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Abstract

Classic studies in the 1950s indicated that endorsement rates of personality test items are very highly correlated with the items’ social desirability (Edwards, 1953; Hanley, 1956). The present study attempted to recreate those findings using two contemporary personality tests: the NEO Five Factor Inventory short form (NEO-FFI) and 59 randomly selected items from the Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality (SNAP). Also included were 7 Rare Virtue items and 7 Common Fault items from the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire, Brief Form.

Participants (N = 286) were randomly assigned to one of four groups, which rated the items for “true of self” (TOS), “true of other people in general” (TOG), “true of friends and family” (TFF), or social desirability (SD). Consistent with the studies from the 1950s, high correlations were found between TOS and SD for the items of the SNAP (r = .857, p < .01) and NEO (r = .810, p < .01). TFF was also highly correlated with SD for the SNAP (r = .828, p < .01) and NEO (r = .803, p < .01). In contrast, TOG exhibited much lower correlations with SD, TOS, and TFF for both the NEO and SNAP (all rs < .45). For Common Fault and Rare Virtue items, the patterns of correlations were very different from each other and from the patterns observed for the NEO and SNAP personality items.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

David Marlowe and Douglas Crowne (1961) defined social desirability as “a need for social approval and acceptance and the belief that this can be attained through culturally acceptable and appropriate behaviors” (p. 109). These researchers created a well-known social desirability scale whose items, when endorsed in the proper direction, were intended to represent behaviors that “are culturally sanctioned and approved but which are improbable of occurrence” (Marlowe & Crowne, 1960, p. 350). These authors posited that the tendency to endorse such items is contingent upon the “needs of the [subjects] to present themselves in a socially desirable or undesirable light” (Marlowe & Crowne, 1960, p. 350).

Allen Edwards, another early researcher on the topic, argued that items on personality tests possess a quantifiable social desirability value that is located on a “social desirability continuum” (1957, p. 3). Like Marlowe and Crowne (1960), he created an instrument, the Edwards Social Desirability Scale (1953), to measure respondents' tendency to endorse socially desirable items.

Whereas researchers such as Edwards (1957) and Marlowe and Crowne (1960) have developed free-standing instruments to measure social desirability, some clinical measures include social desirability scales embedded within them. For example, the MMPI-2 includes a measure of socially desirable responding, the Lie scale (Hathaway & McKinley, 1989). Such scales are included in clinical instruments in an attempt to detect whether the person’s personality profile can be considered to be a legitimate one, or if instead the profile has been distorted by the person’s tendency to give socially desirable responses.
It has been argued that the concept of social desirability can be broken down into subtypes. Paulhus (1984) found evidence supporting the notion that people engage in two different types of socially desirable responding called self-deception and impression management (also called “other deception”). Self-deception refers to instances in which respondents believe unrealistically that they have certain desirable characteristics, and they answer questionnaire items accordingly. In contrast, impression management or other deception refers to the act of knowingly dissembling in order to maintain a positive image in the eyes of other people. Sackeim and Gur (1979) developed two separate scales, the Self-Deception and Other-Deception Questionnaires to measure these two subtypes of social desirability based on this theory of socially desirable responding.

Paulhus (1984) performed a factor analysis using the Marlowe-Crowne, Edwards, and Wiggins Social Desirability Scales, the Self-Deception and Other-Deception Questionnaires and the MMPI Lie Scale. He found that the underlying factor structure of these scales consisted of two factors that corresponded to the Self-Deception and Impression Management dimensions. For instance, the Marlowe-Crowne scale loaded on both factors, whereas the Edwards Social Desirability Scale and the MMPI Lie scale loaded on the self-deception factor. Not surprisingly, the Self-Deception Questionnaire loaded most highly on the self-deception factor and the Other-Deception Questionnaire loaded highest on the impression management factor.

