

16

Measures of Concerns with Public Image and Social Evaluation

Mark R. Leary, Katrina P. Jongman-Sereno and Kate J. Diebels
Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

People's outcomes in life are greatly affected by other people's impressions and evaluations of them. Whether people are perceived as friendly or unfriendly, intelligent or stupid, sincere or duplicitous, dependable or irresponsible, or in myriad other ways has broad-ranging implications for how they fare in their social, occupational, romantic, financial, and other pursuits. As a result, people are attuned to how they are being perceived and evaluated by others, often try to behave in ways that convey impressions of themselves to others that will result in desired outcomes, and sometimes become distressed when others do not perceive and evaluate them as they desire (Leary, 1995; Schlenker, 2012).

Although being concerned with other people's judgments is sometimes viewed as a sign of insecurity, vanity, deceit, or manipulativeness, in fact, social-evaluative concerns are a normal and adaptive aspect of human behavior. Concerns with social evaluations keep socially undesirable behaviors in check and facilitate smooth and rewarding social interactions. People who pay insufficient attention to how they are viewed by others fare very poorly in domains of life in which others' evaluations may affect their outcomes. Indeed, a world in which no one cared how they were viewed by other people would be intolerable for everyone.

Although most people occasionally become concerned with how they are perceived and evaluated by others, individuals differ in the degree to which they are attuned to other people's evaluations of them, are motivated to make desired impressions on others, experience distress when their public images are damaged or others' evaluations of them are unfavorable, and use various tactics to convey impressions of themselves to other people. This chapter focuses on measures of personality characteristics that reflect individual differences in such concerns. These differences in concerns with public image and social evaluation moderate people's behavior when the importance of others' evaluations is salient and help to predict an array of behaviors and emotions that are tied to people's concerns with others' impressions and evaluations of them (Leary, 1995).

People's concerns with public image and social evaluations are reflected in a number of psychological processes involving attentional, motivational, emotional, and behavioral elements. These features are obviously correlated and interdependent, yet they reflect distinct processes that underlie individual differences in social-evaluative concerns.

First, people differ in the degree to which they think about other people's impressions of them and desire to be evaluated in particular ways. Some people think a great deal about their public images, are cognizant that others might be evaluating them, and mull over the possibility of making undesired impressions. Other people think about their social image and others' evaluations much less frequently and do so primarily when situational demands make social evaluation particularly salient. All other things being equal, people who are more attuned to the fact that other people are scrutinizing or judging them will be more concerned about social evaluations – and more motivated to manage their impressions in ways that convey desired impressions – than those who think less about how they are being viewed by others.

Second, people differ in the degree to which they worry about being perceived and evaluated in undesired ways and experience emotional distress when the possibility of making undesired impressions arises.

Whereas some people are rarely troubled by social anxiety, embarrassment, and other negative emotions when they think that others might evaluate them negatively, other people become greatly distressed when they might make an undesired impression or be evaluated negatively.

Third, people differ in the nature of the public images they try to maintain and in the tactics they use to foster such images. For example, people may place more or less emphasis on being viewed as likeable versus competent, and may use different behavioral tactics to convey these images to other people. Given the same interpersonal goals, people may use different self-presentational tactics.

This chapter reviews measures that assess these three aspects of concerns with public image and social evaluation. Although conceptually distinct, these aspects of social-evaluative concerns are obviously interdependent and often highly correlated. Furthermore, many of the measures that we discuss, even ones that purport to assess only one of these aspects of concerns with public image and social evaluation, actually measure more than one. For practical research purposes, this conflation of constructs is often not an issue because the investigator is interested in measuring a global concern with public image or social evaluation and has no need to distinguish among the underlying, component processes. Yet, we caution researchers that some of these measures do not assess the distinct constructs that their labels might imply, and we urge them to consider the item content carefully.

MEASURES REVIEWED HERE

We have chosen nine measures that reflect concerns with public image and social evaluation for review. These measures fall roughly into three categories that reflect the three processes just described. Specifically, we review measures that reflect (1) attentiveness to social evaluation and motivation to impression-manage; (2) affective reactions to social-evaluative concerns; and (3) self-presentational styles.

Attentiveness to Social Evaluation and Motivation to Impression-Manage

1. Public Self-Consciousness Scale (Scheier & Carver, 1985)
2. Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986)
3. Martin–Larsen Approval Motivation Scale (Martin, 1984)

Affective Reactions to Social-Evaluative Concerns

4. Social Interaction Anxiety Scale (Mattick & Clarke, 1998)
5. Social Phobia Scale (Mattick & Clarke, 1998)
6. Social Physique Anxiety Scale (Hart, Leary, & Rejeski, 1989)
7. Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale (Kelly & Jones, 1997)

Self-Presentational Behaviors

8. Self-Presentation Tactics (Lee, Quigley, Nesler, Corbett, & Tedeschi, 1999)
9. Impression Management Styles (Bolino & Turnley, 1999)

OVERVIEW OF THE MEASURES

The first three measures involve the degree to which people attend to their public images and, thus, are motivated to manage other people's impressions and evaluations of them. Public self-consciousness involves the degree to which people attend to and think about their public image, self-monitoring involves the degree to which people monitor their public image so that it is appropriate to social norms and the roles they play, and approval motivation involves the degree to which people are motivated to obtain approval and avoid disapproval from other people. All three of the scales reviewed in this section are revisions of earlier scales. The revised Public Self-consciousness Scale (Scheier & Carver, 1985) is intended for community samples, although the original measure (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975) is an equally sound scale that is typically used for college-educated respondents. In contrast, the revised versions of the Self-monitoring Scale (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986) and the Martin–Larsen Approval Motivation Scale (Martin, 1984) described here are decidedly better measures than their predecessors.

The second set of measures assesses emotional reactions that arise when people become concerned with how others are perceiving and evaluating them. A number of good measures of social anxiety have been developed (see Leary, 1991, for a review), but we review only the Social Interaction Anxiety Scale (Mattick & Clarke, 1998) because it is one of the most recent additions to the body of such measures. Researchers interested in measuring individual differences in social anxiety should consider the merits of the various scales that exist. Despite its name, the Social Phobia Scale (Mattick & Clarke, 1998) does not measure social phobia per se but rather individual differences in the degree to which people become anxious when they believe that others are observing or scrutinizing them. We prefer the term 'scrutiny fear' for this construct. The Social Physique Anxiety Scale (Hart et al., 1989) assesses individual differences in the degree to which people experience social anxiety when they believe that others are evaluating their body or physique. The fourth scale in this section is the Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale (Kelly & Jones, 1997), the first new measure of embarrassability to appear since Modigliani's (1966) classic scale.

Finally, we review two measures that assess the kinds of impressions that people prefer to make on others and the tactics that they use to do so. The Self-Presentation Tactics Scale (Lee et al., 1999) contains subscales that assess the use of 12 self-presentation tactics, including excuses, justifications, disclaimers, self-handicapping, apologies, intimidation, supplication, entitlement, enhancement, blasting, and exemplification. In contrast, the Impression Management Styles Scale (Bolino & Turnley, 1999) measures the degree to which people use each of the five self-presentational styles identified by Jones and Pittman (1982) – to appear competent (self-promotion), friendly and likeable (ingratiation), morally exemplary (exemplification), threatening (intimidation), and helpless and weak (supplication).

As should be clear, each of the nine measures reviewed here assesses a fundamentally different construct. Each of the constructs involves people's concerns with their social image and others' evaluations of them, but the measures tap into different aspects of these concerns.

Public Self-Consciousness Scale (PuSC)

(Scheier & Carver, 1985).

Variable

Public self-consciousness refers to the degree to which people are aware of themselves as social objects, are attuned to the impressions they make on others, and think about how other people might be perceiving or evaluating them.

Sample

The revised PuSC Scale was developed using a sample of 298 university students (Scheier & Carver, 1985).

Description

The original PuSC was developed empirically during construction of the Self-consciousness Scale, a 23-item measure that includes subscales for public self-consciousness, private self-consciousness, and social anxiety (Fenigstein et al., 1975). The seven items on the PuSC Scale assess the extent to which people focus on themselves as social objects and are aware of or concerned about how they are viewed by others. Public self-consciousness consistently emerges as one of three factors in factor analyses of the Self-consciousness Scale.

Although the original PuSC Scale has good psychometric properties and has been used extensively, certain scale items may be difficult for nonstudent respondents to understand. As a result, Scheier and Carver (1985) reworded problematic items without changing their content. Scores on the revised PuSC Scale correlated 0.84 with the original scale. Furthermore, each of the revised items loaded onto the appropriate factors, with similar magnitudes, as the original items. On the revised PuSC Scale, which uses a 4-point response format, the mean scores for a sample of 213 male and 85 female undergraduate students were 13.5 and 14.2, respectively, with no significant difference between men and women. The mean score was 11.8 for a sample of 396 female adults (aged 45–50 years).

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the revised PuSC Scale was found to be 0.84, which was slightly higher than that for the original scale (Scheier & Carver, 1985). White and Peloza (2009) also reported a similar alpha coefficient

($\alpha = 0.81$), and a study that administered an Arabic translation of the revised PuSC Scale reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.75 with high-school students and 0.81 with university students (Alanazi, 2001). Studies that have used the original PuSC Scale typically demonstrate alpha coefficients exceeding 0.70 (Crawford & Novak, 2013; Ghorbani, Watson, & Weathington, 2009; McKenzie & Hoyle, 2008) if not 0.80 (Crawford & Novak, 2013; LaBrie, Pedersen, Neighbors, & Hummer, 2008; Lalwani, Shrum, & Chiu, 2009; Park, Sher, & Krull, 2006; Workman & Lee, 2011; Xu, 2008), although Sharp, Voci, and Hewstone (2011) reported an alpha coefficient of 0.67.

Test–Retest

For the revised scale, the 4-week test-retest correlation was found to be 0.74 (Scheier & Carver, 1985).

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

The original PuSC Scale correlated with variables that reflect an awareness of oneself as a social object and concerns with others' impressions, including social anxiety ($r = 0.34$), fear of negative evaluation ($r_s = 0.65, 0.63$), social identity ($r_s = 0.46, 0.54$), and shyness ($r = 0.30$) (Schlenker & Weigold, 1990). The scale also correlated with scores on the Self-Monitoring Scale ($r = 0.19$ to 0.30), which reflects the degree to which people manage their impressions to meet the demands of the current social situation (Briggs, Cheek, & Buss, 1980). The original PuSC Scale correlated only moderately with sociability ($r = 0.22$; Carver & Glass, 1976).

