Research : 10

A Comparison of Self-Presentation Tactics between Visually Impaired and Sighted Students

By:

Mohammad Y. Safhi, Ed. D.
Department of Special Education, College of Education King Khalid University, Saudi Aribia

Ahmed A. Teleb, Ph. D.
Department of Psychology, The New Valley Faculty of Education, Assiut University, Egypt, and The Department of Special Education, College of Education, King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia

A Comparison of Self-Presentation Tactics between Visually Impaired and Sighted Students

Mohammad Y. Safhi, Ed. D. **Ahmed A. Teleb, Ph. D.**

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to: (1) adapt an Arabic version of the Self Presentation Tactics (SPT) scale, (2) investigate the differences between visually impaired and sighted students in regards to SPT, and (3) explore the gender and degree of disability differences in visually impaired individual scores. In the first study data was collected from two groups of sighted students in the Asir region of Saudi Arabia in order to check the first aim. The first group consisted of 114 students (61 males and 53 females) in middle school, their ages were (15.95 ± 1.14) years old, the second group, consisted of 153 students (93 males and 60 females) from secondary school, their ages were (17.25 ± 0.85) years old. In the second study data was collected from two groups to check the second and third aims. The first group consisted of 85 (46 males and 39 females) visually impaired students; their ages were (17.15 ± 1.12) years old. The second group consisted of 95 (50 males and 45 females) sighted students; their ages were (16.88 ±1.13) years old. The current study used the SPT scale to check the aims. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and item-total correlations was used to check the psychometric properties of the Arabic version of SPT scale. ANOVA was run to explore the differences in SPT between visually impaired and sighted students and to investigate the effect of gender and degree of disability differences on SPT in visually impaired students. Results indicated that: (1) The Arabic version of the SPT scale had good psychometric properties, (2) sighted students had significantly higher scores than visually impaired students in defensive self-presentation tactics (DSPT), and (3) visually impaired males scored significantly higher in assertive self-presentation tactics (ASPT).

Keywords: Self-Presntation Tactics, Visually Impaired Students, and Sighted Students.

1. INTRODUCTION

The researchers started using term "Self-Presentation" in the last century. For example, Goffman (1959) used the term "self-presentation" which consisted of verbal and nonverbal strategies of self-presentation. Self-presentation can be described as behaviors that are designed to convey an image about the self of a person to other people. Self-presentation is "the primary means by which communicators manage others' impressions of the self"' (Shaw & Edwards, 1997, p. 55). Also, Leary (1993) showed that self-presentation is a kind of impression management, which in fact is management of others' impressions of a social unit such as people or organizations. Therefore, individuals can change their

behaviors when they notice that they are being watched by others. For example, when two people meet for the first time, each one tries to present himself by a particular type of verbal and nonverbal tactic of self-presentation. However, these tactics are not used in every situation (Jones & Pittman, 1982).

Self-presentation tactics are defined as "behaviors used to manage impressions to achieve foreseeable short-term interpersonal objectives or goals, while strategic behaviors are directed toward the construction of long-term identities" (Lee et al., 1999, p. 702). Watson (2000) mentioned that self-presentation tactics vary depending on the role that people play. Therefore, individuals with these tactics play different roles in different situations to present themselves.

Previous studies related to psychology presented different categories of self-presentation tactics. For example, Arkin (1985) proposed two styles of self-presentation which are known as the protective style and acquisitive style. Also, Jones and Pittman (1982) offered five tactics of self-presentation which include ingratiation, intimidation, supplication, self-promotion and exemplification. Subsequently, Leary (1996) introduced several self-presentation tactics such as self-descriptions, attitude statements, nonverbal behaviors, social associations, conformity and compliance, aggression and risk-taking. These tactics were involved in a direct and subtle self-presentation which aimed at conveying impressions of an individual to others. Lately, several additional tactics were incorporated by (Lee, et al, 1999) called the Self-Presentation Tactics (SPT) Scale. These tactics scale were designed to measure two separate groups of tactics among people in daily life: assertive tactics and defensive tactics. Assertive tactics are designed to create a particular image, and these tactics include ingratiation, intimidation, supplication, entitlement, enhance-ment, blasting, and exemplification. However, defensive tactics are designed to restore an existing image that has been damaged, and these tactics include excuses, justifications, disclaimers, self-handicapping, and apologies (see Table 1).

