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CHAPTER I
RATIONALE

During an interaction, we have expectations of ourselves and others involved in the encounter. The assumption is that persons will project a public self-image that is consistent with their private self-image (i.e., one's identity) (Goffman, 1959; Gross & Stone, 1964; Schneider, 1981) which is developed through social interaction (Goffman, 1959; Gross & Stone, 1964; Mead, 1934). Each is also expected to present personal poise—control one has over both one's self and the situation (Gross & Stone, 1964). Once each person's identity has been accepted by all interactants and each person is poised, interaction may take place (Gross & Stone, 1964). That is, the participants have come to a "working consensus" of the roles to be played by each person (Goffman, 1959). This negotiation of roles and role appropriate behavior are what make up the "interaction order" (Goffman, 1983). Persons then "trust" that each participant will adhere to the consensus of role appropriate behavior (Garfinkel, 1963).

At times, a person's role is called into question and this person becomes flustered which may result in the emotion of embarrassment which disrupts the interaction order. Emotions and their effect upon interaction have been virtually ignored by communication scholars (Bowers, Metts & Duncanson, 1985) until recently. Research in the
communication field, as well as others, has begun to look at the emotion of embarrassment and its effect upon communication (Apsler, 1975; Cupach, Metts & Hazleton, 1986b; Edelmann, 1982; Edelmann, Asendorpf, Contarello, Georgas, Villanueva & Zammuner; 1987; Edelmann & Hampson, 1979; Edelmann & Iwawaki, 1987; Levin & Arluke, 1982; Metts & Cupach, 1989; Miller, 1987; Petronio, 1984; Sharkey & Stafford, 1989). These studies have shown that embarrassment interferes with the communication episode and causes participants to respond with attempts to ameliorate the situation so interaction may continue smoothly.

Embarrassment is generally viewed as an unintentional occurrence during interaction (Gross & Stone, 1964; Manstead & Semin, 1981; Semin & Manstead, 1982; Weinberg, 1968) and though seen negatively by many (Apsler, 1975; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) as a form of social anxiety (Argyle, 1969; Asendorpf, 1984; Edelmann, 1982, 1985a, 1985b; Leary, 1982; Modigliani, 1968), the fear of embarrassment serves to maintain the agreed upon definition of the roles being played and to restrain prosocial behavior (Armstrong, 1974; Edelmann, 1984). However, some theorists have suggested that, at times, persons may wish to intentionally embarrass another in order to call into question that person's presented image or cause a person to lose his or her poise (Goffman, 1955; Gross & Stone, 1964). Only two studies have tested this hypothesis. Though not the focus of her study, Martin (1987) discovered that this phenomenon of intentional embarrassment is apparent within the school context, specifically the intentional embarrassment of students by teachers to achieve various goals. Only one study has focused explicitly upon intentional embarrassment and how it is employed to
realize specific supervisory goals within the workplace. Sharkey and Waldron (1990) found that despite the attainment of goals through the use of intentional embarrassment, the consequences of such acts appear to have negative effects on interaction and the relationship (e.g., as in hostility, dislike, avoidance, quitting school/job). This is consistent with findings that persons tend to like those who reward them and dislike those who punish (Tedeschi, 1990). Intentional embarrassment may be viewed as a form of punishment in that it questions the person’s role. Hence, deliberate embarrassment may be used to achieve one goal but may disrupt interaction and may call into question one’s relationship with others present.

People behave in a multitude of ways in order to achieve a multitude of goals. Multiple goals are achieved simultaneously (Clark & Delia, 1979; O’Keefe & Delia, 1982; Tracy, 1984), however there may be a single dominant goal being focused upon at any one time (Clark & Delia, 1979). These goals may be divided into two broad categories: "the primary goal serves to initiate and maintain the influence attempt, while the secondary goals act as a set of boundaries which delimit the verbal (and, no doubt, nonverbal) choices available to the source" (Dillard, 1990, p. 89). People attempt to achieve secondary goals such as avoid conflict, manage impressions, maintain politeness and try to co-operate with others in supporting others’ presented roles while simultaneously focusing on the primary goal (see Brown & Levinson, 1978; Schlenker, 1980; Sillars, 1980; Tedeschi, 1990). So, when attempting to gain compliance as a primary goal, it would appear that a person would employ strategies which would, simultaneously, achieve secondary goals.
Persons most often attempt to achieve a goal by using socially acceptable strategies as opposed to negatively perceived strategies such as emotional appeals, criticism, threats or force (Bisanz & Rule, 1990) which call into question participants' roles and threaten actors' face. Intentional embarrassment calls into question a person's role being played and forces the person into the troublesome position of having to repair face. At the same time, it would appear that the embarrassor has also called into question his or her established role, for, if embarrassment is to be avoided, then deliberately causing another embarrassment violates the expectations of others. Hence, the embarrassor may find the consequences of such acts unappealing. Yet, it may be that the embarrassor is more concerned with immediate gratification of a primary goal with little concern for secondary goals. The type of act attempted by a person will affect the target's perception of the source. Tedeschi (1990) has stated that "the ability to delay gratification is important because expedient actions taken to obtain immediate reinforcements might lead to negative reputations for the person" (p. 314). A person who wishes to retain a positive reputation will avoid the use of negative strategies in order to achieve immediate goals at the expense of long-term secondary goals (e.g., a positive reputation) (Kipnis, Schmidt & Braxton-Brown, 1990; Tedeschi, 1990). This then leads to ethical considerations of using embarrassment as a means of achieving one's primary goals.

Ethical communication is by its nature based upon choice and whether a communicator's choices are good, right or moral (Golden, Berquist & Coleman, 1989). When a communicator produces any sort of
harm to an audience, this act is an immoral, unethical act (McCroskey, 1972). Intentional embarrassment is chosen as a strategy which calls into question another’s presented role. Consequently, the person may be harmed. The embarrassee must take steps to reestablish or redefine her or his role. DeVito (1989) argues that during interaction each party deserves honesty, sincerity and caring from each participant. There is an implicit assumption that each party has the choice to behave in ways that are deemed appropriate during the encounter—the ethical code of the encounter. Intentional embarrassment forces another into a situation that was not expected. It forces the other to save face. Also, when one intentionally embarrasses another, the embarrassor has violated the trust of the interactors and in essences has lied about his or her role portrayed. Intentional embarrassment may therefore be interpreted as an unethical form of communication. However, embarrassment may be utilized as a strategy which will benefit the embarrassee or the relationship (e.g., showing solidarity, having a student become more conscientious about study habits; see Gross & Stone, 1964; Martin, 1987; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990).

Embarrassment appears to be an emotion to be avoided because of its disruptive property, since it calls into question the role identity of the embarrassee and the embarrassor and because of the possible ethical ramifications. If intentional embarrassment produces such negative consequences, one would wonder why people would utilize embarrassment as a strategy to attain a primary goal at the expense of secondary goals. Direct investigation of this phenomenon has been extremely limited. Therefore, it appears that intentional embarrassment is important for
communication scholars to study because (a) this deliberate violation of
taken-for-granted roles and rules, which have been agreed upon by
interactants, disrupts the interaction order and calls into question the
working consensus, (b) it may have a direct affect upon the development,
maintenance and deterioration of relationships, (c) it may be a
communicative strategy with which one attains goals and (d) it may prove
to have negative relational consequences.

The present study examines the use of intentional embarrassment as
a form of strategic communication employed to question another's
presented identity or to cause one to lose poise. Specifically, this
study seeks to determine how and why people intentionally embarrass
others and what the consequences of such acts are. In order to fully
understand the phenomenon of intentional embarrassment, it is important
to first review the nature of embarrassment: (a) The interaction order;
(b) the development of embarrassment; (c) the characteristics affecting
embarrassment; (d) situations leading to the embarrassment; (e)
communicative responses of the embarrassed party to embarrassment; (f)
communicative responses of others to the embarrassment and, finally; (g)
intentional embarrassment.
CHAPTER II
THE NATURE OF EMBARRASSMENT

The Interaction Order

Effective interaction demands a working consensus of the roles (selves) displayed by all parties involved (Goffman, 1959). Goffman (1956a) argues that interactants are morally (i.e., a constraint to act in a particular manner) committed to the "interaction order" as defined by the interactants. That is, there are role obligations and expectations which are established as "rules of conduct." Commitment to the interaction order is necessary because of the fragile nature of social selves and the interaction. According to Rawls (1987), there is a constant threat that the consensus will be questioned or violated. This interaction is not based upon the constraints dictated by the social structure nor is it contingent upon the roles that individuals bring to the encounter. The interaction order is maintained as a moral commitment and not a structural imperative and the roles are negotiated by all actors engaged in the encounter. The person is a performer whose present role is defined during interaction. Goffman (1955) has argued that the organization of interaction revolves around the protection of the face of the self and the faces of others involved. When a violation occurs, the interaction order as well as the face of all concerned are threatened. Interactors must take steps to regain face and restore the
interaction to its former, shared consensus or redefine the roles of the participants (Goffman, 1955, 1956b, 1957, 1983). Though not the force guiding the negotiation of role performance, this restoration may be influenced by the contextual features of the encounter.

When discussing role expectations, the notion of situation/context has to be taken into consideration. Goffman (1974) has argued that each social encounter is "framed." There are social constraints which may affect the interaction order and these constraints are assumed to be shared by others during the meeting. Frames provide a background of information for events in which one is involved (Goffman, 1974). The frame creates expectations of the normative kind. Framing allows for social appraisal of actions displayed by participants which convey one's honesty, tactfulness, good taste, elegance, etc. (Goffman, 1959). It appears that Goffman would agree that each person in the encounter would negotiate the frame for the present interaction order and come to a working consensus. But, as he has pointed out, these constraints are not the guiding force toward moral consensus.

It is also noted that each participant enters the encounter with a field of past knowledge of the other interactants, based upon past encounters with these persons or persons of a similar kind (Goffman, 1983). Each party, however, works toward and negotiates the specific roles and rules of interaction and frame the present encounter in cooperation with all others in the interaction. The interaction is the starting point for defining each actor's role; not the self or the social frame (Goffman, 1983).
People are judged by how well they adhere to the part being played during the interaction. A working consensus of each party’s qualities is developed which indicates which qualities are relevant to the present interaction (Silver, Sabini & Parrott, 1987). Whether or not the qualities of each are in fact accurate is irrelevant; it is the perception which is important (Goffman, 1959). All participants need to develop a "trust" in all interactors for interaction to proceed smoothly. That is, each trusts that each will adhere to their role as defined for the immediate interaction order.

This trust of role adherence manifests itself partly in the notion of "constitutive expectancies" (Garfinkel, 1963). As an interactant during an encounter, one assumes to know what the rules of interaction are, assumes the other interactants are bound by the same rules and that they assume the same of him or her (Garfinkel, 1963). As the communicators negotiate the moral character of the interaction, each modifies the constitutive expectations and role expectations. In addition to the constitutive expectations, Garfinkel (1963) suggests each must adhere to "the rules of preferred play"—i.e., choices of action may be made which may be described as effective, aesthetic, and so on as opposed to correct or incorrect. A person may have a variety of behaviors that may be morally based but the person makes a choice of which act to engage in based upon a person’s goal(s). This choice is also guided by ethical considerations as noted above.

When trust is shaken, negative social sanctioning generally occurs to return interaction to its agreed upon expectations or the constitutive expectations of each others’ roles are renegotiated. When
one steps out of a role or calls into question the role of another
(i.e., "breaking frame" or violating trust; Goffman, 1974; Garfinkel,
1963), the possibility of embarrassment is heightened.

Therefore, it appears that persons involved in interaction come to
an agreement about what is and is not appropriate role behavior within
the interaction order. The interaction order is dependent upon each
person playing his or her consensually defined role. All participants
must develop a reciprocal trust with all others for the episode to
proceed smoothly. There may be interactions when this reciprocal trust
is problematic (e.g., interaction with a con-person). In these cases,
the trust may be an illusion. The con-person assumes the other will
play her or his role as defined during interaction and the other assumes
the con-person will play the role defined as well (i.e., not a con-
person). Once it is found that the con-person has been claiming an
inappropriate role, the interaction order is disrupted and a redefining
of the con-person's role begins. That is, it is found that the person
has been presenting a role which is false and steps are then taken to
redefine the con-person's role as just that—a con-person. The opposite
may also be the case as when a person knows that the other is a con-
person but the con-person believes the other does not have this
information. Here, the illusion is in the mind of the con-person. When
an interactor's role is called into question, embarrassment may result.
This phenomenon of embarrassment disrupts the flow of interaction.

Embarrassment is a threat to an interaction (Gross, 1984; Fink &
Walker, 1977; Modigliani, 1968) and appears to be necessarily social
(Silver et al., 1987; cf., Babcock, 1988); that is embarrassment
requires the presence, real or imaginary, of others (Argyle, 1969; Edelmann & Hampson, 1981a, 1981b; Goffman, 1956b; Hellpach, 1913; Leary, 1982; Leary & Schlenker, 1981; Manstead & Semin, 1981; Sattler, 1966; Schlenker, 1980; Semin & Manstead, 1982; Silver et al., 1987). However, the simple thought that others are present or the anticipated future interaction with another could be sufficient for one to experience embarrassment (i.e., anticipatory embarrassment) (Silver et al., 1987; also see Archibald & Cohen, 1971; Brown, 1968; Brown & Garland, 1971; Modigliani, 1971). When the working consensus of an encounter is violated, interaction collapses and embarrassment may result (Goffman, 1955, 1956b). The interaction, though, may withstand occasional violations of the consensus. And, as will be discussed further, at times it may be in the individuals best interest to not uphold the commitment (Goffman, 1983). However, even though embarrassment may have a disruptive effect, it seems more appropriate to state that embarrassment is not the cause of the disruption, but the result of a breakdown of the working consensus. Granted, the display of and responses to embarrassment (e.g., accounts, anger, blushing, etc.) may perpetuate the disruption, but it may also be an attempt to ameliorate it.

Embarrassment has been defined by many researchers. Embarrassment has been globally defined as a form of social anxiety (Argyle, 1969; Asendorpf, 1984; Duck, 1986; Edelmann, 1982, 1985a, 1985b; Gross & Stone, 1964; Leary, 1982; Modigliani, 1968) which "occurs when there is some public violation of a taken-for-granted rule" (Semin & Manstead, 1982, p. 368). Edelmann (1985a) stated that "embarrassment is a common
and highly uncomfortable form of social anxiety which can have a disruptive effect upon social interaction" (p. 195). Social anxiety is defined as "a subjective experience of nervousness and dread [which is]...precipitated by the prospect or presence of interpersonal evaluation" (Leary, 1982, p. 99-100). Embarrassment is, by its very nature, a subjective experience (Leary, 1982). Silver et al. (1987) define embarrassment as "the fluster caused by the perception that a flubbed...performance, a working consensus of identities, cannot, or in any event will not, be repaired in time" (p. 58). Miller (1986) suggested that embarrassment is "an aversive state of momentary chagrin" (p. 295). Buss (1980) stated that embarrassment is an emotional response of anxiety which is trivial and short lived which occurs when one loses poise or when one's identity is questioned. However, Sharkey and Stafford (in press) have indicated that embarrassing situations range from a feeling of triviality to paralyzing shock. If this is the case, then defining embarrassment as trivial is misleading. Next, Leary (1982) states that embarrassment is a form of social anxiety which occurs when a specific social predicament threatens "to result in lowered evaluations and negative sanctions form others" (p. 102). Hence, embarrassment has a multitude of characteristics. First, embarrassment is by necessity social. That is, others need to be present, ostensibly present or their presence is anticipated at a future time. Second, embarrassment is a form of anxiety or fear that one's behaviors will be negatively sanctioned or others will have a lower evaluation of the role being presented. Third, this fear occurs as a result of a discrepancy between a person's presented self and one's
desired presentational self—an interpersonal predicament. Fourth, embarrassment is generally short lived. Hence, embarrassment will be defined as follows: Embarrassment is an emotional/psychological response of social chagrin (i.e., a fear of negative sanctioning or lower evaluations from others) which occurs as a result of a discrepancy between one’s self-presentation and desired self-presentation and is generally short lived.

As noted above, embarrassment is generally seen as a negative experience ranging from an intensity level that is seen as a minor annoyance to paralyzing shock (Apsler, 1975; Sharkey & Stafford, in press). Sattler (1963) found that individuals characterize embarrassment as "rough," "serious," "tense" and "awkward." It has also been suggested that surprise is often a prerequisite for embarrassment to be felt (Silver et al., 1987). This surprise may be viewed as the initial reaction to the violation of trust. Even though embarrassment is seen negatively by many, it is a necessary emotion (Armstrong, 1974) in that it is a fusing mechanism for maintaining an agreed upon definition of the interactants’ social reality (i.e., homeostasis)—the working consensus. The threat of embarrassment may be the force which helps to restrain prosocial behavior (Edelmann, 1984).