Divergent/Discriminant

The original PuSC Scale did not correlate with measures of intelligence ($r = -0.11$), need for achievement ($r = 0.09$), test anxiety ($r = -0.01$), or impulsivity ($r = -0.12$). Additionally, the PuSC Scale did not correlate with openness ($r = 0.02$), extraversion ($r = -0.02$), neuroticism ($r = 0.02$), affinity-seeking ($r = 0.09$), or self-esteem ($r = -0.08$), and correlated only weakly with conscientiousness ($r = 0.16$) and agreeableness ($r = 0.18$) (Lee, Moore, Park, & Park, 2012). Several studies show that the PuSC Scale does not correlate with measures of social desirability (e.g., Hofmann, Gschwendner, & Schmitt, 2005), although it did correlate weakly ($r = -0.23$) with scores on a short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Heintz & Steele-Johnson, 2004).

Construct/Factor Analytic

Public self-consciousness consistently emerges as one of three factors in factor analyses of the Self-consciousness Scale, whether the original or revised scale items are used (Bernstein, Teng, & Garbin, 1986; Burnkrant & Page, 1984; Chang, 1998; Cramer, 2000; Fenigstein et al., 1975; Nystedt & Smari, 1989; Scheier & Carver, 1985). However, questions have been raised about whether the public self-consciousness items themselves might be multidimensional. For example, Mittal and Balasubramanian (1987) suggested that the Public Self-consciousness Scale is composed of two factors – style consciousness (concern about one's personal behavioral style and self-presentation) and appearance consciousness (concern about one's physical appearance and attractiveness).

Although some evidence supports a two-factor structure for the original PuSC Scale (Nystedt & Ljungberg, 2002; Watson, Morris, Ramsey, Hickman, & Waddell, 1996), the two factors relate similarly to other measures (Watson et al., 1996), and separate research supports a unidimensional structure for both the original PuSC Scale (Bernstein et al., 1986; Burnkrant & Page, 1984; Cramer, 2000; Piliavin & Charng, 1988) and the revised scale (Alanazi, 2001; Chang, 1998; Martin & Debus, 1999). Evidently, the bulk of the evidence supports a one-factor structure.

Criterion/Predictive

Two studies demonstrated that people who score high in public self-consciousness think about themselves from the perspectives of other people more than those who are low in public self-consciousness, as the conceptualization of the construct suggests. When asked to draw an 'E' on their forehead, high publicly self-conscious participants were significantly more likely than lows to draw the 'E' from an external perspective – that is, so that it appeared normal to an observer – consistent with the idea that they view themselves as a social object from the perspective of others (Hass, 1984). Furthermore, participants who were high in public self-consciousness demonstrated a stronger 'self-as-target' bias by overestimating the likelihood that they would be chosen to participate in a demonstration in front of their peers, compared to participants low in public self-consciousness (Fenigstein, 1984). Thinking about oneself from the perspectives of other people is associated with a greater sense that one is the target of others' actions.

Location

Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (1985). The self-consciousness scale: A revised version for use with general populations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15*, 687–699.

Results and Comments

The 23-item Self-consciousness Scale has been the primary operationalization of self-consciousness and has been translated into at least 16 languages (Fenigstein, 2009). The revised scale correlates highly with the original, and the factor loadings are similar for the two scales. Most research of the PuSC Scale's validity used the original scale, but researchers should be reasonably confident using the revised scale with general populations given its similarities in structure and operation to the original measure.

PUBLIC SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS SCALE

Instructions: For each of the statements, indicate how much each statement is like you by using the following scale:

- 3 = a lot like me
- 2 = somewhat like me
- 1 = a little like me
- 0 = not like me at all

Please be as honest as you can throughout, and try not to let your responses to one question influence your response to other questions. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. I'm concerned about my style of doing things.
2. I care a lot about how I present myself to others.
3. I'm self-conscious about the way I look.
4. I usually worry about making a good impression.
5. Before I leave my house, I check how I look.
6. I'm concerned about what other people think of me.
7. I'm usually aware of my appearance.

Notes: Revised PuSC Scale. (Reproduced with permission.)

Self-Monitoring (SM) Scale

(Snyder & Gangestad, 1986).

Variable

Self-monitoring refers to the degree to which people monitor and control their self-presentations. The Self-Monitoring (SM) Scale measures the degree to which people consciously manage their behavior and public images in social interactions to meet situational demands and particularly to be viewed as socially appropriate. High self-monitors tend to rely on situational factors to guide their self-presentations, whereas low self-monitors' self-presentations tend to be influenced more strongly by their self-views.

Sample

The original, 25-item SM Scale was constructed using a sample of 192 Stanford University undergraduates (Snyder, 1974). The revised, 18-item version was based on reanalyses of data obtained on numerous samples that had completed the original scale (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986).

Description

The original SM Scale (Snyder, 1974) consisted of 25 items that measured five interrelated aspects of self-monitoring: concern for social appropriateness, the degree to which people attend to social cues indicating appropriate self-presentation, the ability to tailor one's self-presentations to the current context, the use of this ability in interpersonal situations, and the degree to which people's self-presentations and expressive behavior vary across situations (Fuglestad & Snyder, 2009). To address psychometric concerns involving the multidimensionality of the original scale, a revised measure consisting of 18 of the original 25 items was developed (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). Scores on the revised 18-item SM Scale correlated 0.93 with the original scale (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985). The modified measure is generally agreed to be psychometrically superior to the original 25-item SM Scale due to its higher internal consistency and unidimensional factor structure (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000).

As designed, participants respond 'true' or 'false' to each statement, but many researchers have asked respondents to rate the degree to which each statement describes them on 5- or 7-point Likert-type scales.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

A meta-analysis showed that, averaged over numerous studies, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.71 for the 25-item SM Scale and 0.73 for the 18-item version (Day, Shleicher, Unckless, & Hiller, 2002). Furthermore, alpha coefficients were slightly higher when items were scored on continuous scales (0.77) than when dichotomous scoring was used (0.72).

Test–Retest

One month test–retest reliability for both the 25-item and 18-item SM Scales was 0.83 Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). Over a 2-year span, test–retest reliability was somewhat lower (0.55; Anderson, 1991).

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

The 25-item and 18-item SM Scales correlate positively with public self-consciousness ($r = 0.32$ and 0.22 , respectively) and social identity orientation ($r = 0.28$ and 0.20 , respectively; Lamphere & Leary, 1990). In addition, studies have shown that, compared with low self-monitors, high self-monitors are more likely to enter into romantic relationships in order to foster useful social connections (Jones, 1993), define their identities more strongly in terms of the situation (Fiske & von Hendy, 1992), display less consistency between their attitudes and behaviors (Ajzen, Timko, & White, 1982), and are more likely to use positive rather than negative tactics to manage their public impressions (i.e., ingratiation, self-promotion, and exemplification as opposed to supplication and intimidation; Bolino & Turnley, 2003). High self-monitors are more likely to mimic another person's behavior unconsciously when they are trying to affiliate with that individual than are low self-monitors (Cheng & Chartrand, 2003). In work settings, high self-monitors tend to receive better ratings of their work performance as well as more promotions than low self-monitors, and they are also more likely to emerge as leaders within the organization (Day et al., 2002).

Divergent/Discriminant

The 25-item SM scale is unrelated to Machiavellianism, achievement anxiety, inner-other directedness, and knowledge about the types of social performances necessary in a wide range of social situations (Snyder, 1974). Scores correlate weakly with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Psychopathic Deviate scale ($r = -0.20$). The 25-item SM Scale has a weak negative correlation with scores on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale ($r = -0.19$).

Construct/Factor Analytic

Factor analytic studies have shown that the original SM Scale is multidimensional, using a variety of extraction methods (principal axes, maximum likelihood, principal components) and both orthogonal and oblique rotations (Briggs et al., 1980; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). These findings are problematic because self-monitoring was conceptualized as a unitary construct, and having multiple weakly-correlated factors renders the score difficult to interpret (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). In general, the 18-item SM Scale is preferred because it shows greater evidence of being unidimensional than the 25-item version (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000).

Criterion/Predictive

Consistent with the idea that high self-monitors manage their impressions more than lows, research has shown that high self-monitors use more expressive gestures, facial expressions, and vocal tone than low self-monitors (Ickes & Barnes, 1977; Snyder, 1974). Self-monitors also initiate conversations more than lows (Ickes & Barnes, 1977), possibly in an effort to glean information about others that can be used to manage their impressions effectively.

In a study that examined the relationship between self-monitoring and voting behavior, Girvan, Weaver, and Snyder (2010) found that high self-monitors rated social consensus as more important to their decision about which candidate to support than low self-monitors. In addition, high self-monitors took longer to decide who to vote for than low-self monitors, presumably because obtaining social consensus information about candidates takes time. Such findings support the notion that high self-monitors are more concerned than lows about behaving in socially appropriate ways.

Location

Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 125–139.

Results and Comments

The SM Scale has been used to study a wide variety of phenomena in the domains of interpersonal interactions, close relationships, consumer behavior, and organizational behavior, including impression management, self-conceptions, attitude–behavior consistency, internal versus external influences on behavior, and social interactions. Not all research has supported fundamental predictions about self-monitoring. For example, [Leary and Allen \(2011\)](#) did not find that self-monitoring predicted the degree to which people reported conveying different impressions of themselves to different targets. In addition, other studies have failed to find predicted differences between low and high self-monitors in romantic partner preferences ([Rowatt, DeLue, Strickhouser, & Gonzalez, 2001](#); [Shaffer & Bazzini, 1997](#)).

SELF-MONITORING SCALE

The statements on the following pages concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. No two statements are exactly alike, so consider each statement carefully before answering. If a statement is *TRUE* or *MOSTLY TRUE* as applied to you, mark *T* on the answer sheet. If a statement is *FALSE* or *NOT USUALLY TRUE* as applied to you, mark *F* on the answer sheet.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people. (F) 2. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like. (F) 3. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe. (F) 4. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information. (T) 5. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people. (T) 6. I would probably make a good actor. (T) 7. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention. (F) 8. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons. (T) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. I am not particularly good at making other people like me. (F) 10. I'm not always the person I appear to be. (T) 11. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor. (F) 12. I have considered being an entertainer. (T) 13. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting. (F) 14. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations. (F) 15. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going. (F) 16. I feel a bit awkward in public and do not show up quite as well as I should. (F) 17. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end). (T) 18. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them. (T) |
|---|---|

Notes:

Items marked (F) are reverse scored (i.e., changed to T) before counting the number of (T) responses.
Reproduced with permission.

Martin–Larsen Approval Motivation Scale (MLAMS)

([Martin, 1984](#)).

Variable

Approval motivation refers to the desire to please others and to avoid disapproval. People who score high in approval motivation (often called ‘need for approval’) are more concerned with their public images and others’ evaluations as well as more motivated to manage their public impressions in ways that will garner approval ([Schlenker, 1980](#)). (We prefer the label ‘approval motivation’ rather than ‘need for approval’ because of questions regarding whether people actually ‘need’ social approval, as opposed to needing some of the outcomes that approval may facilitate.)