Table 1. Definitions of the Self-Presentation Tactics Scale (Lee, S., et al, 1999).

Tactic	Definition
Assertive Tactics	
Blasting	**Involves verbally abusing others to make one look better by comparison.**
Enhancement	**The individual exaggerates something he/she has done.**
Entitlement	**The individual claims credit for doing something he/she has not done.**
Exemplification	**The individual promotes him/herself by trying to appear morally worthy.**
Ingratiation	**Actions performed to get others to like the actor so that the actor can gain some advantage from them.**
Supplication	**An actor projects himself or herself as weak and displays dependence to solicit help from a target person.**
Intimidation	**Involves threatening others to get others to behave in a certain way.**
Defensive Tactics	
Apologies	**a confession of responsibility for any harm done to others or negative events and expressions of remorse and guilt.**
Disclaimers	**The individual expresses to offer explanations before predicaments occur.**
Excuses	**Involves denying that one is responsible for negative occurrences.**
Justifications	**Involve accepting responsibility for one's behavior, while giving explanations for it.**
Self-handicapping	**involves feelings of anxiety or distress that are not always prominent in psychopaths.**

There have been few studies on how students with visual impairments interact with their sighted peers because having different groups of students with visual impairments such as totally blind students, students with low vision, and visually impaired individuals with other disabilities are relatively hard to come by. Previous studies in visual impairments have proved that visually impaired students lack social skills (Davidow, 1974; Doll, 1953; Hatlen, 2000, 2003; Huebner, 1986; Sacks, Kekelis, & Gaylord-Ross, 1997; Sacks & Silberman, 2000; Schindele, 1974; Stockley & Brooks, 1995; Tuttle, 1987; Van Hasselt, Hersen, & Kazdin, 1985; Wagner, 2004). These studies indicated that the social development of visually impaired

students is typically slower than their sighted peers because social learning depends on visual impersonation. All students must engage in appropriate social interactions to ensure appropriate social, emotional, cognitive and academic development. Furthermore, social skills are more difficult for a student with a visual impairment than for their peers who are sighted (Sacks & Wolffe, 2006).

Some characteristics in the social behaviors of students with visual impairments will be listed in the sentences below ; for example, when students with visual impairments suffer significant loss of vision, they cannot successfully interface with their relatives, peers, and individuals in their surroundings. Also, they need eye contact, varieties in facial expressions, and body languages. As a result, their sighted peers cannot realize their feelings (Tso, 1997).

Chen and Dote-Kwan (1999) and Fazzi (2002) mentioned that it is regular for family members, educators, and adults to compare visually impaired students to their peers of sighted students especially when they are in comprehensive environments. Similarly, individuals with visual impairments compare themselves to their sighted classmates to develop realistic expectations for themselves. Therefore, both sighted students and visually impaired students benefit from opportunities to learn, play, and bond in their homes, schools and communities. However, the impact of visual problems on an individual's development relies on the severity, type of loss, age at which the condition appears and general functioning level of the child. Despite many studies that mentioned self-presentation in different fields with different ages (Sandal et al., 2014 ; Zach and Netz, 2014 ; Hassan et al., 2014; Chen et al., 2012 ; Stoeber & Roche, 2014 ; Zackariasson, 2014 ; Levin et al., 2013 ; Banerjee, Bennett, & Luke, 2012; Sun & Wu 2012; Hewitt et al., 2011; and Aloise-Young, 1993) there has been a failure to deal with this issue in the field of special education in general (except some studies in autism such as Scheeren et al., 2010) and in the visual impairments field in particular.

Therefore, researchers in this study do not find any studies mentioning self-presentation tactics with visual impairments. Consequently, they tried to show how students with visual impairments present themselves to others. The purposes of this study were to compare how visually impaired and sighted students are using self-presentation tactics. Therefore, the study was designed to investigate the following questions:

Are there differences between visually impaired and sighted students in using self-presentation tactics?

Are there differences between males and females with visual impairments in using self- presentation tactics?

Are there differences between totally blind students and students with low vision in using self-presentation tactics?

The current study contains of two parts to answer the previous questions. The first part (study 1) focused on adapting the SPT scale to the Arabic language. The second part (study 2) focused on investigating the differences in relation to the SPT between visually impaired and sighted students and to explore the role of gender and degree of disability in visually impaired individuals' scores on SPT.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Study1

This study aimed to adapt the Arabic version of the Self-Presentation Tactics (SPT) scale to ensure of validity and reliability of the SPT scale and to make it of use for future Arabic native speaker studies.