1.1 Social Desirability and Its Relationship to Endorsement of Personality Test Items as True of Self

All the instruments discussed thus far have been designed to detect individual differences in socially desirable responding. However, research has also examined socially desirable
responding, not as a trait of individuals, but as a general characteristic of all people that emerges when they take personality tests and in many other social settings as well. In particular, research has shown that people are generally more likely to say that something is true of themselves if they perceive it to be socially desirable.

A classic study on this topic was carried out by Edwards (1953). He first had 152 participants judge the social desirability of each item on a personality inventory. He then administered the same inventory to 140 other participants, asking them to endorse the items that were true of themselves. Edwards found a significant correlation of .871 between an item's social desirability as rated by the first group, and the item's endorsement rate as "true of self" by the second group. Based on this finding, Edwards concluded that the social desirability of the personality items, rather than the prevalence of the personality traits, accounted for respondents' tendency to endorse or not endorse the items. He concluded that all personality self-reports must be interpreted with caution because they may often simply reflect respondents' desire to be accepted and approved of.

Edward's (1953) findings were later replicated by Charles Hanley (1956), who studied items randomly selected from the Depression and Schizophrenia scales of the widely used Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Hanley had 87 participants rate the MMPI items for social desirability. He then compared the scores to self-ratings on the MMPI from 106 students that had been previously collected. In findings very similar to those of Edwards, Hanley found that the correlation between social desirability ratings and self-endorsement rates was .82 for items on the Depression scale and .89 for items on the Schizophrenia scale.
A thesis by Davis (2005) also reported a relation between the endorsement rate of personality descriptors and social desirability. In the first step of her study, Davis empirically identified a pool of 150 “Barnum Statements,” personality descriptions from an astrology book that had a high endorsement rate among college students. In the second step of her study, Davis presented these 150 statements to participants and asked them to “Please indicate how well each statement describes you” using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1) Definitely True to 5) Definitely False. She also had the participants rate the items for social desirability. She found a correlation between true of self ratings and social desirability ($r = .772, p < .01$).

Another study also confirmed the existence of a relation between true of self ratings and social desirability. Farley-Icard (2007) attempted to create “Rare Virtue” statements which she defined as those which have high social desirability but low base-rate frequency. She also tried to write “Common Fault” statements which have relatively low social desirability ratings and high base-rate frequency. She then created a questionnaire using 55 of the Barnum Statements previously identified by Davis (2005). She included 84 “candidate statements” that she believed fit the definition of “Rare Virtue” items such as, “You have never disliked anyone.” She also incorporated 37 “candidate statements” fitting the “Common Fault” definition such as, “You have broken a promise to a friend.” Farley-Icard gave the questionnaire to students and asked them to rate the items for true of self and social desirability. She found that social desirability correlated very highly with true of self ratings ($r = .945, p < .01$).

A study by Smith, Smith, and Seymour (1993) examined the same issues as the previous studies, but took a cross-cultural approach. The researchers used a sample of 201 American students and 115 students from Turkey. The participants were given 176 inventory items
originally written by Edwards and were asked to either rate the items for themselves or to rate the items’ social desirability. The authors hypothesized that the correlation between the endorsement rate and social desirability of test items might be lower in the Turkish sample, because Turkish culture does not encourage self-promotion to the same degree that American and Western European cultures do. Contrary to their hypothesis, Smith, Smith, and Seymour found a high correlation between social desirability and endorsement rate in both the American sample \((r (174) = .86)\) and the Turkish sample \((r (174) = .87)\). The endorsement rates of items by Turkish students were also highly correlated with the endorsement rates by American students \((r (174) = .90)\). The findings suggest that even members of a non-Western culture may show the strong tendency to endorse items that are considered socially desirable.

If it is true that the endorsement rate of personality test items is strongly correlated with social desirability, this relation might be explained by what social psychologists call the “self-serving bias.” In a textbook by Breckler, Olson, and Wiggins (2006), “self-serving judgments” are defined as those that enhance a person’s self worth and image. Citing relevant studies, the authors explain that people tend to associate with traits that are seen as positive in society and dissociate from those that are negative. This suggests that the desire to be perceived in a positive light by everyone else influences the way a person chooses to present him or herself.