Sample

A sample of 62 undergraduate volunteers (31 men, 31 women) was used to revise a previous version of the scale, and a second sample of 243 undergraduates (100 men, 143 women) was used to compare the current MLAMS described here to the previous version (Martin, 1984).

Description

The MLAMS (Martin, 1984) assesses the degree to which respondents report that they engage in behaviors that reflect a desire to receive positive evaluations and social reinforcements and avoid negative evaluations and social punishments. Items refer to a number of dimensions in which concerns with evaluation and approval may arise, including being well-regarded, being liked, and making good impressions. The long, 20-item version of the MLAMS consists of 15 positively-worded and 5 negatively-worded items, and the short, 10-item short version has an equal number of positively- and negatively-worded items. Comparisons of correlations for the long and short forms with other personality measures (e.g., self-esteem, intolerance of ambiguity, self-consciousness, self-monitoring) indicate that the short form results in the same pattern of associations as the long form, although the magnitude of some correlations differ for the long and short versions.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Across samples, Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from 0.64 to 0.75 for the long scale and 0.65 to 0.67 for the short scale (Martin, 1984; Miller, 1987; Wei, Mallinckrodt, Larson, & Zakalik, 2005).

Test–Retest

Although Martin (1984) did not report test-retest reliability for the entire scale, 1-week stability coefficients for individual items exceeded 0.70.

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

Scores on the MLAMS correlated positively with other measures that relate to people's concerns with their public impressions, including self-monitoring ($r = 0.40$), public self-consciousness ($r = 0.29$), social anxiety ($r = 0.33$) (Martin, 1984), and fear of negative evaluation ($r_s = 0.69$ and 0.74) (Wei et al., 2005; Wu & Wei, 2008). Social anxiety was positively related to MLAMS scores ($r = 0.33$). Self-monitoring correlated 0.40 with the MLAMS, while public self-consciousness correlated 0.29 with MLAMS.

Divergent/Discriminant

Scores on the MLAMS and the Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS), which is often viewed as a measure of need for approval, showed dramatically different patterns of correlations with other measures (Martin, 1984). The MLAMS correlated negatively with measures of self-esteem ($r_s = -0.46$ to -0.50), whereas correlations between the MCSDS and self-esteem were positive ($r_s = 0.34$ to 0.54). Similarly, social anxiety was negatively related to MCSDS scores ($r = -0.27$). Self-monitoring correlated -0.18 with the MCSDS, and public self-consciousness correlated 0.02 with the MCSDS. Scores on both the long and short versions of the revised MLAMS correlated weakly with scores on the MCSDS ($r_s = -0.12$ to -0.27) and with the Lie scales of the MMPI and the Eysenck Personality Inventory ($r_s = -0.15$ to -0.21 ; Martin, 1984).

Construct/Factor Analytic

We are not aware of any studies that examined the factor structure of this scale.

Criterion/Predictive

Scores on a Japanese translation of the MLAMS predicted eating disturbances and excessive concern with dieting among Japanese women, problems that have often been attributed to an excessive desire for social approval (Kiyotaki & Yokoyama, 2006). Furthermore, when combined into a latent variable with fear of negative evaluation, MLAMS scores mediated the relationship between perfectionism on one hand and anxiety and depression on the other (Wu & Wei, 2008), suggesting that perfectionism creates particular problems for people who score high in approval motivation.

Location

Martin, H.J. (1984). A revised measure of approval motivation and its relationship to social desirability. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 508–519.

Results and Comments

Research interest in individual differences in approval motivation has emerged in two distinct traditions. Perhaps the best known involves the social desirability response bias – the tendency for people to answer self-report questions in ways that portray them in a positive light (Holden & Passey, 2009). Concerns regarding the effects of socially desirable responding on the validity of personality measurement led to the development of several measures of social desirability, some of which were developed as ‘lie scales’ for specific personality measures and some of which were designed as free-standing measures (the best known of which is the Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale). A second line of research has focused on the implications of individual differences in approval motivation for cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal phenomena outside the domain of response biases in personality measurement. Some of that work has used various measures of social desirability, but other research has relied on other measures of approval motivation such as the MLAMS.

The fact that correlations between the MLAMS and measures of social desirability bias (including the Marlowe–Crowne scale) are negative and that the MLAMS and MCSDS correlate quite differently with a variety of other measures confirm an essential distinction between these two scales. Martin (1984) asserted that the Marlowe–Crowne measure assesses ego-defensiveness (high scorers possess an idealized view of themselves that must be maintained and defended), whereas the MLAMS directly assesses the desire for social approval – to please others, receive positive evaluations and approval, and avoid negative evaluations and rejection. Given that the MLAMS’s patterns of correlations diverge from the MCSDS’s, researchers should consider conceptually which construct they wish to measure.

MARTIN-LARSEN APPROVAL MOTIVATION SCALE

1 = Disagree Strongly

2 = Disagree

3 = No Opinion

4 = Agree

5 = Agree Strongly

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Depending upon the people involved, I react to the same situation in different ways. 2. I would rather be myself than be well thought of. (R)* 3. Many times I feel like just flipping a coin in order to decide what I should do. 4. I change my opinion (or the way that I do things) in order to please someone else.* 5. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be.* 6. I find it difficult to talk about my ideas if they are contrary to group opinion.* 7. One should avoid doing things in public which appear to be wrong to others, even though one knows that he is right. 8. Sometimes I feel that I don’t have enough control over the direction that my life is taking. 9. It is better to be humble than assertive when dealing with people. 10. I am willing to argue only if I know that my friends will back me up.* | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. If I hear that someone expresses a poor opinion of me, I do my best the next time that I see this person to make a good impression. 12. I seldom feel the need to make excuses or apologize for my behavior. (R)* 13. It is not important to me that I behave ‘properly’ in social situations. (R)* 14. The best way to handle people is to agree with them and tell them what they want to hear. 15. It is hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged to do so. 16. If there is any criticism or anyone says anything about me, I can take it. (R)* 17. It is wise to flatter important people. 18. I am careful at parties and social gatherings for fear that I will do or say things that others won’t like.* 19. I usually do not change my position when people disagree with me. (R)* 20. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are. |
|---|---|

Notes:

(R) Reverse scored item.

*Items in short form.

Reproduced with permission.

Social Interaction Anxiety Scale (SIAS)

(Mattick & Clarke, 1998).

Variable

Social interaction anxiety refers to distress experienced when meeting and talking to people, specifically distress that concerns 'fears of being inarticulate, boring, sounding stupid, not knowing what to say or how to respond within social interactions, and being ignored' (Mattick & Clarke, 1998, p. 457). We have included a measure of social anxiety in this chapter because levels of social anxiety reflect the degree to which people are motivated to make impressions on others but doubt that they will make the impressions that they desire (Leary & Jongman-Sereno, *in press*; Leary & Kowalski, 1995). Other viable and widely-used measures of social anxiety are reviewed in Leary (1991).

Sample

Scale development involved college students who were enrolled in psychology courses ($n = 482$), an unselected sample of community members ($n = 315$), and three clinical samples who were diagnosed with social phobia ($n = 243$), agoraphobia ($n = 13$), and simple phobias ($n = 16$) (Mattick & Clarke, 1998).

Description

A large pool of items was reduced to 38 items that assess social anxiety. Based on item-total correlations and efforts to minimize the semantic overlap across items, 19 items were retained for the final SIAS. Respondents indicate the degree to which each statement is characteristic or true of them on a 5-point Likert-type response scale ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*extremely*). Five samples of participants – two unselected samples ($ns = 482$ and 315) and three clinical samples ($ns = 243$ diagnosed with social phobia, 13 diagnosed with agoraphobia, 16 diagnosed with simple phobias) completed the items.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's alpha coefficient exceeded 0.88 for all of the five initial samples (Mattick & Clarke, 1998). Inter-item reliability exceeds 0.85 (Heimberg, Mueller, Holt, Hope, & Liebowitz, 1992).

Test–Retest

Four-week and 12-week test-retest reliability were both found to be 0.92 (Mattick & Clarke, 1998).

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

In the initial validation sample, scores correlated 0.74 with the Social Avoidance and Distress Scale, 0.66 with the social phobia subscale of the Fear Questionnaire, and 0.66 with the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. Scores on the SIAS also correlated with scores on the Interaction Anxiousness Scale ($r_s = 0.82$ in an undergraduate sample and 0.88 in a community sample) and the Audience Anxiousness Scale ($r_s = 0.62$ in an undergraduate sample and 0.68 in a community sample).

In addition, scores correlated positively with responses on the Social Interaction Self-statement Test, which assesses the frequency of positive and negative self-statements that pertain to interactions with people of the other sex ($r = 0.69$ with negative self-statements). They also correlated with self-reported state anxiety during a social interaction (Gore, Carter, & Parker, 2002). SIAS scores were significantly higher for people diagnosed with social phobia than with the unselected samples and people diagnosed with agoraphobia.

Divergent/Discriminant

The SIAS possesses discriminant validity with respect to the ability to distinguish the tendency to experience social anxiety from other sources of anxiety (Brown et al., 1997). In addition, scores correlated with responses on the Social Interaction Self-statement Test ($r = -0.56$ with positive self-statements).

Construct/Factor Analytic

A factor analysis conducted on responses from 243 social phobic patients revealed a single factor on which all items loaded greater than 0.30 (Mattick & Clarke, 1998).

Criterion/Predictive

Scores on the SIAS predicted state anxiety during actual face-to-face interactions (Langer & Rodebaugh, 2013) and while watching videos that delivered positive and negative social feedback (Weeks, Howell, & Goldin, 2013). In a two-week daily diary study, SIAS scores predicted more daily negative emotions and less daily positive emotions (Farmer & Kashdan, 2012). Scores on the SIAS also predicted relationship satisfaction via concerns with intimacy and open sexual communication (Montesi et al., 2013).

In a study of college students' Facebook pages, Fernandez, Levinson, and Rodebaugh (2012) found that people with higher scores on the SIAS had fewer Facebook friends but posted more information about themselves and their interests, presumably to convey self-relevant information in a carefully managed form. Furthermore, raters' judgments of students' levels of social anxiety after viewing their Facebook pages correlated with students' SIAS scores.

Location

Mattick, R.P., & Clarke, J.C. (1998). Development and validation of measures of social scrutiny fear and social interaction anxiety. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 36, 455–470.

