

Deceptive Strategic Identity Support: Misrepresentation of Information to Protect Another Individual's Public Self-Image¹

JENNIFER J. ARGO²

*School of Business
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada*

DARREN W. DAHL

*Sauder School of Business
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada*

KATHERINE WHITE

*Haskayne School of Business
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada*

Two laboratory studies identified conditions under which individuals are willing to misrepresent information regarding another person's performance to protect that other person's public self-image (i.e., to provide deceptive strategic identity support). The extent to which deceptive strategic identity support arises is determined by the salience of another person's need for impression-management assistance. Factors increasing the salience of a person in need (including performance discrepancy, relationship closeness, location of the target, and trait empathy) motivated individuals' willingness to engage in deceptive strategic identity support. State empathy was found to mediate the effects.

Deception, which involves intentionally misrepresenting information to others to create a false impression (DePaulo, Kashy, Kirkendol, Wyer, & Epstein, 1996), is a frequently used impression-management strategy in a variety of social contexts, including consumption settings (Argo, White, & Dahl, 2006; Sengupta, Dahl, & Gorn, 2002). Although previous research has suggested that the self-focused motive of maintaining a favorable public self-image drives individuals' willingness to engage in deception, the possibility that people may engage in deception that is other-oriented (i.e., designed to protect another person; DePaulo et al., 1996) has not been

¹The authors thank Robert Fisher, John Peloza, and Monica Popa for their thoughtful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript. Financial support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and an SAS grant from the University of Alberta are gratefully acknowledged.

²Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jennifer J. Argo, School of Business, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada T6G 2R6. E-mail: jennifer.argo@ualberta.ca

empirically explored. Indeed, there are a number of situations in which individuals might willingly misrepresent information to protect others, such as informing a friend's significant other that the regularly priced tools the friend purchased were on sale or claiming to an inquiring onlooker that a friend's fake watch is indeed a designer original. In the current research, we investigate the conditions under which individuals will be willing to impression-manage on behalf of another person.

Initial efforts to explore individuals' tendencies to assist in the enhancement and maintenance of the public self-image of others have been undertaken (e.g., Schlenker & Britt, 1999, 2001). Schlenker and Britt (1999) coined the term *strategic identity support* (SIS) to refer to the tendency to engage in impression management on behalf of another individual. To date, research has focused on approach tendencies that bolster and enhance the beneficiary of the support (i.e., increase positive consequences for the target). In the present research, we demonstrate that individuals also engage in SIS to *protect* a target's public self-image from threatening information (i.e., to decrease negative consequences for the target). Furthermore, we argue that one way in which individuals may engage in SIS is by misrepresenting information.

In two laboratory experiments, we predict that the more salient another person's need for impression-management assistance, the greater will be the willingness of another individual to provide deceptive SIS (i.e., to misrepresent information to manage the impression the first person makes). We test this prediction within the context of communication regarding the purchase price of a product, demonstrating that factors related to the information (i.e., performance discrepancy), social situation (i.e., relationship closeness and location of the target), and individual (i.e., empathy) are fundamental in impacting the salience of another person's need for impression-management assistance and, as a result, the willingness of a second person to engage in SIS. Finally, we expect that state empathy will mediate the impact of factors that increase the salience of a person in need on individuals' willingness to engage in deceptive SIS.

This research provides three important contributions to the literature. First, the current investigation builds on DePaulo et al.'s (1996) taxonomy that identifies *other-oriented deception* as "lies told to protect or enhance other persons psychologically or to advantage or protect the interests of others" (p. 983), by being the first to test empirically the conditions under which strategic misrepresentation to assist another person is likely to occur.

Second, this research shows that SIS can be motivated by protection (vs. enhancement) concerns. Such a distinction is important, given that past research has suggested that it is important to study self-protection and self-enhancement motivations as separate constructs because each has distinct

antecedents and consequences (Baumeister, 1998; Baumeister & Tice, 1985; Baumeister, Tice, & Hutton, 1989).

Finally, while previous work (e.g., DePaulo et al., 1996) has suggested that one motivation for other-oriented deception could include empathetic concern, we validate this relationship. To achieve this, we proposed and tested two competing hypotheses for the role of empathy (i.e., a main effect prediction and an interaction prediction). In doing so, we established boundary conditions for the role of empathy in a deceptive SIS context showing that both the social situation and the information discussed can moderate the behavior of low and high empathizers.

