

5-2009

## How Do You Compare? The Correlations of Social Desirability and Self-Esteem as well as Social Desirability and Self-Consciousness

Kristy Johnson  
*Lindenwood University*

Kristy Myers  
*Lindenwood University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych\\_journals](https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych_journals)



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Johnson, Kristy and Myers, Kristy (2009) "How Do You Compare? The Correlations of Social Desirability and Self-Esteem as well as Social Desirability and Self-Consciousness," *Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 9 , Article 8.

Available at: [https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych\\_journals/vol1/iss9/8](https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych_journals/vol1/iss9/8)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology, Sociology, and Public Health Department at Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal by an authorized editor of Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. For more information, please contact [phuffman@lindenwood.edu](mailto:phuffman@lindenwood.edu).

**How Do You Compare? The Correlations of Social Desirability and Self-Esteem as well as  
Social Desirability and Self-Consciousness**

**Kristy Johnson and Kristy Myers**

*In the present study, 81 participants were asked to self-report their levels of self-esteem and self-consciousness using Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale and Fenigstein's Self-Consciousness Scale, respectively, as well as report their current semester GPA in order to study the correlations between these variables and the variable of GPA inflation. There was no significance found for the correlations between the level of GPA inflation and experimental condition, between GPA inflation and self-esteem, or between GPA inflation and self-consciousness for the 35 participants with obtainable GPA's. However, the present researchers did find significance in the correlation between inflated GPA and self-consciousness for the 80 total participants with a reported GPA.*

The purpose of the present study was to research the observable relationships between self-esteem, self-consciousness, and social desirability in context. Based on the results of the studies reviewed in this paper, one's levels of self-esteem and self-consciousness seem to directly influence their behavior in social or individual contexts depending on what the perceived socially desirable behaviors are in that context.

Abrams and Brown (1989) conducted a study of self-consciousness in relation to social identity and self regulation as a group member. The researchers pointed out that when people are placed in a group context, they tend to surrender their own individuality for what is socially acceptable and popular among the group they are in. They also explained that self consciousness

is sometimes lost because of the desire to achieve positive distinctiveness (Abrams & Brown).

This term refers to decreased conformity to a group's norms, and is important because the conformity differs depending on the social condition one is placed in.

Abrams and Brown's (1989) study assessed a group of 208 secondary education students in England. The students were told that they were being compared to another school on a 'general abilities' test. Additionally, students were told to either cooperate with the other school, or compete against the other school, and the 'winning' student would receive a prize. Students were then led to believe that when compared to their opposing school, data concluded that the other children generally had higher, lower, or equal pretest scores. The experiment concluded with a scale that measured characteristics such as, but not limited to: goal orientation, in-group pride, perceptions of the group's test performances, and competitiveness (Abrams & Brown). They found evidence that individuals who possessed high self consciousness were susceptible to threats of interpersonal individuality, meaning that these individuals behaved in ways that would be deemed socially desirable (Abrams & Brown).

Mesmer-Magnus, Visesvaran, Deshpande, and Joseph (2006) conducted a study designed to measure the correlation of over-claiming (inflated responses) in relation to social desirability, self-esteem in relation to social desirability, and emotional intelligence in relation to social desirability. Mesmer-Magnus et al. assessed 198 participants using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne and Marlowe as cited in Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2006), a ten item over-claiming scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg as cited in Mesmer-Magnus et al.), an emotional intelligence scale, and a demographics survey.

Mesmer-Magnus et al. (2006) found that many factors positively correlate with social desirability, including self-esteem and emotional intelligence. They also found no significant correlation between over-claiming and social desirability (Mesmer-Magnus et al.). Additionally, upon analysis, emotional intelligence, or the ability to examine one's own emotions, possessed a greater variance with social desirability than the other factors.