Results and Comments

Several self-report measures of social anxiety have been developed, but only a few – including the Social Interaction Anxiety Scale (Mattick & Clarke, 1998) and the Interaction Anxiousness Scale (Leary, 1983) – assess feelings of anxiety in social encounters independently of patterns of inhibited, awkward, or avoidant behavior. In most instances, using a 'pure' measure of subjective social anxiety is preferred because scales that assess both anxiety and behavior make it impossible to study the relationship between subjective anxiety and its behavioral and motivational correlates and concomitants (Leary, 1991). The SIAS is a reliable and valid measure of the tendency to experience anxiety as a result of interpersonal concerns.

SOCIAL INTERACTION ANXIETY SCALE

Indicate the degree to which you feel the statement is characteristic or true of you.

- 0 = Not at all characteristic or true of me.
- 1 = Slightly characteristic or true of me.
- 2 = Moderately characteristic or true of me.
- 3 = Very characteristic or true of me.
- 4 = Extremely characteristic or true of me.

1. I get nervous if I have to speak with someone in authority (teacher, boss, etc.).
2. I have difficulty making eye-contact with others.
3. I become tense if I have to talk about myself or my feelings.
4. I find difficulty mixing comfortably with the people I work with.
5. I tense up if I meet an acquaintance in the street.
6. When mixing socially, I am uncomfortable.
7. I feel tense if I am alone with just one other person.
8. I am at ease meeting people at parties, etc.*
9. I have difficulty talking with other people.

10. I find it easy to think of things to talk about.*
11. I worry about expressing myself in case I appear awkward.
12. I find it difficult to disagree with another's point of view.
13. I have difficulty talking to attractive persons of the opposite sex.
14. I find myself worrying that I won't know what to say in social situations.
15. I am nervous mixing with people I don't know well.
16. I feel I'll say something embarrassing when talking.
17. When mixing in a group, I find myself worrying I will be ignored.
18. I am tense mixing in a group.
19. I am unsure whether to greet someone I know only slightly.

Notes:

*Reverse scored item.

Reproduced with permission.

Social Phobia (Scrutiny Fear) Scale (SPS)

(Mattick & Clarke, 1998).

Variable

This scale measures 'anxiety and fear at the prospect of being observed or watched by other people, and in particular, where the individual expresses distress when undertaking certain activities in the presence of others' (Mattick & Clarke, 1998, p. 457). For example, people may fear scrutiny while eating, writing, signing their name, using public toilets, or simply being observed. We warn readers that use of the label, 'social phobia,' for this measure is unfortunate because the items do not measure social phobia in the way that term is typically defined. Rather, the scale assesses a narrow range of social-evaluative concerns that deal specifically with being watched by others. Most researchers would probably view this scale as a measure of concerns regarding social scrutiny.

Sample

Scale development involved an unselected sample of college students enrolled in psychology courses ($n = 482$), an unselected sample of community members ($n = 315$), and three clinical samples who were diagnosed with social phobia ($n = 243$), agoraphobia ($n = 13$), and simple phobias ($n = 16$) (Mattick & Clarke, 1998).

Description

The SPS was developed at the same time as the SIAS just described. The initial item pool included items modified from existing measures of social anxiety and socially-related fears, as well as newly-written items. Item analyses resulted in 20 items for which respondents indicate the degree to which the statement is characteristic or true of them on a 5-point scale (0 = *not at all*; 4 = *extremely*). Thirty-seven items were administered to the five samples. Based on item-total correlations and efforts to minimize semantic overlap across items, 20 items were retained for the final Social Phobia Scale.

Reliability**Internal Consistency**

Results from the five initial samples showed that Cronbach's alpha coefficient exceeded 0.88 for all samples. All 20 corrected item-total correlations exceeded 0.30 for the unselected samples and all but one item did so for the social phobic sample ('I become anxious if I have to write in front of other people').

Test-Retest

Test-retest reliability was 0.91 over an interval of four weeks and 0.93 over a 12-week interval, although these data were based on small samples ($n_s = 36$ and 9, respectively) (Mattick & Clarke, 1998).

Validity**Convergent/Concurrent**

Scores on the SPS correlated highly with scores on other measures of social anxiety, including the Social Interaction Anxiety Scale ($r = 0.72$), the Social Avoidance and Distress Scale ($r = 0.54$), and the social phobia subscale of the Fear Questionnaire ($r = 0.69$). The SPS also correlated positively with both the state and trait versions of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory ($r_s = 0.42$ and 0.57 for state and trait anxiety, respectively). Respondents who were clinically diagnosed with social phobia scored significantly higher on the SPS ($M = 40.0$) than unselected samples of college students ($M = 14.1$) and community members ($M = 14.4$).

Divergent/Discriminant

The SPS successfully distinguishes people who fear social scrutiny from those with other anxiety disorders (Mattick & Clarke, 1998). Respondents who were clinically diagnosed with social phobia scored significantly higher on the SPS ($M = 40.0$) than individuals who were diagnosed with agoraphobia ($M = 27.6$) or simple phobia ($M = 10.3$).

Construct/Factor Analytic

A factor analysis was conducted on responses from 243 social phobics, revealing three factors that were subjected to an oblique (oblimin) rotation. The first factor reflected a general concern with being observed or attracting attention in public places, such as being stared at, entering a crowded room, sitting across from others on public transportation, doing something to attract attention, and simply being watched. The second factor involved specific behaviors such as writing in public, drinking in public, and being seen as trembling. The third factor dealt with fears of being viewed as sick, odd, or having lost control (Mattick & Clarke, 1998).

Criterion/Predictive

Scores on the SPS predicted both anxious cognitions and self-reported anxiety when participants were instructed to ask another person out on a date within the first two minutes of meeting (Gore et al., 2002). Patients with severe rosacea scored significantly higher on the SPS than those with less severe rosacea and people without rosacea. Understandably, many people who have the unsightly skin disorder are highly concerned about scrutiny from other people. In a daily diary study of reactions to distressing social events, SPS scores were related to the amount of time that people spent thinking about events than involved negative social evaluations both on the same day as the event and on the day afterwards (Lundh & Sperling, 2002).

Location

Mattick, R.P., & Clarke, J.C. (1998). Development and validation of measures of social phobia scrutiny fear and social interaction anxiety. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 36, 455–470.

Results and Comments

As noted, the SPS is not actually a measure of social phobia and should not be used as such. However, as a measure of concerns with being observed while engaging in mundane behaviors, the SPS is the measure of choice. Most work on concerns with social scrutiny has involved clinical samples (typically individuals diagnosed with social phobia), so research is needed on the effects of such concerns (such as self-conscious distraction and choking under pressure) in nonclinical samples.

SOCIAL PHOBIA SCALE

Indicate the degree to which you feel the statement is characteristic or true of you.

0 = Not at all characteristic or true of me.

1 = Slightly characteristic or true of me.

2 = Moderately characteristic or true of me.

3 = Very characteristic or true of me.

4 = Extremely characteristic or true of me.

1. I become anxious if I have to write in front of other people.
2. I become self-conscious when using public toilets.
3. I can suddenly become aware of my own voice and of others listening to me.
4. I get nervous that people are staring at me as I walk down the street.
5. I fear I may blush when I am with others.
6. I feel self-conscious if I have to enter a room where others are already seated.
7. I worry about shaking or trembling when I'm watched by other people.
8. I would get tense if I had to sit facing other people on a bus or a train.

9. I get panicky that others might see me to be faint, sick or ill.
10. I would find it difficult to drink something if in a group of people.
11. It would make me feel self-conscious to eat in front of a stranger at a restaurant.
12. I am worried people will think my behavior odd.
13. I would get tense if I had to carry a tray across a crowded cafeteria.
14. I worry I'll lose control of myself in front of other people.
15. I worry I might do something to attract the attention of others.
16. When in an elevator I am tense if people look at me.
17. I can feel conspicuous standing in a queue.
18. I get tense when I speak in front of other people.
19. I worry my head will shake or nod in front of others.
20. I feel awkward and tense if I know people are watching me.

Note: Reproduced with permission.

Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS)

(Hart et al., 1989).

Variable

Social physique anxiety is the tendency to experience anxiety about others' perceptions or evaluations of one's physique. Although many people are disconcerted when they believe that others are evaluating their body's size

and shape, some individuals – those high in social physique anxiety – become quite distressed when they think their physique is being judged.

Sample

A sample of 195 undergraduate students (97 women, 98 men) from health and fitness classes was used to develop the scale. The items were then administered to 89 participants (46 women, 43 men) to examine the scale's reliability and factor structure. To examine construct validity, the SPAS was administered to a sample of 187 participants (93 women, 94 men) (Hart et al., 1989).

Description

The Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS) is a 12-item self-report scale that measures people's concerns about others' perceptions of their bodies. Respondents indicate how characteristic each item is of them on a 5-point scale (1 = *not at all characteristic of me*; 5 = *extremely characteristic of me*).

This scale was validated using two university samples (Hart et al., 1989). For Sample 1, the mean score for men was 30.2, and the mean score for women was 37.9. For Sample 2, the mean score for men was 30.1 and the mean score for women was 37.0.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found to be 0.90, and all items on the SPAS correlate at least 0.50 with the sum of all other items (Hart et al., 1989).

Test-Retest

Test-retest reliability was found to be 0.82 over an interval of 8 weeks (Hart et al., 1989).

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

The SPAS correlates moderately with interaction anxiousness ($r = 0.33$) and fear of negative evaluation ($r = 0.35$). These relationships reflect the fact that all three constructs involve concerns about others' impressions, but the correlations are low enough to suggest that social physique anxiety is a distinct construct. The SPAS also correlates positively with public self-consciousness ($r = 0.30$).

Divergent/Discriminant

The SPAS does not correlate significantly with private self-consciousness ($r = 0.05$) but correlates negatively with body esteem ($r = -0.36$ to -0.43). In addition, the SPAS accounted for 17% of the variance in negative thoughts about one's body over and above the variance accounted for by typical measures of physique such as weight, body fat, and body self-rating.

Evidence suggests that the SPAS accounts for only a small proportion of unique variance in predicting exercise behavior. For example, Lantz, Hardy, and Ainsworth (1997) found that the SPAS and Beck's Depression Inventory account for a great deal of the same variance in predicting engaging in physical exercise. In fact, social physique anxiety accounted for only about 2% additional variance in engaging in physical exercise over and above depression (Lantz et al., 1997). In addition, the SPAS did not account for any unique variance in exercise behavior over and above self-perceptions of physical conditioning (Kowalski, Crocker, & Kowalski, 2001).

Construct/Factor Analytic

Hart et al. (1989) reported that for two samples ($n = 89$ and $n = 56$) a principal components analysis showed that all 12 items loaded greater than 0.55 on a single unrotated component. However, other studies have obtained multiple factors (Eklund, Mack, & Hart, 1996; Motl & Conroy, 2000; Petrie, Diehl, Rogers, & Johnson, 1996), although these factors may simply represent positively- versus negatively-worded items (Motl & Conroy, 2000). They found that a unidimensional solution better fit both 9-item and 7-item versions of the scale.