In one example, Dunning, Perie, and Story (1991) asked students to describe “prototypes” of desirable and undesirable constructs such as “aloofness” and “intelligence.” They found that students were more likely to view characteristics as indicative of desirable social constructs if they also felt that they possessed those characteristics. However, when the construct was socially undesirable, self-descriptive attributes were seen as uncharacteristic of the
construct. For example, “Demonstrates a good vocabulary” correlated with the prototype of intelligence and self-ratings ($r = .420$, $p < .01$). When the students believed they possessed characteristics of the desirable construct, they considered those characteristics to be central to the prototype of the construct.

In additional studies Dunning, Perie, and Story (1991) discovered further evidence of self-serving bias. They found that when participants were asked to articulate the characteristics of a “good leader” they were more likely to use traits that they had previously identified with. That is, the participants believed that they, themselves, possessed the traits of a good leader.

1.2 Social Desirability and Its Relationship to Endorsement of Test Items as True of Other People

Some research indicates that social desirability can strongly influence not only the way people rate their own personalities, but also the way they rate the personalities of other people. In another study by Edwards (1959), participants were asked to describe five people they knew very well and he found that those ratings correlated with social desirability $r = .84$ and $r = .86$ for males and females, respectively. This finding led him to theorize that the true of self and social desirability correlation could be because traits more common to society are perceived as being more socially desirable.

In an attempt to replicate Edwards’ (1959) true of others findings, Smith, Smith, and Seymour (1993) also had participants in their study describe others that they knew quite well and found that these ratings correlated with social desirability ratings at $r = .81$. This, they suggest is further proof of Edwards’ (1959) assertion that socially desirable traits are more common in society.
In the thesis described in the previous section, Davis (2005) also had participants rate the degree to which her 150 Barnum statements were true of other people:

“Please rate each statement for how true it is of people in general on a scale from 1 (Definitely False of People in General) to 5 (Definitely True of People in General). In other words, is the trait true of your friends, family and other people you know?”

Davis (2005) found that the endorsement rate of items as true of other people (TOO) correlated substantially with the items endorsement rate as true of oneself (TOS; $r = .650, p < .01$). Furthermore, the ratings of other people were moderately correlated with social desirability ratings ($r = .456, p < .01$). In a multiple regression analysis, Davis also found that ratings for TOO and social desirability each independently and significantly contributed to the prediction of TOS ratings.

Farley-Icard (2007) replicated the findings of Davis (2005) regarding the relationship of TOO, TOS, and social desirability of test items. Using the pool of items described in the previous section of this thesis, and rating instructions modeled on the instructions used by Davis, Farley-Icard found that the correlation between TOO and TOS ratings of test items was $r = .935, p < .001$, and that the correlation between TOO ratings and social desirability was $r = .876, p < .01$.

Research from social psychology might help explain the findings of Davis (2005) and Farley-Icard (2007) regarding the relationship between social desirability and ratings of other people. The instructions for TOO ratings that were used by Davis and Farley-Icard specifically directed participants to consider the following question: “Is the trait true of your friends, family and other people you know?” It may be that the specific mention of “friends” and “family”
influenced the way that participants made their ratings. In a classic study by Berscheid, Graziano, Monson, and Dermer (1976), it was evident that the amount of “outcome dependency” that a person places on others will mitigate attributions. The experimenters placed participants in one of three conditions. In the first, they were led to believe they would be dating one of three people that they observed on a television screen. They were told there would be five dates over the course of the next five weeks. In the second condition, they were told they would have one date with one of the three people they observed. They found that participants that were in the “high dependency” condition (five dates) were more likely to attribute positive characteristics to the potential date and report liking them more than those in the “low dependency” condition. Breckler, Olson, and Wiggins (2006) later theorized that this propensity to attribute socially desirable characteristics to other people may occur because when asked to describe others, people often look to those they are close to for reference. The self-serving judgments, they say, come from the idea that people like to think that they only associate with other good people; thus family, friends, and acquaintances become extensions of the self.