Deception as an Impression-Management Tactic

The impressions people convey have ramifications for how others perceive, evaluate, and treat them. As a result, people often attempt to portray positive self-images to others and do so by engaging in a variety of impression-management tactics (e.g., Goffman, 1959; Schlenker, 1980). Arguably, one of the most pervasive forms of impression management is deception (Goffman, 1959; Hamble, 1980). While past research has demonstrated that people often engage in deception as a result of self-focused impression-management concerns (e.g., to appear to be a smart shopper; Argo et al., 2006; Sengupta et al., 2002), other researchers have provided exploratory evidence suggesting that people may also engage in deception to help enhance others' public self-image (DePaulo et al., 1996).

Similarly, while Schlenker and Britt (1999, 2001) have not explored the role of deception per se in their work, they have described the tendency for people to assist in the management of the impressions others make as SIS. Thus, we set out to demonstrate empirically the conditions under which people will be most willing to misrepresent information to protect the public self-image of another individual.

Deceptive Strategic Identity Support

As implied earlier, the objective of SIS is to assist someone else (i.e., a target) in maintaining a desirable public self-image (Schlenker & Britt, 1999, 2001). For example, Schlenker and Britt (1999) investigated the tendency for people to be more likely to provide SIS by enhancing the description of a target to an attractive, rather than an unattractive third person. Other factors that have been shown to influence the decision to engage in SIS include the target's (i.e., the SIS recipient's) social need, psychological closeness of the

other, importance of the skill dimension to the other, and evaluative pressure (Schlenker & Britt, 1999). While this previous work is based on the notion that people offer SIS to bolster and enhance the beneficiary of the support (Pontari & Schlenker, 2004; Schlenker & Britt, 1999, 2001), we propose that individuals may also engage in SIS to protect a target's public self-image from negative, threatening information. Such a distinction between providing SIS to protect, as opposed to enhance, another person's image is important, given that research on motivation suggests that approach versus avoidance orientations should be differentiated as a result of their unique implications for affect, behavior, and cognition (e.g., Avnet & Higgins, 2006; Higgins, Roney, Crowe, & Hymes, 1994).

In two laboratory experiments, we predict that the more salient another person's need for impression-management assistance, the greater will be the willingness of another individual to provide deceptive SIS. The specific variables we manipulate to influence this salience include performance discrepancy (Study 1), relationship closeness (Study 1), physical location of the target (Study 2), and trait empathy (Study 2).

Study 1

In Study 1, participants were presented with a scenario in which they learned that a target has paid too much for a product. Their willingness to misrepresent information on behalf of the target is assessed in the present study. In the current context, we expect that when the price (i.e., performance) discrepancy between what the target and a third party paid is larger, the salience of the target's need for impression-management assistance will be heightened to such a point that individuals will be willing to engage in SIS not only for those whom they know well, but also for strangers.

Support for this is found in research on altruism and random acts of kindness. The research has shown that under certain circumstances, individuals are willing not only to assist someone who is psychologically close, but also to help someone who is unfamiliar (Baskerville et al., 2000; McGuire, 2003), especially when the degree of perceived need increases (Bartlett & DeSteno, 2006; for an opposing view, see Schlenker & Britt, 1999). Thus, individuals will be more likely to help a stranger by providing deceptive SIS when the salience of the need (i.e., performance discrepancy) is high, rather than low.

In contrast, we expect that when the social interaction involves a close friend, the tendency to engage in SIS will be similar, regardless of the size of the performance discrepancy, because individuals tend to be more receptive to the needs of people with whom they are close. As such, the salience of the

target's need for impression-management assistance will always be high. In sum, we predict that relationship type and performance discrepancy will interact to influence willingness to provide deceptive SIS. Thus, we propose the following:

Hypothesis 1a. Individuals will be more willing to engage in deceptive strategic identity support on behalf of a psychologically distant target (i.e., stranger) when the performance discrepancy is large versus small.

Hypothesis 1b. Individuals will be willing to engage in deceptive strategic identity support on behalf of a psychologically close target (i.e., friend), regardless of the size of the performance discrepancy.