Development of Embarrassment

Embarrassment signals the presence of the social self (Buss, Iscoe, & Buss, 1979; Buss, 1980). Public self-consciousness and embarrassment occur when a child experiences him or herself as an object of observation (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). It was discovered that children who were able to recognize themselves in a mirror were more prone to
embarrassment than those who could not. Hence, embarrassment developed only after self-referential behavior was evidenced (Lewis, Sullivan, Stanger & Weiss, 1989). Once children become social objects unto themselves, they become aware that others will view their actions and pass judgments (Mead, 1934). Therefore, the person who has not developed a social self will have no reason to feel embarrassed (Buss et al., 1979).

Embarrassment does not appear to be present at birth but is a learned phenomenon (Miller, 1986). English (1975) suggested that through "shaming" (i.e., the instillation of fear) by parents and society, a child learns when to be embarrassed and what to be embarrassed about. Buss (1980) echoed the same sentiment that we are taught what is acceptable social behavior through punishment and the correction of certain behaviors. A major source in the development of embarrassment has been related to painful self-consciousness—"the negative reaction of a parent who looks upon the infant anxiously when the child is engaged in genital exploration or play" (Amsterdam & Levitt, 1980, p. 78). Children universally enjoy and participate in genital play, males at about 6 to 7 months of age and females about 10 to 11 months of age (Galenson & Roiphe, 1974). The child is restrained from the action or distracted, as well as chastised and punished for looking, touching, exhibiting and playing with his or her genitals; hence, the child is introduced to shame (Amsterdam & Levitt, 1980). This shaming may be viewed as a socialization tool. In this line, Gross and Stone (1964) suggested that through deliberate embarrassment by other children, a child will gain the social skills needed to maintain
poise in later life when his or her poise is threatened. This could also be applied to shaming by caretakers.

Varying ages have been reported for the onset of embarrassment. Baldwin (1902) claimed that blushing (i.e., equating a blush with the feeling of embarrassment) begins just before the age of 6 years and diminishes and is less intense as one grows older. Buss et al. (1979) reported that the majority of children begin to show objective embarrassment symptoms (e.g., blushing) at about the age of 5. A small percentage of children were reported to show signs of embarrassment as early as 3 years of age. This is consistent with Seidner, Stipek and Feshbach's (1988) finding that by kindergarten, children have begun to acquire the adult-like concept of embarrassment. However, Amsterdam (1968, 1972) concluded that children as early as 14 months exhibit behaviors of embarrassment through self-recognition, although the majority of the children exhibited embarrassment after the age of 20 months. However, self-recognition is not sufficient to set the stage for embarrassment to occur.

**Characteristics Affecting Embarrassment**

Whether or not one becomes embarrassed and to what extent the embarrassment will be felt is partially dependant upon a variety of characteristics. These characteristics include; (a) the status, similarity, and size of the audience, (b) the emotional closeness of the audience to the embarrassed party, (c) the number of embarrassed persons, (d) the sex and age of the potentially embarrassed party and audience, and (e) personality traits.
It has been found that the higher the status of an audience and the larger an audience the more embarrassment was felt (Argyle, 1969; Garland & Brown, 1972; Jackson, 1979; Jackson & Latane', 1981; also see Latane' & Harkins, 1976; Sharkey & Stafford, 1989). This may also be seen during interactions between adults and children where the adult is seen as being of higher status. Some researchers suggest that an adult is rarely embarrassed in relation to a child but a child often experiences embarrassment in relation to an adult (e.g., Hellpach, 1913) but others have discovered the reverse (e.g., Druian & DePaulo, 1977).

Research has found that similarity also has an effect upon the severity of embarrassment felt. Garland and Brown (1972) using the length of time subjects sang as a measure of embarrassment, asked females, who were rated as poor vocalists, to sing a song to an ostensibly all female audience which was seen as containing poor or excellent singers. The subjects sang an average of 119 seconds in front of the poor singers and 32 seconds in front of the excellent singers. Subjects stated that they felt less similar to the expert group than to the poor group. It was also suggested that the expert group may be seen as being of a higher status.

The emotional closeness of the audience to the embarrassed party also has an affect upon the level of embarrassment. MacDonald and Davies (1983) found actors felt more embarrassed when a stranger was observing than when a friend was observing them in an embarrassing situation. However, based upon self reports of situations personally felt in respondents' lives, Sharkey and Stafford (1989) found that participants tended to classify highly embarrassing situations as
occurring while interacting with friends or family members and moderately embarrassing situations occurring with strangers. And, when there was a multitude of diverse relationships, the situation was reported as highly embarrassing. Hence it is not clear how emotional closeness affects the degree of embarrassment felt.

Jackson (1979) found that "as the number of co-performers increased, individual nervousness and tension decreased" (p. 34; also see Hellpach, 1913). Jackson (1979) found that actors felt less anxious in a crowd of other embarrassed persons for three reasons: (a) it is expected that the audience would divide its focus between performers; (b) the ability of hiding in the crowd avoiding identification hence lessening possible embarrassment during a performance; and (c) if the performance is perceived by the audience as bad, responsibility may be distributed among the group membership; whereas if a single person acts, he or she accepts full responsibility.

Situations which cause embarrassment change through the life of an individual (Sattler, 1965). For example, it was discovered that adolescents appear to be most concerned with being made the focus of attention or the recipient of embarrassing acts. College students reported being embarrassed for others as well as being made the focus of attention. Both groups also had a high concern with embarrassing incidents which included persons of the opposite sex. Adults, however, reported being concerned more with how others perceived them (i.e., acting socially inappropriate) and revealing private matters.

Also, the sex of an individual may affect what is perceived as embarrassing though this has not been shown in the research (Sharkey &
Stafford, 1989) or the affect is relatively minor (Sattler, 1965). Equating blushing with embarrassment, early researchers claimed that women were more embarrassable than men (Darwin, 1872/1965; Baldwin, 1902). It was suggested that this may be due to a situational "physiological predisposition" of a woman (Buytendijk, 1950, p. 138). Feldman (1962) noted that prior to the 1960's, women blushed more than men but that the differences have not been as pronounced since the 1960's. From this research, one is lead to believe that through the socialization of males and females, females may exhibit a higher level of embarrassability than males, though not supported in more recent literature.

Some people are more susceptible to embarrassment than others. Modigliani (1968) refers to this susceptibility as "embarrassability" and certain traits may increase this susceptibility. He specified 5 traits which have an impact upon embarrassability: (a) High empathic ability; (b) Low general-subjective-public-esteem; (c) Low general-self-esteem; (d) Unstable general-self-esteem; and (e) high test anxiety (Modigliani, 1967, 1971). Modigliani (1968) found subjects who displayed both a "sensitivity to the immediate evaluations of others, and...a general readiness to believe that these evaluations are more negative than they really are" (p. 325), seem to have a higher risk of embarrassability. Therefore, persons with low self esteem are more easily embarrassed than high esteemed persons (Rosenberg, 1965). Archibald and Cohen (1971) found that the lower one's self-esteem the more embarrassed they are by positive feedback when they failed at a task and when they anticipated an interaction with evaluators. However,
"subjects were [generally] more embarrassed by disapproval than [by] approval" (p. 296).

Related to self-esteem is the notion of social anxiety. Social anxiety is a feeling of discomfort while in the presence of others (Buss, 1980). Edelmann (1985b) found socially anxious persons to have a higher level of embarrassability than those who were not socially anxious. Socially anxious persons underestimated their own performances and overestimated the ability of others to deal with embarrassing situations. A reason given for this was that socially anxious people "believe that they are not able to deal with the situation adequately" (p. 286). They are concerned with the reduction of self-attention and attaining a protective self-presentational style to gain more social approval. He also found that embarrassability is negatively associated with extraversion and positively associated with persons who indicate high levels of being other-directed (i.e., concern for conformity and a need to please others) and those who are concerned with their observable behavior (i.e., publicly self-conscious). Sharkey (1989) supported these notions that as one's level of embarrassability increases so too does one's level of social anxiety, public self-consciousness, private self-consciousness and neuroticism. And, as one's level of embarrassability increases, extraversion decreases. Hence, overall, those who exhibit social anxiety, worry about the impressions of others and worry about them acutely, are introverted and tend to self-reflect will tend to be more embarrassable.

Despite the focus upon embarrassability and its relation with a person's self-esteem, Parrott, Sabini and Silver (1988) discovered that
an increase in embarrassability need not be associated with a decrease in self-esteem, either from the self or from another person. They suggest that the antecedent of embarrassment is simply the inability to present oneself in the appropriate role for the interaction. They then agree with Goffman (1955, 1956b) and Gross and Stone's (1964) social interaction theory of embarrassment.

This overview of embarrassment has focused upon the interaction order, the development of embarrassment and characteristics which affect the emotion of embarrassment. What remains to be addressed are the types of situations which lead to the emotion of embarrassment and responses to embarrassment. Finally, attention will be turned to the focus of this treatise, intentional embarrassment.

Situations Leading to Embarrassment

Embarrassment is caused by someone creating, intentionally or unintentionally, a situation which violates one's assumed role. A number of researchers have proposed typologies of causes of embarrassment; that is, situations. Gross and Stone (1964) proposed that embarrassing situations may be divided into three broad categories; (a) inappropriate social identity refers to the inability to perform the role created and agreed upon by the interactors, (b) a loss of social poise which is the inability to control one's self and the situation and (c) a loss of confidence in the expectations for interaction. These distinctions however are problematic in that a person may simultaneously violate more than one of the assumptions.

Sattler (1965) found that embarrassing predicaments could be categorized into five distinct situations. These divisions were,
however, not situational but "agent" classifications. In other words, these categories referred to who or what the perpetrator of the act was and not the cause of the act. These five categories included: (a) The embarrassed party is the cause of the embarrassment (e.g., tripping, calling someone by the wrong name, etc.), (b) embarrassed person places another in an awkward situation (e.g., not accepting a check from someone, person not able to accept a date, etc.), (c) another person embarrasses the embarrassed person (e.g., criticism, teasing, person walks in on embarrassed person during an intimate act, etc.), (d) another person acts in such a way that the act reflects on the embarrassed person (e.g., a person's children acting up in front of others, seeing persons or animals engaged in intimate acts, etc.) and (e) the person is embarrassed for someone else (e.g., feeling embarrassed when a friend is on stage and flubs the act, feeling embarrassed when another is embarrassed, etc.).

Buss (1980) extended the work of Sattler (1965) and created a five item typology of embarrassing situations: (a) improprieties, these include showing up wearing the wrong clothing, talking dirty or using profanity; (b) a lack of competence, for example when called on in a class not knowing the answer, tripping or spilling a drink; (c) conspicuousness, the idea of being singled out from the crowd; (d) a breach of privacy, which refers to the violation of a person's body or personal space and the leaking of personal information; and (e) overpraise; which is the reception of excessive compliments. Here, Buss is making more concrete the situations which lead to embarrassment.
There have been three other lines of research which have attempted to advance the conceptualization of these situations.

Edelmann (1985c), in an attempt to ameliorate the problem of developing a typology of embarrassing situations, attempted to inductively categorize students' reported embarrassments into similar categories as those of Buss (1980), but these categories were slightly expanded. Edelmann utilized a category system he created earlier (Edelmann, 1981) and stated that this typology was not a solution to the problem (Edelmann, 1987). The typology included the following classifications: (a) inappropriate identity; (b) a loss of poise or loss of social/bodily/visceral control; (c) disagreements over the definition of the situation; (d) the breaching of privacy; (e) overpraise; and (f) vicarious embarrassment.

Sharkey and Stafford (in press) have suggested that there appear to be five basic types of embarrassing situations: (a) violations of privacy which include, body exposure/clothing exposure, invasion of body/clothing or intimate act, invasion of space/property and revealing privacy/secrecy; (b) forgetfulness/lack of knowledge or skill; (c) criticism which could take the form positively or negatively as in blatant criticism, rejection, praise/flattery, teasing (fun criticism) and being made the focus of attention; (d) awkward acts as in situationally improper act, ungraceful/clumsy/awkward acts, excessive or inappropriate expression of emotions, talking about sex or talking dirty and verbal blunders/speaking mistakes; and (e) image appropriateness which includes concern for one's body or clothing and concern for
personal possessions. These categories were also inductively generated from self-report data.

Although all the above work has heuristic value, Cupach and Metts (1990) indicate that, for example, the categories inductively derived by Sharkey and Stafford (1989) as well as those developed by Buss (1980) are not directly comparable. It appears that Edelmann's (1985c) typology would also be criticized on this basis. The typologies do not appear to be equivalent and mutually exclusive.

Next, Weinberg (1968) discussed four types of embarrassing situations which appear to have the advantage of being mutually exclusive and equivalent (Cupach & Metts, 1990); (a) "Situations where intentional behavior is defined post facto as inappropriate to the social situation" (Weinberg, 1968, p. 383). This situation may be referred to as a faux pas. Here a person acts intentionally but defines the situation incorrectly as in dressing informally for a gathering only to find that the situation called for formal attire. (b) "Situations where expectations are correctly defined but where the expectations are breached by an unintended act" (p. 384). Accidents would be covered by this type of situation; for example tripping, a person losing her or his bathing suit while getting out of a pool, etc. (c) "Situations where incorrect definitions lead to an unintended act" (p. 384). These situations may be referred to as mistakes. For example a person walks out of a bathroom thinking that one’s clothing has been zipped, snapped, buttoned, etc., but finding that is not the case. Last, (d) "Situations in which the internal audience evokes embarrassment" (p. 384). This type of embarrassment derives from one’s own internal nature and
interpretation of the situation. "In such a situation it is only an internal orientation that can evoke embarrassment. Duties sometimes prompt embarrassment in this context where the actor proceeds against internal constraints" (Weinberg, 1968, p. 384). Such examples may include a bride or groom becoming embarrassed on his or her wedding night or a medical student examining a patient's "intimate" areas of the body. These four categories, however, do not exhaust the possible number of embarrassing situations, are too abstract for careful analysis and fail to take into consideration those situations which are caused by others (Cupach & Metts, 1990).

Metts and Cupach (1989) modified Weinberg's (1968) category system. They dropped his forth category, that of "Situations in which the internal audience evokes embarrassment, for there appeared to be no reports of such incidents. However, they created another category titled "recipient." It was noted that this category was one of Sattler's (1965) categories for the agent of the act and not of a situation (Sharkey & Stafford, in press). The final categories Metts and Cupach (1989) utilized included; (a) faux pas, (b) mistakes, (c) accident and (d) recipient.

It has been shown that embarrassment may be caused by a particular agent and this may determine the type of situation causing the embarrassment (see discussion of Sattler's typology of "situations" above). In discussing the relationship between the agent of the act and the type of situation, Sharkey and Stafford (in press) discovered a few combinations. They found that when the subject was the agent of his or her own embarrassment, the type of situation was most likely either
forgetfulness or an awkward act. And, when another was the cause of the embarrassment, the type of situation was most likely a form of criticism or a violation of one's privacy.

Last, Cupach and Metts (1990) have offered an hierarchical typology for categorizing embarrassing situations in an attempt to ease the problems with past typologies while respecting the agent of the act. Here situations were divided initially into two broad categories of agent (i.e., who was responsible for the act). First, embarrassment may occur when the actor is responsible for an act and the act is incongruent with (a) the idealized social self, (b) the accomplished role performer or (c) the idealized self-image. When the agent of the act is another, the embarrassor may cause the embarrassment of another directly or indirectly. Direct embarrassment may take the form of individualization (i.e., recognition/praise, criticism/correction or teasing) or causing the other to look unpoised. Indirectly one may cause the embarrassment of another through association, empathy or violations of privacy. Thus, past research has discovered numerous, yet similar, typologies of embarrassing situations in which persons may be involved which are partly dependant upon the agent of the act. Cupach and Metts (1990) offer a tentative taxonomy of situations which they state "is an initial step toward formalizing a comprehensive and reliable method for classifying types of embarrassing predicaments. [They] think it merits elaboration and refinement through additional research" (pp. 347-348).
Communicative Responses of the Embarrassed Party

Initially, if a person is aware of the threat of embarrassment, that a specific act will cause embarrassment the person may attempt to evade the behavior that would cause such a situation. However, if a person fails at escaping the situation, then, once embarrassment is felt, participants (including the embarrassed party(s)) begin to reestablish the face of those embarrassed.

Because embarrassment is extensively viewed negatively and something which should be avoided, persons would do best to dodge situations that are potentially embarrassing. Researchers (e.g., Argyle, 1969, 1985; Fink & Walker, 1977; Goffman, 1955, 1956b, 1959; Heider, 1958) have noted that through the use of tact, social skill, and graciousness, one may avoid causing the self or others embarrassment. One may evade situations, topics, and/or people that are seen as promoting embarrassment. People can use discretion and be aware of situational etiquette. A person may also use humor or openly discuss an embarrassing situation or topic to lessen or eliminate the potential embarrassment. One may inform another that a potentially embarrassing act is to occur (Hewitt & Stokes, 1975) or a person may request another's permission to engage in an embarrassing act. The request is seen as "as asking license of a potentially offended person to engage in what could be considered a violation of his rights" (Goffman, 1971, pp. 144-145). These requests generally precede the disruptive act (Semin & Manstead, 1983). It has been indicated that the possibility of being embarrassed is so threatening that people will sacrifice monetary rewards to avoid performing an embarrassing task (Brown, 1970; Brown &
Garland, 1971; Garland & Brown, 1972). Also, the more embarrassing the act the more rewards are sacrificed (Brown, 1970). If one can circumvent the embarrassing situation, then there is no need to be concerned with appropriate face-work techniques (Goffman, 1955). But this is not always the case and the person engages in a violation of a taken-for-granted rule of the interaction order. When this occurs, those embarrassed may respond with "symptoms" of a subjective kind (i.e., invisible flusterings) and/or with those of an objective kind (i.e., visible flusterings) and begin the face-repair sequence (Goffman, 1955).