1.3 Central Purpose of the Present Study

Since the pioneering work of Edwards in the 1950s, the relation between social desirability and endorsement rate has received relatively little attention from researchers, although psychological testing textbooks still cite his work and comment on its significance (e.g., Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). For example, Nunnally and Bernstein (1994 p. 385) identified social desirability as a “major factor” in self-report inventories and discussed how it can account for individual differences in response style.
The relation between social desirability and endorsement rate continues to be relevant to commonly used tests. With the creation of new personality self-report inventories and the evolution of already existing ones, continued attention must be given to the accuracy of the reports being generated so that personality assessment can be a dependable way of better understanding people.

In the present study, it was hypothesized that on contemporary personality questionnaires, as with questionnaires in the 1950s, people will tend to more highly endorse personality test items that are seen as highly socially desirable. The study was conducted using methods similar to those used by Edwards (1953) and Hanley (1956). Students were given items from two well-accepted tests, a test of normal personality traits and a test of abnormal personality traits, and asked to rate the items for “true of self,” “true of other people in general,” “true of friends and family,” and social desirability. The participants were also asked to rate 7 common fault and 7 rare virtue items in the same way. The ratings were then examined to determine the correlation between endorsement rate and social desirability. The present study is similar to studies by Davis (2005) and Farley-Icard (2007) which also examined the relationship between social desirability and endorsement rates. However, those studies both dealt with test items that the researchers had developed as part of their research projects. In contrast, the present study examined test items that belong to well-established tests that are used on a daily basis in research and clinical practice.

It was predicted that the findings of Davis (2005) and Farley-Icard (2007) would be replicated in the present study, using test items from well-established tests. Specifically, it was predicted that personality test items more highly rated as being socially desirable would also be
more likely to be endorsed as both “true of self” and “true of friends and family,” and, to a lesser degree, as “true of other people in general.”

1.4 Common Fault and Rare Virtue Items

A secondary issue explored in the present study concerned the characteristics of what are sometimes referred to as “Rare Virtue” and “Common Fault” test items (Farley-Icard, 2007). A “Rare Virtue” item has relatively high social desirability but low endorsement rate, for example, “I always tell the entire truth.” A “Common Fault” item is just the opposite, having low social desirability but high endorsement rate, for example, “Sometimes I’m a bit lazy.”

In the thesis described earlier, Farley-Icard (2007) attempted to create a pool of both “Rare Virtue” and “Common Fault” test items, but found that it was virtually impossible to identify items that fell into these categories. She concluded that such items may not really exist. That is, if items were considered highly socially desirable, the participants in Farley-Icard's study showed a strong and consistent tendency to endorse these items as true of themselves. Similarly, if items were considered to have low social desirability the participants were unlikely to endorse items as true of themselves.

The present study set out to further explore the performance of so-called Rare Virtue and Common Fault items. Whereas Farley-Icard (2007) attempted to create her own Rare Virtue and Common Fault items, the present study examined the performance of Rare Virtue and Common Fault items that were published as part of the Unlikely Virtues scale of the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire Brief Form (MPQ-BF; Patrick, Curtin, Tellegen, 2002). The purpose of this exploratory study was to determine whether the MPQ-BF Rare Virtue items did in fact have high social desirability and low endorsement rates, and whether the MPQ-BF Common
Fault items had low social desirability and high endorsement rates. If such findings were obtained, the question would then arise as to why Farley-Icard was unable to create test items with these characteristics.
Chapter 2: Method and Participants

Participants

The sample for the study consisted of 286 undergraduate students from the University of Texas at El Paso who were given course credit in exchange for participation. The sample was 61% Mexican American, 10% Mexican National, 14% other Hispanic or Latin ethnic group, 6% Anglo, 2% African American, 0.6% Asian American, and 6% other ethnic group or combination of ethnic groups. The group was 34% male and 66% female with a mean age of 20.6 years (standard deviation = 11.02).