Finally, given that past research has suggested that empathy (i.e., the tendency or ability to experience and understand another individual's affective or psychological state) is an important precursor to helping (Batson, 1995; Krebs, 1975), we argue that it is the ability and willingness to empathize with another individual in an impression-management situation that motivates individuals to engage in deceptive SIS. We expect that when the impression-management needs of one individual increase in salience, another person will be more likely to empathize, as this person will be better able to understand what it is like to be caught in a social predicament in which deception might be necessitated. This empathy, in turn, is predicted to lead to increased willingness to engage in deceptive SIS.

Hypothesis 2. State empathy will mediate the predicted interaction.

Method

Participants

Study 1 participants were 95 undergraduates at the University of Alberta. The students took part in a 2 (Relationship Closeness: close vs. distant) \times 2 (Performance Discrepancy: small vs. large) between-subjects experimental design.

Procedure

Participants read a scenario in which the participant is described as sitting in class, talking to another student (i.e., the target). In the *close condition*, the

target is described as a friend whom they know very well; whereas in the *distant condition*, the target is described as a classmate whom they do not know (i.e., a stranger).

During the course of the conversation, the target indicated that he or she was the proud owner of a new vehicle that he or she got for a great price. He or she then took out a photo of the car to show the participant. While the participant asked the target a number of questions about the car, a classmate (i.e., a third person) came in and sat down on the participant's vacant side. The third person, who had just joined the conversation, noticed the photo and indicated that he or she purchased the same car model last week for \$18,000. The third person then asked the participant how much money the target paid for the vehicle. In the high performance-discrepancy condition, participants knew that the target paid \$2,000 more (i.e., \$20,000); while in the low performance-discrepancy condition, they knew the target paid \$200 more (i.e., \$18,200).

To assess participants' willingness to misrepresent the target's performance, the participants were asked to indicate "How likely do you think you would be to misrepresent the actual purchase price of the car?" Participants responded to this question by rating four items on a 7-point scale drawn from previous research (Argo et al., 2006; e.g., *very unlikely to misrepresent the truth* to *very likely to misrepresent the truth*; $\alpha = .96$). The participants were then asked to indicate in a space provided "What price do you think you would tell the other person that the car cost?" (i.e., price paid).

Relationship closeness was then assessed following prior research (e.g., Argo et al., 2006). The participants were asked to rate three items on a 7-point scale. A sample item is "How strong is your relationship with this person?" which was rated from 1 (*not very strong*) to 7 (*very strong*; relationship index, $\alpha = .96$).

To assess whether participants were cognizant of the performance discrepancy between the target and the third person's cars, they rated two items on a 7-point scale. The first question asked "Did s/he pay a significant amount more for the car?" and was rated from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much so*). The second question asked "How much more was the purchase price of his/her car?" and was rated from 1 (*not very big*) to 7 (*very big*; performance discrepancy index, $r = .79$).

Finally, the participants indicated their gender and age, and completed a suspicion probe. As demographic information did not predict significant variance in any of the dependent measures across both studies, it is not discussed further. In addition, no participants indicated awareness of the experimental hypotheses in either Study 1 or Study 2.

To determine whether participants' situational empathy for the target mediated the predicted effects, the participants were next asked the reasons

why they responded to the situation as they did. A set of five items to assess state levels of empathy were drawn from past research (e.g., Davis, 1983; DePaulo et al., 1996) and were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much so*). A sample item is "I empathized with my friend (the first classmate)" (empathy index, $\alpha = .90$).

Results and Discussion

Preliminary Analyses

A 2 (Relationship Closeness: close vs. distant) \times 2 (Performance Discrepancy: small vs. large) ANOVA with the relationship index as dependent variable produced a significant main effect only for relationship closeness, $F(1, 91) = 126.01, p < .001$. The friend was perceived to be closer ($M = 5.39$) than the classmate ($M = 2.52$). An ANOVA with the performance discrepancy index as dependent variable and the same two independent variables reveals a significant main effect only for price discrepancy, $F(1, 91) = 41.08, p < .001$. Participants indicated that a \$2,000 price differential was significantly larger ($M = 4.06$) than the \$200 price differential ($M = 2.16$). Thus, both manipulations were successful.