Criterion/Predictive

Scores on the SPAS are related to actual and perceived fitness. Compared with women who scored in the lower third of the distribution of scores on the SPAS, women who scored in the top third weighed significantly

more ($M_s = 63.8$ kg and 57.0 kg for high and low scorers, respectively) and had a significantly higher percentage of body fat ($M_s = 31.6\%$ vs. 28.1% , respectively). These differences were verified by observers who rated women scoring high on the SPAS as significantly larger than women who scored low (Hart et al., 1989).

In a study that examined commitment to exercise among female college students, Finkenberg, DiNucci, McCune, Chenette, and McCoy (1998) found that women who were least committed to engaging in physical exercise scored highest on the SPAS and that female college athletes had the lowest SPAS scores. Interestingly, Frederick and Morrison (1996) found that exercise frequency predicted higher SPAS scores. Thus, although high physique anxiety may deter people from starting to exercise, once a person is committed to an exercise program, those with greater concerns about their physique may exercise more, presumably to improve their physical appearance.

Not only has research shown that SPAS scores predict commitment to exercise and exercise frequency, but scores are also influenced by engaging in physical exercise. McAuley et al. (2002) found that SPAS scores in sedentary older adults ($M = 65$ years) decreased after they completed a structured exercise program for 6 months and that level of physical fitness predicted lower social physique anxiety at the end of the exercise intervention.

Location

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

Results and Comments

The SPAS assesses the degree to which people are concerned about others' judgments of their body's size and shape. It has been used to study eating disorders, the motivation to engage in physical exercise, and the effectiveness of weight loss interventions. The majority of research that has used the SPAS examined the relationships among self-presentational concerns, social physique anxiety, and exercise behavior.

The SPAS has been administered mostly to female participants, and results concerning gender differences on the SPAS are mixed. Most studies show that women score significantly higher on the SPAS than men (Hagger & Stevenson, 2010; Motl & Conroy, 2000), but one did not find a difference when using a translated version of the SPAS with a Swedish sample (Lindwall, 2004).

Studies have also shown gender differences in the relationship between SPAS and engaging in physical exercise. Studies have found a stronger negative relationship between social physique anxiety and engaging in physical exercise for men than for women (Belling, 1992; Lantz et al., 1997). Moreover, Frederick and Morrison (1996) found that women who scored highly on the SPAS actually engaged in more exercise.

The SPAS has been used with a range of ages, and the patterns of internal consistency, convergent validity, and predictive validity are similar when used with adolescents, children, and adults (Hagger & Stevenson, 2010). However, other studies have shown that the negative relationship between social physique anxiety and adhering to an exercise intervention decreases with age (Treasure, Lox, & Lawton, 1998). Modified versions of the SPAS (both shortened versions and translations) generalize across cultures (Hagger et al., 2007; Maiano et al., 2010).

SOCIAL PHYSIQUE ANXIETY SCALE

The following questionnaire contains statements concerning your body physique or figure. By physique or figure we mean your body's form and structure; specifically, body fat, muscular tone, and general body proportions. Read each item carefully and indicate how characteristic it is of you according to the following scale.

- 1 = Not at all characteristic of me
- 2 = Slightly characteristic of me
- 3 = Moderately characteristic of me
- 4 = Very characteristic of me
- 5 = Extremely characteristic of me

1. I am comfortable with the appearance of my physique or figure. (R)

- 2. I would never worry about wearing clothes that might make me look too thin or overweight. (R)
- 3. I wish I wasn't so up-tight about my physique or figure.
- 4. There are times when I am bothered by thoughts that other people are evaluating my weight or muscular development negatively.
- 5. When I look in the mirror I feel good about my physique or figure. (R)
- 6. Unattractive features of my physique or figure make me nervous in certain social settings.
- 7. In the presence of others, I feel apprehensive about my physique or figure.
- 8. I am comfortable with how fit my body appears to others. (R)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 9. It would make me uncomfortable to know others were evaluating my physique or figure. | 12. When in a bathing suit, I often feel nervous about how well-proportioned my body is. |
| 10. When it comes to displaying my physique or figure to others, I am a shy person. | <i>Notes:</i> |
| 11. I usually feel relaxed when it's obvious that others are looking at my physique or figure. (R) | (R) Reverse scored item.
Reproduced with permission. |

Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale (SES)

(Kelly & Jones, 1997).

Variable

Embarrassability refers to the general susceptibility to become embarrassed, which is a state of mortification, abashment, and chagrin that occurs when a person's desired public identity in a particular situation is damaged (Miller, 2009).

Sample

The scale was developed on a sample of 206 American undergraduate college students (72 men, 134 women) (Kelly & Jones, 1997).

Description

Although Modigliani's (1966) Embarrassability Scale, which assesses people's levels of embarrassment across a variety of embarrassing incidents, remains a popular measure of embarrassability (see Leary, 1991), the Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale (SES) was designed to assess the psychological characteristics of people who are easily embarrassed, such as the tendency to feel emotionally exposed and being concerned about publicly making mistakes. The scale consists of 25 items to which participants respond on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all like me*; 7 = *very much like me*).

In the original sample of 206 American undergraduate college students, scores ranged from 30 to 149, with a mean of 92.4 and no significant difference between men ($M = 94.1$) and women ($M = 93.1$). A subsequent sample with 203 adults (84 men, 119 women) in the U.K. found statistically significantly lower scores for men ($M = 69.5$) and women ($M = 73.5$) compared with the mean scores in Kelly and Jones' (1997) sample, but no sex differences were obtained by Maltby and Day (2000).

Reliability

Internal Consistency

In Kelly and Jones' (1997) original sample, corrected item-total correlations ranged from 0.35 to 0.70 with a mean of 0.56, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.92. Maltby and Day (2000) reported that item-total correlations ranged from 0.50 to 0.88, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found to be 0.96.

Test–Retest

Over an 8-week interval, the test–retest correlation was found to be 0.64, with item stability correlations ranging from 0.30 to 0.67 (Kelly & Jones, 1997). Maltby and Day (2000) found a test–retest correlation of 0.67 over an 8-week interval.

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

Scores on the SES correlate strongly with the criterion item 'I am easily embarrassed' ($r_s = 0.66, 0.70$) and with scores on Modigliani's Embarrassability Scale ($r_s = 0.60, 0.61$) (Kelly & Jones, 1997; Maltby & Day, 2000). Furthermore, scores correlated appropriately with public self-consciousness ($r = 0.47$), fear of negative evaluation ($r_s = 0.75, 0.72$), imaginary audience ($r = 0.69$), and various measures of social anxiety, such as audience anxiety ($r = 0.71$), interaction anxiety ($r = 0.81$), and social anxiety ($r_s = 0.75–0.81$) (Kelly & Jones, 1997; Maltby & Day,

2000). SES scores also correlated with extraversion ($r = -0.47$), neuroticism ($r = 0.55$), and openness to experience ($r = -0.25$). A comparison of how the SES and the Embarrassability Scale correlated with an array of variables showed that the SES consistently correlated more strongly with other measures of social-evaluative concerns than did the Embarrassability Scale.

Divergent/Discriminant

Scores on the SES did not correlate with agreeableness ($r = -0.10$), conscientiousness ($r = -0.15$), emotional empathy ($r = 0.07$), or private self-consciousness ($r = 0.12$). Furthermore, SES scores correlated more strongly with measures that are closely related specifically to social-evaluative concerns than with more general measures of emotionality and personality (Kelly & Jones, 1997). The correlation between the SES and the Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale was -0.17 (Kelly & Jones, 1997).

Construct/Factor Analytic

A principal components analysis of the correlations among the responses of 203 English adults revealed the SES to be unidimensional, with loadings on the single component ranging from 0.53 to 0.83 (Maltby & Day, 2000).

Criterion/Predictive

No evidence on criterion or predictive validity is currently available.

Location

Kelly, K.M., & Jones, W.H. (1997). Assessment of dispositional embarrassability. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 10, 307–333.

Results and Comments

The Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale takes a different approach to measuring the tendency to become embarrassed than Modigliani's (1966) widely-used Embarrassability Scale. Whereas Modigliani's scale assesses the degree to which people feel embarrassed across a variety of situations, the Susceptibility to Embarrassment Scale assesses the dispositions that are presumed to underlie embarrassability. Available evidence suggests that the SES is a reliable and valid measure of this construct.

SUSCEPTIBILITY TO EMBARRASSMENT SCALE

We are interested in people's personality attributes. Listed below are a variety of statements. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which you feel it applies to you using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much
like me						like me

- I feel unsure of myself.
- I don't feel comfortable in public unless my clothing, hair, etc. are just right.
- I feel uncomfortable in a group of people.
- I don't mind being the center of attention. (R)
- I probably care too much about how I come across to others.
- I feel inadequate when I am talking to someone I just met.
- I feel clumsy in social situations.
- I feel uncomfortable leaving the house when I don't look my best.
- Sometimes I just feel exposed.
- I feel humiliated if I make a mistake in front of a group.
- I get flustered when speaking in front of a group.
- I often feel emotionally exposed in public and with groups of people.
- It is unsettling to be the center of attention.
- I get tense just thinking about making a presentation by myself.
- I have felt mortified or humiliated over minor embarrassment.
- I am very much afraid of making mistakes in public.
- I don't like being in crowds.
- I do not blush easily. (R)
- I often worry about looking stupid.
- I feel so vulnerable.
- I am concerned about what others think of me.
- I'm afraid that things I say will sound stupid.
- I worry about making a fool out of myself.
- What other people think of me is very important.
- I am not easily embarrassed. (R)

Notes:

(R) Reverse scored item.

Reproduced with permission.

Self-Presentation Tactics Scale (SPTS)

(Lee et al., 1999).

Variable

Self-presentation tactics are the specific behaviors in which people engage to make particular impressions of themselves on other people.

Sample

Initial item selection was based on responses of 206 college students (96 men, 107 women, 3 unknown) and then validated on a sample of 395 students (179 men, 212 women, 4 unknown) (Lee et al., 1999).

Description

The SPTS contains 63 items that were developed to assess the use of 12 self-presentation tactics that have been identified in previous theory and research: excuses (verbal statements that deny responsibility for negative events), justifications (statements that offer reasons that an undesirable behavior was justified), disclaimers (pre-emptive explanations that are offered before image-damaging events occur), self-handicapping (creating obstacles to one's success to obfuscate attributions for possible failure), apologies (expressions of remorse and guilt for harmful behaviors), ingratiation (actions that promote others' liking of the individual), intimidation (actions that convey an impression of being powerful and dangerous), supplication (actions that convey an impression of being weak and in need of others' support), entitlement (actions that claim responsibility for positive outcomes), enhancement (actions that foster the perceived positivity of the outcomes of one's behavior), blasting (actions that derogate people or groups with which one is associated), and exemplification (actions that convey an impression of being moral and having integrity). All subscales contain five items except ingratiation, which contains eight. Respondents rate how frequently they engage in each behavior on a scale ranging from 1 (*very infrequently*) to 9 (*very frequently*).

