms of motivation on the self-determination continuum. However, from a conceptual standpoint, it is possible that an individual could be motivated to engage in acts of self-presentation due to any of the regulations in the previous paragraph. A desire to appear friendly and kind to others, for example, could be driven by a person's recognition that personally important outcomes can be obtained from such an image (e.g., maintenance of valued interpersonal relationships). Alternatively, motivation for the same goal (to appear friendly and kind) could be based on pursuing external rewards from the image (e.g., being made captain of a team). Proponents of SDT acknowledge that self-presentation could be driven by different regulations in the self-determination continuum (e.g., Ryan, Huta, & Deci, 2008). However, self-determination theorists also argue that self-presentation concerns are undesirable not only because they *may* be driven by controlled motives but because their inherent nature is unlikely to be (needs) satisfying. In other words, a differentiation is made in SDT between the motives that energize behavior (i.e., the "why" of goals), which were discussed in the previous paragraph, and the nature or substance (i.e., the "what") of goals (Kasser & Ryan, 1993, 1996). In relation to the nature (the "what") of goals, *intrinsic* goals, such as those for self-acceptance, affiliation, community contribution, and health, are thought to be concordant with humans' innate personal growth and (psychological) flourishing tendencies and are closely associated with basic need satisfaction. In contrast, *extrinsic* goals, which are related to contingent approval or external signs of worth (e.g., image or fame) are, on average, less likely to satisfy basic psychological needs and may even detract from it (Deci & Ryan, 2000). By definition, self-presentation concerns are underpinned by a desire to project an image, and so the content of these concerns, regardless of how they are conceptualized in different frameworks on self-presentation, are extrinsic in nature. Self-determination theorists not only argue that the "what" and "why" of goal pursuits are conceptually distinct, but they also indicate that both the reason for goal pursuit *and* the content of goals bear an expression on a host of outcomes (e.g., Ryan et al., 2008).

Accumulating evidence supports predictions in SDT inasmuch as the "what" and "why" of goals have both been shown to predict cognitive, affective, and behavioral outcomes (e.g., Carver & Baird, 1998; Sheldon, Ryan, Deci, & Kasser, 2004). In relation to exercise goals, *relatively intrinsic goal contents* (i.e., a greater proportion of intrinsic than extrinsic goals) have been shown to positively predict physical self-worth, self-reported exercise behavior, psychological well-being, and psychological need satisfaction, and negatively predict exercise anxiety, and that most of these relationships are significant after controlling for exercise motivation (Sebire et al., 2009). Also, Vansteenkiste and colleagues have shown that advertising an exercise activity in terms of fitness and health benefits (i.e., an intrinsic goal content) has a positive effect on effort expenditure, autonomous exercise motivation, performance, long-term persistence, and sport club membership, whereas exercise framing on physical appearance and attractiveness (i.e., extrinsic goal contents related to self-presentation) undermined those outcomes, relative to a no-future-goal control group (Vansteenkiste, Simons, Soenens, & Lens, 2004). In their systematic review of exercise, physical activity, and SDT, Teixeira and colleagues (Teixeira, Carraça, Markland, Silva, & Ryan, 2012) reported that, across a variety of studies, extrinsic exercise goals (i.e., those related to self-presentation, such as social recognition and appearance) did not predict, or negatively predicted, exercise participation.

The development of the Goal Content for Exercise Questionnaire (Sebire, Standage, & Vansteenkiste, 2008) has allowed insight into broad relationships between exercise-related goal contents and a variety of outcomes associated with those goals. Interestingly, the two forms of extrinsic goal contents in this measure are both related to self-presentation motivation (i.e., the goals are focused on influencing others, either through image creation or social recognition). Interestingly, too, these subscales in the GCEQ use acquisitive-framed items. That is, items for these subscales are framed in terms of goals to

improve social recognition or image, rather than to avoid social disapproval or poor image. In the 2 × 2 framework, arguments are made (and research has demonstrated) that acquisitive motives often yield better outcomes than protective motives, and yet research using the GCEQ has shown that even acquisitively oriented (and self-presentation oriented) concerns are unsupportive of basic psychological needs and healthy functioning (see Sebire et al., 2008).