Test of Hypotheses

An ANOVA with relationship closeness and performance discrepancy as independent variables and the misrepresentation index as dependent variable produced a significant main effect for relationship closeness, $F(1, 91) = 11.64, p < .01$. This main effect was qualified by a significant two-way interaction, $F(1, 91) = 5.40, p < .05$, (close/small, $M = 3.47$; close/large, $M = 3.27$; distant/small, $M = 1.78$; distant/large, $M = 2.95$). Consistent with predictions, participants were less willing to misrepresent information when the relationship was distant and the performance discrepancy was small versus large, $t(91) = 2.89, p < .01$. No significant differences arose in willingness to misrepresent information on behalf of a close target, regardless of the performance discrepancy ($t < 1$).

To analyze the impact of our focal factors on the amount participants indicated that the target paid for the product, we conducted another ANOVA. Creating proportions for the difference between price indicated, relative to the true price discrepancy that the target had paid, the 2 (Performance Discrepancy) \times 2 (Relationship Closeness) ANOVA produced main effects for performance discrepancy, $F(1, 91) = 6.51, p < .05$; and relationship closeness, $F(1, 91) = 9.43, p < .01$; and, importantly, a significant two-way

interaction, $F(1, 91) = 10.62, p < .01$. Planned contrasts reveal that consistent with Hypothesis 1a, participants protected the target more when the target was psychologically distant (i.e., stranger) and the performance discrepancy was large ($M = 0.59$) versus small ($M = -1.58$), $t(91) = 4.22, p < .001$. Also consistent with Hypothesis 1b, participants were equally willing to protect a psychologically close target, regardless of price (small, $M = 0.79$; large, $M = 0.52$), $t(91) = 0.48, ns$.

We conducted mediation analysis to assess whether situational empathy mediated participants' willingness to misrepresent information. Linear regression analysis—including relationship closeness, performance discrepancy, and their interaction term as the independent variables—indicates that the interaction significantly predicted the misrepresentation index, $t(91) = 2.32$ ($\beta = -0.34, p < .05$). Using the same independent variables, we then conducted an analysis with the empathy index as dependent variable. The results indicate that the two factors also interacted to influence empathy, $t(91) = 1.99$ ($\beta = -0.31, p < .05$). Finally, inclusion of the empathy index in the original analysis for willingness to misrepresent information produced a significant main effect for the empathy index, $t(90) = 4.25$ ($\beta = 0.38, p < .001$). More importantly, the once significant interaction between relationship and performance discrepancy fell from significance, $t(90) = 1.61$ ($\beta = -0.22, p > .10$). Sobel's test demonstrates that the mediation was significant ($z = 1.80, p < .05$).

Study 1 highlights conditions under which individuals are willing to engage in deceptive strategic identity support to help protect another individual's public self-image. The results demonstrate that participants were equally willing to misrepresent information to the third person when the target was psychologically close, regardless of the performance discrepancy. Participants were more willing, however, to misrepresent information on behalf of a stranger only when the performance discrepancy was large versus small. This same pattern of effects arose for the amount participants indicated that the target individual paid for the product.

Finally, the results suggest that state empathy underlies individuals' willingness to engage in deceptive SIS. The demonstration that under certain conditions individuals are willing to misrepresent information to protect someone else's image extends previous research showing that individuals will engage in deception to protect their own self-image (Argo et al., 2006; Sengupta et al., 2002). Further, the study extends earlier work on SIS by finding that one strategy individuals use to provide this type of support is deception.

Study 2

In our second study, given that the physical presence of an individual is likely to enhance empathy, as well as the salience of a target's need for

impression-management assistance, we explore whether the physical presence of the target is a necessary condition for individuals to be willing to provide deceptive SIS, or if support will arise even in the absence of the target. Moreover, unlike Study 1, which assessed situational empathy as a mediator, in Study 2 we determine trait empathy's role in determining willingness to engage in deceptive SIS.