In addition to providing scores for 12 self-presentation tactics, the subscale scores may be combined to provide global measures of defensive and assertive self-presentation tactics. Defensive self-presentation tactics are used to defend or restore public images that have been damaged, and include excuses, justification, disclaimers, self-handicapping, and apologies. Assertive self-presentation tactics are used to foster public images proactively and include ingratiation, intimidation, supplication, entitlement, enhancement, blasting, and exemplification.

An initial set of 90 items was administered to 206 respondents. After refining the item set on the basis of item-total correlations and inter-item reliability, 73 items were administered to a second sample of 395 individuals.

Reliability

Internal Consistency

Lee et al. (1999) reported that Cronbach's alpha coefficient exceeded 0.70 for all tactics subscales except self-handicapping ($\alpha = 0.58$), supplication ($\alpha = 0.60$), and blasting ($\alpha = 0.68$). Even so, these alpha coefficients are probably adequate for 5-item scales.

Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.86 for the defensive self-presentation tactic subscale and 0.91 for the assertive self-presentation tactic subscale. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the whole Self-presentation Tactics Scale was found to be 0.93.

Test–Retest

The 3-week test-retest correlations ($n = 77$ college students) for the total scale, defensive tactic subscale, and assertive tactic subscale were 0.89, 0.88, and 0.89, respectively. The test-retest correlations for all 12 subscales were also acceptable ($0.70 < r < 0.85$) (Lee et al., 1999).

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

All subscales except apology correlated significantly with self-monitoring ($0.14 < r < 0.35$). The defensive tactics subscale ($r = 0.29$), the assertive tactics subscale ($r = 0.35$), and the total scale score ($r = 0.35$) also correlated significantly with self-monitoring. The Self-handicapping Scale correlated significantly more highly with the defensive tactics subscale ($r = 0.44$) than with the assertive tactics subscale ($r = 0.19$).

Given that social anxiety arises from people's concerns with how they are perceived and evaluated by others, Lee et al. (1999) examined correlations between social anxiety and the self-presentational tactics. Social anxiety correlated weakly with the subscales that assess the use of excuses ($r = 0.22$), justifications ($r = 0.14$), disclaimers ($r = 0.26$), self-handicapping ($r = 0.31$), and supplication ($r = 0.31$), as well as with the defensive tactics subscale ($r = 0.26$) and the total scale score ($r = 0.19$), but not the assertive tactics subscale ($r = 0.08$).

Divergent/Discriminant

Two questions arise regarding the divergent validity of the SPTS. The first is whether the various subscales tap into distinct self-presentational tactics. The answer appears to be no; although Lee et al. (1999) did not present correlations between each pair of subscales, factor analyses suggest that the structure is two-dimensional, with the various subscales falling on two factors that reflect assertive versus defensive tactics. The second question is whether the overall scale, and the individual subscales, assess something distinct from measures of related constructs. Evidence regarding divergent validity is scarce, although data show that, with one exception, the subscales do not generally correlate with locus of control (Lee et al., 1999). With the exception of the apology subscale (which correlated positively with social desirability, $r = 0.24$), scores on the 12 tactics subscales correlated negatively with scores on the Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale ($-0.21 < r < -0.38$). Negative correlations were also obtained between social desirability scores and the defensive tactics subscale ($r = -0.27$), the assertive tactics subscale ($r = -0.30$), and the total scale score ($r = -0.31$).

Construct/Factor Analytic

Lee et al. (1999) conducted confirmatory factor analyses showing that a two-factor model that distinguished between the defensive and assertive factors was superior to a one-factor model. This finding suggests that the total scale score should rarely, if ever, be used. However, the fit for the two factor solution was still not high (CFI = 0.88), and Lee et al. did not test alternative models.

Criterion/Predictive

No evidence on criterion or predictive validity is currently available.

Location

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.

Results and Comments

The Self-Presentation Tactics Scale shows promise as a measure of impression-management tactics, but it has not yet been widely used. Inspection of item content suggests that some subscales may assess self-presentational tactics whereas other subscales assess general approaches to influencing other people. For example, some items explicitly reference self-presentational or social-evaluative goals (e.g., to avoid being blamed, I let others know that I did not intend any harm; I lead others to believe that I cannot do something in order to get help), whereas others refer to interpersonal behaviors that might or might not bear any relationships to people's self-presentational goals or tactics (e.g., I threaten others when I think it will help me get what I want from them; I act in ways I think others should act). Of course, people's general approach to influencing others is probably related to the ways in which they tend to manage their impressions, but work is needed to show that all of the subscales assess self-presentational tactics as opposed to general social influence strategies.

SELF-PRESENTATION TACTICS SCALE

You will be asked a number of questions dealing with your perceptions of yourself. Please read the instructions carefully and try to respond to all the items as openly and honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. In responding to the items, please indicate the number on the scale that most closely represents your behavior.

Very infrequently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very frequently
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------------

Excuse

39. When I am blamed for something, I make excuses.
48. I make up excuses for poor performance.

- 36. When things go wrong, I explain why I am not responsible.
- 62. To avoid being blamed, I let others know that I did not intend any harm.
- 35. I try to convince others that I am not responsible for negative events.

Justification

- 44. I offer socially acceptable reasons to justify behavior that others might not like.
- 64. After a negative action, I try to make others understand that if they had been in my position they would have done the same thing.
- 61. I offer good reasons for my behavior no matter how bad it may seem to others.
- 45. When others view my behavior as negative, I offer explanations so that they will understand that my behavior was justified.
- 05. I justify my behavior to reduce negative reactions from others.

Disclaimer

- 04. I offer explanations before doing something that others might think is wrong
- 17. I try to get the approval of others before doing something they might perceive negatively.
- 10. When I believe I will not perform well, I offer excuses beforehand.
- 25. I justify beforehand actions others may not like.
- 49. I offer an excuse for possibly not performing well before taking a very difficult test.

Self-handicapping

- 58. Anxiety interferes with my performances.
- 53. I do not prepare well enough for exams because I get too involved in social activities.
- 57. I put obstacles in the way of my own success.
- 12. I get sick when under a lot of pressure to do well.
- 42. Poor health has been responsible for my getting mediocre grades in school.

Apology

- 13. I apologise when I have done something wrong.
- 29. I accept blame for bad behavior when it is clearly my fault.
- 50. I express remorse and guilt when I do something wrong.
- 18. I try to make up for any harm I have done to others.
- 03. If I harm someone, I apologise and promise not to do it again.

Ingratiation

- 52. When I want something, I try to look good.
- 38. I tell others about my positive qualities.
- 11. I use flattery to win the favor of others.
- 63. I compliment people to get them on my side.
- 09. I express the same attitudes as others so they will accept me.
- 33. I express opinions that other people will like.
- 28. I do favors for people in order to get them to like me.
- 43. I help others so they will help me.

Intimidation

- 51. I intimidate others.
- 01. I behave in ways that make other people afraid of me.
- 59. I do things to make people afraid of me so that they will do what I want.
- 02. I use my size and strength to influence people when I need to.
- 32. I threaten others when I think it will help me get what I want from them.

Supplication

- 08. I ask others to help me.
- 54. I tell others they are stronger or more competent than me in order to get others to do things for me.
- 14. I lead others to believe that I cannot do something in order to get help.
- 31. I hesitate and hope others will take responsibility for group tasks.
- 07. I use my weaknesses to get sympathy from others.

Entitlement

- 55. I claim credit for doing things I did not do.
- 40. I point out the positive things I do which other people fail to notice.
- 23. I tell people about my positive accomplishments.
- 46. When working on a project with a group I make my contribution seem greater than it is.
- 22. When telling someone about past events, I claim more credit for doing positive things than was warranted by the actual events.

Enhancement

- 60. When I succeed at a task, I emphasize to others how important the task was.
- 30. I exaggerate the value of my accomplishments.
- 06. I tell people when I do well at tasks others find difficult.

19. In telling others about things that I own, I also tell them of their value.
41. I do correct people who underestimate the value of gifts that I give to them.

Blasting

56. I make negative statements about people belonging to rival groups.
27. I have put others down in order to make myself look better.
34. I say negative things about unpopular groups.
20. I point out the incorrect positions of the opposing political party.
47. I exaggerate the negative qualities of people who compete with me.

Exemplification

24. I try to set an example for others to follow.
15. I try to serve as a model for how a person should behave.
26. I try to get others to act in the same positive way I do.
37. I act in ways I think others should act.
21. I try to induce imitation by others by serving as a positive example.

Notes:

Item numbers refer to the order in which items are listed when the full SPT Scale is used.

Reproduced with permission.

Impression Management Styles (IMS) Scale

(Bolino & Turnley, 1999).

Variable

The IMS Scale was constructed to measure impression management behavior based on the five self-presentational styles identified by Jones and Pittman (1982): self-promotion (trying to be viewed as competent), ingratiation (trying to be viewed as friendly and nice), exemplification (trying to be viewed as morally exemplary), intimidation (trying to be viewed as threatening), and supplication (trying to be viewed as helpless and weak).

Sample

The IMS Scale was constructed and validated using various samples of undergraduate management students, employees working for the Department of the Navy, and employees and managers of a Fortune 500 technology company in the southern United States (Bolino & Turnley, 1999).

Description

The IMS Scale contains 22 statements, 4 to 6 of which measure each of Jones and Pittman's (1982) five self-presentational strategies. The response format is a 5-point Likert-type scale that reflects the frequency with which respondents behave in the stated fashion (1 = *never behave this way*, 2 = *very rarely behave this way*, 3 = *occasionally behave this way*, 4 = *sometimes behave this way*, 5 = *often behave this way*).

An initial pool of 44 items was administered to 33 students in an undergraduate management class who were currently employed or had previous work experience. Eighteen items were discarded, and exploratory factor analyses were conducted on a sample of 306 civilian employees working for the Department of the Navy. The scale was revised and administered to a sample of 120 managers (26 females, $M = 40$ years) who worked for the Department of the Army. The final 22-item measure was administered to 147 employees of a Fortune 500 technology firm (62 women). The mean scores on each subscale were as follows: self-promotion ($M = 2.95$), ingratiation ($M = 2.95$), exemplification ($M = 2.29$), intimidation ($M = 1.91$), and supplication ($M = 1.62$). A sample of 94 students (41 women) enrolled in management classes and currently employed also completed the scale. Subscale mean scores were as follows: self-promotion ($M = 3.40$), ingratiation ($M = 3.46$), exemplification ($M = 2.82$), intimidation ($M = 2.22$) and supplication ($M = 1.68$).