2.1.1. Method

2.1.1.1. Participants

Data was collected from 267 sighted students (154 males [57.68%] and 113 females [42.32%]) from middle and secondary schools in the Asir region in Saudi Arabia, their ages ranged between 14.71 and 19.82 years old (M = 16.7 and S.D. = 1.17). The middle school students consisted of 114 (61 males [53.51%] and 53 females [46.49%]) individuals, their mean ages were 15.95 years old and the standard deviation was 1.14. The

secondary school students consisted of 153 (93 males [60.78%] and 60 females [39.22%]) individuals, their mean ages were 17.25 years old and the standard deviation was 0.85. A total of the 267 participants were asked to complete the Arabic version of SPT scale.

2.1.1.2. Measures

The study used the Self-Presentation Tactics (SPT) scale, that was developed by Lee et al. (1999). It consists of 63 items measuring 12 different self-presentation tactics. As described in the introduction, the 63 items distributed among the 5 items for each of the 11 subscales and 8 items for "ingratiation". The items are rated on a 9-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (very infrequently) to 9 (very frequently). Lee et al. (1999) conducted four studies. Their results indicated that: (1) The SPT scale is reliable and provides encouraging evidence for the scale's validity. (2) Cronbach's alpha indicated good internal reliability for the items measuring each of the 12 tactics that made up the SPT scale and a high value of alpha for the complete scale. (3) The test-retest correlations revealed that the scale was highly reliable over time. (4) Several indices; such as the over all χ^2 differences test, goodness-of-fit index (GFI) and comparative fit index (CFI), indicated that two factors were an acceptable model fitting the obtained data. (5) Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) indicated that a two-factor solution, corresponding to defensive and assertive tactics, provided a better fit to the data than a one-factor solution, although apologies failed to load on either factor. In addition, Lewis and Neighbors (2005) reported internal consistencies of the subscales ranging from 0.56 for self-handicapping to 0.84 for intimidation.

In this study, the researchers chose the SPT scale (by Lee et al., 1999) because it is the first measure of a person's reported tendency to use specific self-presentation tactics. However, the researchers made changes in the alternative choices for the items, so in the Arabic Version of SPT scale, the items are rated on a 3-point Likert-type scale; ranging from 1

(very infrequently) to 3 (very frequently). The researchers of the current study made this change due to the alternative choices to be sure of the validity and reliability of SPT scale, which can be used in future studies with visually impaired students to make the choices easier for them.

2.1.1.3. Procedures

The study required translation of the SPT scale (by Lee et al., 1999) into the Arabic languge. Secondly, three professors who are fluent in English from the Department of English in King Kalid University (KKU) were asked to check the translation equivalence of the scale. Thirdly, three professors from the Department of Psychology in KKU were asked to revise the scale into Arabic. Next, the researchers modified the suitable changes to reach the final version of the scale. Thereafter, the researchers distributed the SPT scale to participants to respond. Then responses of the participants were analyzed using: (CFA) and Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), internal consistency, split-half coefficients, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient in order to assess the consistency of the psychometric characteristics of the SPT scale.

2.1.2. Results

CFA with a maximum likelihood method was carried out using LISREL8.54. First, the researchers examined the fit criteria statistic: a χ^2 statistic, GFI (Cziráky, 2004). The fit criteria data for the two-factor solution is shown in Table 2. All of the defensive tactics loaded on factor1 and all of the assertive tactics loaded on factor2. While χ^2 for the two-factor was significant, χ^2 (54) = 299.89, $p<0.001$, the values of RMR, GFI and CFI indicate a relatively good model fit. Path coefficients between the latent variables and observed variables were statistically significant ($p<0.05$) for all subscales. The 2 latent variables were also significantly correlated each other, $r = 0.66$, $p<0.001$.