Mesmer-Magnus et al. (2006), initiated research on the topic of social desirability and the relevant studies revealed motivation and ability both have the tendency to cause one to distort responses in certain situations. This is a feasible correlation because one must first have the ability to inflate responses, but that same individual also needs a reason, or motivation to distort responses as well. For example, if something were to remain a secret and no one would ever find out, there would be no point in lying about it. Individual differences also played a role in a distortion of responses. This is also a likely correlation because, for example, an individual with a low level of modesty may feel it necessary to exaggerate the truth to a potential employer. On the other hand, an individual with a high level of modesty may feel that even a slight exaggeration in response to a potential employer would constitute a lie, which may be against his or her ethics. Unconscious and conscious response styles, distortion, and impression management all played into the tendency to inflate responses in given situations as well. Mesmer-Magnus et al. suggests that when acting upon self deception, the participants themselves believe their own exaggerated perceptions of their abilities. Such deception is generally viewed as unconscious; however, when one desires to create a good impression on others, and have the motivation to do so, the deception is more deliberate and serves to maintain moral consistency (Mesmer-Magnus et al.). Regardless of the reasoning, social desirability is manifested in social

instances, especially if one has reason to desire acceptance and a higher status within the situation (Mesmer-Magnus et al.).

Brown, (as cited in Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2006) found that high self-esteem correlated positively with social desirability and vice versa. Mesmer-Magnus et al. ultimately concluded that self-esteem related to social desirability, however, felt it necessary to further investigate the many factors that underlie the characteristics.

Troop, Allan, Treasure and Katzman (2003) studied the correlation between social desirability and eating disorders. The researchers assessed 102 participants with eating disorders from two different hospitals and comparison participants were assessed from previous studies that measured the same constructs. They took both age and gender into consideration when completing analysis (Troop et al.). The participants were given an eleven item Likert scale designed to measure several aspects of social comparison. Participants were also given an inventory to measure submissive behaviors as well as eating disorders (Troop et al.). Upon analysis, researchers found that patients with eating disorders displayed a higher number of submissive behaviors, such as vulnerability, humiliation, and avoidance, and that the same participants also reported an adverse reaction to social comparison. Their study demonstrates that individuals sometimes go to extreme measures to maintain status, especially in social settings.

Pager and Quillian (2005) held a study that focused on comparing results from a self-report measure of discriminative attitudes with an employer's actual behavior in real-life situations where they would be employing white or black ex-offenders. The researchers focused on labor and employment scenarios in order to control for the effects of social desirability in an employer's characteristic attitudes of their individual social life. Pager and Quillian theorized

that an employer's actual hiring behavior would differ from that in which they reported on the self-measure for both ex-offenders and racial differences. Pager and Quillian used hypothetical vignettes, or situations in which an employer would typically encounter in order to study what their actual behavior might be if they did encounter such an employment situation. However, Pager and Quillian admitted that discrimination in an employment setting is often influenced by factors of a particular situation and environment, and these factors lessen the relationship between attitude and behavior in certain situations. Therefore, Pager and Quillian also theorized even an employer that would normally be discriminatory to certain types of potential employees would change their behavior in order to be more compliant to a particular situation rather than their own desires.

For a six-month period in 2001, Pager and Quillian sent matched pairs of white and black men to apply for a total of 350 entry-level employment opportunities. Each pair was according to race, with two white (n=150) or black (n=200) men applying for a job, one with a false "ex-offender" status, and one without. The discriminative preference of each hiring employer was measured by the amount of calls they made to each applicant. White non-ex-offenders received 34 percent call backs and white false offenders received 17 percent call backs. However, black non-ex-offenders only received 14 percent call backs and 5 percent call back ratings for false offenders. Pager and Quillian concluded that ex-offenders and blacks were only half, if not less, as likely to receive call backs from potential employers.