Another potential disadvantage of self-presentation goals, as found in SDT-based research, relates to possible interactions between the nature of these goals and the reasons for their enactment. Notwithstanding the conceptual differences between the content of goals and the motives that underscore them, it appears that goal content and goal motives are related to some degree. Extrinsic goals, such as those related to self-presentation (e.g., image or fame), often seem to be driven by introjection or external regulation (i.e., controlled motives), whereas intrinsic goals tend to be more autonomously enacted (Ryan et al., 2008; Sheldon & Kasser, 1995). According to Deci and Ryan (2000), such covariation is understandable—and even typical—in light of the notion that goal-related content and processes both relate to underlying satisfaction versus thwarting of basic needs. For example, if people's need for relatedness is repeatedly thwarted over time, then these individuals might compensate by attempting to gain approval by pursuing image-related goals, such as appearing fit to others. These "need substitutes" can subsequently lead to further interference with attainment of basic psychological needs, leading to a cycle of maladaptive functioning (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Support for the interplay between intrinsic (extrinsic) goal contents and autonomous (controlled) motivation regulations has been obtained in a number of studies, and in exercise, the influence of specific goal contents on exercise participation has even been shown to be fully mediated by motivation regulation (Ingledew & Markland, 2008). More specifically, Ingledew and Markland (2008) found that appearance/weight motives, which are at least partly related to self-presentation concerns, were associated with increased external regulation, which in turn was associated with lower exercise participation. In the same study, health/fitness motives were positively aligned with identified regulation, and social engagement motives predicted intrinsic motivation; in turn, both of these motivations were positive predictors of participation.

In a direct test of the association between self-presentation and self-determination, Lewis and Neighbors (2005) showed that (a) an autonomy orientation was inversely related to the use of self-presentation strategies, (b) a controlled orientation was aligned with the use of more self-presentation strategies, and (c) an impersonal orientation was associated with the use of self-presentation strategies to gain assistance or prevent high expectations. The authors concluded that image-bolstering forms of self-presentation were more consistently associated with a controlled orientation, and that efforts to present the self less favorably (e.g., in order to receive compassion and/or assistance) were more consistently aligned with an impersonal orientation. In other research on relationships between self-determination and self-presentation, Zuckerman, Gioioso, and Tellini (1988) found that more controlled individuals preferred image-based advertisements versus quality-based advertisements, and across multiple studies, individuals who were more autonomously motivated (relative to controlled motivation) engaged in less self-serving bias and self-handicapping (Hodgins, Yacko, & Gottlieb, 2006; Knee & Zuckerman, 1996, 1998). Also, individuals with an autonomy orientation have been found to take greater responsibility for their actions that resulted in harm, whereas controlled or impersonally oriented individuals were more defensive and deceptive in attempting to minimize personal responsibility (Hodgins & Liebeskind, 2003; Hodgins, Liebeskind, & Schwartz, 1996).

Overall, research and theorizing couched within SDT indicates that goals related to self-presentation lead to a series of suboptimal outcomes, at least when compared to outcomes from goals that inherently satisfy basic psychological needs. We would like to close this section, however, by echoing Eklund and Howle's (2018) call to avoid underestimating the potential benefits of self-presentation in physical activity. By engaging in effective forms of self-presentation, individuals can create favorable interpersonal outcomes (e.g., being perceived as appealing or competent), and it possible that in some cases, presenting an image as warm and/or competent may precipitate supportive behavior from others (toward oneself). For instance, presenting one's achievements to others, such as leaders, may at times encourage those others to provide encouragement and reinforcement of those achievements. In addition, when self-presentation acts portray an accurate part of self-concept, the act itself, as well as people's responses to the act, could reinforce the portrayed image in one's self-concept. Overall, self-presentation has been referred to as natural, adaptive, and often essential (Leary, Allen, & Terry, 2011), and in this light, it is understandable that individuals might occasionally become concerned about the impressions they cast. Moreover, self-presentation goals are likely to reside alongside a host of other goals for exercise, and what seems to be important for predicting overall health, functioning, and ongoing participation is the relative weight of intrinsic versus extrinsic exercise goals (Gunnell, Crocker, Mack, Wilson, & Zumbo, 2014; Sebire et al., 2009; Sebire, Standage & Vansteenkiste, 2011), rather than the possession of self-presentation goals, per se.