Materials

An informed consent form and a demographic questionnaire were administered to participants, along with questionnaires made up of the 60 items from the NEO Five Factor Inventory Short Form (NEO-FFI), 59 randomly selected items from the Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality (SNAP), and 14 items taken from the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire Brief Form (MPQ-BF).

NEO Five-Factor Inventory

The first measure used in the study was the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI). It is a short version of the widely used Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R). The NEO PI-R is a personality measure designed to assess 5 dimensions of normal personality also called “domains.” It is further broken down into 30 “facet scales” to provide a more specific assessment. The five domains are also known as the “Big Five” personality factors labeled Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. The items consist of statements and the respondents must decide to what degree they identify with the items. They
are asked to choose from 5 answer choices that consist of “strongly agree,” “agree,” “neutral,” “disagree,” and “strongly disagree.”

The NEO-FFI 60 item Form S was used in this study (See Appendix A). The NEO-FFI was created from the items of the NEO PI-R by selecting 12 items for each of the five personality factors. For each factor, those 12 items were selected which showed the highest loadings on the relevant personality factor in a factor analysis of NEO PI-R items.

In the test manual for the NEO-FFI (Costa & McCrae, 1992), the authors report good internal consistency for the five scales, with coefficient alphas ranging from .76 to .90. The test has been validated mainly by calculating correlations of the shorter NEO-FFI scales with their parent scales on the NEO PI-R. In one sample consisting of volunteers in The Augmented Baltimore Longitudinal Study, fairly good correlations were found: Neuroticism, .92, Extraversion, .90, Openness, .91, Agreeableness, .77, and .87 for Conscientiousness. This sample largely consisted of individuals who either retired from or currently worked in professional, managerial, or scientific areas and were likely more educated than the population in general. With a different sample consisting of younger, less educated and more ethnically diverse participants, correlations were slightly lower but still acceptable: Neuroticism, .86, Extraversion, .77, Openness, .73, Agreeableness, .68, and .81 for Conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality

The second personality measure used in the study was the Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality (SNAP; Clark, 1993), which is a self-report measure that is used in both clinical and research settings to assess personality traits, especially traits associated with personality disorders. The SNAP consists of 375 true/false items and is made up of 12 primary
scales, 3 temperament scales, 6 validity scales, and 13 diagnostic scales for *DSM-III-R*
personality disorders. For example, the trait and temperament scales include the “Mistrust,”
“Negative Temperament,” and “Dependency” scales. The SNAP also includes three validity
scales to detect inconsistent responding or response bias (Clark, 1993).

Clark, McEwen, Collard, & Hickok (1993) reported adequate reliability ratings for the
scales of the SNAP. Median alpha reliabilities ranged from .76 to .85 in both student and patient
samples. A median one-week retest correlation was .81 for a patient sample, and median one-
month retest correlation of .81 with a student sample was also reported. Finally, a factor analysis
produced three factors similar to those found with other personality measures, namely,
Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Disinhibition versus Constraint. For the purpose of this study, 60
SNAP items were randomly selected. As consequence of typographic error, only 59 were
actually used (See Appendix B).

**Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire Brief Form**

At the end of the SNAP questionnaires, the 14 items from the Unlikely Virtues scale of
the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire Brief Form (MPQ-BF; Patrick, Curtin, Tellegen,
2002) were added. The MPQ-BF is a 155 item personality questionnaire whose subscales are
designed to measure temperament, interpersonal style, and behavioral regulation. The MPQ-BF
includes a 14-item scale entitled “Unlikely Virtues” which is intended to measure a tendency to
give socially desirable answers (Patrick, Curtin, & Tellegen, 2002). For this study, these 14 items
were divided into 7 items tentatively labeled as “Rare Virtues,” and 7 items tentatively labeled as
“Common Faults.” Specifically, the tentatively labeled Rare Virtue items described behaviors
that were apparently socially desirable but uncommon, “I have never felt that I was better than
someone else.” Similarly, the tentatively labeled Common Fault items described behaviors that were apparently socially undesirable but common, “At times, I have been envious of someone.” Appendix C lists all of the tentatively labeled Rare Virtue and Common Fault items from the MPQ-BF that were included in the present study.