After this first part of the study, Pager and Quillian (2005) conducted phone interviews with these employers in order to gauge what their reported individual attitudes about employment discrimination were. Out of the 350 original employers, 199 responded. During the

phone interview, employers were read vignettes of typical situations they might be involved in, and their likelihood of hiring an applicant. Vignettes included applicants with similar features of the original study: if the original applicant was a white non-offender, then the respondent's second vignette involved a white non-offender, and vice versa. According to this phone survey, 60 percent of employers said they would hire an ex-offender, whereas in the audit only 17 percent white and 5 percent of blacks received call backs. Also, in survey results, employers reported interviewing 55 percent of total applicants, eight for each individual job. What employers reported and what was presented by Pager and Quillian's sample were not equivalent, and thus researchers concluded that employers reported socially desirable answers when they knew that their answers would be directly attributed to them, when their respective hiring behavior exhibited otherwise. This study serves justice to the present researchers' hypotheses because it demonstrated that when placed in an actual situation, in which social desirability was presumed to be irrelevant, the employers did not distort their personal judgment. On the other hand, when specifically asked in a socially desirable situation, in which such judgments could be attributed to each employer, the employers consistently distorted their judgment and response to appear socially desirable.

Santos-Pinto and Sobel (2005) mentioned that positive self-image, or a high self-esteem, positively correlates with egocentrism. Myers (as cited in Santos-Pintos) pointed out that in economically significant circumstances, 90 percent of individuals assess themselves as greater than average. Santos-Pinto and Sobel hypothesized that several factors play into an increase of self-esteem, such as ability, skills needed, and one's level of technological knowledge.

Santos-Pinto and Sobel (2005) tested their hypothesis by putting individuals in several different conditions, for example a group receiving instruction in technology and a single individual receiving instruction in technology, and having the individuals rate their own abilities on a specific task. They also had others rate the participants' abilities on the same task. They gave each person a list of words to choose from, and the number of words differed for each condition. The control group did not receive describing words to choose from, but instead were allowed to write whatever they desired when describing their ability. They found that the easier the task, the higher individuals rated themselves. They also found that individuals in the group setting were more likely to have a lower self-image than those in individual settings, and that the amount of technology one was allotted to use for specific tasks also had a correlation with self-assessments.

James L. Gibson (1981) found that self-esteem has a significant impact on one's decision making of a judicial nature (legal decision making). Gibson hypothesized that the impact of external or internal influences on judicial decisions depends on the judge's level of self-esteem. Gibson theorized that those with higher self-esteem would be less likely to be swayed by external role expectations, whereas those with lower self-esteem would be more likely to change their opinions based on external role expectations.

Gibson (1981) stated that those with a career in politics have certain roles they must adhere to, and that their judgments are largely influenced by the norms and expectations of the role in which they hold. A total of 48 judges in the state of California were interviewed, and their selection was based on the fact that each of them had held both legislative and judicial positions throughout their careers. All 48 selected judges were male, and 45 were white, three



were classified as “non- white”. Almost half of these judges were selected because they have suffered a defeat politically, and Gibson found that high self-esteem did not positively correlate to the judges holding the highest political offices.

Gibson (1981) used a Likert scale which was a, “Modified version of the Eagly revision of the Janis- Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale,” in order to measure each judge’s level of self- esteem (p. 111). This self-esteem measure was administered by pencil and paper, and then Gibson asked each judge was a series of questions regarding judicial role expectations and altering behavior to meet such expectations that of which are typical of judicial behavior. The first set of verbal items was focused on external expectations, and the second set dealt with internal expectations of behavior. High self-esteem according to the written scale was very poorly correlated with role orientations: what a judge perceives their own role to be, and role expectations: what a judge perceives as external expectations of their role. Judges scoring low on the self-esteem scale were more strongly influenced by both role orientations and role expectations.

Gibson (1981) concluded from these data that judges who scored higher in self-esteem would be more likely to take into account their own personal opinions when making a judicial decision and less likely to take into account precedent or externally motivated role expectations; and that those who scored lower in relation to self-esteem would be more likely to make decisions solely based on precedent and what is externally expected of them.