Applications and Research Opportunities

Our discussion on self-presentation carries implications for goal setting in physical activity contexts. Many individuals are attracted to physical activity due to self-presentation concerns (e.g., to appear attractive or to gain social recognition), but as previously argued, these extrinsic goals are less likely to satisfy basic psychological needs than intrinsic goals and are consequently less likely to support well-being and sustained participation in physical activity. As a general rule, interventionists should encourage individuals to pursue intrinsic goals in exercise, and a number of strategies could be employed to achieve this end. One option is to utilize the 2 × 2 framework as a lens through which to administer goal setting programs. For instance, prior to offering participants the opportunity to set personal exercise goals, individuals could be educated about the relative merits of approach-related goals and avoidance-related goals, and then be introduced to examples of common agentic-related goals and communion-related goals. Through the provision of rationales, individuals who set self-presentation goals related to these constructs could be encouraged to re-appraise how they evaluate their progress toward communion and agency. More specifically, instead of relying on contingent approval or external measures of worth (i.e., the likely basis of evaluation for self-presentation goals), participants could be encouraged to measure progress toward agency or communion by using self-referenced goals. Agency could be measured, for example, by comparing one's health and fitness across time, and communion could be measured according to whether one feels closer to others as a function of participation in group exercise. In sum, it may be possible to work with individuals to encourage a shift in focus from *presenting* the self as agentic and/or communal to *being* agentic or communal.

In terms of future research on self-presentation, the elephant in the room is that a comprehensive theory on self-presentation is needed. Undertaking research on self-presentation is difficult without a theoretical framework to test, and review papers (and book chapters) are difficult to structure in the absence of a theory to scaffold discussion. Martin Ginis et al. (2007) noted a linear increase in the volume of self-presentation studies published in the 20 years prior to their review, and there is every chance that the trend has continued over the last decade as well. Despite the volume of work in this field, however, it is difficult to bring coherence, structure, and order to these collective efforts, and such difficulties are likely to remain until a comprehensive theory on self-presentation is developed. Of course, the 2 × 2 framework might help in this matter to some extent, but it lacks the testable hypotheses and comprehensiveness of a formal theory. The framework draws from and applies theory rather than representing a theory in itself. There is no doubt that SDT, with its clear articulation on the influence of goals (including those related to self-presentation) on need satisfaction and downstream outcomes, offers a useful lens through which self-presentation in sport and exercise could be viewed.

Earlier in this chapter, we indicated that acts of self-presentation typically involve disclosure, or strategic non-disclosure, of aspects of the self rather than the portrayal of false images (Martin Ginis et al., 2007). In some cases, however, it may be beneficial to present impressions that do not necessarily portray aspects of the self. Embodiment research on power posturing indicates that it might be possible to "fake it until you make it," whereby individuals obtain adaptive psychological, physiological, and behavioral changes merely from posturing as powerful (e.g., Carney, Cuddy, & Yap, 2010; Cuddy, Wilmuth, Yap, & Carney, 2015). Despite these findings, conjecture remains about whether power posturing is beneficial for all individuals; it is possible, for instance, that power postures operate as a self-validation mechanism, increasing confidence in one's initial feelings and thoughts irrespective of the nature of those feelings and thoughts (Briñol, Petty, & Wagner, 2009). In this manner, power postures, as might be exhibited by the New Zealand rugby team (i.e., "haka" ritual) prior to performances, may be detrimental for performance among players who are worried about the contest, because such posturing could serve to validate those worries. For the same self-validation reasons, individuals who are confident about an upcoming performance might benefit from power postures due to the affirmation of those thoughts via the embodiment mechanism. More research is encouraged on this topic in sport and exercise, because self-presentation related to power (agency) is likely to be common among athletes and exercisers.

An area that is deserving of future research on self-presentation in sport and exercise relates to the effects of impression management on others. A large amount of research in sport and exercise psychology has been undertaken on the influence of self-presentation on actors' cognitive, affective, and behavioral experiences, but more work is needed to explore the effects of self-presentation on individuals who observe these acts. Others' interpretations of impression construction, and the moderators and consequences of such interpretations, are not well understood in relation to acts of self-presentation by athletes and exercisers. Research in other contexts is more advanced, showing, for instance, that individuals who are unfamiliar to an audience are regarded as generous when those individuals communicate their prosocial deeds but as selfish when they communicate to an audience that is familiar with the

individuals' prior behavior (Berman, Levine, Barasch, & Small, 2015). In fact, for every desired impression management technique (e.g., ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification), the impressions that are created can align with the impression being sought (e.g., likeable, competent, worthy) or can be interpreted in negative terms (e.g., obsequious, conceited, sanctimonious; Jones & Pittman, 1982). We encourage research on the concordance of desired images and created images for athletes and exercisers, as well as an assessment of actor and recipient moderators to these effects.