Numerous subjective responses to embarrassment have been reported. These consist of the constriction of the diaphragm, a wobbliness feeling, an awareness of unnatural gestures, a dazed sensation, dryness of the mouth, muscle tension, a tingling of the body, an increase or decrease in heartbeat, a disruption of breathing, and an increase in body or facial temperature (Buck & Parke, 1972; Burgess, 1839; Edelmann & Iwawaki, 1987; Goffman, 1956b; Schandry & Poth, 1983). Objective symptoms may also develop. Blushing has been discussed by many researchers as a response to the breach of social-interactive rules (see Argyle, 1969; Baldwin, 1902; Darwin, 1872/1965; Goffman, 1956b; Sattler, 1966). Other responses reported include: sweating, excessive blinking, escape or withdrawal from situation, topic shifting, fumbling, hesitations and vacillation of movements, hand tremoring, speech disturbances, including low and high pitch extremes, stuttering, quavering speech or breaking of voice, avoidance or decrease of eye contact, and smiling and laughter (Argyle, 1969; Edelmann, 1982;

When evading the situation has failed, people who are embarrassed may not want others to know they are embarrassed. Concealment of objective responses could be used to amend the disruption embarrassment has upon social interaction (Goffman, 1956b). One may conceal the objective symptoms of embarrassment or pretend that nothing has occurred and continue with the interaction (Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, in press). However, occasionally one is unable to conceal the responses (Edelmann & Hampson, 1981a) and the person "floods out" (Goffman, 1961; also see Gross & Stone, 1964). Flooding out may take the form of blushing, crying, laughing, anger, impatience, boredom, or anguish. As the level of tension increases so too the possibility of flooding out increases (Goffman, 1961). Another possible occurrence is that when a person wishes to conceal his or her embarrassment and fails, a positive feedback loop may occur. That is, "The person begins with being embarrassed about some unintended mistake...and ends up with being embarrassed about appearing embarrassed" (Asendorpf, 1984, p. 109). One is placed in a paradoxical control situation; i.e., blushing is seen as an involuntary physiological phenomenon, when one attempts to voluntarily suppress the act of blushing, not only will this person fail to do so, but may in fact increase the intensity of the blush (Asendorpf, 1984; Darwin, 1872/1965; Sattler, 1966). Thus, embarrassment can be seen as a self feeding behavior. This awareness of
embarrassment may be self evident or pointed out by another (Edelmann, 1985a).

It is interesting to note that the show of embarrassment itself may play a role in restoring the interaction (Tedeschi & Riess, 1981). Armstrong (1974) found if one demonstrated embarrassment during a disruption, others reported a decrease in perceived deviance. It has also been reported that when a person looks as if he or she is embarrassed, that person is seen as more likeable (Edelmann, 1982). Therefore, it may be beneficial for embarrassed individuals to allow the objective responses to develop rather than concealing them. It could be viewed as an announcement to others that the embarrassed person is aware of her or his transgression and is, in effect, offering an acknowledgement.

The concealment of objective responses themselves may be rule governed, for example, in gynecological examinations (Emerson, 1972) and in nudist camps (Weinberg, 1965, 1968; also see Smith, 1980). The show of embarrassment indicates that the definition of each of the party's roles in the interaction order is not accepted. In these two settings if either party overtly experiences embarrassment, it could be an indication that the person sees the situation as having sexual overtones as opposed to the medical definition needed in the gynecological condition or the naturalness of the body definition in the nudist camp. Weinberg (1968) noted that, because of the definition of the situation, those who remained clothed in the nudist camp occasionally experienced embarrassment because attention would be drawn toward them. The same is true for those who do not have a complete tan. When embarrassment was
elicited in the camp, "it was due to a breakdown in the official
definition of the situation" (p. 387). When these persons left the camp
and returned to the clothed society, the rules were redefined. One
nudist commented that if a person saw him walking around his house
naked, he would feel embarrassed (Weinberg, 1968).

If embarrassment is not evaded or concealed, when the moral
character of the interaction is called into question, the persons'
engage in face-work (Apsler, 1975, Cupach & Metts, 1990; Goffman, 1955;
Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, in press; also see Edelmann,
1985a). This face-work is utilized to return interaction the shared
consensus, thus correcting for the incident's effects (Goffman, 1955).
There is the perception that the person did not deliberately attempt to
call into question his or her role nor the roles played by others and
should be given the opportunity to rectify the situation. Face-work
could also be utilized in order to mold future behaviors and to avoid
possible punitive measures (Jellison, 1990). Social exchange theory
suggests that persons attempt to minimize punishments and maximize
rewards. Hence, the "correct" choice of face-saving techniques may be
one way of receiving socially desirable rewards for acknowledging the
violation (see Jellison, 1990). Jellison (1990), arguing from an
attributional theory frame, reminds us that "individuals should explain
their own socially desirable actions in terms of internal factors---by
doing so, they will be held responsible and are more likely to receive
possible socially mediated benefits" (p. 287). Whereas, if the act is
undesirable the act should "be accounted for in terms of external
factors, so as to avoid responsibility and minimize punishment" (p.
287). Also, the degree of embarrassment may dictate the amount of face work necessary to remedy the situation. Generally, the greater the embarrassment or transgression, the more face-work needed (Archibald & Cohen, 1971; Goffman, 1955; Modigliani, 1971; Schlenker & Darby, 1981) though this was not supported in other research (Sharkey & Stafford, 1988). General responses used, solely or in combination, to remediate an infraction of the interaction order as defined by the interactants may include: (a) escape/avoidance (e.g., humor, jokework, physical escape, changing the topic); (b) accounts (e.g., justifications or excuses); (c) apologies; (d) descriptions of the act; (e) remediation (Cupach, Metts, & Hazleton, 1986a, 1986b; Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, in press); (f) objective symptoms (Semin & Manstead, 1982; Sharkey & Stafford, in press); or (g) hostility/aggression or indignation toward the person causing the embarrassing situation (Baldwin, 1955; Fink & Walker, 1977; Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sattler, 1966; Sharkey & Stafford, in press; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990).

First, escape/avoidance may be used in three ways: (a) physically leaving the setting; (b) humor or jokework which allows the person to acknowledge responsibility for the infringement without offering an excuse; or (c) changing the topic of the conversation (Cupach et al., 1986a, 1986b; Edelmann, 1987; Sharkey & Stafford, in press; also see Emerson, 1972; Fink & Walker, 1977).

Second, accounts may take the form of excuses or justifications. Excuses are seen as "accounts in which one admits that the act in question is bad, wrong, or inappropriate but denies full responsibility" (Scott & Lyman, 1968, p. 47; also see Schonbach, 1980; Sykes & Matza,
Scott and Lyman (1968) suggested several forms that excuses may take: an appeal to accidents; an appeal to defeasibility; an appeal to biological drives; and scapegoating. With a justification, a person "accepts responsibility for the act...but denies the pejorative quality associated with it" (Scott & Lyman, 1968, p. 47). Sykes and Matza (1957) suggested several techniques of neutralizing a deviant behavior which can be seen as justifications (also see Goffman, 1971; Scott & Lyman, 1968): (a) accept responsibility for the act but give a denial of injury (i.e., no one was hurt); (b) appeal to a higher loyalty (i.e., the violation of the rule was done to enforce another; Edgerton, 1985); (c) state a denial of the victim (i.e., turning the tables); or (d) condemn the condemners (i.e., shifting the focus from one's own deviant acts to the motives and behavior of those who disapprove of the act).

Scott & Lyman (1968) also offer strategies for avoiding the use of accounts—meta-accounts. One may use mystification. Persons state that they are aware that an infraction has been made, but there are reasons for the behavior that can not be divulged. Second, persons may use referrals. Referrals are statements which indicate that the infraction has been made but if others wish to know why it was made they would be told to see another individual. Lastly, the use of identity switching may be utilized. Persons inform the others that they are mistaken about the role he or she has taken.

Third, a person who states an apology acknowledges responsibility for an inappropriate, bad, or wrong act and acknowledges blameworthiness (Cupach et al. 1986a, 1986b; Goffman, 1971; Schlenker & Darby, 1981; Semin & Manstead, 1983). People use apologies to indicate to others
that behaviors will improve in the future (Edgerton, 1985). If the
infraction is repeated, apologies lose their efficaciousness (Mehrabian,
1967). Schlenker and Darby (1981) have suggested several components
which may be used as apologies. These include: (a) the use of the
statement "pardon me;" (b) apologetic intent statements such as "I'm
sorry;" (c) expressions of embarrassment, remorse, or sorrow; (d)
offering to assist the damaged party or attempt to restore the situation
to the previously defined agreement; (e) self-castigation; or (f) asking
for forgiveness.

Fourth, the use of descriptions could be utilized. These
strategies acknowledge the problem but offer no acceptance of
responsibility for the infraction (e.g., "I spilled my drink," "I just
tripped") (Cupach et al., 1986a, 1986b). However, it may be that
descriptions of the act are implicitly placing responsibility (Sharkey &
Stafford, in press), as in the above examples, the actor is accepting
the responsibility. Whereas with, "you forgot my name" one is
implicitly placing responsibility on "you." Sharkey and Stafford (in
press) have combined the categories of excuses, justifications,
apologies and descriptions into the single category, "Accounts." They
argue that all four are responses that place responsibility, hence,
attempt account for an act.

Fifth, the use of actions which enable the embarrassed party to
resume his or her role without verbal explanation--remediation (Cupach
et al., 1986a). Remediation may include cleaning up a spilled drink,
zipping or buttoning up exposed undergarments or helping a person up who
has fallen.
Sixth, Sharkey & Stafford (in press) found that objective symptoms were the most reported response to embarrassment. However, as they noted, many of these responses may be uncontrollable responses as in blushing or laughing. Nonetheless, Darwin (1872/1965) stated that one who blushes is seen as having a sensitive regard for others and their opinions of him or her. Edelmann et al. (1987; also see Semin and Manstead, 1982) suggested that "the effect of appearing embarrassed after committing a social transgression may be analogous to providing an apology for one's behaviour" (p. 375). Edelmann et al. (1987) found that viewers of a video tape of a person who knocked over a supermarket display, rated those who showed objective symptoms of embarrassment more positively than those who did not express these symptoms.

Last, Baldwin (1955) stated that aggression/hostility could be used as a strategy to degrade others and lessen their status (also see Fink & Walker, 1977; Sattler, 1966). Brown (1968) found that when bargainers were made to look foolish and weak before an audience, the embarrassed person would retaliate in spite of the costs in order to save face and restore their capability and strength/status. Others (Metts & Cupach, 1989; Martin, 1987; Sharkey & Stafford, in press; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990) have found that hostility is generally used as a response to embarrassment caused by others.

The choice of responses is influenced by the type of embarrassing act (e.g., violations of privacy, forgetfulness, awkward acts, etc.), the agent of the act and/or the embarrassed party's sex (Cupach & Metts, 1990; Cupach et al., 1986a; Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, 1989, in press). Though the amount of research on the influence of acts
upon the responses of embarrassed persons has been sparse, the results appear to be solid evidence that situations leading to embarrassment do in fact influence responses. Sharkey and Stafford (in press) found that the type of situation was predictive of the reactions of the embarrassed person. When the cause of embarrassment was a violation of privacy, the most predominant response was the use of remediation. When the cause of embarrassment was forgetfulness the embarrassed party was most likely to use an account in an attempt to assign a level of responsibility for the action. When an awkward act was experienced accounts tended to follow. When one was embarrassed by criticism, the embarrassed party tended to respond with hostility. And lastly, when image/appropriateness was the cause of embarrassment, the embarrassed persons responded with a form of concealment or an account. Metts and Cupach (1989) found that when a person made a mistake he or she responded most often with an excuse. Justifications were more likely to be utilized in response to a faux pas and when an accident was the cause of embarrassment it was most likely to result in the use of humor or remediation. As Cupach and Metts (1990) clearly state, "Although extant research is limited, it is clear that the type of situation causing the embarrassment influences remedial behavior" (p. 339).

Sharkey and Stafford (in press) have discovered that the agent of the act is predictive of the response of the embarrassed party as well. When the embarrassed party was the cause of his or her own embarrassment, the person was more than likely to utilize a form of remediation and not hostility the reverse was true when another was the cause of the embarrassment. Also, the embarrassed person had a tendency
to report using accounts or responding with objective symptoms when embarrassment was self imposed. Metts and Cupach (1989) also found hostility to be the response most likely to follow from a situation caused by another.

Although the results are conflicting, sex of the interactants may influence the remedial responses of an embarrassed person. Very little has been done recently in researching the difference between the sex of the respondents and responses to embarrassment (Petronio, 1984). Petronio (1984) using self-reports asked the question: "In what ways do women differ from men in strategies they judge as being helpful in reducing embarrassment?" (p. 31). Men claimed that apologizing to others present, verbally blaming the incident on something else, having others indicate nothing wrong happened, and having others change the topic helpful in reducing embarrassment. Cupach et al. (1986a) found women preferred apologies more than men. Males saw avoidance as more effective than females but not more appropriate. Also, Brown (1970) found that men chose withdrawal, having others apologize to them when embarrassed, and laughing at their own behavior helpful strategies to deal with embarrassment.

Women tended to report the use of excuses (Petronio, 1984; also see Brown, 1970; Cupach et al., 1986a). They chose to blame the incident on others, wanting others to become the center of attention, wanting others to blame the incident on themselves, wanting others to express sympathy, and wanting others to become embarrassed as well were strategies selected by women.
When using these strategies...women may hope to influence others into taking responsibility by making them feel guilty...if the woman criticizes herself for becoming embarrassed, she may in fact be manipulating the others so they will make her feel better, thereby influencing them to take responsibility for her embarrassment. (Petronio, 1984, p. 36)

However, Sharkey and Stafford (1989) found no sex differences in responses used.

In a study where an all male or all female audience was ostensibly watching, Garland and Brown (1972) found that females engaged in more face-saving than males when performing an embarrassing act (singing a song after being evaluated as having a poor voice). The length of time subjects sang was used as the dependent variable (the longer the subjects sang, the more money they received). Males sang twice as long as females overall. In a post-experiment self report, females reported a higher level of embarrassment than did the males. Also, females sang four times as long in front of an all male audience than for an all female audience. Good and Good (1973) also found that females evidenced more face-saving behavior than males in front of a mixed audience and more face-saving in front of a female audience.

It seems that the type of situation and the agent of the act have a definite link to what type of responses are utilized by the embarrassed party. However, it is not clear whether or not the sex of the participants is predictive of a person’s responses.

Communicative Responses of Others

Several authors (Cody & McLaughlin, 1985; Goffman, 1955, 1971; McLaughlin, Cody, & O’Hair, 1983; McLaughlin, Cody, & Rosenstein, 1983; Morris, 1985; Remler, 1978; Scott & Lyman, 1968) have suggested that once a strategy, or combination of strategies, has been offered, others
may honor or disallow the strategy or strategies utilized. If the strategy is accepted as sufficient for the infraction committed, the interaction may resume. If, however, the strategy is not accepted, the embarrassed party must offer another strategy or combination of strategies until the acceptance has been made. The acceptance of or the non-acceptance of a strategy is dependant upon the taken-for-granted rules of the working consensus, the embarrassing act, the degree of damage caused by the act and the intentionality of the act (see Cupach et al., 1986a, 1986b; Goffman, 1963; Scott & Lyman, 1968).

Embarrassment is a contagious emotion (Argyle, 1969; Goffman, 1956; Gross & Stone, 1964; Modigliani, 1968). Because of the disruptive nature of embarrassment, and because of its infectiousness, others will help to prevent the interruption and breakdown caused by embarrassment (Argyle, 1985; Goffman, 1957) because empathic embarrassment is always a possibility (Miller, 1987). This help, however, is contingent upon the perceived intentionality of the offensive act (Goffman, 1963).

Foss & Crenshaw (1978) created one highly embarrassing situation and one slightly embarrassing situation to find if the embarrassability of a situation would have an effect upon the helpfulness of others. A college female dropped a box of envelopes in one situation and a box of Tampax in the second. Seventy-two percent of the persons helped either by returning the box or calling attention to the drop in the slightly embarrassing situation and only 47% helped in the highly embarrassing situation. In the high embarrassment situation, 63% of the females helped whereas only 31% of the males helped. It might be argued that the males either felt that they would feel embarrassed or that they
wanted to avoid embarrassing the female and help to avoid possible embarrassment. Sharkey and Stafford (in press) found that when an embarrassed person attempted to conceal objective symptoms, others tended to follow suit and conceal as well. They argued that this may simply be that both persons are trying to avoid the disruption and continue with their interaction as though an incident had not occurred.