Damasio (1998) pointed out that consciousness is a very difficult concept to study because it is a private status that occurs within the human species. Damasio made note, however, that consciousness is possible to study in a well controlled environment abiding the strict

guidelines that have been placed on the scientific community as well as using stringently controlled stimuli. The stimuli generally used in experiments attempting to unravel consciousness are known to produce inner feelings, which can then be analyzed (Damasio).

Damasio (1998) broke consciousness into two levels, one is commonly known as core consciousness and the other is known as extended consciousness. Core consciousness is a more basic concept, and involves a general awareness of surroundings and thoughts. Extended consciousness is more complex and involves past, present, and expected future thoughts. Both require some form of memory, and both occur involuntarily, or without will. The present researcher's experiment attempts to tap into participants' core consciousness. The present researchers hoped to create an environment in which participants are forced to decide whether to be completely honest about his or her Grade Point Average in both a controlled and manipulated environment. The decision the participants made should tell present researchers general information about the participant's level of consciousness, which could then be correlated with self-esteem and social desirability. Damasio made note that consciousness was the beginning of rules, ethics, science, technology, art, and the foundation of representing oneself.

Researchers for the present study wished to study the relationship between environmental condition and changing of one's behavior to be more socially desirable, as well as whether or not there was a positive or negative relationship between self-esteem and social desirability, and self-consciousness and social desirability. The present researchers hypothesized that when placed in an environment in which a certain socially desirable behavior was expected, such as reporting a high GPA, participants would inflate their own GPA in order to be perceived as more socially desirable. The present researchers also hypothesized that there exists a negative relationship

between self-esteem and socially desirable behavior and that there exists a positive relationship between self-consciousness and exhibiting socially desirable behavior. The present researchers hypothesized that an individual with high self-esteem will not be as likely as one with low self-esteem to change their own behavior to be more socially desirable. The present researchers arrived at this hypothesis by reasoning that participants would be more likely to give a distorted response in a situation in which social desirability was valued, especially if participants had low self-esteem. These participants, the present researchers hypothesized, would have more of a reason to desire social approval. The present researchers also hypothesized that individuals with high self-consciousness will be more likely to distort responses in order to appear socially desirable. In being highly self-conscious one should, hypothetically, be much more conscious about one's own behavior and thus more likely to change to be socially desirable. A vast amount of research has been done studying the correlations between self-esteem and / or self-consciousness related to social desirability.

The researchers for the present experiment presumed, based on Pager and Quillian's (2005) study, that students would alter their self-reported GPA in an experimental setting in which a confederate was present. The present researchers also thought that Pager and Quillian's study demonstrated that when participants were placed in a control setting in which all social characteristics are removed, the participant would be less likely to alter their self-reported GPA. Also, Santos-Pinto and Sobel's (2005) hypothesis specifically relates to the present researchers' experiment because participants must first see themselves as able to retain a high GPA, and they must also have the skills necessary to distort their GPA as well. Finally, the participants needed to understand the purpose of the self-esteem scale administered, and be able relate it to the

specific GPA task, in order to avoid overstating their own GPA and not present themselves as socially desirable.

Additionally, Gibson's (1981) conclusion is significant because it shows that individuals with high self-esteem seem to have less of a reason to distort judgments and responses, which is what researchers for the present experiment also hypothesized. Finally, Damasio's (1998) observation is important because by controlling environment as well as stimuli, researchers of the present experiment hope to obtain an accurate representation of self-consciousness, which directly relate to some of these mentioned themes.

## Method

### *Participants*

The participants in this study consisted of 81 college students (28 men, 53 women), attending Lindenwood University. All 81 participants were recruited via the Lindenwood University Human Subject Pool (HSP). The HSP is a way for researchers to recruit participants, and the participants are rewarded for participation with bonus points in general education social science classes. The individuals who chose not to participate in experimental research have the option of completing an alternate assignment for bonus points in the same social science classes. The average age of participants was 19.86 years old, and most participants were in their freshman year of college. In fact, 53.1% of participants were freshmen, 27.2% were sophomores, 14.8% were juniors, and only 4.9% were seniors. Of the participants recruited, one participant failed to report his or her GPA. Participants were assigned to conditions using random assignment.