The 2 × 2 framework could be a useful lens through which to undertake research on others' evaluations of actors' self-presentations. Are acquisitive self-presentation motives more conducive toward eliciting favorable evaluations in others than protective motives, as was found by Howle, Jackson, et al. (2016) among participants in basketball? Also, are communal self-presentations more influential than agentic self-presentations in determining others' affective and behavioral reactions? Fiske, Cuddy, and Glick (2007) argue that evaluations of warmth (i.e., related to communion) are usually judged before evaluations of competence (i.e., related to agency), and that warmth judgments carry more weight in affective and behavioral reactions. This general pattern of prioritizing warmth in evaluations of others is fitting, according to Fiske et al. (2007), because it is more important for survival to determine people's intent for good or ill than to determine whether people are capable of acting on those intentions. However, Cuddy, Glick, and Beninger (2011) warn that there are exceptions to the primacy of warmth (over competence) in evaluations of others, such as when individuals are already closely related. Athletes who have been teammates for an extended period (and have already developed trust between each other), for instance, might find themselves more focused on agentic self-presentations by the other person. Similarly, in sports in which opponents engage in little confrontation, opponents' agentic self-presentations might be more salient than their communal self-presentations. In other sports, in which the possibility of harm from an opponent is more real, the typical pattern of evaluation (i.e., communal-over-agentic) of opponents may be more likely to remain.

Research within the broad area of others' impressions could investigate the serial position effect (Murdock, 1962), in which first or last impressions might be most impactful when a series of impressions are made. It is well known that people are quick to judge others, possibly as a result of adaptive mechanisms and evolutionary pressures (Cuddy et al., 2011; Todorov, 2008), so primacy effects might well occur in shaping others' opinions. Also worthy of investigation are the inter-relationships of self-presentations between athletes or exercisers. Judgments about communion are likely to determine approach-avoidance tendencies (Fiske et al., 2007), so effective self-presentations related to friendship and kindness from one person may predict acquisitive responses in others. Priming and contagion effects may also exist, such that particular features of the environment or types of self-presentation in others may predispose the same types of self-presentations from oneself, and this influence could occur below the threshold of one's consciousness (Tyler, 2012). Finally, we encourage self-presentation research on social media use among athletes and exercisers. Self-presentation motives in face-to-face interactions might differ to those that underpin social media use because, among other factors, self-presentation efficacy (i.e., confidence in one's ability to present the images that lead to desired outcomes; Maddux, Norton, & Leary, 1988) might differ between these contexts. For instance, perhaps athletes and exercisers are more inclined to adopt acquisitive motives in their social media use (relative to face-to-face interactions), because they are likely to feel a greater sense of control over the content in their self-presentations.

The literature on self-presentation in sport and exercise has steadily increased in size, but a coherent picture of self-presentation processes in these contexts is still lacking due to the absence of a significant theory to guide research efforts. In this chapter, we have overviewed existing literature on self-presentation in sport and exercise, and we have discussed two frameworks that can be used to provide structure to research in these areas. The 2 × 2 framework, with its grounding in the large approach-avoidance and communal-agentic literatures in social psychology, provides a promising lens through which to examine self-presentation processes. Likewise, Goal Contents Theory, under the umbrella of the more substantial and comprehensive SDT, offers researchers a useful scaffold to undertake self-presentation research. We hope that our discussion of these frameworks will stimulate more work on self-presentation in sport and exercise and help to build a coherent picture of the nature, antecedents, and consequences of self-presentation among athletes and exercisers.

References

Arkin, R. M. (1981). Self-presentation styles. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), *Impression management theory and social psychological research* (pp. 311–333). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Arkin, R. M., & Sheppard, J. A. (1990). Strategic self-presentation: An overview. In M. J. Cody & M. L. McLaughlin (Eds.), *The psychology of tactical communication* (pp. 175–193). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence: Isolation and communion in western man*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*, 1394–1411.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, *5*, 323–370.

Baumeister, R. F., & Showers, C. J. (1986). A review of paradoxical performance effects: Choking under pressure in sports and mental tests. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *16*, 361–383.

Berglas, S., & Jones, E. E. (1978). Drug choice as a self-handicapping strategy in response to noncontingent success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *36*, 405–417.

Berman, J. Z., Levine, E. E., Barasch, A., & Small, D. A. (2015). The braggart's dilemma: On the social rewards and penalties of advertising prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *52*, 90–104.

Brewer, B. W., Diehl, N. S., Cornelius, A. E., Joshua, M. D., & Van Raalte, J. L. (2004). Exercising caution: Social physique anxiety and protective self-presentational behaviour. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, *7*, 47–55.