In order to determine the factor structure of the SPT, EFA was employed for the sample. Factor loadings of the subscales were between (0.43-0.65) for Excuse, (0.33-0.61) for

Justification, (0.42-0.62) for Disclaimer, (0.36-0.51) for Self-handicapping, (0.36-0.55) for Apology, (0.32-0.59) for Ingratiation, (0.34-0.47) for Intimidation, (0.33-0.64) for Supplication, (0.32-0.61) for Entitlement (0.35-0.69) for Enhancement, (0.36-0.68) for Blasting, and (0.33-0.67) for Exemplification. Twelve factors with Eigenvalues greater than 1 emerged from analyses of the SPT. Eigenvalues for the first factor were 5.224 (33.54%), and for the second factor 3.342 (21.25%). Therefore, the researchers ensure that SPT scale is characterized by constructive validity and consistency.

Table 2. Results of factor loadings and fitting indices of SPT

Measures	**Factor loading**	
	Factor 1	**Factor 2**
Excuse	**0.657**	**----**
Justification	**0.736**	**----**
Disclaimer	**0.606**	**----**
Self-handicapping	**0.626**	**----**
Apology	**0.307**	**----**
Ingratiation	**----**	**0.771**
Intimidation	**----**	**0.762**
Supplication	**----**	**0.749**
Entitlement	**----**	**0.543**
Enhancement	**----**	**0.775**
Blasting	**----**	**0.709**
Exemplification	**----**	**0.513**
	Goodness-of-fit indices	
χ^2	**299.89***	
Df	**54**	
RMR	**0.13**	
GFI	**0.89**	
CFI	**0.90**	

RMR = Root Mean Square Residual; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; CFI = comparative fit index. All factor loadings are significantat p<0.05. *p<0.001.

In order to examine the psychometric characteristics of SPT scale, item-total correlations were calculated for all subscales, they ranged between (0.426-0.674) for Excuse, (0.539-0.683)

for Justification, (0.495-0.611) for Disclaimer, (0.512-0.671) for Self-handicapping, (0.487-0.742) for Apology, (0.389-0.646) for Ingratiation, (0.484-0.770) for Intimidation, (0.430-0.680) for Supplication, (0.399-0.565) for Entitlement, (0.473-0.657) for Enhancement, (0.272-0.784) for Blasting, and (0.506-0.645) for Exemplification (see Table 3). Also, factor-total correlation was 0.868 for Defensive Self-Presentation Tactics (DSPT), 0.947 for Assertive Self-Presentation Tactics (ASPT), and ranged from 0.377 to 0.765 for subscales. In addition, the overall scale, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.901, 0.722 for DSPT, 0.845 for ASPT, and ranged from 0.387 to 0.694 for suscales. Moreover, the split-half coefficient, for the overall scale, was 0.860, 0.698 for DSPT, 0.887 for ASPT, and ranged from 0.458 to 0.638 for subscales (see Table 3).

Table 3. Factor-total correlations, Cronbach's alpha and Split-half coefficients for SPT

Measures	Factor-total correlations	Cronbach's alpha coefficients	Split-half coefficients
DSPT	**0.868****	**0.722****	**0.698****
Excuse	**0.652****	**0.387****	**0.605****
Justification	**0.747****	**0.558****	**0.470****
Disclaimer	**0.602****	**0.452****	**0.463****
Self-handicapping	**0.630****	**0.564****	**0.574****
Apology	**0.377****	**0.613****	**0.515****
ASPT	**0.947****	**0.845****	**0.887****
Ingratiation	**0.763****	**0.580****	**0.592****
Intimidation	**0.736****	**0.694****	**0.600****
Supplication	**0.733****	**0.455****	**0.539****
Entitlement	**0.547****	**0.431****	**0.458****
Enhancement	**0.765****	**0.505****	**0.544****
Blasting	**0.686****	**0.556****	**0.638****
Exemplification	**0.543****	**0.509****	**0.534****
TSPT	-----	**0.901****	**0.860****

TSPT = total of DSPT and ASPT scores; DSPT = defensive self-presentation tactics; ASPT = assertive self-presentation tactics. **p<0.01

2.1.3. Discussion

The findings of current study indicated that the Arabic version of the SPT scale had an internal consistency. In order to demonstrate the validity of the Arabic version of the SPT scale, the construct validity was assessed by performing EFA and CFA. Cronbach's alpha and the split-half method were used to check the reliability of the scale. The results reconfirmed the factor structure of the Arabic version of the SPT scale. Furthermore, the results demonstrated that the Arabic version of the SPT scale had good validity and reliability indicators.

2.2. Study 2

This study aimed to: (1) investigate the differences between visually impaired and sighted students on each of the SPT subscales and (2) explore gender and degree of disability differences in visually impaired student scores on each of the SPT subscales.