Additionally, since many of the participants were either first semester freshmen or transfer students, the actual cumulative GPA was obtainable for only 35 of the 80 participants in total. Of these 35 participants, there were 12 men and 23 women. Also, freshman status remained the grade level most represented, as 37.1% were second semester freshmen, 34.3% were sophomores, 17.1% were juniors, and 11.4% were seniors. The mean age of the 35 participants was 20.63.

### *Materials and Procedure*

The materials for the present study consisted of a sign-up sheet posted on the Lindenwood Human Subject Pool (HSP) bulletin board, so that the present researchers could recruit participants for the study, and so that participants could sign up for convenient times in which to participate, as well as two informed consent forms per participant (see Appendix A); one for the present researchers to keep on file, and another for the participant to read and refer back to if necessary. The sign-up sheet provided contact information for both participants and researchers so that communication regarding the study would be possible, and the informed consent form explained to participants the reason behind the study, as well as the fact that the experiment requires the release of participants GPA. It also reinforced the notion of withdrawal, and made sure participants were at least 18 years of age or had a parent or legal guardian's consent on file. Additionally, each participant received a separate GPA release to sign (see Appendix B), which aided researchers for the present study in obtaining accurate GPAs for each participant. A feedback letter was given to participants at the end of the session, which was used to thank participants for their contribution to the study. The feedback letter also provided the

present researchers' names and phone numbers in case the participants had any further questions about the study, or wished to obtain the results of the experiment upon completion.

Each participant received a short demographic survey (see Appendix C) as well as a copy of Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (as cited in <http://www.wwnorton.com/>), which is a Likert scale which assessed self-esteem for each individual (see Appendix D). The ten items were based on a four- point scale in which participants read a statement related to self-esteem, such as, "I feel that I have a number of good qualities..." and decided if they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with each statement. Participants then received a copy of Fenigstein's Self-Consciousness Scale (as cited in <http://www.psychbytes.com>), which is also a Likert scale with five anchors (see Appendix E). There were 20 questions for the participants to answer, and participants were required to describe how characteristic or uncharacteristic the statements were of them. The ultimate goal of this scale was to measure one's level of self-consciousness in order to give the present researchers general personality characteristics that may alter one's self-esteem.

Researchers for the present study had four trays set up, each labeled with a range of possible GPAs. The first tray was labeled 0-1, the second 1.1-2.0, the third 2.1-3.0, and the fourth was labeled 3.1-4.0. The present researchers used the trays to hold the surveys, and a different amount of phony surveys were placed in each tray. The number of surveys in each tray depended on whether the participants were assigned to the experimental group or control group. In the control group, an equal number of surveys was put in each tray. In the experimental condition, however, the 3.1-4.0 tray had the most, 5 phony surveys in this tray, and less in each of the others. The number of surveys in each tray differed for the experimental and control

groups because it created an opportunity for participants to compare themselves to others, otherwise, there would be no reason for participants to inflate (or in some cases deflate) their answer.

Since all participants were recruited from the HSP, participants were given a participant receipt signed by the present researchers in order to receive extra credit. Also, the participants were required to sign up for the date and time they wished to complete the experiment on a signup sheet that was posted on the HSP bulletin board located on the fourth floor of Young Hall. The present researchers then met the participant at the predetermined lab room to conduct the experiment. The lab room was also located in Young Hall, and was a small room with a desk and two chairs. Pens were provided to participants so they could complete the necessary forms and surveys, and the chairs were provided to make participants as comfortable as possible. Candy was passed out concluding the experiment to thank the participants for helping the present researchers conduct their study. Finally, a computer was used to analyze data, create a spreadsheet, and write a paper over findings. Microsoft Office as well as the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was the program of choice for these tasks.