Briñol, P., Petty, R. E., & Wagner, B. (2009). Body posture effects on self-evaluation: A self-validation approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*, 1053–1064.

Brunet, J., & Sabiston, C. M. (2009). Social physique anxiety and physical activity: A self-determination theory perspective. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *10*, 329–335.

Brunet, J., & Sabiston, C. M. (2011). Self-presentation and physical activity in breast cancer survivors: The moderating effect of social cognitive constructs. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *33*, 759–778.

Brunet, J., Sabiston, C. M., & Gaudreau, P. (2014). A prospective investigation of the relationships between self-presentation processes and physical activity in women treated for breast cancer. *Health Psychology*, *33*(3), 205–213.

Bushman, B. A., & Brandenburg, T. (2009). Social physique anxiety and obligation to exercise in college males and females: Exercise activity, location, and partners. *Missouri Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *19*, 41–54.

Carney, D. R., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Yap, A. J. (2010). Power posing: Brief nonverbal displays affect neuroendocrine levels and risk tolerance. *Psychological Science*, *21*(10), 1363–1368.

Carver, C. S., & Baird, E. (1998). The American dream revisited: Is it what you want or why you want it that matters? *Psychological Science*, *9*, 289–292.

Conroy, D. E., Motl, R. W., & Hall, E. G. (2000). Progress toward construct validation of the self-presentation in exercise questionnaire. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *22*(1), 21–38.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Beninger, A. (2011). The dynamics of warmth and competence judgments and their outcomes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 73–98.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Wilmuth, C. A., Yap, A. J., & Carney, D. R. (2015). Preparatory power posing affects nonverbal presence and job interview performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(4), 1286–1295.

Czopp, A. M., Lasane, T. P., Sweigard, P. N., Bradshaw, S. D., & Hammer, E. D. (1998). Masculine styles of self-presentation in the classroom: Perceptions of Joe Cool. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *13*, 281–294.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227–268.

Donne, J. (1975). *Devotions upon emergent occasions*. Montreal: McGill Queens University Press.

Eklund, R. C., & Howle, T. C. (2018). Self-presentation and communication in physical activity settings. In B. Jackson, J. A. Dimmock, & J. Compton (Eds.), *Persuasion and communication in sport, exercise, and physical activity* (pp. 250–265). Abingdon: Routledge.

Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist*, *34*, 169–189.

Elliot, A. J. (2005). A conceptual history of the achievement goal construct. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 52–72). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.

Elliot, A. J. (2008). *Handbook of approach and avoidance motivation*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*(2), 77–83.

Fox, J., & Rooney, M. C. (2015). The dark triad and trait self-objectification as predictors of men's use and self-presentation behaviors on social networking sites. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *76*, 161–165.

Gammage, K. L., Hall, C. R., & Martin Ginis, K. A. (2004a). Self-presentation in exercise contexts: Differences between high and low frequency exercisers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *34*, 1638–1651.

Gammage, K. L., Martin Ginis, K. A., & Hall, C. R. (2004b). Self-presentational efficacy: Its influence on social anxiety in an exercise context. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *26*, 179–190.

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

Grove, J. R., & Dodder, R. A. (1982). Constructing measures to assess perceptions of sport functions: An exploratory investigation. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, *13*, 106.

Gunnell, K. E., Crocker, P. R. E., Mack, D. E., Wilson, P. M., & Zumbo, B. D. (2014). Goal contents, motivation, psychological need satisfaction, well-being and physical activity: A test of self-determination theory over 6 months. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *15*, 19–29.

Haase, A. M., & Prapavessis, H. (2001). Social physique anxiety and eating attitudes in female athletic and non-athletic groups. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, *4*, 396–405.

Hart, W., Adams, J., Burton, K. A., & Tortoriello, G. K. (2017). Narcissism and self-presentation: Profiling grandiose and vulnerable Narcissists' self-presentation tactic use. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *104*, 48–57.

Hart, W., Leary, M. R., & Rejeski, W. J. (1989). The measurement of social physique anxiety. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *11*, 94–104.

Hill, D. M., Carvell, S., Matthews, N., Weston, N. J. V., & Thelwell, R. R. C. (2017). Exploring choking experiences in elite sport: The role of self-presentation. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, *33*, 141–149.

Hill, D. M., Hanton, S., Matthews, N., & Fleming, S. (2010). Choking in sport: A review. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *3*(1), 24–39.