2.2.1. Method

2.2.1.1. Participants:

Participants of this study consisted of two groups. The first group, consisted of 85 (46 males [54.12%] and 39 females [45.88%]) visually impaired students, their ages ranged between 12.76 and 19.76 years old (M = 17.15 and S.D. = 1.12). Moreover, the participants of visually impaired students were 46 totally blind and 39 with low vision. The second group, consisted of 95 (50 males [52.62%] and 45 females [47.37%]) sighted students, their ages ranged between 14.71 and 19.82 years old (M = 16.88 and S.D. = 1.13). The participants of both groups were selected from middle and secondary schools in the Asir region of Saudi Arabia. All 180 participants were asked to fill in the Arabic version of the SPT scale. In the first group, the interviews of students were individual conducted and the students' teachers helped them to fill in the scale, while, in the second group, the interviews of students were in groups of no more than 10.

2.2.1.2. Measures:

Participants were administered the Arabic version of the SPT scale that had been previously generated in study1. To measure individual proclivity for using self-presentation tactics, participants were asked to describe their use of each tactic on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = (very infrequently) to 3 = (very frequently).

2.2.1.3. Procedures:

The instructions for this study were mentioned in study1. The participants were asked to respond to the Arabic version of the SPT scale. Then, their responses were analyzed by ANOVA to investigate the differences between visually impaired and sighted students and to explore the differences in visually impaired students in SPT according to gender and degree of disability.

2.2.2. Results:

In order to investigate the differences in the scores on each scale of the 12 tactics between visually impaired students and sighted students, using the 12 SPT subscales as dependent variables, one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) indicated that sighted students had significantly higher scores on Justification, $F(1,178) = 6.56$, $p<0.05$, Disclaimer, $F(1,178) = 7.70$, $p<0.01$, Self-handicapping, $F(1,178) = 9.70$, $p<0.01$, Apology, $F(1,178) = 4.96$, $p<0.05$, Supplication, $F(1,178) = 9.38$, $p<0.01$. Visually impaired students had only a significantly higher score regarding Enhancement, $F(1,178) = 4.11$, $p<0.01$. There were no significant differences in the scores concerning Excuse, Ingratiation, Intimidation, Entitlement, Blasting, and Exemplification ($ps>0.05$) (see Table 4).

To examine the differences between visually impaired students and sighted students in using DSPT and ASPT subscales, the scores of these subscales were used as dependent variables in a one-way MANOVA. The main effect indicated that there were no significant differences in scores on ASPT ($p>0.05$). However, sighted students reported significantly higher scores on DSPT, $F(1,178) = 15$, $p<0.01$.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations for the SPT scale of visually impaired and sighted students

Scales	Visually impaired (n=85)		Sighted (n=95)		F(1,178)
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
DSPT	9.37	1.33	10.10	1.22	15.00**
Excuse	9.38	2.21	9.86	1.77	2.70
Justification	9.11	2.16	9.90	1.98	6.56*
Disclaimer	8.94	1.85	9.72	1.89	7.70**
Self-handicapping	8.12	1.85	9.00	1.94	9.70**
Apology	11.29	2.37	12.04	2.14	4.96*
ASPT	9.67	1.49	9.76	1.35	0.19
Ingratiation	15.53	3.01	15.53	2.88	0.00
Intimidation	7.29	2.03	7.31	2.01	0.01
Supplication	7,94	1.88	8.79	1.83	9.38**
Entitlement	9.56	2.10	9.51	1.66	0.03
Enhancement	9.52	2.00	8.92	1.98	4.11*
Blasting	7.42	1.69	7.97	2.20	3.42
Exemplification	10.44	2.07	10.34	1.86	0.11

DSPT = defensive self-presentation tactics; ASPT = assertive self-presentation tactics. *p<0.05; **p<0.01

MANOVA analysis was run to explore the differences in the scores on each scale of the 12 tactics according to gender, degree of disability and interaction between them, using the 12 SPT scales as dependent variables.