### Results

The present researchers hypothesized that when placed in an environment in which a certain socially desirable behavior was expected, such as reporting a high GPA, participants would inflate their own GPA score in order to be perceived as more socially desirable. The present researchers manipulated the experimental condition by either placing a confederate with a reportedly high GPA (3.9) in close proximity and observable to the participants when they reported their own GPA (experimental), or not (control).

In this study, GPA inflation refers to the level of distortion in a participant's reported GPA in reference to their actual GPA on file. Of the 81 participants who contributed to this study, an actual GPA was obtainable for only 35 participants.

An independent t-test comparing the two conditions on GPA inflation for the 35 participants did not reveal statistical significance,  $t_{(33)} = .811$ ,  $p > .05$ . The experimental group had a mean GPA inflation score of .2026 points and standard deviation of .43972, whereas the control group had a mean GPA inflation of .0894 points and a standard deviation of .38211.

In order to determine whether or not there was a positive or negative relationship between self-esteem and social desirability, as well as self-consciousness and social desirability, a multiple regression analysis was conducted with GPA inflation as the dependent variable and experimental condition, self-esteem, and self-consciousness as the independent variables. The results did not reveal any significant findings. The findings did reveal that GPA inflation was correlated with experimental condition  $r_{pb} = -1.40$ , with self-esteem  $r = -.122$ , and with self-consciousness  $r = .252$ , indicating that the present researchers did assume the correct directions of these relationships.

### Discussion

Though significance was not found for the original hypotheses, the present researchers still wanted to study the relationships between self-reported GPA and self-esteem, self-consciousness, and social desirability for the 80 total participants that reported a GPA. Since GPA inflation between participants' self-reported and actual GPA's could not be obtained for all 81 total participants, researchers instead used self-reported GPA level as the dependent variable



in these measures. Since one participant did not report a GPA, all but one of the 81 participants' self-reported GPA's were included in the following analyses.

An independent t-test comparing the experimental conditions on self-reported GPA level for the 80 total participants did not reveal statistical significance,  $t_{(78)} = .810$ ,  $p > .05$ . Since actual GPA's were not obtainable for the 81 total participants, the present researchers instead wished to only study the difference between condition on the inflated level of self-reported GPA. Present researchers deduced from these results that condition was not a defining factor in this experiment in determining the amount of inflated GPA, and that participants inflated their GPA regardless of condition.

In order to determine whether or not there was a positive or negative relationship between self-esteem and social desirability, as well as self-consciousness and social desirability, a multiple regression analysis was conducted for all 80 participants with a reported GPA, with GPA level as the dependent variable and experimental condition, self-esteem, and self-consciousness as the independent variables. The results revealed a significant finding for the self-consciousness measure,  $F_{(1,78)} = 5.097$ ,  $p < .05$ . In fact, self-consciousness scores accounted for about 6% of the variance in GPA inflation ( $R^2 = .061$ ).

Also, present researchers found significance in the correlation between self-esteem and self-consciousness,  $r = -.579$ , conveying that those who scored high in self-esteem also scored low in self-consciousness, and vice versa. These results indicate that the relationship between self-esteem and self-consciousness might be an interesting avenue for future research.

There were several limitations to the present study, the first and foremost being the time constraints. The present researchers although allotted ample time to analyze data, did not have

sufficient time to recruit participants and run experiments. The times that the present researchers posted were not being requested by participants, as most participants had classes to attend, and did not want to try to complete an experiment during breaks. The realization that the times posted were not feasible for individuals to participate prompted the present researchers to take off of work to run experiments, and times earlier in the morning were posted as well as later in the afternoon to curb this issue. Posting different times for participation seemed to work, as many individuals began signing up for the experiment.