Hodgins, H. S., & Liebeskind, E. (2003). Apology versus defense: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *39*, 297–316.

Hodgins, H. S., Liebeskind, E., & Schwartz, W. (1996). Getting out of hot water: Facework in social predicaments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 300–314.

Hodgins, H. S., Yacko, H. A., & Gottlieb, E. (2006). Autonomy and nondefensiveness. *Motivation & Emotion*, *30*, 283–293.

Howle, T. C., Dimmock, J. A., & Jackson, B. (2016a). Relations between self-efficacy beliefs, self-presentation motives, personal task goals, and performance on endurance-based physical activity tasks. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *22*, 149–159.

Howle, T. C., Dimmock, J. A., Ntoumanis, N., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Sparks, C., & Jackson, B. (2017). The impact of agentic and communal exercise messages on individuals' exercise class attitudes, self-efficacy beliefs, and intention to attend. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *39*(6), 397–411.

Howle, T. C., Dimmock, J. A., Whipp, P. R., & Jackson, B. (2015a). Moving to self-present: An investigation into proposed antecedents of 2 × 2 self-presentation motives. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *37*(5), 547–558.

Howle, T. C., Dimmock, J. A., Whipp, P. R., & Jackson, B. (2015b). The self-presentation motives for physical activity questionnaire: Instrument development and preliminary construct validity evidence. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *37*, 225–243.

Howle, T. C., & Eklund, R. C. (2013). The effect of induced self-presentation concerns on cognitive appraisal and affect. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, *26*, 700–710.

Howle, T. C., Jackson, B., Conroy, D. E., & Dimmock, J. A. (2015). Winning friends and influencing people: Self-presentation motives in physical activity settings. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *8*(1), 44–70.

Howle, T. C., Jackson, B., & Dimmock, J. A. (2016b). On the formation of favourable impressions: Associations between self-presentation motives, task behaviour, and others' evaluations of the self in a team-sport setting. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *26*, 40–47.

Ingledew, D. K., & Markland, D. (2008). The role of motives in exercise participation. *Psychology and Health*, *23*(7), 807–828.

Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). A dark side of the American dream: Correlates of financial success as a central life aspiration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 410–422.

Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*, 80–87.

Knee, R. C., & Zuckerman, M. (1996). Causality orientations and the disappearance of the self-serving bias. *Journal of Research and Personality*, *30*, 76–87.

Knee, R. C., & Zuckerman, M. (1998). A nondefensive personality: Autonomy and controlled as moderators of defensive coping and self-handicapping. *Journal of Research and Personality*, *32*, 115–130.

Jones, E. E., Gergen, K. J., & Jones, R. G. (1963). Tactics of ingratiation among leaders and subordinates in a status hierarchy. *Psychological Monographs*, *7*, 1–20.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (pp. 231–262). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lantz, C. D., Hardy, C. J., & Ainsworth, B. E. (1997). Social physique anxiety and perceived exercise behavior. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *20*(1), 83–93.

Latimer, A. E., & Martin Ginis, K. A. (2005). The importance of subjective norms for people who care what others think of them. *Psychology and Health*, *20*, 53–62.

Leary, M. R. (1992). Self-presentational processes in exercise and sport. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *14*(4), 339–351.

Leary, M. R. (1995). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Leary, M. R., Allen, A. B., & Terry, M. L. (2011). Managing social images in naturalistic versus laboratory settings: Implications for understanding and studying self-presentation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*, 411–421.

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

Leary, M. R., Nezlek, J. B., Downs, D., Radford-Davenport, J., Martin, J., & McMullen, A. (1994a). Self-presentation in everyday interactions: Effects of target familiarity and gender composition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*(4), 664–673.

Leary, M. R., Robertson, R. B., Barnes, B. D., & Miller, R. S. (1986). Self-presentations of small group leaders: Effects of role requirements and leadership orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 742–748.

Leary, M. R., Tchividjian, L. R., & Kraxberger, B. E. (1994b). Self-presentation can be hazardous to your health: Impression management and health risk. *Health Psychology*, *13*, 461–470.

Levitt, H. M., & Ippolito, M. R. (2013). Being transgender: Navigating minority stressors and developing authentic self-presentation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *38*(1), 46–64.

Lewis, M. A., & Neighbors, C. (2005). Self-determination and the use of self-presentation strategies. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *145*(4), 469–489.

Lindwall, M. (2005). Examining the validity of a Swedish version of the Self-presentation in Exercise Questionnaire. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, *9*, 113–134.