First, to investigate the role of gender in scores on the SPT among visual impairments the MANOVA analysis was run. The results indicated that males had significantly higher scores on Excuse, $F(1,81) = 4.60$, $p<0.05$, Intimidation, $F(1,81) = 17.96$, $p<0.01$, Supplication, $F(1,81) = 9.41$, $p<0.05$, and Blasting, $F(1,81) = 13.05$, $p<0.01$. However, females had significantly higher scores on Apology, $F(1,81) = 8.31$, $p<0.01$. There were no significant differences in the scores related to Justification, Disclaimer, Self-Handicapping, Ingratiation, Entitlement, Enhancement, and Exemplification. Moreover, the main effect indicated that there were no significant gender differences in score on DSPT subscale ($p>0.05$). However, males had

significantly higher scores on ASPT subscale, F(1,81) = 4.77, p<0.05 (see table 5).

Table 5. Means and standard deviations for the SPT scale of visually impaired students

Scale	Gender					Degree of disability					Gender*Degree of disability
	Males (n=46) Females (n=39)					TB (n=46) LV (n=39)					
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	F(1.81)	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	F(1.81)	F(1.81)
DSPT	9.34	1.35	9.36	1.33	0.01	9.30	1.11	9.45	1.57	0.32	0.18
Excuse	9.85	2.50	8.82	1.65	4.60*	9.50	2.19	9.23	2.24	0.29	0.03
Justification	9.02	2.26	9.21	2.05	0.22	8.87	2.18	9.39	2.12	1.39	1.16
Disclaimer	9.12	1.88	8.75	1.82	0.82	8.85	2.01	9.05	1.65	0.25	0.01
Self-handicapping	8.28	1.83	7.92	1.87	0.75	8.00	1.55	8.26	2.16	0.42	0.04
Apology	10.63	2.38	12.08	2.13	8.31**	11.26	2.24	11.33	2.55	0.02	0.00
ASPT	9.99	1.61	9.30	1.24	4.77*	9.84	1.04	9.48	1.88	1.30	0.07
Ingratiation	15.76	3.18	15.26	2.83	0.71	15.65	2.36	15.39	3.67	0.23	1.03
Intimidation	8.07	2.19	6.39	1.37	17.96**	7.78	1.89	6.72	2.06	7.09**	0.10
Supplication	8.50	1.77	7.28	1.81	9.41**	7.74	1.78	8.18	1.99	1.42	0.40
Entitlement	9.83	2.10	9.23	2.08	1.67	9.74	2.02	9.33	2.21	0.77	0.01
Enhancement	9.72	2.13	9.28	1.84	1.08	9.72	1.85	9.28	2.16	1.08	0.39
Blasting	8.00	1.76	6.74	1.33	13.05**	7.76	1.65	7.03	1.68	4.15*	3.67
Exemplification	10.04	2.05	10.90	2.02	3.24	10.46	1.94	10.41	2.25	0.05	2.04

DSPT = defensive self-presentation tactics; ASPT = assertive self-presentation tactics; TB = totally blind; LV = low vision. *p<0.05; **p<0.01

Second, to investigate the degree of disability in scores on SPT and the role it played; the results of MANOVA analysis indicated that totally blind students had significantly higher scores on intimidation, F(1,81) = 7.09, p<0.01 and blasting, F(1,81) = 4.15, p<0.05 than students with low vision. However, the differences between them were not significant in scores on the10 subscales, DSPT and ASPT subscales (ps>0.05) (see table 5).

As shown in table 4, the results of the MANOVA analysis indicated that there isn't a negative effect on the interaction between gender and degree of disability in scores in relation to all 12 subscales, DSPT and ASPT subscales(ps>0.05).

2.2.3. Discussion

Differences between Visually Impairmed and Sighted Students

The results of this study reported that sighted students used more DSPT than visually impaired students did (specially in justification, disclaimer, self-handicapping, and apology), but there were no differences in degree of disabilites regarding the use of ASPT. Nevertheless, sighted students used more "supplication" than visually impaired students did. On the other hand, visually impaired students were higher in "enhancement". This differences can be interpreted in light of the deficit that is caused by visual impairment and its implications for visually impaired student behaviors (Truan & Trent, 1997).

Gender Differences between Visually Impairmed Students

The results showed that males with visual impairements generally used more ASPT (specially in intimidation, supplication, and blasting) than females with visual impairements did, but there were no gender differences on the use of DSPT (except in using excuse which had a significant difference for males). These tendencies are reflected by the significantly higher scores of males on the ASPT subscale and the lack of gender differences on the DSPT subscale (Lee et al. 1999 and Sadler et al. 2010).