Another major limitation was the design of the experiment. Since the present researchers only used the Human Subject Pool for participants, many of the participants were freshmen. This is true because the teachers that offered extra credit for participation were primarily for introductory classes. The present researchers did not realize the problem this could post at the beginning of the project. Even though the present researchers ran 81 participants, only 35 of the participant's data could be used in analysis because the registrar's office did not have the GPA of freshmen or transfer students on file. GPA was used to determine one's level of social desirability, and was a vital part of the study. Not being able to obtain sufficient data really lowered the validity of this study. To overcome this limitation, the present researchers could have used participants that were not part of the HSP. Although the thought occurred halfway through the experiment, the present researchers could not change the design of the study because it would have taken too long to get approval from the Institutional Review Board. Another idea would be to ask for approval at the beginning of the project to obtain permission from Lindenwood teachers to run experiments in their classrooms, however, that could also harm the validity because it would have been extremely difficult to control the level of social desirability.

Additionally, the differences in responses then could be attributed to a myriad of factors, such as participant's friends being present, or coercion from friends to participate if one did not want to.

The sample size obtained was yet another limitation. For this research to be considered reliable and valid, thousands of participants should have been assessed. As previously mentioned, time constraints as well as design confounds made such a sample size impossible to obtain. Perhaps if the researchers of the current experiment could have visited other colleges this limitation could have been defeated. Additionally, the sample was composed primarily of females, which could also affect the level of social desirability because perhaps women have a higher level of social desirability than men, or vice versa, when in social situations. It would have been ideal to have an equal number of men and women participants in the experiment.

#### References

- Abrams, D., & Brown, R. (1989). Self-consciousness and social identity: Self-regulation as a group member. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 52, 311-318. Retrieved March 13, 2009, from <http://www.jstor.org.gatekeeper.lindenwood.edu>.
- Damasio, A.R. (1998, November, 29). Investigating the biology of consciousness. *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences*, 353, 1879-1882. Retrieved March 31, 2009, from <http://www.jstor.org.gatekeeper.lindenwood.edu>.
- Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M.F., & Buss A.H.. (1975). *Fenigstein's Self-Consciousness Scale*. Retrieved February 18, 2009, from <http://www.psychbites.com/Quizzes/Self%20Consciousness%20%20Multiple%20Scores/Self%20Consciousness%20Scale.htm>

- Gibson, J.L. (1981). Personality and elite political behavior: The influence of self esteem on judicial decision making. *Journal of Politics*, 104(22), 104-125.
- Mesmer-Magnus, J., Viswesvaran, C., Deshpande, S., & Joseph, J. (2006). Social desirability: The role of over-claiming, self-esteem, and emotional intelligence. *Psychology Science*, 48, 336-356.
- Pager, D., & Quillian, L. (2005). Walking the talk? What employers say versus what they do. *American Psychological Review* 26, 355-380.
- Santos-Pinto, L., & Sobel, J. (2005). A model of positive self-image in subjective assessments. *American Economic Association* 95, 1386-1402.
- Troop, N. A., Allan, S., Treasure, J. L., & Katzman, M. L. (2003). Social comparison and submissive behavior in eating disorder patients. *Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 3, 237-49. Retrieved March 13, 2009, from ProQuest Psychology Journals database. (Document ID: 443173661).
- Rosenberg, Marshall. (1965). *Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale*. Retrieved February 13, 2009, from <http://www.wwnorton.com/college/psych/psychsci/media/rosenberg.htm>

#### Author Note

We thank Dr. Nohara-LeClair for her continued support and persistent encouragement throughout this research experiment.

We also thank the registrar's office staff for taking time to assist researchers' data collection by looking up participants' GPA.

A special thank you is due to Mr. Finnegan of the registrar's office for his enduring patience and understanding while aiding researchers in data collection.

We thank our participants for volunteering for our research experiment, without participants the experiment would have been impossible!

We thank our classmates for the helpful and insightful critiques of our work. We also thank our classmates for emotional support throughout this research project.