Locke, K. D., & Nekich, J. C. (2000). Agency and communion in naturalistic social comparison. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 864–874.

Maddux, J. E., Norton, L. W., & Leary, M. R. (1988). Cognitive components of social anxiety: An investigation of the integration of self-presentation theory and self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *6*, 180–190.

Martin, K. A., & Leary, M. R. (2001). Self-presentational determinants of health risk behaviour among college freshmen. *Psychology & Health*, *16*, 17–27.

Martin, K. A., Leary, M. R., & O'Brien, J. (2001). Role of self-presentation in the health practices of a sample of Irish adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *28*, 259–262.

Martin, K. A., Sinden, A. R., & Fleming, J. C. (2000). Inactivity may be hazardous to your image: The effects of exercise participation on impression formation. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *22*, 283–291.

Martin Ginis, K. A., Latimer, A. E., & Jung, M. E. (2003). No pain no gain? Examining the generalizability of the exerciser stereotype to moderately active and excessively active targets. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *31*, 283–290.

Martin Ginis, K. A., & Leary, M. R. (2004). Self-presentation processes in health-damaging behaviour. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *16*, 59–74.

Martin Ginis, K. A., Lindwall, M., & Prapavessis, H. (2007). Who cares what other people think? Self-presentation in exercise and sport. In G. Tenenbaum & R. C. Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook of Sport Psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 136–157). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Mesagno, C., Harvey, J. T., & Janelle, C. M. (2011). Self-presentation origins of choking: Evidence from separate pressure manipulations. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *33*, 441–459.

Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal of Personality*, *79*, 1013–1042.

Moskowitz, D. S. (2005). Unfolding interpersonal behavior. *Journal of Personality*, *73*, 1607–1632.

Murdock, B. B. (1962). The serial position effect of free recall. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *64*(5), 482–488.

Nicholas, J. C., Dimmock, J. A., Donnelly, C. J., Alderson, J. A., & Jackson, B. (2018). "It's our little secret…an in-group, where everyone's in": Motives for participation in a stigmatized form of physical activity. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, *36*, 104–113

Nikitin, J., & Freund, A. M. (2010). When waiting and fearing go together: The effect of co-occurring social approach and avoidance motivation on behaviour, affect, and cognition. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 783–804.

Ojanen, T., Sijtsema, J. J., & Rambaran, J. A. (2013). Social goals and adolescent friendships: Social selection, deselection, and influence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *23*, 550–562.

Payne, S., Hudson, J., & Akehurst, S., & Ntoumanis, N. (2013). Development and initial validation of the Impression Motivation in Sport Questionnaire—Team. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *35*(3), 281–298.

Podlog, L., Dimmock, J., & Miller, J. (2011). A review of return to sport concerns following injury rehabilitation: Practitioner strategies for enhancing recovery outcomes. *Physical Therapy in Sport*, *12*, 36–42.

Podlog, L., Lochbaum, M., Kleinert, J., Dimmock, J., Newton, M., & Schulte, S. (2013). The relationship between self-presentation concerns and pre-game affect among adolescent American football players. *Journal of Sport and Health Science*, *2*, 168–175.

Renfrew, J., Howle, T. C., & Eklund, R. C. (2017). Self-presentation concerns may contribute toward the understanding of athletes' affect when trialing for a new sports team. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *29*(4), 484–492.

Renner, K., Laux, L., Schutz, A., & Tedeschi, J. T. (2004). The relationship between self-presentation styles and coping with social stress. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, *17*, 1–22.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 68–78.

Ryan, R. M., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*, 139–170.

Sadalla, E. K., Linder, D. E., & Jenkins, B. A. (1988). Sport preference: A self-presentational analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *10*(2), 214–222.

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

Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1982). Audiences' reactions to self-enhancing, self-denigrating, and accurate self-presentations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *18*, 89–104.

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

Schneider, D. J. (1981). Tactical self-presentations: Toward a broader conception. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), *Impression management theory and social psychological research* (pp. 23–40). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Schutz, A. (1998). Assertive, offensive, protective, and defensive styles of self-presentation: A taxonomy. *The Journal of Psychology*, *132*, 611–628.

Schwerin, M. J., Corcoran, K. J., Fisher, L., Patterson, D., Askew, W., Olrich, T., et al. (1996). Social physique anxiety, body esteem, and social anxiety in bodybuilders and self-reported anabolic steroid users. *Addictive Behaviors*, *21*, 1–8.