The results also indicated that there was no impact on the degree of disability in relation to the ASPT and DSPT (except in using intimidation and blasting which had significant differences for totally blind students). Finally, there was no effect of interaction between gender and degree of disablitiy on all SPT subscales.

3. CONCLUSION

This study focused on: (1) Adapting an Arabic version of the SPT scale (by Lee et al., 1999) for future Arabic studies. This objective was accomplished; the scale has proven to be an effective instrument for measuring SPT in Arabic native speakers. (2) Exploring the differences between sighted and

visually impaired students in the SPT. The results showed that there were significant differences betweeen them in some subscales of the SPT. (3) Investigating the effect of gender and degree of disability differences in SPT among visually impaired students. The results indicated that the gender and degree of disability had an effect on some subscales of SPT.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

This study recommended that: (1)future research should consider larger samples that are tested more carefully than the base SPT according to different demographic variables in Arabic studies. (2) Future research should consider studying the SPT among numerous groups of individiuals with special needs (e.g., hearing impairments, physical and learning disabilities). (3) The field needs to study the relationships between SPT and other psyhological variables among normal and individiuals with special needs.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers in this study are greatly indebted to: (1) The teachers in the middle and secondary schools for their assistence in applying the SPT scale. (2) The students who participated in the study.

REFERENCES

- Aloise-Young, P. A. (1993). The development of self-presentation: self-promotion in 6 to 10-year old children. Social Cognition, 11, (2), 201 - 222.
- Arkin. R. M. (1981). Self-presentational styles. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Impression management theory and social psychological research (pp. 311-333). New York: Academic Press.
- Banerjee, R.; Bennett, M. and Luke, N. (2012). Children's Reasoning about Self-Presentation Following Rule Violations: The Role of Self-Focused Attention, Child Development, 83 (5), 1805–1821.
- Chen, C.; Hewitt, P. L.; Flett, G. L.; Cassels, T. G.; Birch, S. & Blasber, J. S. (2012). Insecure attachment, perfectionistic self-presentation, and social disconnection in adolescents. Personality and Individual Differences, 52 (8), 936-941.
- Chen, D. & Dote-Kwan, J. (1999). Conveying High Expectations. In K. E. Wolfe (Ed.) Skills for success: A career education handbook for

children and adolescents with visual impairments. (2nd ed., pp. 47-76). New York: AFB Press.
- Cziráky, D. (2004). LISREL 8.54: A programme for structural equation modelling with latent variables. Journal of Applied Econometrics, 19, 135-141.
- Davidow, M. E. (1974). A guide for social competency: Course of study for the visually handicapped. Louisville, KY: American Printing House for the Blind.
- Doll, E. A. (1953). Measurement of social competence: A manual for the Vineland Social Maturity Scale. Minneapolis, MN: Educational Publishers.
- Fazzi, D. (2002). Social focus: Developing social skills and promoting positive interaction. In Pogrund, R, & Fazzi, D. (Eds.), Early focus: Working with young children who are blind or visually impaired and their families (2nd ed., pp. 188–218). New York: American Foundation for the Blind.
- Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Doubleday
- Hassan, S.; Flett, G.; Ganguli, R. and Hewitt, P. (2014). Perfectionistic self-presentation and suicide in a young woman with major depression and psychotic features, Case reports in psychiatry, 2014, 901-981.
- Hatlen, P. (2000). Soziale fertigkeiten [Social skills]. Blind-sehbehindert, 112(2), 84–87.
- Hewitt, P. L.; Blasberg, J. S.; Flett, G. L.; Besser, A.; Sherry, S. B.; Caelian, C.; Papsdorf, M.; Cassels, T, G. & Birch, S. (2011). Perfectionistic self-presentation in children and adolescents: Development and validation of the Perfectionistic Self-Presentation Scale-Junior Form. Psychological Assessment. 23, 125-142.
- Huebner, K. M. (1986). Social skills. In G. T. Scholl (Ed.), Foundations of education for blind and visually handicapped children and youth: Therapy and practice (pp. 341–362). New York: American Foundation for the Blind.
- Jones, E. E. & Pittman, T S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives of the self, (pp. 231-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leary, M. R. (1993). The interplay of private self-processes and interpersonal factors in self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self, 4, (pp. 127-155). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leary, M. R. (1996). Self-Presentation – Impression Management and Interpersonal Behaviour. Boulder, CO: Westview.