To date, the role of empathy in a deceptive-based situation is not clear. Indeed, there are two interesting competing predictions that can be drawn from past work on empathy. First, it may be that individual differences in empathy trump other factors, such as whether the other is present or absent and whether the other person is a friend or an acquaintance. Past research has generally shown positive correlations with trait empathy and helping (Sturmer, Snyder, & Omoto, 2005; Unger & Thumhuri, 1997). Given this, it may be that those high in trait empathy will be more willing to be deceptive on behalf of a friend, regardless of the price discrepancy and the target's location (present vs. absent).

Hypothesis 3. High empathizers will be more willing to provide deceptive strategic identity support than will low empathizers.

An alternative possibility is that while high empathizers will be willing to engage in SIS—and misrepresent information on behalf of a close other when the target is physically present—when the target is absent, it may be more difficult for high empathizers to be empathetic because the salience of the target's image needs will be arguably lower, as they are further removed (e.g., Argo, Dahl, & Manchanda, 2005). Indeed, past research has suggested that empathy is less likely to lead to helping when the target is psychologically distant (Sturmer, Snyder, Kropp, & Siem, 2006; Sturmer et al., 2005).

In the present research, we propose that this may also be the case when the target is physically distant. This is especially likely to be true when the performance discrepancy is small, as the need for impression management is minimal. Low empathizers will be relatively unwilling to provide SIS when the target is absent, regardless of performance discrepancy. This prediction is based on the notion that low empathizers often do not connect with individuals who are present, hence being physically absent will likely produce no motivation for providing image assistance. However, it seems likely that when the target is present, low empathizers may be more likely to think about what it would be like to face a major threat to their own images. It follows that when the performance discrepancy is large, rather than small, low empathizers will be relatively more willing to misrepresent information on behalf of another individual. In sum, a significant three-way interaction between location of the target (present vs. absent), performance discrepancy (small vs. large), and empathy on willingness to provide deceptive SIS is predicted.

Hypothesis 4a. High empathizers will be less willing to provide deceptive strategic identity support when the performance discrepancy is small and the target is absent, as compared to present.

Hypothesis 4b. High empathizers will be more willing to engage in deceptive strategic identity support when the performance discrepancy is large, regardless of the location of the target.

Hypothesis 5a. Low empathizers will be more willing to provide deceptive strategic identity support when the performance discrepancy is large and the target is present versus absent.

Hypothesis 5b. Low empathizers will be equally unwilling to provide deceptive strategic identity support when the performance discrepancy is small, regardless of the location of the target.

Method

Participants

Study participants were 117 undergraduate students from the University of Alberta. The study used a 2 (Performance Discrepancy: small vs. large) \times 2 (Location of Target: present vs. absent) \times 2 (Trait Empathy) between-subjects experimental design.

Procedure

A scenario similar to that described in Study 1 was used, with two differences. First, relationship closeness was held constant (i.e., the target individual was always someone close). Second, the location of the target was manipulated by indicating in the *absent* condition that after the third person sat down next to the participant, the friend excused himself or herself and left the room; while in the *present* condition, that the friend remained in the room.

Performance discrepancy and willingness to misrepresent information were assessed using the same items described in Study 1 ($\alpha = .93$, $r = .78$). Participants also completed a measure of trait empathy (Davis, 1983; $\alpha = .75$), which included 28 items that were rated on a 5-point scale. The trait empathy measure was mean-centered for the analysis. Finally, an open-ended

question assessed whether participants were cognizant of the target's location by asking where the target was located when participants responded to the third person's inquiry.

Results and Discussion

Preliminary Analyses

Linear regression analysis assessed the effectiveness of the performance-discrepancy manipulation. Using performance discrepancy, location, empathy, and the interaction terms as the independent variables, and the performance-discrepancy index as the dependent variable, the analysis only produced a main effect for performance discrepancy, $t(109) = 7.40$ ($\beta = 1.01$, $p < .001$). The open-ended question indicates that 92% of participants correctly identified the location of the target in the scenario.

Test of Hypotheses

Linear regression analysis using willingness to misrepresent information as the dependent variable produced a significant main effect for location, $t(109) = 4.54$ ($\beta = 0.55$, $p < .001$); but did not show a main effect for empathy. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported. However, our results show the predicted significant three-way interaction, $t(109) = 3.91$ ($\beta = 1.36$, $p < .001$). To facilitate the interpretation of the three-way interaction, simple slopes analyses were conducted.