If the embarrassment cannot be evaded, others are still responsible for helping to restore the composure of the embarrassed party(s) (Levin & Arluke, 1982). Several researchers have offered possible responses others may implement in order to alleviate the embarrassment of another or to indicate that the transgression has been identified (see Edelmann et al., 1987; Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, in press). One may pretend that nothing has happened or make excuses for the embarrassed person (Argyle, 1985). Others may help the embarrassed party in redefining his or her public-self (Gross & Stone, 1964; Goffman, 1956b). Others may also attempt to attenuate "the importance of the incident or the failure to carry it out successfully" (Duck, 1986). Duck also identified other possible strategies; referring to mitigating incidents, referring to one's past experience which is similar to that of the embarrassing incident, the use of apologies, or the use of "jokework" (i.e., humor and laughter). Berlyne (1969) stated that laughter may be used to reduce tension for the interactors. If the embarrassed party used the objective symptom of laughter, others may laugh to help alleviate the discomfort of the situation (Edelmann & Hampson, 1981b).
Metts and Cupach (1989) and Sharkey and Stafford (in press) have focused directly on the responses of others to the embarrassment of a fellow interactant. Metts and Cupach (1989) found no relationship between the type of situation and the responses of others, though it was noted that this may be due to the small sample size. However, Sharkey and Stafford (in press) found that objective symptoms were the most reported response to the embarrassment of another person. But when taking into account the situation, it was discovered that persons tended to respond with a form of remediation or aggression when an actor suffered from forgetfulness. When criticism was the cause of the embarrassment others tended to respond with a form of escape or objective symptoms. When an awkward act was the cause of the embarrassment, others tended to report responding with objective symptoms and with avoidance when image appropriateness was called into question.

Sharkey & Stafford (in press) took the others' responses a step further in discovering the interactive nature of persons involved in an encounter. It was found that the embarrassed party's response was a good indicator of how others would respond. The results suggest that when an embarrassed person responded with remediation, others tended to respond in kind or with objective symptoms. When an embarrassed person responded with an account others were most likely to utilize remediation. Objective symptoms tended to elicit objective symptoms or a form of escape. Lastly, as noted above, it was discovered that when an embarrassed party attempted to conceal the embarrassment, others also tended to conceal their overt responses. All these responses seem to
indicate the cooperative face-saving that persons engage in to keep the interaction order intact.

It may also be suggested that others may suffer from empathic embarrassment (Miller, 1987; Sattler, 1963). Others may share the embarrassment felt even though the attention may be focused upon the primary embarrassed party. A person may feel that he or she is a part of something more than simply the self (Sattler, 1963). This then supports the notion of the interaction order. All involved create a context which is mutually shared by all involved and in which all define each other's roles and constitutive expectations. Once shared, all may empathize with one another's role. Hence, as one becomes flustered, all understand and may feel a part of the flustering. The shared consensus has been called into question. The more involved in the interaction the participants, the more empathic embarrassment felt (Miller, 1987).

Miller (1987) and Sattler (1963) also suggest that empathic embarrassment is influenced by the relationship with the embarrassed person. More empathic embarrassment was exhibited when one was in a more intimate relationship with the actor. But it was also discovered that a person may simply have a disposition to being empathically embarrassable (Miller, 1987). Thus, Miller (1987) suggests that as one becomes embarrassed, the flow of interaction is not only disrupted, but others may become embarrassed because of the person initially being embarrassed. Therefore, the responses of others may in part be due to the embarrassment which they feel for the other person.
**Intentional Embarrassment**

**Introduction.** When during interaction a person violates a taken-for-granted assumption which is a part of the working consensus, the meaning imputed by the offended person(s) is somewhat determined by the intentionality or unintentionality of the act. Embarrassment has been characterized as "generally unforeseen" and unintentional (Gross & Stone, 1964; Manstead & Semin, 1981; Martin, 1987; Semin & Manstead, 1981, 1982, 1983; Weinberg, 1968). But, it may be that the embarrassment may be deliberately perpetrated (Goffman, 1955; Gross & Stone, 1964; Martin, 1987; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990). That is one may, for example, criticize in order to embarrass so to negatively sanction inappropriate behavior. More generally, when a person has a goal in mind, a person has a repertoire of communicative tactics which may be utilized to achieve her or his goal. Once the person has focused upon those tactics which seem appropriate to the goal set, the person selects a tactic or sequence of tactics which appear to be suitable in attaining the goal while taking into consideration the situational and personal constraints (Greene, 1990; Tedeschi, 1990). Hence, the intentional violation of taken-for-granted rules of interaction (e.g., criticism in front of others) which result in the embarrassment of someone in-order-to (e.g., get person to follow rules) may be referred to as a strategy used to achieve such a specific goal. Dillard (1990) states that "goals are desired future states which an individual is committed to achieving or maintaining" (p. 70). These goals in turn cause mental planning which then guide one's acts. However, many strategies and tactics are not rationally arrived at as products of conscious deliberation.
Because of the temporal and interactive nature of interpersonal communication,

if every individual really did start from scratch in selecting verbal strategies for interaction goals, the variation between individuals in goal priority would lead to such incongruity of act and response the chaos would quickly ensue....[Hence,] it seems likely that the selection of verbal forms is goal-oriented, but is only partly the result of conscious calculation. (Goody, 1978, p. 8)

With this in mind, let us look at the process more closely.

Many researchers have suggested that competent communication is related to the management of multiple, complex, and at times, competing objectives (Clark & Delia, 1979; Dillard, 1990; O'Keefe, 1988; O'Keefe & Delia, 1982; Tracy & Moran, 1983). These objectives may be: (a) "minimally structured," that is with no clear goal pursued; (b) "unifunctional," which involve the attempt of a single goal; or (c) "multi-functional," the pursuit of two or more goals simultaneously (O'Keefe, 1988). Dillard offers three assumptions about those who are seeking to achieve goals: (a) Persons have multiple goals, (b) goals may be arranged hierarchically, temporally, or in order of importance and (c) persons attempt to achieve multiple goals simultaneously though there may be one dominant goal (1990). For example, one may wish to negatively sanction inappropriate behavior as the dominant goal. This goal may be accomplished using the tactic of criticism in connection with the strategy of embarrassment. Concurrently, the person may wish to be perceived as someone who is in charge and knowledgeable. Also, the person may wish to indicate that he or she is one who has the authority to sanction this other's behaviors. Hence, multiple sub-goals may be accomplished at the same time. Marwell and Schmitt (1967a, 1967b) also note that people attempt two goals simultaneously; they
attempt to cause a behavioral change in another and avoid those behaviors which would be more costly to attain the same goal. Clark and Delia (1979) expand upon this and state that there exists three simultaneous goals being achieved overtly or tacitly while communicating with others: (a) instrumental goals, those dealing with the prime task at hand; (b) interpersonal goals, those dealing with the establishment and/or maintenance of the relationship; and (c) identity goals, those dealing with the preservation of the self-image and the image of others. Dillard (1990) sees these as primary (i.e., instrumental goals) and secondary goals (i.e., interpersonal and identity goals).

In order to realize one’s goals, whether primary or secondary, one must utilize tactics and/or strategies to accomplish such tasks. The selection and utilization of a specific tactic or strategy with the in-order-to conceptualization is a very complex matter (Greene, 1990). Briefly, Greene (1990) suggests viewing the process of strategic message production in three stages: (a) representation, (b) selection and (c) utilisation. First, Greene (1990) defines representation as "the structure and symbolic coding of information in long-term memory" (p. 41). Persons decode procedural information and organize this information either structurally or functionally. This information is then placed in one’s long-term memory for latter retrieval.

Next, one must have a mechanism that would allow for the selection of appropriate elements from long-term memory strategically attempting to achieve a goal. Greene argues the equation, "If situation X, then behaviour Y" is too simplistic. What happens when all the features of situation X are not matched? Because all social situations are to
varying degrees novel, it is probably the case that only sub-sets of the situation are required for behavior Y to be selected. In any case, there are mechanisms which allow persons to select appropriate elements from one’s long-term memory in order to achieve one’s goals.

Finally, once elements have been selected, one moves to behavior, i.e., utilisation. The results of the selection of elements from long-term memory then is the strategic message, i.e., the production of a sequence of verbal and nonverbal behaviors.

The present study is being performed to explore the strategic use of embarrassment to achieve various goals. In the representational stage, one would have to have some long-term-memory notion of the goal and ways to achieve the goal, this may be structurally (e.g., scripted) or functionally based. A person then selects a strategic message to achieve the goal (e.g., embarrassment of another). For example, a tactic (e.g., violation of a person’s privacy) or sequence of tactics would be retrieved from one’s long-term memory to induce embarrassment in another in order to achieve one’s goal. After the selection of procedural elements, the person utilizes this information and interprets it into behaviors within a temporal pattern which would, one would hope, elicit the goals attempted. However, in so doing, secondary goals may suffer which will be discussed later.

Goals/functions of intentional embarrassment. Generally, "persons do not initiate actions unless there is apt to be something gained from it" (Kane, Suls & Tedeschi, 1977, p. 13). Goals direct various tactics and/or strategies (Canary, Cunningham, & Cody, 1988; Cody, Canary, & Smith, in press). Previous conceptualizations have advocated that
embarrassment whether unintentional or goal oriented/intentional should be avoided. It is a disruption to interaction and causes participants to try and remedy the situation through evasion, concealment or face-work. However, it may be that intentional embarrassment is used to achieve specific primary goals. Specifically, it has been suggested that intentional embarrassment may be used (a) to negatively sanction inappropriate role behavior, (b) to establish and maintain power, (c) to socialize persons into a culture, group or organization, and to maintain a level of solidarity or (d) to discredit a person's presented role (Fuligni & Savin-Williams, 1989; Gross & Stone, 1964; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990). It thus appears that there are primary goals attempted through the use of intentional embarrassment for the development and maintenance of relationships. Martin (1987) reported that, from students' perspectives, intentional embarrassment directed at students by educators served to negatively sanction inappropriate behavior, to maintain power and to socialize students into the teacher's expectations of what a student's role is suppose to be (i.e., doing the best they can). Sharkey and Waldron (1990) have discovered that within the superior/subordinate work context, intentional embarrassment was utilized for the attainment of all the goals noted above. Superiors and subordinates reported that superiors used embarrassment as a socialization tool (i.e., to teach subordinates the rules and procedures of the organization). Both superiors and subordinates reported the utilization of embarrassment to show solidarity. Also, subordinates reported that they perceived that superiors intentionally embarrassed them as a means of displaying power. And last, deliberate embarrassment
was used as a means to negatively sanction the behaviors of subordinates thus supporting Gross and Stone's (1964) contentions. However, as noted earlier, Martin's (1987) study was not focused upon intentional embarrassment and Sharkey and Waldron's (1990) study was exploratory.

In sum, it seems that intentional embarrassment is used in an attempt to achieve various goals. However, the research provided thus far is limited and is either theoretical or contextually based. Hence, three questions remain; (a) what primary goals do people attempt during everyday interactions regardless of specific contextual constraints? (b) Are the attempts successful? And, (c) how often is the strategy of embarrassment utilized by people?

RQ1: What primary goals are people attempting to achieve through the use of intentional embarrassment?

RQ2: Do people achieve their primary goals using intentional embarrassment?

RQ3: How often is embarrassment used as a strategy to achieve a primary goal?

Tactics used to intentionally embarrass another. Because the present study focuses upon intentional embarrassment, it is important to note what specific tactics, from those discussed earlier, appear to be employed to cause embarrass in order to achieve one's goals. Tactics here refer to the types of situations created by an embarrassor to embarrass. First, intentional embarrassment is by its very nature caused by another person. Although it is acknowledged that people may intentionally embarrass themselves for various reasons (e.g., to get a laugh, recognition, monetary rewards, etc.) (also see Miller, 1986), this will not be addressed here. So, what types of situations are caused by others? Though the majority of studies do not focus upon the
deliberate use of tactics to cause another embarrassment, some guiding information may be generated by looking at research which notes what types of embarrassing situations are caused by another regardless of intentionality. Sattler (1965) indicated that when another person was the perpetrator of the embarrassing situation, the type of situations tended to be that of criticism (e.g., rejection, praise, teasing) and violations of privacy/body/space (e.g., being touched inappropriately, private information is given out). Sharkey and Stafford (in press) supported Sattler's findings that when another person was the agent of the embarrassment, the situation tended to be one of criticism or violations of privacy. These two situations were echoed by Metts and Cupach's (1989) "recipient" category. The recipient category included; "being criticized in class, receiving excessive praise in public, or having one's parents appear unexpectedly while one is only 'partially clothed' in the living room with one's boyfriend" (p. 155). Martin (1987) also discovered that criticism by teachers was one of the most reported types of embarrassing situations by students.

Cupach and Metts (1990) suggested a tentative hierarchical classification of embarrassing predicaments where another is responsible for the transgression. This classification does not guarantee that the predicament was deliberately caused, however, because the focus of this investigation is upon intentional embarrassment, these situations may be utilized as a guide. Cupach and Metts (1990) stated that one may embarrass another either directly or indirectly. When directly embarrassing another, "attention is drawn to a person through actions that somehow distinguish the embarrassed person from others" (p. 345).
This may include the use of recognition/praise, criticism/correction or teasing. Or, one may cause the person to look awkward or unpoised. However, the embarrassment may be caused indirectly as well through association, empathy or a violation of privacy. Association occurs when one feels embarrassed because of being associated with another’s inappropriate behavior and assumes that any negative attributions will be generalized to her or him because of those acts. One may become embarrassed by feeling for another who is embarrassed or one may be embarrassed when another reveals private information about the person to others without her or his knowledge or presence.

Last, in the one study which focused specifically on intentional embarrassment, Sharkey and Waldron (1990) suggested that superiors intentionally embarrassed subordinates through the use of criticism, teasing, causing subordinate to look unpoised (i.e., awkward acts) and violations of privacy.

In sum, it appears that people utilize various tactics to cause another to feel embarrassed so as to achieve one’s goals. However, only one study has focused upon intentional embarrassment (Sharkey & Waldron, 1990). The tactics utilized within a broad range of contexts needs to be addressed.

RQ4: What tactics are utilized to cause another to experience embarrassment, that is, what types of situations do agents create in order to embarrass another?

Research, as noted above, has claimed that the goal of a person has a direct affect upon the strategy and/or tactic employed (Canary et al., 1988; Cody et al., in press). Thus, if it is found that specific tactics are utilized to intentionally embarrass another, are specific
tactics associated with a particular primary goal and the success of attaining the goal?

RQ5: What is the association between the tactic used to cause embarrassment, the desired primary goal and the success of achieving primary goals?

Responses to Intentional Embarrassment. If the act was intentional, then the perpetrator has violated his or her public self-image which was presented to all present and has deliberately called into question the victim's identity or causes a loss of poise. However, the person whose self has been threatened and the person who threatened the victim may both feel embarrassed. The victim has been discredited and has lost his or her face due to the action of another which in turn disrupts the flow of interaction. However, the perpetrator may be more guilty of disruption, for if this person had been poising as a tactful person, by devastating another's image, the perpetrator's image has been also been called into question. Both the victim who has become embarrassed by the act and the perpetrator, who has violated the common trust of the interaction order, must attempt to return interaction to a homeostatic state through the use of face-work (Goffman, 1955). The focus here is upon the recipient of the embarrassment and how this person responds behaviorally to such tactics in order to regain her or his poise and/or identity. Although the present study focuses upon intentional communication by an embarrassor, the responses by the embarrassee are immediate reactions to the emotion of embarrassment and may not be rational or intentional behavioral responses (see Bowers et al., 1985; Sharkey & Stafford, in press).
When people are embarrassed, they attempt to reestablish their poise and identities which they displayed prior to the embarrassment (Goffman, 1955, 1956b). As noted above, past research has shown that the type of situation (e.g., violations of privacy, criticism, awkward acts, etc.) is associated with the type of response offered (Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, in press). The agent of the act has also been shown to affect what responses are displayed (Sharkey & Stafford, in press). Specifically, Sharkey and Stafford (in press) have found that when a person is the cause of her or his own embarrassment, the person was most likely to respond with a form of remediation or with an account. And when the perpetrator of the embarrassment was another, the embarrassed person was more than likely to respond with a form of hostility (Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, in press). The response of hostility may be used to retaliate and place the focus of attention upon the perpetrator. Baldwin (1955) supports this notion and states that hostility could be used as a strategy to degrade others and lessen their status (also see Fink & Walker, 1977; Sattler, 1966). Brown (1968) found that when bargainers were made to look foolish and weak before an audience, the embarrassed person would retaliate in spite of the costs in order to save face and restore their capability and strength/status. Others have noted that when persons perceived that they were intentionally embarrassed they reported responding with hostility and anger (Martin, 1987; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990). However, Sharkey & Waldron (1990) also discovered that if the intentional embarrassment was in the form of teasing (i.e., just for fun), then the
embarrassed person tended to respond with objective symptoms (e.g., laughing, blushing).

In sum, it appears that how one responds to intentional embarrassment may well depend upon what type of tactic (i.e., type of situation created) is used to cause the embarrassment.

RQ6: How do embarrasses respond to intentional embarrassment?

RQ7: Does the tactic used by an embarrassor predict the response of an embarrasssee?