## Appendix A

## Informed Consent Form

I, \_\_\_\_\_ (print name), understand that I will be taking part in a research project that requires me to complete a short questionnaire concerning my Grade Point Average (GPA), as well as Rosenberg's self-esteem scale and Fenigstein's self consciousness Scale. I also understand that I am giving permission for the researchers to request my official GPA from the registrar's office to be reported anonymously. I understand that my identity and GPA will remain anonymous for the entire duration of this study. I understand that I should be able to complete this project within 10-15 minutes. I am aware that my participation in this study is strictly voluntary and that I may choose to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty or prejudice. I understand that the information obtained from my responses will be analyzed only as part of aggregate data and that all identifying information will be absent from the data in order to ensure anonymity. I am also aware that my responses will be kept confidential and that data obtained from this study will only be available for research and educational purposes. I understand that any questions I may have regarding this study shall be answered by the researcher(s) involved to my satisfaction. Finally, I verify that I am at least 18 years of age and am legally able to give consent or that I am under the age of 18 but have on file with the HSP office, a completed parental consent form that allows me to give consent as a minor.

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Signature of participant)

\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Signature of researcher obtaining consent)

Student Researchers' Names and Numbers:

Kristy Johnson: kj673@lionmail.lindenwood.edu 314-960-8747

Kristy Myers: klm252@lionmail.lindenwood.edu 636-345-2134

Supervisor:

Dr. Michiko Nohara-LeClair

(636)-949-4371

## Appendix B

I understand that I am giving my student ID number; if I do not know my student ID number, I will make every attempt to obtain my student ID number in an expedient manner in order to aid researchers in obtaining data for this study's purposes.

---

---

 / / 

---

Participant Signature

Date

## Appendix C

### Demographic Survey

1. Are you Male or Female? (check one)

Male

Female

2. What is your age in years? \_\_\_\_\_

3. What college grade level are you currently? (check one)

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

4. Are you a first semester freshman or first semester transfer student? (check one)

First Semester Freshman

First Semester Transfer

Neither



## Appendix D

Participant ID Number: \_\_\_\_\_

(Assigned by Researcher)

STATEMENT		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.	I feel that I have a number of good qualities..	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5.	I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6.	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7.	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8.	I wish I could have more respect for myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9.	I certainly feel useless at times.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10.	At times I think I am no good at all.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Appendix E

**.Self Consciousness Scale**

by Allan Fenigstein,

Michael Scheier, and Arnold Buss

Below are twenty-three statements that may or may not be characteristic of the way you see yourself as a person. Read each one carefully and rate whether the statement is characteristic of uncharacteristic of you using the rating scale below. Select the number of your answer after each question.

Extremely uncharacteristic	= 0
Generally uncharacteristic	= 1
Equally characteristic and uncharacteristic	= 2
Generally characteristic	= 3
Extremely characteristic	= 4

**1. I'm always trying to figure myself out.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**2. I'm concerned about my style of doing things.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**3. Generally, I'm very aware of myself.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**4. It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**5. I reflect about myself a lot.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**6. I'm concerned about the way I present myself.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**7. I'm often the subject of my own fantasies.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**8. I have trouble working when someone is watching me.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**9. I constantly scrutinize myself.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**10. I get embarrassed very easily.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**11. I'm self-conscious about the way I look.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**12. I find it hard to talk to strangers.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**13. I'm generally attentive to my inner feelings.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**14. I usually worry about making a good impression.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**15. I'm constantly examining my motives.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**16. I feel anxious when I speak in front of a large group.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**17. One of the last things I do before I leave the house is look in the mirror.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**18. I sometimes have the feeling that I'm off somewhere watching myself.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**19. I'm concerned about what other people think of me.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**20. I'm alert to changes in my mood.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**21. I'm usually aware of my appearance.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**22. I'm aware of the way my mind works when I work through a problem.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4

**23. Large groups make me nervous.**

- a.  0
- b.  1
- c.  2
- d.  3
- e.  4