Following Aiken and West (1991; see also Preacher, Curran, & Bauer, 2006), regression lines were plotted for 1 *SD* above and 1 *SD* below the mean for empathy. Examining first those participants high in empathy, when the performance discrepancy was small, high empathizers were more willing to misrepresent information on behalf of a friend when the target was present versus absent ($\beta = 1.17$), $t(109) = 4.66$, $p < .001$. Among high empathizers, no significant differences arose in willingness to misrepresent information when the performance discrepancy was large, regardless of the location of the target ($\beta = 0.29$), $t(109) = 1.13$, $p > .20$. Examining those participants low in empathy, when the performance discrepancy was large, participants were more willing to misrepresent information when the target was present, as compared to absent ($\beta = 0.97$), $t(109) = 3.75$, $p < .001$. When the performance discrepancy was small, there were no differences in low empathizers' willingness to misrepresent information, regardless of whether the target was present or absent ($\beta = -0.22$), $t(109) = 0.88$, $p > .30$.

Study 2 establishes important boundary conditions for both high empathizers and low empathizers with respect to their willingness to engage in deceptive SIS. Our findings show that it is not simply that high empathizers are more likely to engage in deceptive SIS compared to low empathizers, but, rather, the specific nuances of the situation (i.e., presence of the target and level of the performance discrepancy) can moderate the likelihood of deception for both of these types of people.

General Discussion

Two experiments identified conditions under which individuals would be most willing to provide SIS by misrepresenting information to protect someone else's public self-image. We found that individuals' willingness to engage in deception to protect someone else's image depends on their relationship with the target, the performance discrepancy, the location of the target, and individual differences in empathy. In general, conditions that fostered increased salience of the target's need for impression-management assistance led to a greater willingness on the part of another to engage in deceptive SIS. Further, we found that empathy, studied as both a situational variable and an individual difference, underlies the tendency to provide deceptive SIS.

Overall, we found that individuals are most willing to engage in deceptive SIS for someone who is close when the performance discrepancy is large. We found that even those low in empathy would provide deceptive SIS in this instance when the target other is present. When the performance discrepancy is small, individuals' willingness to misrepresent information depends on whether the target is present or absent, with a greater willingness arising under the former condition.

A boundary condition was identified for those high in empathy here as they are less likely to deceive when the target is absent. In contrast to the common tendency for consumers to engage in SIS for someone psychologically close, conditions under which they are willing to misrepresent information to protect someone who is psychologically distant are more limited. Our research contributes to the literature suggesting that individuals will utilize a variety of tactics to enhance the impressions they make on others (e.g., Argo et al., 2005, 2006; Sengupta et al., 2002). To our knowledge, this research is the first to demonstrate conditions under which individuals will be more willing to misrepresent information to protect another person's public self-image.

In the present context, we find support that empathy is one motivation that underlies individuals' willingness to provide SIS and to engage in

other-oriented deception. However, there may be other motivations that also provide insight into the underlying process that deserve attention in future research. For example, one motivation for other-oriented deception may be related to relationship management. In this situation, the purpose of other-oriented deception is to preserve the relationship benefiting both the target and individual: It avoids "rocking the boat." An interesting element of this type of motivation is that there exists a potential sense of obligation on the part of the individual: Good friends may be expected to misrepresent information to help those who are close to them. Thus, future research could investigate whether a sense of obligation or a sense of personal responsibility experienced by temporary connectedness (e.g., eye contact, calling the individual by name, making specific requests) will increase the likelihood that people will misrepresent information on behalf of a target who is not close.

A unique characteristic inherent in other-oriented deception is that it often presents situations that are double-edged swords for individuals for two reasons. First, because misrepresenting information is typically a proscribed behavior (i.e., people should not misrepresent information) while helping others is a prescribed behavior (i.e., people are expected to help their friends), individuals find themselves facing a conflict between two societal norms. Second, negative consequences are generally associated with being perceived as a liar, which may arise even when people engage in other-oriented deception. This is most notable when information is misrepresented on behalf of a close other who is physically present. Even though an individual may reason that his or her deceptive behavior is to help a friend, the friend may realize that if the individual is willing to misrepresent information for something as small as a \$200 price discrepancy on an \$18,000 product, the individual may also be likely to misrepresent information in other situations that may not always be in the friend's best interest. Thus, future research could assess how a target feels about someone misrepresenting information on his or her behalf and if there are ramifications for the deceptive individual's self-image.