- Lee, S.; Quigley, B. M.; Nesler, M. S.; Corbett, A. B. & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Development of a self-presentation tactics scale. Personality and Individual Differences, 26, 701-722.
- Levin, R.; Bachner-Melman, R.; Edelman, S.; Ebstein, R.; Heresco-Levy, U. and Lichtenberg, P. (2013). Hypnotizability is associated with a protective but not acquisitive self-presentation style, The International journal of clinical and experimental hypnosis, 61 (2), 183-192.
- Lewis, M. A. & Neighbors, C. (2005). Self-determination and the use of self-presentation strategies. The Journal of Social Psychology, 145, 469-489.
- Sacks, S. Z.; Kekelis, L. S. & Gaylord-Ross, R. J. (Eds.). (1997). The development of social skills by blind and visually impaired students. New York: AFB Press.
- Sacks, S. Z. & Silberman, R. K. (2000). Social skills. In A. J. Koenig & M. C. Holbrook (Eds.), Foundations of education (2nd ed.), 2, pp. 616–652). New York: American Foundation for the Blind.
- Sacks, S. Z., & Wolffe, K. E. (Eds.). (2006). Teaching social skills to students with visual impairments: From theory to practice. New York: AFB Press.
- Sadler, M. E; Hunger, J.M.; & Miller, C. J. (2010). Personality and impression-management: Mapping the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire onto 12 self-presentation tactics. Personality and Individual Differences, 48(5), 623–628.
- Sandal, G.; Vijver, F.; Hege H. Bye, H., David L. Sam, D.; Amponsah, B.; Cakar, N.; Franke, G.; Ismail, R.; Kjellsen, K.; Kosic, A.; Leontieva, A.; Mortazavi, S. & Sun, C. (2014). Intended Self-Presentation Tactics in Job Interviews A 10-Country Study, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 45 (6), 939-958.
- Scheeren, A.; Begeer, S.; Banerjee, R.; Terwogt , M. and Koot, H. (2010).Self-presentation in children and adolescents with high functioning autism spectrum disorder in hypothetical and real life situations, Autism, 14 (5), 457-473.
- Schindele, R. (1974). The social adjustment of visually handicapped children in different educational settings. American Foundation for the Blind Research Bulletin, 28, 125-144.
- Shaw, C. M. & Edwards, R. (1997). Self-concepts and self-presentations of males and females: Similarities and differences. Communication Reports, 10 (1), 55-62.
- Stockley, J. & Brooks, B. (1995). Perception and adjustment: Self and social. British Journal of Visual Impairment, 13, 15–18.
- Stoeber, J. & Roche, D. (2014), Affect Intensity Contributes to Perfectionistic Self-presentation in Adolescents Beyond

Perfectionism, Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 32 (2), 164–180.
- Sun, T. & Wu, G. (2012). Traits, Predictors, and Consequences of Facebook Self-Presentation, Social Science Computer Review, 30 (4), 419–433.
- Truan, M. B. & Trent, S. D. (1997). Impact of adolescents' adjustment to progressive vision loss on Braille reading skills: Case studies. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 91 (2), 301-308.
- Tso, M. S. (1997). The characteristics of visually impaired children with multiple disabilities. Retrieved (2014, December 9) From: http://www.ebenezerenhs.edu.hk/web_doc/visually_impaired_children_with_multip_disabilities.htm.
- Tuttle, D. (1987). The role of the special education teacher-counselor in meeting students' self-esteem needs. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 81, 156–161.
- Van Hasselt, V. B., Hersen, M., & Kazdin, A. E. (1985). Assessment of social skills in visually handicapped adolescents. Behavior Research and Therapy, 23, 53–63.
- Wagner. E. (2004). Development and implementation of a curriculum to develop social competence for students with visual impairments in Germany. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 98 (11), 703-710.
- Watson, J. G. (2000). William Faulkner: Self-presentation and performance. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Zach, S. and Netz, Y. (2014). Self-Presentation Concerns and Physical Activity In Three-generation Families, Social Behavior and Personality, 42 (2), 259–267.
- Zackariasson, M. (2014). Being Yourself Identity and Self-presentation among Youths in Christian Youth Organizations, Young, 22 (2), 153–170.

❋❋❋❋❋