Consequences of Intentional Embarrassment. Though the use of strategic use of embarrassment may achieve a primary goal (e.g., the quieting of a student or having a worker adhere to a rule of an organization), the short-term and long-term secondary goals of being perceived as a competent and an effective communicator may be hampered (Dillard, 1990; Tedeschi, 1990). These secondary goals (e.g., relational outcomes) are here referred to as the consequences of intentional embarrassment. Self-presentation theorists would argue that persons attempt to be socially approved and perceived as socially competent and likeable (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Goffman, 1959; Jones & Pittman, 1982). Competence literature has suggested that the consequences of competent communication lead to communication and relational satisfaction, interpersonal attraction, interpersonal solidarity, trust and the confirmation of others' presented selves (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984). Jones and Pittman (1982) have proposed that the quest for social approval and liking is the principal force which underlines the presentation of the self. However, as one achieves a power role, the opinions and/or the feelings of others may not be of importance (Arkin & Shepperd, 1990). Hence, one may not be concerned
with achieving secondary goals. However, it has been suggested that persons who produce messages which serve multiple goals (i.e., primary and secondary goals) are perceived as being more competent than those who focus on a single goal (see Waldron, Cegala, Sharkey & Teboul, in press).

Consequences for intentionally embarrassing another appear to be dependent upon the tactic used to cause embarrassment (Martin, 1987; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990). Martin (1987) reported that consequences of perceived deliberate embarrassment (which took the form of criticism, for the most part, and violations of privacy) in the educational setting were generally negative. Students who felt teachers were intentionally embarrassing them developed dislike for the teachers, became angry, became afraid of the teachers, developed negative self-concepts, negatively affected student learning and instilled an attitude of wanting to quit school. Sharkey and Waldron (1990) found that 59% of subordinates stated that the effects of perceived intentional embarrassment were negative. These included avoidance and disrespect for the superior. And it was also found that 20% of the subordinates reported quitting their job because of the perceived deliberate embarrassment.

The consequences of embarrassment may also lead to a person's tendency to follow the rules, conventions, and behaviours of interaction (Edelmann, 1987) which appear to be positive consequences. Martin (1987) discovered that a number of students felt that the threat of teacher induced embarrassment may have positive features. Students reported studying harder for exams so as to "avoid the embarrassment
caused when a teacher announces one’s low mark to the class” (p. 291). Also, some reported putting extra effort into doing homework to avoid the ridicule of a teacher. Thus, it may be that students are forced into learning course content, self discipline and how to follow directions because of "anticipatory embarrassment" (see Silver et al., 1987). Sharkey and Waldron (1990) also discovered that approximately 18% of their respondents perceived the consequences of intentional embarrassment as positive, for example, embarrassing another as a show of solidarity through the use of "kidding around" or teasing or that subordinates learned how to do their jobs more effectively because of the embarrassment.

In sum, it is unclear whether the use of intentional embarrassment has positive or negative consequences. It may be that the consequences of such a strategy may be dependent upon the tactic employed to embarrass (e.g., criticism, teasing).

RQ8: What are the short-term and long-term consequences of intentional embarrassment?

RQ9: Are the short-term and long-term consequences of intentional embarrassment dependent upon the type of tactic employed?

It may also be the case that the long-term consequences may vary in relation to the short-term consequences. Knapp, Stafford and Daly (1986) suggested that regrettable messages may lose their negative effect as time goes on. They found that 16% of the short-term consequences reported were non-consequential and 28% indicated negative relationship changes. But, a four fold increase in positive consequences and an increase to 40% of the respondents reported no-
consequences for long-term consequences. This suggests that short-term consequences may be predictive of long-term consequences.

RQ10: Are short-term consequences of intentional embarrassment predictive of long-term consequences?

Summary

In summary, the following areas of intentional embarrassment are the focus of the present study: (a) the attempted primary goals of intentional embarrassment and the success of attaining these goals; (b) the tactics (i.e., types of embarrassing situations) employed to intentionally embarrass; (c) the responses of the embarrassed party to the transgression and (d) the consequences of such acts. Hence, nine questions are being asked:

RQ1: What primary goals are people attempting to achieve through the use of intentional embarrassment?

RQ2: Do people achieve their primary goals using intentional embarrassment?

RQ3: How often is embarrassment used as a strategy to achieve a primary goal?

RQ4: What tactics are utilized to cause another to experience embarrassment, that is, what types of situations do agents create in-order-to embarrass another?

RQ5: What is the association between the tactic used to cause embarrassment, the desired primary goal and the success of achieving primary goals?

RQ6: How do embarrasses respond to intentional embarrassment?

RQ7: Does the tactic used by an embarrassor predict the response of an embarrasssee?

RQ8: What are the short-term and long-term consequences of intentional embarrassment?
RQ9: Are the short-term and long-term consequences of intentional embarrassment dependent upon the type of tactic employed?

RQ10: Are short-term consequences of intentional embarrassment predictive of long-term consequences?
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

As noted earlier, the amount of information on intentional embarrassment is limited. Consequently, there is virtually no guide for setting up ethnographic or laboratory studies. Because of the lack of guidance as well as the delicate and personal nature of embarrassment—in which strong ethical considerations would be of concern—a questionnaire study appeared to be the most appropriate method.

An open-ended questionnaire study appeared to be the most unobtrusive means of gaining the personal information needed. Here, by not focusing on a particular context, as the two studies mentioned above (i.e., Martin, 1987; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990), a broad range of situations in multiple contexts were gained. The researcher’s influence was minimized to allow the respondent to report more openly on such delicate issues. This procedure also allowed for more standardization of responses. The ethical concerns of intentionally embarrassing another in a lab setting or in the field or the problem of locating a number of situations naturally occurring in the field were hence avoided.
Respondents

Participants consisted of students enrolled in communication classes and non-students over 30 years of age who were solicited by students enrolled in communication classes at a large midwestern university. Participants included 546 males and 588 females and 2 individuals who did not report their sex. Participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 77 with a mean age of 32.6 years. Participation in the study was voluntary and students received extra credit for their involvement.

Procedure

Questionnaires were distributed and instructions delivered verbally in class. Students were supplied with two questionnaires. Each questionnaire was the same but with two separate cover letters. One questionnaire was addressed to the student (see Appendix A) while the second questionnaire was addressed to a person over the age of 30 who was solicited by the student (see Appendix B). The cover letters briefly explained the research to the respondents. Participants were instructed to return the questionnaires in an envelope to the researcher either in person or by mail. Respondents were assured of anonymity and confidentiality.

The Instrument

Questionnaires (see Appendix A and B) contained 4 open ended questions, 3 demographic questions and 2 likert scales which measured the degree of embarrassment and degree of consequences of the event. All questions concerned specific instances in the participant’s life as opposed to general observations, thus alleviating some of the validity problems with retrospective self report data (Ericson & Simon, 1984).
Participants were asked to describe a situation in their life when they intentionally embarrassed someone (see Appendix A for the introduction to the study the respondents read). Participants were asked (a) to describe the incident, (b) to explain why they intentionally embarrassed the person (i.e., what his or her goal was), (c) to indicate how the person responded to the embarrassment and (d) to report the short and long-term consequences of their act. The respondents were not asked if they had ever intentionally embarrassed another. The purpose was to force the respondents to think through their lives and try to describe a situation they were in as opposed to taking the "easy-way-out" and simply checking a "no" box.

**Coding Procedure**

Responses to the open-ended questions were coded for the four variables of interest: goals of intentional embarrassment, tactics used to embarrass, responses of the embarrassee and the perceived consequences of intentional embarrassment. In order to assess the adequacy of typologies, a preliminary questionnaire was distributed to 100 undergraduate students at the same midwestern university. The researcher and two undergraduate assistants coded the entire data set and modified any typologies as needed.

For the type of goal being attempted, Gross and Stone's (1964) typology was used and slightly modified based upon the data. During initial coding, it was discovered that a person may embarrass another as a characteristic of his or her personality (e.g., "I just wanted to see how the person would handle it") and the category of "Negative Sanction"
was divided into a second category, namely "To Discredit." A complete
description of goals attempted and examples is presented in Table 1.

For the tactic utilized to cause embarrassment, a combination of
the typologies for embarrassing situations presented by Cupach and Metts
(1990) and Sharkey and Stafford (in press) was used. A complete
description of the tactics used by people to intentionally embarrass
another and examples are displayed in Table 2.

The responses of the embarrassed party to the embarrassment were
derived from the typologies developed by Sharkey and Stafford (in
press). A complete description of these responses and examples are
provided in Table 3.

A typology for the short and long-term consequences produced by
intentional embarrassment were borrowed from the work of Knapp et al.
(1986) and Sharkey and Waldron (1990) as well as two categories which
emerged from the data (i.e., continued embarrassment and person takes
protective measures now to avoid future embarrassments). A complete
description of these responses and examples are provided in Table 4.

After categories were established for coding, the present study's
questionnaires were coded. First, one hundred questionnaires were
jointly coded by the researcher and a research assistant after which the
assistant independently coded another one hundred questionnaires. The
researcher then tested the reliability of agreement on these second
hundred questionnaires. After joint discussion of these codings the
assistant then independently coded the remaining questionnaires.
Table 1

Goals of Intentional Embarrassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Show Solidarity</td>
<td>For fun, socialization into a group or organization, retaliation (pos), to show solidarity with the group, to look better in the eyes of others, to be one of the crowd, to get a laugh, to be the center of attention, to make a time memorable, to make person feel important, to honor the person. Examples: &quot;Just for fun,&quot; &quot;I was getting her back,&quot; &quot;I was trying to give him a good laugh on his birthday,&quot; &quot;It’s how we initiate a person,&quot; &quot;I wanted to make this a time she would never forget,&quot; &quot;The surprise will always be remembered,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Sanctioning</td>
<td>To get person to follow rules, teach a lesson, to punish. Examples: &quot;I reprimanded my child so he wouldn’t do the same thing again,&quot; &quot;I wanted to get this person to take a closer look at the problem,&quot; &quot;I need my workers to show up on time,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Discredit</td>
<td>Retaliation (neg), puncture false fronts, make sure other doesn't get his/her way. Examples: &quot;We didn't want him to get the job,&quot; &quot;She deserved it, she was asking for it for some time,&quot; &quot;He was lying to everyone for a year. I just wanted them to see who he really was,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Power</td>
<td>To take control, to get ahead, to get one's way (self move). Examples: &quot;I wanted the supervisors to see that I was best for the job,&quot; &quot;I needed to have the final say,&quot; &quot;To get him to stop talking,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>A person’s personality, wanting to see a reaction, etc. Examples: &quot;Because I think it's funny,&quot; &quot;I just wanted to see her reaction,&quot; &quot;I just like to embarrass my brother,&quot; &quot;I wanted to see the person blush,&quot; &quot;I wanted to see how the person would handle it,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactic Used to Intentionally Embarrass</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition/Praise</td>
<td>Examples: &quot;I asked _____ to stand and perform for all of us,&quot; &quot;We threw her a retirement party,&quot; &quot;I hired a gorilla to sing happy birthday to her at school,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism/Correction</td>
<td>Examples: &quot;I slapped my son's hand in front of his friends so he would stop...,&quot; &quot;I yelled at a subordinate for not getting the work finished on time,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>Making fun of another in a positive way, practical joking. Examples: &quot;I teased her about her hair cut,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause to Look Unpoised</td>
<td>Examples: &quot;I tripped my boyfriend,&quot; &quot;We painted our friend's face green when he passed out from drinking. He didn't notice it until he saw himself in the mirror the next morning,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of Privacy</td>
<td>Revealing things which one would rather not have revealed. Examples: &quot;I showed my daughter in law a nude baby picture of my son,&quot; &quot;I told a person that my friend had crabs,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body/Clothing Exposure and Invasion of Space/Property</td>
<td>Examples: &quot;I pulled a boy's swimming trunks down,&quot; &quot;When my friend was using the bathroom, I opened the door so everyone could see him,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Embarrassed person feels embarrassment because he/she is associated with someone (or something) who is enacting untoward behavior and assumes that negative attributions will be generalized to him/her from those actions. Examples: &quot;I acted like an idiot at the restaurant,&quot; &quot;I wore a very sexy outfit to my husband's work social just to embarrass him,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Responses of the Embarrassed Party to the Intentional Embarrassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concealing Symptoms</td>
<td>An attempt at suppressing emotions or actions or continuing interaction or embarrassing act like nothing happened. Examples: 'She didn’t let it show,' &quot;He didn’t let us know he was embarrassed,&quot; &quot;She covered up her embarrassment,&quot; &quot;He didn’t let it affect him,&quot; &quot;She didn’t say/do anything,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>Excuses: The expression of denial of responsibility, appeals to accidents, defeasibility-being not fully informed, biological drives, scapegoating. Examples: &quot;I didn’t do it,&quot; &quot;I didn’t know,&quot; &quot;I wasn’t feeling well,&quot; &quot;That’s not what I said,&quot; etc. Justifications: Acceptance of responsibility, but denying any negative outcome, denial of injury, denial of victim, appeal to loyalties, sad tales. Examples: &quot;Don’t worry about it,&quot; &quot;I had to for my brother's sake,&quot; &quot;No one was hurt,&quot; etc. Apologies: The acceptance of responsibility, self-castigation, expressions of remorse, sorrow, etc. Examples: &quot;I'm sorry,&quot; &quot;Pardon me,&quot; &quot;I'm so stupid,&quot; &quot;It was my fault,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Symptoms</td>
<td>Laughing, blushing, smiling, silence, looks, crying, screams, exclamations (without hostility), threats of retaliation (pos). Examples: &quot;He didn’t know what to do he just stood there and watched,&quot; She kept her mouth shut,&quot; &quot;He just stood there stunned,&quot; &quot;She got quiet,&quot; &quot;He hung his head,&quot; &quot;She said 'Oh S___!'&quot; &quot;I'll get you for this,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Table 3 (continued)"

### Escaping/Avoiding
Try to get out of situation, changing topic, physically leave or verbally avoid or escape situation. Examples: "He left the room," "She started talking about something else," "He put the pictures away," etc.

Humor, Jokework, teasing remarks, retaliation (pos). Examples: "She made a joke of it," "He thought it was really funny," "She tried to get me back," etc.

### Aggression
Condemnation of condemners, protest, threats, retaliation (neg), anger, dirty looks, hostile sarcasm, exclamations (neg), etc. Examples: "I'm not the only one who...," "She told John she was mad," "He was sarcastic," "He gave me a dirty look," "She yelled at me," "You're a real [S.O.B]," "You wait 'til I tell dad," etc.

### Remediation
Correcting the problem (e.g., clean up spill, zip up zipper, doing the job, etc.), the requesting of help or comfort. Examples: "He asked me to help him back up," "She fixed the problem," "He cleaned up the stack of papers on the floor," etc.
Table 4

**Short and Long-Term Consequences of Intentional Embarrassment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Consequences</strong></td>
<td>Examples: &quot;There were no consequences,&quot; &quot;None as of yet, I'm waiting,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Relational,</strong></td>
<td>The relationship benefits, either person feels better, the tasks are completed, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feeling, Task Change</strong></td>
<td>Examples: &quot;She and I are now married,&quot; &quot;We get along much better now,&quot; &quot;He feels more like a part of the group,&quot; &quot;She cleaned her room,&quot; &quot;He comes home when we tell him to,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Relational,</strong></td>
<td>The relationship suffers, either person feels worse, the tasks are not completed, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feeling, Task Change</strong></td>
<td>Examples: &quot;She and I are no longer interact,&quot; &quot;We got divorced,&quot; &quot;He quit his job,&quot; &quot;She hasn't changed, she still...,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protective Measures</strong></td>
<td>Person now acts in such a way so as to avoid possible embarrassment in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: &quot;He locks his doors now,&quot; &quot;She completes her work on time,&quot; &quot;He doesn't talk about it anymore,&quot; &quot;She doesn't introduce me to anyone,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retaliation</strong></td>
<td>Examples: &quot;She got even with me,&quot; &quot;He did the same to me a week later,&quot; &quot;This is a constant state of our relationship,&quot; &quot;She got her revenge,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continued Embarrassment</strong></td>
<td>The situation is talked about or laughed about still. Examples: &quot;We still like to rib him about it,&quot; &quot;We remember it 'til this day,&quot; &quot;Everyone keeps bringing up the subject just to watch him squirm,&quot; etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inter-coder reliability was computed on 15% of the data using Scott’s pi (1955) which adjusts for chance agreement. Pi values were .89 for goal (95.8% agreement), .88 for the tactic used (90.3% agreement), .96 for the responses of the embarrasssee (97.3% agreement) and .87 for short-term consequences (92.0% agreement) and .92 for long-term consequences (93.6% agreement).

Data Analysis

The primary analyses consisted of log-linear model testing. A complication of models utilizing goal, response and consequences of the embarrassment as a single factor was the issue of multiple responses. When more than one goal or consequence was reported, one was randomly chosen for analysis. After coding the data, it appeared that the listing of goals and consequences were chosen from a list of alternatives and not necessarily temporally or strategically arranged (see Sharkey & Stafford, in press). Also, the decision to randomly choose one was influenced by the relatively small number of participants reporting multiple goals (6.6%)--resulting in a loss of only (6.9%) of the goals reported. The decision to randomly choose one response from short-term and long-term consequences were based upon the same argument (see Sharkey & Stafford, in press). Only 4% of the participants report two short-term consequences and 3.4% reported two long-term consequences. Hence, only 3.8% of the data for short-term-consequences and 3.2% of the long-term consequences were not utilized.