Reliability

Internal Consistency

All self-presentational subscales appear to be homogeneous in light of the obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficients: self-promotion ($\alpha = 0.88$ to 0.92); ingratiation ($\alpha = 0.85$ to 0.91); exemplification ($\alpha = 0.76$ to 0.81);

intimidation ($\alpha = 0.84$ to 0.89); and supplication ($\alpha = 0.93$). Inter-factor correlations among the five self-presentational strategies range from 0.13 to 0.60 with the majority falling between 0.27 to 0.37 suggesting that people have a general tendency to use (or not use) all five strategies.

Test-Retest

Test-retest reliability has not been explored to-date.

Validity

Convergent/Concurrent

Self-monitoring correlates positively with the self-promotion ($r = 0.32$), ingratiation ($r = 0.28$), and exemplification ($r = 0.20$) subscales. Measures of careerism (i.e., pursuing advancement in one's career in ways other than job performance) correlated positively with the self-promotion ($r = 0.30$), intimidation ($r = 0.80$), and supplication ($r = 0.24$) subscales. In addition, convergent validity of the IMS Scale was further demonstrated by correlating it with subscales of the Impression Management by Association Scale (IMAS) which measures the frequency with which people try to associate with other people and things in order to make desired impressions (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). Specifically, as expected, the self-promotion subscale of the IMS Scale was significantly positively correlated with the most conceptually relevant IMAS subscales of blurring (i.e., exaggerating relationships with important others) ($r = 0.16$) and boasting (i.e., advertising relationships with important others) ($r = 0.44$) and the exemplification subscale of the IMS Scale was positively correlated with the most conceptually relevant IMAS subscales of blaring (i.e., publicly distancing oneself from poor performers) ($r = 0.29$) and blurring ($r = 0.24$) (Kacmar, Harris, & Nagy, 2007).

In organizational settings in which politics are perceived to govern decisions about employees, performance is no longer the leading criterion for professional gain and so employees are more likely to engage in impression management tactics. Indeed, four subscales (ingratiation, exemplification, intimidation, and supplication) of the IMS Scale explain a significant proportion of the variance in perceived organizational politics (Kacmar et al., 2007).

Divergent/Discriminant

Subscales of the IMS Scale were not correlated with conscientiousness, perceived organizational support, or various measures of organizational citizenship behavior (Bolino & Turnley, 1999; Kacmar et al., 2007). In addition, little overlap was found between the conceptually unrelated subscales of the IMS Scale and the Impression Management by Association Scale (Kacmar et al., 2007).

Construct/Factor Analytic

Bolino and Turnley (1999) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis on the scale ($n = 147$ professionals and managers). Two pairs of items from each subscale were averaged to create parcels indicating each of the five impression management strategies. Three indices of fit were used: the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) indicated a fit of .97, the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) indicated a fit of 1.00, and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) indicated a fit of 1.00. A second confirmatory factor analysis was conducted restricting each item to load only on its corresponding scale. The GFI indicated a fit of .81, the TLI indicated a fit of .87, and the CFI indicated a fit of .89. In addition, a five factor confirmatory factor analytic solution fit the data better than a four, three, or one factor solution. Finally, when each of the five subscales was used as an indicator for a latent variable of impression management (the GFI indicated a fit of .91, the TLI indicated a fit of .92, and the CFI indicated a fit of .94), the paths between each of the five subscales and the latent variable ranged from .46 to .78 indicating that together the subscales measure global impression management.

Criterion/Predictive

No evidence on criterion or predictive validity is currently available.

Location

Kacmar, K.M., Harris, K.J., & Nagy, B.G. (2007). Further validation of the Bolino and Turnley impression management scale. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 9, 16–32.

Results and Comments

The authors based the design of this scale on a broad taxonomy of self-presentational strategies. Previous attempts to construct impression management scales focused largely on only ingratiation and self-promotion, but

the authors specifically included all five of Jones and Pittman's (1982) strategies of impression management. Although this is the case, many researchers have modified or used a subset of the items on the IMS Scale to examine specific impression management styles.

Additional validation of the scale is needed. Because the IMS Scale is a self-report measure with high face validity, social desirability might be an issue, but this possibility has not been explored. In addition, test–retest reliability, criterion validity, and incremental validity of the scale have not been adequately examined.

IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT STYLES SCALE

Respond to the following statements by thinking about 'how often you behave this way'.

- 1 = never behave this way
- 2 = very rarely behave this way
- 3 = occasionally behave this way
- 4 = sometimes behave this way
- 5 = often behave this way

Self-Promotion

1. Talk proudly about your experience or education.
2. Make people aware of your talents or qualifications.
3. Let others know that you are valuable to the organization.
4. Make people aware of your accomplishments.

Ingratiation

1. Compliment your colleagues so they will see you as likable.
2. Take an interest in your colleagues' personal lives to show them that you are friendly.
3. Praise your colleagues for their accomplishments so they will consider you a nice person.
4. Do personal favors for your colleagues to show them that you are friendly.

Exemplification

1. Stay at work late so people will know you are hard working.
2. Try to appear busy, even at times when things are slower.

3. Arrive at work early to look dedicated.
4. Come to the office at night or on weekends to show that you are dedicated.

Intimidation

1. Be intimidating with coworkers when it will help you get your job done.
2. Let others know you can make things difficult for them if they push you too far.
3. Deal forcefully with colleagues when they hamper your ability to get your job done.
4. Deal strongly or aggressively with coworkers who interfere in your business.
5. Use intimidation to get colleagues to behave appropriately.

Supplication

1. Act like you know less than you do so people will help you out.
2. Try to gain assistance or sympathy from people by appearing needy in some areas.
3. Pretend not to understand something to gain someone's help.
4. Act like you need assistance so people will help you out.
5. Pretend to know less than you do so you can avoid an unpleasant assignment.

Note: Reproduced with permission.

References

- Ajzen, I., Timko, C., & White, J. B. (1982). Self-monitoring and the attitude–behavior relation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 426–435. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/0022-3514.42.3.426>.
- Alanazi, F. M. (2001). The revised self-consciousness scale: An assessment of factor structure, reliability, and gender differences in Saudi Arabia. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 29, 763–776.
- Anderson, L. R. (1991). Test–retest reliability of the revised self-monitoring scale over a two-year period. *Psychological Reports*, 68, 1057–1058.
- Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2001). Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 347–366. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1002/job.92>.
- Belling, L. R. (1992). *The relationship between social physique anxiety and physical activity*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

- Bernstein, I. H., Teng, G., & Garbin, C. P. (1986). A confirmatory factoring of the self-consciousness scale. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 21*, 459–475.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring impression management in organizations: A scale of development based on the Jones and Pittman taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods, 2*, 187–206. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1177/109442819922005>.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2003). More than one way to make an impression: Exploring profiles of impression management. *Journal of Management, 29*, 141–160. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1177/014920630302900202>.
- Briggs, S. R., Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1980). An analysis of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 679–686. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037//0022-3514.38.4.679>.
- Brown, E. J., Turovsky, J., Heimberg, R. G., Juster, H. R., Brown, T. A., & Barlow, D. H. (1997). Validation of the social interaction anxiety scale and the social phobia scale across the anxiety disorders. *Psychological Assessment, 9*, 21–27. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/1040-3590.9.1.21>.
- Burnkrant, R. E., & Page, T. J., Jr. (1984). A modification of the Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss self-consciousness scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 629–637. Available from http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4806_10.
- Carver, C. S., & Glass, D. C. (1976). The Self-consciousness scale: A discriminant validity study. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 2*, 169–172.
- Chang, L. (1998). Factor interpretation of the self-consciousness scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*, 635–640. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(97)00222-5.
- Cheng, C. M., & Chartrand, T. L. (2003). Self-monitoring without awareness: Using mimicry as a nonconscious affiliation strategy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 1170–1179. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.6.1170>.
- Cramer, K. M. (2000). Comparing the relative fit of various factor models of the self-consciousness scale in two independent samples. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 75*, 295–307. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1177/0146167288143018>.
- Crawford, L. A., & Novak, K. B. (2013). The effects of public self-consciousness and embarrassment on college student drinking: Evidence in support of a protective self-presentational model. *Journal of Social Psychology, 153*, 109–122. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/00224545.2012.711381>.
- Day, D. V., Shleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 390–401.
- Eklund, R. C., Mack, D. E., & Hart, E. A. (1996). Factorial validity of the social physique anxiety scale for females. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 18*, 281–295.
- Farmer, A. S., & Kashdan, T. B. (2012). Social anxiety and emotion regulation in daily life: Spillover effects on positive and negative social events. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, 41*, 152–162.
- Fenigstein, A. (1984). Self-consciousness and the overperception of self as a target. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 860–870. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/0022-3514.47.4.860>.
- Fenigstein, A. (2009). Private and public self-consciousness. In M. R. Leary, & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 495–511). New York: Guilford Press.
- Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*, 522–527.
- Fernandez, K. C., Levinson, C. A., & Rodebaugh, T. L. (2012). Profiling: Predicting social anxiety from Facebook profiles. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*, 706–713.
- Finkenber, M. E., DiNucci, J. M., McCune, S. L., Chenette, T., & McCoy, P. (1998). Commitment to physical activity and anxiety about physique among college women. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 87*, 1393–1394.
- Fiske, S. T., & von Hendy, H. M. (1992). Personality feedback and situational norms can control stereotyping processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 577–596. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037//0022-3514.62.4.577>.
- Frederick, C. M., & Morrison, C. S. (1996). Social physique anxiety: Personality constructs, motivations, exercise attitudes, and behaviors. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 82*, 963–972. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.2466/pms.1996.82.3.963>.
- Fuglestad, P. T., & Snyder, M. (2009). Self-monitoring. In M. R. Leary, & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 574–591). New York: Guilford Press.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (1985). 'To carve nature at its joints': On the existence of discrete classes in personality. *Psychological Review, 92*, 317–349. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/0033295X.92.3.317>.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 530–555. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037//0033-2909.126.4.530>.
- Ghorbani, N., Watson, P. J., & Weathington, B. L. (2009). Mindfulness in Iran and the United States: Cross-cultural structural complexity and parallel relationships with psychological adjustment. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues, 28*, 211–224. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1007/s12144-009-9060-3>.
- Girvan, E. J., Weaver, J., & Snyder, M. (2010). Elevating norm over substance: Self-monitoring as a predictor of decision criteria and decision time among independent voters. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 10*, 321–336.
- Gore, K. L., Carter, M. M., & Parker, S. (2002). Predicting anxious response to a social challenge: The predictive utility of the social interaction anxiety scale and the social phobia scale in a college population. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 40*, 689–700. doi: 10.1016/S0005-7967(01)00029-8.
- Hagger, M. S., Açıcı, F. H., Lindwall, M., Hein, V., Mülazımoğlu-Ballı, Ö., Tarrant, M., et al. (2007). Cross-cultural validity and measurement invariance of the social physique anxiety scale in five European nations. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 17*, 703–719. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2006.00615.x>.
- Hagger, M. S., & Stevenson, A. (2010). Social physique anxiety and physical self-esteem: Gender and age effects. *Psychology & Health, 25*, 89–110. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/08870440903160990>.
- Hart, E. A., Leary, M. R., & Rejeski, W. J. (1989). The measurement of social physique anxiety. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*, 94–104.