Sebire, S. J., Standage, M., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2008). Development and validation of the Goal Content for Exercise Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *30*, 353–377.

Sebire, S. J., Standage, M., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2009). Examining intrinsic versus extrinsic exercise goals: Cognitive, affective, and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *31*, 189–210.

Sebire, S., Standage, M., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2011). Predicting objectively assessed physical activity from the content and regulation of exercise goal contents: Evidence for a mediational model. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *33*, 175–197.

Sheldon, K. M., & Kasser, T. (1995). Coherence and congruence: Two aspects of personality integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 531–543.

Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L., & Kasser, T. (2004). The independent effects of goal contents and motives on well-being: It's both what you pursue and why you pursue it. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*, 475–486.

Shin, H., & Ryan, A. M. (2012). How do young adolescents cope with social problems? An examination of social goals, coping with friends, and social adjustment. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *32*, 851–875.

Sutton, R. M., Robinson, B., & Farrall, S. D. (2011). Gender, fear of crime, and self-presentation: An experimental investigation. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, *17*, 421–433.

Teixeira, P. J., Carraça, E. V., Markland, D., Silva, M. N., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Exercise, physical activity, and self-determination theory: A systematic review. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, *9*, 78.

Tetlock, P. E., & Manstead, A. S. (1985). Impression management versus intrapsychic explanations in social psychology: A useful dichotomy? *Psychological Review*, *92*, 59–77.

Thogersen-Ntoumani, C., & Ntoumanis, N. (2007). A self-determination theory perspective approach to the study of body image concerns, self-presentation and self-perceptions in a sample of aerobic instructors. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *12*, 301–315.

Tice, D. M., Butler, J. L., Muraven, M. B., & Stillwell, A. M. (1995). When modesty prevails: Differential favorability of self-presentation to friends and strangers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 1120–1138.

Todorov, A. (2008). Evaluating faces on trustworthiness: An extension of systems for recognition of emotions signalling approach/avoidance behaviors. In A. Kingston & M. Miller (Eds.), The year in cognitive neuroscience 2008, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1124*, 208–224.

Trail, G. T., Kim, Y-K., Kwon, H. H., Harrolle, M. G., Braunstein-Minkove, J. R., & Dick, R. (2012). The effects of vicarious achievement on BIRGing and CORFing: Testing moderating and mediating effects of team identification. *Sport Management Review*, *15*(3), 345–354.

Trapnell, P. D., & Paulhus, D. L. (2012). Agentic and communal values: Their scope and measurement. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *94*, 39–52.

Treasure, D. C., Lox, C. L., & Lawton, B. R. (1998). Determinants of physical activity in a sedentary obese female population. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *20*, 218–224.

Tyler, J. M. (2012). Triggering self-presentation efforts outside of people's conscious awareness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(5), 619–627.

Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Intrinsic versus extrinsic goal contents in self-determination

theory: Another look at the quality of academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, *41*(1), 19–31.

Vansteenkiste, M., Simons, J., Soenens, B., & Lens, W. (2004). How to become a persevering exerciser? Providing a clear, future instrinsic goal in an autonomy-supportive way. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *26*, 232–249.

Verma, N., Eklund, R. C., Arthur, C. A., Howle, T. C., & Gibson, A. (2019). Increasing physical activity among adolescent girls: Linking transformational teaching, self-presentation motives, and physical activity identity. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *41*(1), 1–9.

Wann, D. L., Royalty, J., & Roberts, A. (2000). The self-presentation of sport fans: Investigating the importance of team identification and self-esteem. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *23*(2), 198–206.

Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). When helping helps: Autonomous motivation for prosocial behaviour and its influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*(2), 222–244.

Wiggins, J. S. (1991). Agency and communion as conceptual coordinates for the understanding and measurement of interpersonal behavior. In W. M. Grove & D. Cicchetti (Eds.), *Thinking clearly about psychology* (pp. 89–113). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Wilson, P., & Eklund, R. C. (1998). The relationship between competitive anxiety and self-presentational concerns. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *20*, 81–97.

Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*, 590–597.

Wojciszke, B., Abele, A. E., & Baryla, W. (2009). Two dimensions of interpersonal attitudes: Liking depends on communion, respect depends on agency. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*, 973–990.

Zuckerman, M., Gioioso, C., & Tellini, S. (1988). Controlled orientation, self-monitoring, and preferences for images versus quality approach to advertising. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *22*, 89–100.