It was also found that 181 respondents reported the embarrasssee as utilizing two or more responses to the situation. Initially, it was suspected that the responses reported were, as well, simply alternatives
and not temporally or strategically arranged as Sharkey and Stafford (in press) suggested. However, upon closer examination, the majority of participants did in fact report the multiple responses in a temporal order (e.g., "He just pulled his pants up, gave me a dirty look and then walked out"). Decision rules had to be devised. Based upon crosstabs of the first and second responses of the embarrassed party, it was discovered that a substantial number of multiple responses (n=91) were of two sets; objective symptoms with a form of escape and objective symptoms with aggression. Hence, two additional response categories were developed (i.e., objective symptom/escape and objective symptom/aggression). Sixteen other participants listed three responses and one person reported the embarrassment using four responses. In all these cases, it was discovered that the embarrassed person utilized a combination of one of the above two response groupings with an additional response (e.g., objective symptom, escape and an account). The decision was made to utilize the two response combination and disregard the third. It was decided that the loss of eighteen responses with such a large sample size would not violate the integrity of the data. It should be noted that seven of the aforementioned cases contained an objective symptom and both escape and hostility. In these seven cases, either escape or hostility was chosen at random to form the combination used for future analyses.

Last, for the remaining 73 participants who stated that the embarrassment used two responses, the first occurring response was utilized for those which were temporally ordered (n=55) and when the responses were not temporally reported (n=18), one response was chosen
at random. In all, 91 response units were not used. This represents 7.5% of the total number of responses (n=1218). Thus, it was deemed low enough to not harm the integrity of the data.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Respondents described a total of 1033 tactics (i.e., situations) which could be coded in which they intentionally embarrassed another individual. Fifty-nine responses were blank or not descriptions of intentional embarrassment, 14 were either anomalous or too vague to be coded for tactic used and 30 participants stated that they "do not intentionally embarrass others." Thus, 10% of the participants were placed in an "unclassifiable" category. Also, the degree of embarrassment produced by the embarrasser was rated by each participant on a seven-point likert scale ranging from "not at all embarrassing" to "extremely embarrassing." Mean level of embarrassment produced was 5.21 for 1045 respondents (8.7% failed to indicate the degree of embarrassment).

Research Question 1 asked what primary goals do people attempt to achieve using intentional embarrassment. Of the 1110 total goals reported, 87.5% reported attempting a single primary goal while 5.9% reported attempting two goals simultaneously and 0.3% reported attempting three goals. In order to indicate the full range of goals reported (i.e., the frequencies for all goals, not only the one chosen at random for subsequent analyses), distribution was constructed utilizing a multiple response technique which is based upon the
frequency of occurrence of goals regardless of the number of goals. Participants reported attempting the goal of solidarity with the most frequency (approximately 47%), followed by negative sanctioning of behavior (22%), to discredit another (18%), the establishment of power (9%) and because of the person's own interest in seeing the responses of others as the goal (i.e., personality) (4%).

Research Question 2 was concerned with the achievement of the participants' goals. Specifically, did the participants achieve their primary goals using intentional embarrassment? Of 1034 respondents, 91.7% reported achieving their goal whereas 8.3% reported not achieving their goal.

The third research question asked how often participants have deliberately embarrassed others in the past six months. Of 1126 respondents (10 failed to indicate), the majority (53.2%) of respondents stated that they have intentionally embarrassed others 1-5 times in the past six months, 10.3% reported embarrassing others 6-10 times, 2.8% 11-15 times, 2.5% 16-20 times and 6.7% stated embarrassing others more than 20 times in the past six months. Also, 276 (24.5%) participants stated that they have not intentionally embarrassed anyone in the past six months.

Research Question 4 was concerned with the tactics used in order to embarrass another. Of the 1033 tactics reported, the most frequently reported tactic employed to cause embarrassment was causing a person to look unpoised (31.5%) followed by criticism (21%), violations of privacy (19%), teasing (13%), association (8%) and recognition/praise (8%).
Research Question 5 focused on the association between the goal attempted, the tactic used to achieve the goal and whether the goal was achieved. First, it was of interest to find if the goal attempted and the tactic used were associated with each other. A two-way, 5 X 6 (goal attempted by tactic) Symmetrical-Model Log-Linear design was executed. It was discovered that the goal and the tactic used to achieve the goal were associated ($\chi^2_{[20]} = 457.98, p. < .0001$). That is, there were differences between the tactics utilized with respect to the goals attempted. Table (5) exhibits the conditional proportions and results of significance testing on Lambda scores.

Next a three-way, 5 X 6 X 2 (goal attempted by tactic by achievement of goal) design Logit-Model Log-Linear Analysis, with a delta value of .05 added, was constructed. The results showed no interaction effect between the goal attempted and the tactic used ($\chi^2_{[20]} = 17.97, p. < .589$). However, main effects existed between levels of the explanatory variables—i.e., the goal attempted ($\chi^2_{[4]} = 57.52, p. < .0001$) and the tactic used ($\chi^2_{[5]} = 25.48, p. < .0001$). Therefore, even though the interaction of the goal attempted and the tactic used did not predict whether a person achieved her or his goal, the goal attempted was a good predictor of whether or not a person achieved his or her goal and knowing the tactic used was also a good predictor of whether or not people achieved their goal. Conditional proportions and results of significance testing on lambda parameters are displayed in Table (6) and (7) respectively.
Table 5

Conditional Proportions of Goal Attempted by Tactic Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Goal Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>-.02****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpoised</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vio Privacy</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=507)(n=224)(n=74)(n=176)(n=49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (-) denotes negative deviation from expected frequencies; all others positive deviations. Conditional proportions rounded to nearest hundredth.

*p. < .10; **p. < .05; ***p. < .01; ****p. < .001.
Table 6

**Conditional Proportions of Goal Attempted and Goal Achieved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Show Solidarity</td>
<td>.96**</td>
<td>-.04**</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Sanctioning</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Power</td>
<td>-.82**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Discredit</td>
<td>.96*</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (-) denotes negative deviation from expected frequencies; all others positive deviations. Conditional proportions rounded to nearest hundredth.

*p. < .05; **p. < .001.
## Table 7

### Conditional Proportions of Tactic Employed by Goal Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Goal Achieved</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.99*</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>-.86**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>-.89*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpoised</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vio Privacy</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (-) denotes negative deviation from expected frequencies; all others positive deviations. Conditional proportions rounded to nearest hundredth.

*p. < .05; **p. < .001

Research Question 6 focuses on the reported responses of the embarrassee. In order to indicate the full range of responses reported, the same procedure was utilized as was employed for deriving the frequency of goals attempted. Of the 1218 total responses reported by the participants, 68.8% reported the embarrassee responding with only one behavior, 13.5% reported the embarrassee using two responses, 1.3% stated that the embarrassee utilized three responses and 0.08% reported an embarrassee using four responses. A total of 9.6% of the participants' responses were either left blank or unclassifiable (see Table 8).
### Table 8

**Conditional Proportions of Responses Displayed By Embarrassee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concealing Symptoms</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Symptoms</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape/Avoidance</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 1218)

Next, Research Question 7 focused upon the predictability of the response of the embarrassee when the tactic used to cause embarrassment was known. A two-way Logit-Model Log-Linear Analysis, a 6 X 8 (tactic by response of embarrassee) design, with a delta of .05 added, was used. The results indicate that prominent main effects exist between levels of the explanatory variable ($\chi^2_{34} [35] = 145.18$, p. < .0001). Hence, the tactic employed was a good predictor of the embarrassee's response. Conditional proportions and significance tests on lambda parameters are reported in Table (9).
Table 9

Conditional Proportions of Tactic Used by Response of Embarrassed Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Recog</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Teasing</th>
<th>Unpoised</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Assoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceal</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj Sym</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediate</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj/Escape</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj/Aggression</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=80) (n=214) (n=124) (n=319) (n=188) (n=85)

Note: (-) denotes negative deviation from expected frequencies; all others positive deviations. Conditional proportions rounded to nearest hundredth.

*p. < .05; **p. < .01; ***p. <.001

Research Question 8 asked what short and long-term consequences were encountered as a direct result of the intentional embarrassment. In order to indicate the full range of consequences reported, frequencies for all consequences, not only the one chosen at random for subsequent analyses, were computed. Distribution was constructed utilizing the same multiple response technique which was discussed above. Of the 1008 total short-term consequences reported, 81.9% of the
participants (n=1136) described a single short-term consequence while 3.4% reported two short-term consequences. A total of 14.7% of the respondents either left the item blank or the response was unclassifiable (see Table 10). Of 941 total long-term consequences reported, 77.4% of the participants described a single consequence while 2.7% reported two long-term consequences. A total of 19.9% of the participants either left this question blank or the consequence was unclassifiable (see Table 10).

Table 10

Conditional Proportions of Short and Long-term Consequences of Intentional Embarrassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Consequences</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relational, Feeling, Task Change</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Relational, Feeling, Task Change</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Measures</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Embarrassment</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 1008) (n = 941)

Research Question 9 asked what associations there were between the short and long-term consequences of intentional embarrassment and the tactics used to create the embarrassing situation. First, a 6 X 6 (tactic by short-term consequences) Logit-Model Log-Linear Analysis,
with a delta of .05 added, was executed. Main effects due to the tactic utilized were discovered \( \chi^2_{3,4} [25] = 123.30, p. < .0001 \). Therefore, the tactic one used was a good predictor of short-term consequences. Conditional proportions and significance test results are reported in Table (11).

A second 6 X 6 (tactic by long-term consequences) Logit-Model Log-Linear Analysis design was executed. Just as main effects were found for the tactic with short-term consequences, so too main effects existed for tactic with long-term consequences \( \chi^2_{3,4} [25] = 77.82, p. < .0001 \). That is, when the tactic was known long-term consequences were predictable. Conditional proportions and significance test results are reported in Table (12).

Last, Research Question 10 asked if long-term consequences were able to be predicted when the short-term consequences were known. A 6 X 6 (short-term by long-term consequences) Logit-Model Log-Linear design was developed. Main effects for short-term consequences were discovered \( \chi^2_{3,4} [25] = 109.74, p. < .0001 \). Hence, long-term consequences vary as a function of short-term consequences. Table (13) presents the conditional proportions and results of significance testing.
Table 11

Conditional Proportions of Tactic Used by Short-Term Consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-Term Consequences</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Recog</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Teasing</th>
<th>Unpoised</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Assoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliate</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Emb.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=79) (n=202) (n=117) (n=305) (n=179) (n=77)

Note: (-) denotes negative deviation from expected frequencies; all others positive deviations. Conditional proportions rounded to nearest hundredth.

*p. < .10; **p. < .05; ***p. < .001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Consequences</th>
<th>Recog</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Teasing</th>
<th>Unpoised</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Assoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.40****</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.03**</td>
<td>.25*****</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliate</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Emb.</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>-.03***</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=66)</td>
<td>(n=181)</td>
<td>(n=111)</td>
<td>(n=292)</td>
<td>(n=171)</td>
<td>(n=78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (-) denotes negative deviation from expected frequencies; all others positive deviations. Conditional proportions rounded to nearest hundredth.

*p. < .10; **p. < .05; ***p. < .01; ****p. < .001
Table 13

Conditional Proportions of Short-Term Consequences by Long-Term Consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Consequences</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Neg</th>
<th>Protective</th>
<th>Retali ate</th>
<th>Cont. Emb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retali ate</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03**</td>
<td>-.03***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Emb.</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=79) (n=269) (n=447) (n=9) (n=24) (n=42)

Note: (-) denotes negative deviation from expected frequencies; all others positive deviations. Conditional proportions rounded to nearest hundredth.

*p. < .01; **p. < .05; ***p. < .01.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The present study focused on the phenomenon of intentional embarrassment as a strategy for the attainment of primary goals. Specifically, the focus was upon what tactics were employed by persons to deliberately cause another person to feel embarrassment, what goals people attempt to achieve with such acts, how embarrassed persons respond immediately to the embarrassment, what the short and long-term consequences of such strategic behavior are and how often this strategy is utilized. It has been shown that, just as researchers have suggested embarrassment is deliberately used as a strategy to achieve a variety of goals (e.g., Goffman, 1956b; Gross & Stone, 1964; Martin, 1987; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990). It was found that embarrassment is a very effective strategy in that one’s goals are generally achieved. Also, the goal attempted as well as the tactic employed were good predictors of the achievement of one’s goal. The strategy of intentional embarrassment was utilized by 3/4 of the respondents in the past six months. The goal strived for was predictive of the tactic applied. The goals attempted and the tactics used to cause embarrassment were predictive of the responses evoked from the embarrassee as well as the short and long-term consequences of embarrassment. It was also discovered that short-term
consequences of deliberate embarrassment were predictive of long-term consequences.

The first question addressed the issue of goals of intentional embarrassment. It was discovered that a few persons attempt multiple primary goals simultaneously. For example, some participants stated that they wanted to discredit another while attempting to establish power for themselves or to establish solidarity with the group. This finding is in line with research on goal attainment and compliance gaining (e.g., Clark & Delia, 1979; O'Keefe & Delia, 1982; Tracy 1984). The findings support research which has suggested that it is most likely that a single dominant goal will be focused on at a time (e.g., Clark & Delia, 1979), though just over 6% of the participants noted focusing on two or more goals.

As for the types of goals attempted using intentional embarrassment, the results support and extend Gross and Stone's (1964) typology. That is, it was discovered that individuals utilized intentional embarrassment, in order to show solidarity, to negatively sanction inappropriate behaviors, to establish power, to discredit a person's presented role and to see what kind of reaction would be elicited (i.e., personality). Sharkey and Waldrone (1990) also discovered that the two most reported reason for superiors embarrassing subordinates (according to the superiors) was to show solidarity followed by negatively sanctioning behaviors. This goal of solidarity is very interesting. It appears to represent a form of relationship maintenance. Ayres (1983) stated that once a relationship reaches a level of exchanges that are mutually satisfactory (i.e., maintenance) to
both parties then the relationship has stability. In other words, "the basic patterns of exchange in the relationship are established and accepted" (Ayres, 1983, p. 62). Developmental theory (e.g., Miller & Sunnafrank, 1982) suggests, as people progress from impersonal toward more interpersonal relationships, there is a move from judging interactional outcomes from information based upon cultural information and/or societal information one has about another interactant to the ability to predict outcomes based upon psychological information about the other. As two people become more informed about each other as individuals, the more able the two are to predict how each will respond to various communicative stimuli. They also develop communicative rules which are idiosyncratic to the relationship. It may be that as two or more people become more interpersonal with each other, the more apt they are to predict what types of behavior cause each other to feel embarrassed and what behaviors are allowable (or forgivable) -- hence, stability. Each may come to know how the other will respond to the situation and know that the other will assign the same "solidarity" label to the act. They will see it as "all in fun," as a "pay back" (with positive affect) or as a form of praise or recognition -- for the good of and maintenance of the relationship. Or there may exist a pressure to conform to the ways of the group (e.g., everyone embarrasses each other in the family, group, organization).

The fact that others reported using embarrassment to negatively sanction inappropriate behavior appears to be more in line with previous speculations of making a person uncomfortable when engaging in inappropriate behavior so as to get the person to follow the established
rules. This action may be explained by social exchange theory (e.g., Homans, 1958; Roloff, 1981; Thibaut & Kelly, 1959) and social learning theory (Bandura, 1977). Basically, social exchange promotes the theory that people will, for the most part, engage in behaviors which are rewarding and avoid those which are costly. Social learning theory contends that people learn in two ways: first, people learn through response consequences and second, through modelling. In response consequence learning, persons produce behaviors during interaction which are either reinforced (rewarded), have no effect (neutral) or are punished (costs). Persons then continue to produce reinforced behaviors while others are discarded. Because people can recall past episodes and can anticipate future consequences of their acts, they will be able to build expectations which may be turned into rewarded behaviors. Therefore, the person has learned through motivation. One may also learn through modelling of others' behaviors. As one observes the performances of others, the observations are internalized and serve as guidelines for future behaviors. The embarrasor may have learned through modelling that intentional embarrassment may be used to chastise. For example, if a person is engaging in what is perceived by another as inappropriate behavior, then the person may be intentionally embarrassed (an attempt at issuing a cost) in the hope that the person will view the consequence of his or her act as deriving a cost. Hence, the person may learn that she or he will be rewarded for appropriate acts (or will simple reap no rewards or costs) or will be embarrassed for the same transgressions (costs). This is similar to Lewis' (1969) notion of "imitation." One acts in a manner in which he or she expects
others to act. Throughout one's life, behaviors, responses and goal achievements are observed. Whether intentional or out of awareness, this person may imitate actions in order to achieve similar responses and goals. For the present study, a person may simply imitate observed past behaviors for negatively sanctioning behaviors though the use of embarrassment. The difference between modeling and imitation rests upon intentionality. Modeling appears to be a rational process whereas imitation need not be.