- Hass, R. G. (1984). Perspective taking and self-awareness: Drawing an E on your forehead. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 788–798. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/0022-3514.46.4.788>.
- Heimberg, R. G., Mueller, G. P., Holt, C. S., Hope, D. A., & Liebowitz, M. R. (1992). Assessment of anxiety in social interaction and being observed by others: The social interaction anxiety scale and the social phobia scale. *Behavior Therapy*, 23, 53–73. doi: 10.1016/S0005-7894(05)80308-9.
- Heintz, P., Jr., & Steele-Johnson, D. (2004). Clarifying the conceptual definitions of goal orientation dimensions: Competence, control, and evaluation. *Organizational Analysis*, 12, 5–19.
- Hofmann, W., Gschwendner, T., & Schmitt, M. (2005). On implicit-explicit consistency: The moderating role of individual differences in awareness and adjustment. *European Journal of Personality*, 19, 25–49.
- Holden, R. R., & Passey, J. (2009). Social desirability. In M. R. Leary, & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 441–454). New York: Guilford Press.
- Ickes, W., & Barnes, R. D. (1977). The role of sex and self-monitoring in unstructured dyadic interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 315–330.
- Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (pp. 231–261). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jones, M. (1993). Influence of self-monitoring on dating motivations. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 27, 197–206. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1006/jrpe.1993.1014>.
- Kacmar, K. M., Harris, K. J., & Nagy, B. G. (2007). Further validation of the Bolino and Turnley impression management scale. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 9, 16–32.
- Kelly, K. M., & Jones, W. H. (1997). Assessment of dispositional embarrassability. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 10, 307–333. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/10615809708249306>.
- Kiyotaki, Y., & Yokoyama, K. (2006). Relationships of eating disturbances to alexithymia, need for social approval, and gender identity among Japanese female undergraduate students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 609–618.
- Kowalski, N. P., Crocker, P. R. E., & Kowalski, K. C. (2001). Physical self and physical activity relationships in college women: Does social physique anxiety moderate effects? *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 72, 55–62.
- LaBrie, J., Pedersen, E. R., Neighbors, C., & Hummer, J. F. (2008). The role of self-consciousness in the experience of alcohol-related consequences among college students. *Addictive Behaviors*, 33, 812–820. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2008.01.002>.
- Lalwani, A. K., Shrum, L. J., & Chiu, C. (2009). Motivated response styles: The role of cultural values, regulatory focus, and self-consciousness in socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 870–882. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/a0014622>.
- Lamphere, R. A., & Leary, M. R. (1990). Private and public self-processes: A return to James' constituents of the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16, 717–725. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1177/0146167290164012>.
- Langer, J. K., & Rodebaugh, T. L. (2013). Social anxiety and gaze avoidance: Averting gaze but not anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 37, 1110–1120.
- Lantz, C. D., Hardy, C. J., & Ainsworth, B. E. (1997). Social physique anxiety and perceived exercise behaviour. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 20, 83–93.
- Leary, M. R. (1983). Social anxiousness: The construct and its measurement. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 47, 66–75. Available from http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4701_8.
- Leary, M. R. (1991). Social anxiety, shyness, and related constructs. In J. Robinson, P. Shaver, & L. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 161–194). New York: Academic Press.
- Leary, M. R. (1995). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Leary, M. R., & Allen, A. B. (2011). Self-presentational persona: Simultaneous management of multiple impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 1033–1049. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/a0023884>.
- Leary, M. R., & Jongman-Sereno, K. (in press). Social anxiety as an early warning system: A refinement and extension of the self-presentational theory of social anxiety. In S. G. Hofman & P. M. DiBartolo (Eds.), *Social phobia and social anxiety: An integration* (3rd ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1995). *Social anxiety*. New York: Guilford.
- Lee, J. R., Moore, D. C., Park, E., & Park, S. G. (2012). Who wants to be 'friend-rich'? Social compensatory friending on Facebook and the moderating role of public self-consciousness. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28, 1036–1043. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.01.006>.
- 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. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00178-0.
- Lindwall, M. (2004). Factorial validity and invariance testing of the Swedish social physique anxiety scale: Arguments for gender-specific scales. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 6, 492–499.
- Lundh, L., & Sperling, M. (2002). Social anxiety and the post-event processing of socially distressing events. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 31, 129–134.
- Maïano, C., Morin, A. J. S., Eklund, R. C., Monthuy-Blanc, J., Garbarino, J., & Stephan, Y. (2010). Construct validity of the social physique anxiety scale in a French adolescent sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 92, 53–62.
- Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2000). The reliability and validity of a susceptibility to embarrassment scale among adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 749–756. doi: 10.1016/S0191 8869(99)00229-9.10.1016/S0191 8869(99)00229-9.
- Martin, A. J., & Debus, R. L. (1999). Alternative factor structure for the revised self-consciousness scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 72, 266–281.
- Martin, H. J. (1984). A revised measure of approval motivation and its relationship to social desirability. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 508–519. Available from http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4805_10.

- Mattick, R. P., & Clarke, J. C. (1998). Development and validation of measures of social phobia scrutiny fear and social interaction anxiety. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 36, 455–470. doi:10.1016/S0005-7967(97)10031-6.
- McAuley, E., Marquez, D. X., Jerome, G. J., Blissmer, B., & Katula, J. (2002). Physical activity and physique anxiety in older adults: fitness, and efficacy influences. *Journal of Aging and Mental Health*, 6, 222–230.
- McKenzie, K. S., & Hoyle, R. H. (2008). The self-absorption scale: Reliability and validity in non-clinical samples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 726–731. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.07.020>.
- Miller, R. S. (1987). *The nature of embarrassability: Correlates and sex differences*. Unpublished manuscript, Sam Houston State of University, Huntsville, TX.
- Miller, R. S. (2009). Social anxiousness, shyness, and embarrassability. In M. R. Leary, & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 176–191). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Mittal, B., & Balasubramanian, S. K. (1987). Testing the dimensionality of the self-consciousness scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 51, 53–68. Available from http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5101_5.
- Modigliani, A. (1966). *Embarrassment and social influence*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor: MI: University of Michigan.
- Montesi, J. L., Conner, B. T., Gordon, E. A., Fauber, R. L., Kim, K. H., & Heimberg, R. G. (2013). On the relationship among social anxiety, intimacy, sexual communication, and sexual satisfaction in young couples. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42, 81–91.
- Motl, R. W., & Conroy, D. E. (2000). Validity and factorial invariance of the social physique anxiety scale. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 5, 1007–1017. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1097/00005768-200005000-00020>.
- Nystedt, L., & Ljungberg, A. (2002). Facets of private and public self-consciousness: Construct and discriminant validity. *European Journal of Personality*, 16, 143–159. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1002/per.440>.
- Nystedt, L., & Smari, J. (1989). Assessment of the Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss self-consciousness scale: A Swedish translation. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 53, 342–352. Available from http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5302_11.
- Park, A., Sher, K. J., & Krull, J. L. (2006). Individual differences in the 'Greek effect' on risky drinking: The role of self-consciousness. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 20, 85–90. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/0893-164X.20.1.85>.
- Petrie, T. A., Diehl, N., Rogers, R. L., & Johnson, C. L. (1996). The social physique anxiety scale: Reliability and construct validity. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 18, 420–425.
- Piliavin, J. A., & Charng, H. (1988). What is the factorial structure of the private and public self-consciousness scales?. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 587–595. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1177/0146167288143018>.
- Rowatt, W. C., DeLue, S., Strickhouser, L., & Gonzalez, T. (2001). The limited influence of self-monitoring on romantic partner preferences. *Personality and individual differences*, 31, 943–954. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00197-5.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). The self-consciousness scale: A revised version for use with general populations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 687–699. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1985.tb02268.x>.
- Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole.
- Schlenker, B. R. (2012). Self-presentation. In M. R. Leary, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 542–570). New York: Guilford Press.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Weigold, M. F. (1990). Self-consciousness and self-presentation: Being autonomous versus appearing autonomous. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 820–828. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/0022-3514.59.4.820>.
- Shaffer, D. R., & Bazzini, D. G. (1997). What do you look for in a prospective date? Reexamining the preferences of men and women who differ in self-monitoring propensities. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 605–616. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1177/0146167297236004>.
- Sharp, M., Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Individual difference variables as moderators of the effect of extended cross-group friendship on prejudice: Testing the effects of public self-consciousness and social comparison. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations*, 14, 207–221. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1177/1368430210391122>.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 526–537.
- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 125–139. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037//0022-3514.51.1.125>.
- Treasure, D. C., Lox, C. L., & Lawton, B. R. (1998). Determinants of physical activity in a sedentary obese female population. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 20, 218–224.
- Watson, P. J., Morris, R. J., Ramsey, A. R., Hickman, S. E., & Waddell, M. G. (1996). Further contrasts between self-reflectiveness and internal state awareness factors of private self-consciousness. *The Journal of Psychology*, 130, 183–192. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/00223980.1996.9915000>.
- Weeks, J. W., Howell, A. N., & Goldin, P. R. (2013). Gaze avoidance in social anxiety disorder. *Depression and Anxiety*, 30, 749–756.
- Wei, M., Mallinckrodt, B., Larson, L. M., & Zakalik, R. A. (2005). Adult attachment, depressive symptoms, and validation from self versus others. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 368–377. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.3.368>.
- White, K., & Peloza, J. (2009). Self-benefit versus other-benefit marketing appeals: Their effectiveness in generating charitable support. *Journal of Marketing*, 73, 109–124. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1509/jmkg.73.4.109>.
- Workman, J. E., & Lee, S. (2011). Vanity and public self-consciousness: A comparison of fashion consumer groups and gender. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 35, 307–315. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1111/j.1470-6431.2010.00934.x>.
- Wu, T., & Wei, M. (2008). Perfectionism and negative mood: The mediating roles of validation from others versus self. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55, 276–288. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1037/0022-0167.55.2.276>.
- Xu, Y. (2008). The influence of public self-consciousness and materialism on young consumers' compulsive buying. *Young Consumers*, 9, 37–48. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1108/17473610810857309>.