Future research opportunities are also provided by the limitations of the current research. Our research was framed in impression management; however, specific measures of impression management as the causal motivation for deceptive SIS were not obtained. Future research would strengthen our findings by directly linking impression management to the deceptive behavior identified. Both empirical studies utilized a scenario-based approach. Hypothetical situations in which the participant is asked to visualize a situation is limiting, in comparison to actual, real-life contexts.

Finally, our research focused only on empathy and communication with respect to the target other. The need of the third person receiving the communication was not considered, nor was potential empathy toward their circumstances. Future research can address these implications by utilizing

new contexts and by capturing the broader motivations of other parties in the communication exchange. We believe this research is a first step toward examining an important new topic in the exchange of deceptive communication during interactions between individuals.

References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Argo, J. J., Dahl, D. W., & Manchanda, R. V. (2005). The influence of a mere social presence in a retail context. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *32*, 207–212.
- Argo, J. J., White, K., & Dahl, D. W. (2006). Social comparison theory and deception in the interpersonal exchange of consumption information. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *33*, 99–108.
- Avnet, T., & Higgins, E. T. (2006). How regulatory fit affects value in consumer choices and opinions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *43*, 1–10.
- Bartlett, M. Y., & DeSteno, D. (2006). Gratitude and prosocial behavior. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 319–325.
- Baskerville, K., Johnson, K., Monk-Turner, E., Slone, Q., Standley, H., Stansbury, S., et al. (2000). Reactions to random acts of kindness. *Social Science Journal*, *37*, 293–298.
- Batson, C. D. (1995). Prosocial motivation: Why do we help others? In A. Tesser (Ed.), *Advanced social psychology* (pp. 333–381). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1998). The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 680–740). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Tice D. M. (1985). Self-esteem and responses to success and failure: Subsequent performance and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality*, *53*, 450–467.
- Baumeister, R. F., Tice, D. M., & Hutton, D. G. (1989). Self-presentational motivations and personality differences in self-esteem. *Journal of Personality*, *57*, 547–579.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*, 113–126.
- DePaulo, B. M., Kashy, D. A., Kirkendol, S. E., Wyer, M. M., & Epstein, J. A. (1996). Lying in everyday life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 979–995.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Oxford, UK: Doubleday.

- Hample, D. (1980). Purposes and effects of lying. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 46, 33–47.
- Higgins, E. T., Roney, C. J. R., Crowe, E., & Hymes, C. (1994). Ideal versus ought predilections for approach and avoidance distinct self-regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 276–286.
- Krebs, D. L. (1975). Empathy and altruism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 1134–1146.
- McGuire, A. M. (2003). It was nothing—extending evolutionary models of altruism by two social cognitive biases in judgments of the costs and benefits of helping. *Social Cognition*, 21, 363–394.
- Pontari, B. A., & Schlenker, B. R. (2004). Providing and withholding impression management support for romantic partners: Gender of the audience matters. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 41–51.
- Preacher, K. J., Curran, P. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2006). Simple intercepts, simple slopes, and regions of significance in MLR 3-way interactions. Retrieved January 1, 2010, from <http://www.people.ku.edu/~preacher/interact/mlr3.htm>
- Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Britt, T. W. (1999). Beneficial impression management: Strategically controlling information to help friends. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 559–573.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Britt, T. W. (2001). Strategically controlling information to help friends: Effects of empathy and friendship strength on beneficial impression management. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 357–372.
- Sengupta, J., Dahl, D. W., & Gorn, G. G. (2002). Misrepresentation in the consumer context. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12, 69–79.
- Sturmer, S., Snyder, M., Kropp, A., & Siem, B. (2006). Empathy-motivated helping: The moderating role of group membership. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 943–956.
- Sturmer, S., Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (2005). Prosocial emotions and helping: The moderating role of group membership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 532–546.
- Unger, L. S., & Thumhuri, L. K. (1997). Trait empathy and continuous helping: The case of voluntarism. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12, 785–800.