Next, intentional embarrassment was utilized as a means of discrediting a person's presented role and to keep others from attaining their goals. Gross and Stone (1964) indicated that one may step out of line, behave in a way that causes another or a group to be look upon negatively. Hence, embarrassment may be employed to set the person straight; to help redefine the person's role—put the person back in her or his place (also see Garfinkel, 1956 on degradation ceremonies). A prime example of such a goal has been suggested with anecdotal evidence which focuses upon the intentional use of past embarrassing experiences of police officers in order to discredit officers suspected of perjured testimony (Wolchover, 1988). By intentionally embarrassing the officer by bringing to the front past transgressions or improprieties of the officer, the defense attorney may hope the jury will begin to question the credibility of the testifying officer. Wolchover (1988) supplies the following example, "a previous award of damages for assaulting some person in the course of police work may well undermine the credibility of an officer giving evidence against a defendant charged with
assaulting police where the defence are alleging the charge is a pretext for covering up a gratuitous assault on th (sic) accused" (p. 574).

As for the establishment of power, Lang and Lang (1961) suggest that any device or strategy that is used which devalues the communicative role of another leads to communicative control or dominance. Because deliberate embarrassment in effect is a maneuver at controlling the response of another, it may be viewed as an attempt to establish power. One forces another into a situation where he or she must resort to face repairs. This is very much in line with the self-presentation strategy of "intimidation" discussed by Jones and Pittman (1982). The intimidator is a person whose goal is to convince others that he or she is dangerous; one who can cause another to feel discomfort or pain. This person wants to be feared, to gain or retain power through the creation of negative consequences for another. Intentionally embarrassing another can be utilized in such an endeavor.

Last, some people simply embarrassed another in order to see how the person would handle the situation or because he or she just enjoys placing another in a awkward situation. Gross and Stone (1964) discussed the fact that children as well as adults test each other's ability to remain in control of themselves and the situation. One possible explanation may be derived from Hedonic theories. Here motives are attributed to consequences of pleasure or pain (Heider, 1958). Some people simply desire to embarrass others for no other reason than the joy and pleasure of seeing another squirm or to see how they will respond.
Researchers have implicitly suggested that embarrassment is something to avoid because of its disruptive effect on interaction (Cupach & Metts, 1990; Goffman, 1956b; Sharkey & Stafford, in press) or that it is the result of one who has failed as a social performer (Silver et al., 1987). But, the results shown above indicate that embarrassment is also utilized to achieve a variety of goals and this strategy to achieve one's goal is very effective. Approximately 92% of the respondents stated that, regardless of the goal being attempting, their goal was achieved. Also, more than 75% of the respondents stated that they have deliberately embarrassed another within the past six months. The majority (53.2% of the respondents) indicated using embarrassment at least 1-5 times in the past six months.

It was also of interest to find what tactics people use in order to achieve their goals. The most widely reported tactic was to cause another to look unpoised followed by criticism and violations of privacy. Sharkey and Stafford (in press), Metts and Cupach (1989) and Sattler (1965) all have stated that when another is the cause of embarrassment, it generally takes the form of criticism (also see Martin, 1987) or a violation of privacy. Hence, the present study supports these findings, albeit causing another to look unpoised was the most frequently reported tactic. Sharkey and Stafford (in press) found that regardless of who perpetrated the embarrassing incident, the most widely reported cause of embarrassment was awkwardness (i.e., loss of poise). Why did so many persons in the present study report this as the tactic used? The answer may partly lie in the reason for embarrassing the person in the first place; i.e., the embarrassor's goal.
Concerning the association of the goal and the choice of tactic employed, it was found that when a person wished to show solidarity, the most likely tactics used were (a) recognition (e.g., surprise parties, winning an unexpected award). Here people show support and appreciation toward another. (b) Teasing and (c) causing the other to look unpoised are ways of indicating to another that a person is just having fun with one of the people he or she enjoys being with. It is playful in nature (see Eder, 1987). What is interesting is that Gross and Stone (1964) indicate that children and adults attempt one-upmanship through teasing and causing another to appear unpoised as a way of maintaining solidarity in a relationship. This was also supported by Fuligni and Savin-Williams (1989) who found that those youths who perceived themselves being teased tended to respond in kind—a kind of reciprocal "get-even" game. And, (d) violating another's privacy is a little more difficult to explain. Sharkey and Stafford (in press) have discovered that violations of privacy are ranked as the most embarrassing situations a person can be in. If this is the case, then why would one wish to place a friend or peer in such a predicament? It may be for the same reason as noted above, people enjoy playing the game to see how far they can push the other. Chances are that it is simply a matter of getting the "win." Some respondents stated that they, for example, pulled a friend's pants down at a basketball game because of a dare by another friend. Consequently, people within a group may strive to outdo one another as a show of togetherness.

When one wishes to negatively sanction another's behaviors the tactic preferred overwhelmingly tended to be criticism. From a
rhetorical point of view, Andrews (1983) defines criticism as "the systematic process of illuminating and evaluating products of human activity" (p. 4). He stresses that viewing criticism as destructive and constructive is misleading. Criticism as defined above "can never be destructive, and to say that it is constructive is redundant" (p. 4). Oxford’s American Dictionary (1980) concedes this definition but offers another definition as well, "finding fault, a remark pointing out a fault" (p. 151). Therefore, when wanting to correct a person’s performance one may wish to find fault in order to have the person adhere to the rules and norms of the situation.

When discrediting another’s presented self, the embarrassor predominately used criticism as well or caused the person to look unpoised. Intuitively this makes sense. In order to discredit the presented role, one must either call into question that role through the use of an evaluation or condemnation; as noted above, criticism serves this function well. Also, one may discredit by placing the other in a situation in which the person must "do some fancy foot work" in order to save face. If the embarrassor knows that the person is not able to save face skillfully, then causing the recipient to lose poise is another way in which one may call into question that persons presented role.

When one wished to establish power the tactic employed was most likely causing the person to appear unpoised or criticize the person. Again, the intimidator (Jones & Pittman, 1982) is someone who attempts a power relationship through coercion, browbeating and threatening. The goal is to have another fear the intimidator in the hopes that the intimidator then will attain a power role. Causing persons to appear as
though they are not in control of themselves (i.e., lose of poise) or by calling into question their performances (i.e., criticism) while simultaneously, implicitly or explicitly indicating the correctness, knowledge, skill, poise, etc. of the self, one attempts to be perceived as more powerful. But as Blau (1986) has stated, "the steps necessary to attain dominance tend to antagonize others and evoke their disapproval" (p. 317). Hence, it may be that the use of these tactics will elicit negative consequences. This will be discussed latter.

And finally, if one simply wanted to "see how the person would react," the most likely tactic employed was to cause the person to look unpoised. As people develop relationships, the goal is the predictability of each other's reactions (Miller & Sunnafrank, 1982). Some persons may produce a loss of poise in another simply as a way of gaining individual knowledge so as to better predict the results of future interactions or as a means to "see what one can get away with." It may also be the case that, as will be seen later, the short-term consequences of such acts are generally negative but the long-term consequences are none existent or positive. Hence, long-term effects may be minimal. So, the immediate costs of such tactic use may be outweighed by future rewards.

As previously discussed, participants overwhelmingly reported that they achieved their goals using embarrassment as their strategy. Be this as it may, in regard to the association between the goal attempted and the goal achieved, significantly more persons than were statistically expected stated that they did not achieve their goal when the goal was either negatively sanctioning another's behavior or trying
to establish power even though over 80% reported accomplishing these two goals. When negatively sanctioning another's behavior or when attempting to establish power, one is in essence communicating a need to be in control. If others are also in effect trying to attain the same final goal or are vying for a relationship based on equality, then any tactic or strategy used to establish power or negatively sanction behavior may be ineffective. One may change his or her ways, or one may give in and allow the embarrassor to retain, regain or attain power. Why then is "to discredit" not also in this same situation? When one discredits another, the primary goal is not necessarily to the benefit of the self but the devaluation of the other or the questioning of another's presented role. One may benefit from the discredit but that is only a secondary result.

The predictive nature of the tactic used and whether a goal was accomplished or not also received support. Regardless of the tactic, participants reported overwhelmingly that they achieved their goals (92%). Although, more persons than would be expected statistically stated that when criticism was used, they did not achieve their goal. Still 86% of the persons using criticism achieved their goals. Because, as noted previously criticism was associated with negatively sanctioning behaviors, establishing power and discrediting another, it would seem the definition of "finding fault" is appropriate. Criticism is a direct assault upon a person's behavior or self. The embarrassee may retaliate or attempt to prove the criticism as holding no worth. Therefore, at times, the embarrassor's goal may not be achieved.
It was also realized that more people than would be statistically expected reported not achieving their goals when teasing was employed, though 89% did. The achievement of one's goal may be the result of the embarrassee's interpretation of the tactic. Eder (1987) has discussed the difference between teasing and ridicule. Traditionally the two have been viewed as synonymous (Fuligni & Savin-Williams, 1989). The difference is this; teasing is considered playful and is communicated in a humorous manner with the goal of expressing positive feelings about or toward another, to convey social concerns and norms in an indirect manner or to express feelings of tension or embarrassment within a group. Ridicule, on the other hand, is characterized as conveying negative affect; e.g., anger, disrespect, dislike (Eder, 1987). Regardless of the intent, a recipient of intended teasing may interpret this as ridicule which may result in the perpetrator not achieving her or his goal. For example, Sharkey and Waldron (1990) found that what was intended by supervisors and what was perceived by subordinates appear to differ in interpretations. Even though the study did not focus on the dyad (i.e., both parties within an embarrassing incident), superiors reported teasing subordinates with much more frequency than reported by subordinates. And subordinates reported much more criticism being utilized (a form of ridicule).

When intentionally embarrassing another, a response is generally elicited. As was found in the studies by Metts and Cupach (1989) and Sharkey and Stafford (in press), the present investigation shows that persons may utilize multiple responses to regain the homeostatic interaction state. Even though the majority of participants reported
the embarrassee employing a single response (n=838), 181 reported that the embarrassed person employed two or more. The most common response to intentional embarrassment was objective symptoms (e.g., laughing, blushing). This was also found to be the most predominate response in Sharkey and Stafford's (in press) study and from the superiors' perspective in Sharkey and Waldron's (1990) study. This may be due to the assumption "that many objective symptoms are uncontrollable emotional behavioral responses" (Sharkey & Stafford, in press). This was followed by aggressiveness. It was reported that when another is the agent of the embarrassment, regardless of intentionality, a person tended to respond with hostility (Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, in press). Martin (1987) and Sharkey and Waldron (1990) have supported this with their discovery of aggressive responses by students and subordinates respectively to perceived intentional embarrassment perpetrated by teachers and superiors. Intentional embarrassment is a violation of another's claimed role. People who are made to look as though the role they are claiming is false, may retaliate in a way that will degrade others or lessen their status and to either return the self to the original role or simply place the perpetrator in a similar situation (Brown, 1968; Fink & Walker, 1977; Sattler, 1966). This discussion leads to the finding that the tactic used by an embarrassor is a good predictor of the response used by the embarrassed party (Cupach & Metts, 1990; Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, in press; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990).

It was discovered that the tactic used to cause embarrassment is a good predictor of an embarrassee's response. When one embarrasses
another person by recognizing or praising, the embarrasssee tends to respond with an objective symptom. This result is in line with Buss' (1978) discovery that overpraise causes one to respond with more blushing and laughing than would normally be the case. Recognition/praise is not an attack upon a person's character or role, it is a way of indicating that others feel he or she is important to others or that what this person has done is appreciated.

Criticism promoted accounts, concealment, aggression, objective symptoms. Embarrasseses appear to respond in numerous ways when criticized. One may account for one's behavior. If a superior (e.g., parent, teacher, boss) criticizes your actions, you may wish to apologize, justify or provide an excuse to place the blame either on yourself or to external factors. One may also respond by concealing any overt reactions. It may be in the best interest, at times, to just "bite the bullet" out of fear of repercussions or you realize the criticism was warranted. As state above, one may use aggression as a means of challenging the criticism. Homans (1974) noted that if a person's behavior fails to receive an expected reward or is punished in some way (e.g., criticism), then the person is likely to respond with aggression. Or, if one was unable to conceal responses, objective symptoms may simply be produced.

When one would tease another, the embarrasssee tended to respond with objective symptoms or aggression and a combination of the two was utilized as well. Again the perception of the person being embarrassed probably plays a large role in how the person will respond to the embarrassment. If an embarrasssee interprets a tease as a tease then it
seems natural for the person to simply respond with some form of exclamation, blush or laugh, etc., whereas if the tease is interpreted as ridicule then aggression seems the logical response (see the foregoing discussion of criticism). At times it may well be that the embarrasssee is unsure of the intent and simply responds "mindlessly" (Langer, 1978), i.e., instinctively with either or both responses.

When a person intentionally caused another to look unpoised, violated a person's privacy or associated the person with someone or something embarrassing, the embarrasssee most likely responded with either objective symptoms or aggression. In every embarrassing episode, persons respond with objective symptoms of some sort (e.g., blushing, averting eye gaze, laughing, etc.) though not reported by every respondent. This may simply be "an artifact of retrospective questionnaires. Respondents may simply not be able to recall all the responses utilized but rather focus upon the most salient" (Sharkey & Stafford, in press). Each of the above tactics places the embarrasssee in a situation where one's presented control over the situation and the self has been placed into question as in causing a person to fall to the floor by pulling a chair out from under her or him, pulling a person's pants down in front of a cheering audience or associating a prosecutor with an officer who is an embarrassment to the force. Each of these scenarios questions the control over one's self or the situation of the embarrasssee. Aggression as noted previously is a means of bringing the perpetrator down as well. It may also be an attempt at negatively sanctioning the embarrassor's behavior so that such acts will not occur again in the future.
The last area of concern was the short-term and long-term consequences of intentional embarrassment. It will be recalled that researchers suggest that persons strive for multiple goals simultaneously (Clark & Delia, 1979; O'Keefe & Delia, 1982; Seibold, Cantrill, & Meyers, 1985). One goal may be considered the primary focus. That goal has already been discussed above under the guise of goal attempted. One may also have secondary goals in the form of impression management (e.g., being liked, perceived as competent), relational maintenance (e.g., continuing a friendship or superior/subordinate relationship). Many times, communicators are not aware of their objectives (Langer, Blank, & Chanowitz, 1978). It was found that overall, short-term consequences were generally negative (50%). This is consistent with Knapp et al.'s (1986) discovery that persons who say things they wish they hadn't said reported negative consequences in the short-term. However, many participants did state that short-term consequences were positive.

Long-term consequences tended to be either no long-term consequences or positive or continued embarrassment (e.g., reminding the embarrasssee about the situation). In fact, no long-term consequences increased by almost 378%, positive consequences remained relatively stable from short-term effect while negative long-term consequences reduced three fold. Sharkey and Waldron's (1990) finding that superiors claimed that positive or no consequences resulted from their intentional embarrassment of subordinates and that 81% of the subordinates remained employed at the company, supports this discovery. Also, Knapp et al. (1986) found that positive long-term consequences and no long-term
consequences increased more than four fold and two fold respectively over short-term consequences after using regrettable messages. Overall, it appears that short-term consequences of intentional embarrassment may be negative but that over time, the initial consequences either dissipate or turn positive. This will be addressed latter. The question then arises, does the type of tactic employed have any baring on the short and long-term consequences?

It was discovered that the predictive nature of the tactic employed fostered the following results. Short-term consequences of recognition tended to be positive or, though relatively few respondents reported it, more persons than would be statistically expected stated that the embarrassment continued (e.g., being reminded of the surprise party and the stripper who was hired). When one utilized criticism the most likely response was negative. Again, criticism is calling into question a person's performance or claimed role. Hence, the person may dissolve the relationship, avoid the embarrassor, dislike the embarrassor, etc. Martin (1987) supports this in that students reported responding negatively to a teacher's criticism in the forms of dislike, anger, fear, negatively affected learning, etc. And Sharkey and Waldron (1990) discovered the same consequences from the subordinate's perspective. Criticism elicited avoidance of the supervisor and disrespect. Over 30% stated that they quit or were fired as a direct result of criticism. Research on interpersonal influence indicates that there is a negative correlation between coercive strategies (e.g., criticism) with satisfaction and desire to work (e.g., Herold, 1977; Oldham, 1976).
Teasing and association promoted either positive or negative short-term consequences. This may, as discussed above, be the result of interpretation. A recipient may interpret the tactic as either teasing or ridicule. This interpretation should then promote effects of either positive or negative respectively.

Both violations of privacy and causing another to appear unpoised tended to elicit negative short-term consequences and significantly less positive consequences than would be statistically expected. Forcing one into an awkward situation or violating the person’s privacy places the embarrasssee in a situation where the person must expend much energy in order to regain composure and would seem to elicit negative consequences toward the embarrassor for placing the person in this situation to begin with. Negative short-term consequences to both tactics seems reasonable for as noted above, people tend to respond with aggression when one uses these tactics.

Long-term consequences were also discovered to be predicted across levels of tactic utilized. Recognition fostered either no long-term consequences, positive consequences or continued embarrassment. Criticism elicited significantly more positive or negative long-term consequences than other consequences. Note however that the frequencies have switched (see Tables 11 and 12); short-term consequences tended to be more negative whereas long-term tend to be positive or no consequences. And no long-term consequences or positive consequences were most likely to occur with the remaining tactics, i.e., teasing, causing one to look unpoised, violations of privacy and association. Overall, these findings suggest that regardless of the tactic, the long-
term repercussions either are non-existent or have resulted in a positive change with the exception of the tactic of criticism which carries a longer lasting negative consequence.

Last, short-term consequences were predictive of long-term consequences. It was uncovered that when there were no short-term consequences neither were their long-term consequences. This seems reasonable. Embarrassing incidents are generally momentary and, as shown above, effects tend to dissipate over time. Positive short-term consequences or retaliation (with positive affect) tended to be followed by positive or no long-term consequences. Again, if one feels good about the self, relationship or accomplishes the task, then one would expect long-term effects to be of a positive nature or perceived as non-existent.

Negative short-term consequences were more interesting in that negative long-term consequences were reported significantly more than statistically expected but that many persons stated long-term consequences as being positive or having no long-term consequence. If short-term consequences were protective measures against future embarrassments, there tended not to be any long-term consequences. And, continued embarrassment as a short-term consequence tended to be succeeded by the same.

Conclusion

Competence literature declares that the competent communicator should engage in behaviors which are effective and appropriate (Bochner & Kelley, 1974; Canary & Spitzberg, 1987; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Wiemann, 1977). Effective communication achieves the goals of the
communicator while communicative appropriateness avoids the violation of the rules and norms of the communicative episode (Canary & Spitzberg, 1987). Here it has been shown that from the embarrassor's point of view, at least from the effectiveness standpoint, the person has been very effective. The majority of persons stated that they achieved their primary goals. From an appropriateness and ethical standpoint, the issue of competence is a bit more muddled. Contextually, the rules of interaction may, from a societal or cultural standpoint, indicate that an effective communicator must use behaviors which do not disrupt the flow of interaction, call into question another's character or role nor cause the person to lose poise. However, there are situations in which it is expected and accepted, though maybe not appropriate, to call into question a person's role or cause another to lose poise, for example, a Don Rickels' performance, a roast, Candid Camera and shows of the like. However, as noted previously, the interaction order indicates that persons develop their own rules and norms of interaction (Goffman, 1983) and each trusts that each will abide by the expectations (Garfinkel, 1963). As relationships progress from impersonal to interpersonal, the interactants decide what is "appropriate" and what is not. Some research suggests that topics or issues may be considered taboo for the possibility of inducing embarrassment is high (Baxter & Wilmot, 1985). It may also simply be that some rules are more important in some situations with some people and not so in others (Smith, 1982, 1984). Noting the goal of the majority of respondents as showing solidarity, those relationships may have defined teasing, violating another's privacy, etc. as expected and acceptable behavior within the confines of
that particular relationship and that engaging in this type of behavior was not only acceptable but may be a way of maintaining and defining their relationships. However, it may also be the case that persons have deemed criticism, as a tactic for achieving goals, inappropriate behavior. The result of such acts lead to negative consequences. But, some persons, while developing relationships, may find it to their advantage to use embarrassment as a weapon against the other person. Such a tactic may be criticism which was shown to be used for negative sanctioning behaviors, discrediting the other or to establish power. Indeed, while people develop relationships they do define the rules and norms of the partnership. In so doing, both become aware of what tactics are useful and which are not, which need to be avoided and which should not, which cause embarrassment and which do not. Thereafter, this knowledge may be utilized for achieving interpersonal goals.

Goal research has suggested that persons order tactics in an hierarchical fashion (e.g., Bisanz & Rule, 1990; Cody et al., in press). These researchers have suggested that negative tactics (e.g., criticism, emotional appeals, force) tend to be utilized as a last resort. Although the present study did not ask respondents to list strategic choices hierarchically, in many situations, embarrassment may be used as a first choice, especially when in a playful mood to show solidarity, to discredit or to negatively sanction another’s behavior, or even to establish power. Or, it just may be, as Goody (1978) noted, that a person simply uses the strategy at hand without in-depth pre-planning. The purpose of this study has been to ascertain the extent to which and the effectiveness of intentionally embarrassing others to achieve a
variety of goals, what tactics are employed to be successful, what responses these acts produce from the embarrassee and what the short and long-term consequences of such acts entail. There are limitations to this study and possible future directions that will now be addressed.

All studies are plagued with limitations; this study is not an exception. As with any questionnaire study, what is being studied is in effect participants remembrances of past occurrences and not communication occurring in the here and now. Because of this, persons may deliberately or unintentionally reorganize, falsify, delete, add or emphasize or de-emphasize information that wasn't in the actual communicative situation. Specifically, because communication is so taken-for-granted in everyday life, much of what occurs is not noticed or noticed but not attended to. For example, people may be unsure of how the other party responded to being intentionally embarrassed. The participant may only report the salient responses recalled or go so far as to report how the person feels the embarrassee responded based upon socially ritualized responses in similar situations. Also, with a subject as sensitive as embarrassment, social desirability may have played a role in what situations persons reported. For example, a person who uses embarrassment to establish power or to negatively sanction behaviors, but feels this is unethical behavior, may only report a situation where he or she employed embarrassment as a show of solidarity (e.g., teasing, recognition). The fact that approximately 2% of the respondents reported never intentionally embarrassing another, leads one to believe that deliberate embarrassment is plagued with ethical considerations. There is also the problem of definition. The
definition of embarrassment was left totally in the hands of the participant. No definition of what constituted embarrassment was given to the respondents. So differences in what people perceive as or not as embarrassment will affect the results. Case in point, the 30 persons who claimed that they have never intentionally embarrassed another person may in fact never have, can’t remember ever doing so, refuse to admit to using it or simply define embarrassment only in extreme negative ways which they would not engage in.

Future research needs to focus upon the use of intentional embarrassment from a variety of perspectives using more observational methodological procedures. First, personality traits may have much to do with whether embarrassment is used to achieve one’s goal, how often it is used and what types of tactics are utilized. Research has indicated that personality types affect what strategies may be used when goal seeking (see Cody et al., in press). Second, situational factors may play a role in the use, effectiveness and appropriateness of tactical communication (e.g., intentional embarrassment); that is, the relationship between the people (e.g., superior/subordinate, parent/child, peer/peer, etc.), the age of the people, the culture, number of people present, the place (e.g., work, school, home), the sex of the people, etc. (see for example, Bisanz & Rule, 1990; Canary et al., 1988; Cody & McLaughlin, 1988; Cody, McLaughlin, & Jordan, 1980, Cody et al., in press; Fitzpatrick & Winke, 1979; Kipnis et al., 1990; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990; Smith, Cody, Lovette, & Canary, 1990). Third, those studying embarrassment need to take into consideration that the phenomenon is not just the effect of unexpected violations of taken-for-
granted norms, but may be the result of strategic maneuvers on the part of another party to achieve various goals (see for example, Martin, 1987; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990). Also, one may be in a position to intentionally embarrass her or himself in an effort to gain acceptance, a laugh, etc. (Miller, 1987). And last, compliance-gaining literature, persuasion and influence research (e.g., Bisanz & Rule, 1990; Canary et al., 1988; Cody et al., in press; Kipnis et al., 1990; O'Keefe & Delia, 1982; Oldham, 1976; Smith et al., 1990) need to take into consideration the use of embarrassment as a strategy useful for gaining compliance or to persuade and influence others.

Future research as well must engage in more unobtrusive observation studies. Most research on embarrassment has utilized questionnaires (e.g., Edelmann, et al., 1987; Gross & Stone, 1964; Metts & Cupach, 1989; Petronio, 1984; Sharkey & Stafford, 1990) and some have moved into the laboratory (Apsler, 1975; Brown, 1968, 1970; Brown & Garland, 1971; Edelmann, 1982; Edelmann & Hampson, 1981b) or have had confederates create situations in the field (Foss & Crenshaw, 1978). Obviously the direction to move in the study of intentional embarrassment is the more difficult task of catching people in the act, followed by immediate and detailed interviews of both persons which should foster a clearer and more accurate representation and, hopefully, explanation of the phenomenon. Unfortunately, ethical considerations bar much research in this area because of the delicate nature of embarrassment. But to understand and predict communicative acts and responses in such situations, this type of research is essential. And last, as Sharkey and Waldron (1990) suggest, responses to and consequences of intentional
embarrassment may be a function of perceptions. That is, regardless of intentionality and regardless of one's goals, the perception that one has been intentionally embarrassed to achieve a perceived goal, may lead to undesired situational and relational ramifications. Future investigations need to take these issues into consideration.
A tactic has been identified as a single act utilized to achieve a goal, whereas a strategy is a behavioral sequence of tactics used to attain a goal (Greene, 1990; Hazleton, Holdridge & Liska, 1982).

It should be noted that Cupach and Metts (1990) classified body exposure as "cause to look unpoised" whereas Sharkey and Stafford (in press) have redefined this type of situation to a "violation of privacy." This act does cause one to appear unpoised, however, the act which causes one to appear unpoised is the violation of one's privacy. This study has opted for the latter categorization for it appears that one's privacy (i.e., physical body) has been violated by another and this act is more specific than that of stating one has caused another to appear unpoised.

"Because the likelihood-ratio $L^2$ possesses additive properties, the arithmetic difference between the residual $L^2$ statistics of two models can be tested for statistical significance to determine if the more parsimonious member of the pair fits data significantly less well than the less parsimonious member of the pair" (Kennedy, 1983, p. 89). This difference is termed the component chi-square value. Component $L^2$'s enable researchers to identify terms which do not contribute much to the reduction of residual chi-square (Kennedy, 1983).

The subscript (as in, $L^2_{5-6}$) represents the difference between the residual chi-squares of various models (e.g., 5 and 6 in this example). The model numbers reflect "the number of general (not basic) parameters in the models...The number of general parameters is equivalent to the number of terms (or factors) in the model" (Kennedy, 1983, p. 86).

When component $L^2$ lead to the acceptance of a particular model, significant z-scores on lambda parameters need to be investigated. However, when z-scores in these models are not significant but approach significance, conditional proportions may be reported to indicate trends which emerged (Kennedy, 1983).

Because sampling zeros were found in large tables, a delta value of .05 was added (see Goodman, 1978; Kennedy, 1983) which results in a more conservative procedure (Clogg & Eliason, 1987; Knoke & Burke, 1980).
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO STUDENTS
TO STUDENT: Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study on embarrassment. It is only through the cooperation of individuals such as yourself that we can learn more about communication in such situations. In addition to the knowledge we will gain, you will receive extra credit for your involvement (assuming you meet the requirements and guidelines announced by your instructor). This questionnaire is being distributed as part of a class research project. The questionnaire is relevant to upcoming units in the course devoted to communication rules and communication research. If enough responses are received, the results of the questionnaire will be discussed during one of the lectures. In addition, the responses to the survey may be included in ongoing research relevant to the topic of emotions and their affect upon communication. Every effort will be made to keep your answers anonymous and confidential. Thus, do not put your name on the questionnaire.

In order for you to receive extra credit, the completed questionnaire must be mailed to the person below or sealed in an envelope and returned to the person below:

William F. Sharkey  
The Ohio State University  
Dept. of Communication  
205 Derby Hall  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Be sure to place your name, course number and your instructor's name on the bottom left hand corner of the envelope so we will know which student should receive the extra credit. If mailed, the envelope must be postmarked no later than February 28, 1990 for you to receive extra credit.

We would like you to fill out the entire questionnaire as best you can. Please read the directions carefully. If, however, you find a question too sensitive, you may pass over it. We do want to assure you that there is absolutely no penalty involved for you if you do not complete the questionnaire. Failure to return the questionnaire will in no way adversely affect your grade. Participation is strictly voluntary and is for extra credit only. Thank you again for your assistance with our project.

Sincerely,

William F. Sharkey  
Lecturer
DIRECTIONS: The purpose of this study is to examine how and why people embarrass one another as well as the consequences of this embarrassment. The following questions may be applied to any relationship you have ever had. Throughout our lives we all have experienced embarrassment. And at one time or another, most of us have intentionally/deliberately embarrassed someone (or someone has intentionally/deliberately embarrassed us). This other person may be a family member, a school mate, a boss, an intimate partner, a teacher, a fellow worker, a friend, etc.

Think back through your life (e.g., at home, school, work, socials events, etc.) and find a situation when you intentionally/deliberately embarrassed someone. Then, please answer all the following questions the best you can. Try to be as detailed as possible. If you need more room, use the back of the questionnaire or attach a separate sheet of paper. Remember, your answers are totally anonymous. Thank you again for your participation.

Your Age __________ Your Sex: _____ Male _____ Female

1. Please describe a situation in which you intentionally/deliberately embarrassed another person.

2. On a scale from 1 to 7, how embarrassing was this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all embarrassing</td>
<td>moderately embarrassing</td>
<td>extremely embarrassing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Why did you intentionally/deliberately embarrass this person (in other words, what were you trying to achieve; what was your goal)?

4. Did you achieve your goal? _____ yes _____ no
5. What did this person do or say in response to the intentional/deliberate embarrassment?

6. What were the short-term consequences or effects of this intentional/deliberate embarrassment?

7. What were the long-term consequences or effects of this intentional/deliberate embarrassment?

8. On a scale from 1 to 7, how significant were the long-term consequences or effects of this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>moderately significant</td>
<td>highly significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How often have you intentionally/deliberately embarrassed someone in the past six (6) months?

| 0 times | 1-5 times | 6-10 times | 11-15 times | 16-20 times | more than 20 times |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO PERSONS OVER 30 YEARS OF AGE
TO STUDENT: This questionnaire is being distributed as part of a class research project. You will receive extra credit for participating (assuming you meet the requirements and guidelines announced by your instructor). The questionnaire is relevant to upcoming units in the course devoted to communication rules and communication research. If enough responses are received, the results of the questionnaire will be discussed during one of the lectures. In addition, the responses to the survey may be included in ongoing research relevant to the topic of emotions and their affect upon communication.

TO PARTICIPANT: Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study on embarrassment. It is only through the cooperation of individuals such as yourself that we can learn more about communication in such situations. In addition to the knowledge we will gain, the student who gave you the questionnaire will receive extra credit for soliciting your involvement. Hence, we both greatly appreciate your assistance. Every effort will be made to keep your answers anonymous and confidential. Thus, do not put your name on the questionnaire. The only stipulation for filling out this questionnaire is that you are over the age of thirty (30). If you are not over 30, please give the questionnaire back to the student.

In order for the student to receive extra credit, the completed questionnaire must be mailed to the person below or sealed in an envelope and returned by the communication student to the person below:

William F. Sharkey  
The Ohio State University  
Dept. of Communication  
205 Derby Hall  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Be sure to place the student's name, course number and the student's instructor's name on the bottom left hand corner of the envelope so we will know which student should receive the extra credit. The envelope must be postmarked no later than February 28, 1990 for the student to receive extra credit.

We would like you to fill out the entire questionnaire as best you can. Please read the directions carefully. If, however, you find a question too sensitive, you may pass over it. We do want to assure you that there is absolutely no penalty involved for the student if you do not complete the questionnaire. Failure to return the questionnaire will in no way adversely affect the student's grade. Participation is strictly voluntary and is for extra credit only. Thank you again for your assistance with the project.

Sincerely,

William F. Sharkey  
Lecturer
DIRECTIONS: The purpose of this study is to examine how and why people embarrass one another as well as the consequences of this embarrassment. The following questions may be applied to any relationship you have ever had. Throughout our lives we all have experienced embarrassment. And at one time or another, most of us have intentionally/deliberately embarrassed someone (or someone has intentionally/deliberately embarrassed us). This other person may be a family member, a schoolmate, a boss, an intimate partner, a teacher, a fellow worker, a friend, etc.

Think back through your life (e.g., at home, school, work, social events, etc.) and find a situation when you intentionally/deliberately embarrassed someone. Then, please answer all the following questions the best you can. Try to be as detailed as possible. If you need more room, use the back of the questionnaire or attach a separate sheet of paper. Remember, your answers are totally anonymous. Thank you again for your participation.

Your Age ________ Your Sex: _______ Male _______ Female

1. Please describe a situation in which you intentionally/deliberately embarrassed another person.

2. On a scale from 1 to 7, how embarrassing was this situation?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all moderately extremely embarrassing embarrassing

3. Why did you intentionally/deliberately embarrass this person (in other words, what were you trying to achieve; what was your goal)?

4. Did you achieve your goal? _______ yes _______ no

[over please]
5. What did this person do or say in response to the intentional/deliberate embarrassment?

6. What were the short-term consequences or effects of this intentional/deliberate embarrassment?

7. What were the long-term consequences or effects of this intentional/deliberate embarrassment?

8. On a scale from 1 to 7, how significant were the long-term consequences or effects of this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>moderately significant</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>highly significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How often have you intentionally/deliberately embarrassed someone in the past six (6) months?

0 times _____ 1-5 times _____ 6-10 times _____ 11-15 times _____ 16-20 times _____ more than 20 times _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
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