Method

Participants were asked to come to either the laboratory or a separate conference room for administration. Upon arrival, participants were told that they would be participating in a study about personality tests and were instructed to not discuss anything during administration. They were given an Informed Consent form and asked to fill out a short demographic questionnaire (See Appendixes D and E, respectively). After filling out both the Informed Consent and demographic questionnaire, they were randomly given one of four questionnaires to complete: true of self (TOS), true of others in general (TOG), true of friends and family (TFF), and social desirability (SD). The participants were tested in groups that ranged from 2 to 6 people. Upon completion of the questionnaires, the participants were given a written debriefing form that informed them of the purpose and hypothesis of the study. The form instructed participants to not mention anything about the nature of the study to anyone. All identifying information was removed from the questionnaires prior to data entry to ensure confidentiality.

Group 1. In the first condition, TOS, the participants were administered the items from the SNAP, NEO-FFI, and the MPQ-BF using the standard administration instructions found in the manuals of the measures. For the SNAP and MPQ-BF, participants were asked to determine whether the items were true or false for them. The instructions read: “Read each statement carefully. Then, determine whether it is true or false for you.” Select ‘T’ if it is mostly true and ‘F’
if it is mostly false.” For the NEO-FFI they were asked to determine to what degree they relate to or agree with the items using a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The instructions read: “Read each statement carefully. Then circle one of the following answer choices.” The choices were SD for strongly disagree, D for disagree or it is mostly false, N for neutral, A for agree or it is mostly true, and SA for strongly agree (See Appendix F). For purposes of statistical analysis, the Likert responses were re-coded on a one-to-five scale in the present study, from “1” for SD to “5” for SA.

Group 2. In the second condition, TOG, participants were administered a questionnaire that consisted of exactly the same items from the SNAP, NEO-FFI, and MPQ-BF. However, participants were asked to rate how well the items describe other people in general (See Appendix G). The items were changed slightly to represent the traits of others. For example, “I laugh easily” was changed to “Most people in general laugh easily.” So, for the SNAP and MPQ-BF, participants were asked to determine if the items were “true or false of other people in general.” The instructions read: “Read each statement carefully. Then determine whether it is true or false for other people in general.” For the NEO-FFI participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement based on the same 5 point Likert-type scale and the instructions read: “Read each statement about other people in general carefully. Then circle one of the following answer choices.” For statistical analyses, the Likert responses were recoded from one-to-five as previously explained.

Group 3. For the third condition, TFF participants were administered the SNAP, NEO-FFI, and MPQ-BF questionnaires. They were asked to rate the items in terms of how well they represented the participants’ friends and family; again the items were changed slightly. For
example, “I rarely feel fearful or anxious” was changed to “My friends and family rarely feel fearful or anxious” (See Appendix H). For the SNAP and MPQ-BF the instructions read: “Read each statement carefully. Then determine whether it is true or false for your friends and family.” For the NEO-FFI, the instructions read: “Read each statement about your friends and family carefully. Then circle one of the following answer choices.” They again used a 5 point Likert-type scale to indicate a level of agreement. These Likert responses were also recoded from one-to-five as previously explained.

Group 4. Participants in the fourth condition, SD, were given the SNAP and NEO-FFI items but were asked to determine the level of social desirability of each item (See Appendix I). Again, the items were changed slightly. For example, “I like to keep my dignity at all costs” became “John likes to keep his dignity at all costs.” The instructions for this questionnaire read: “Below is a list of personality test items. Read each statement carefully then determine how socially desirable it is. That is, determine whether it is good to have or bad to have. The higher the social desirability, the better it is to have.” For all items in the SD questionnaire, participants were asked to rate the items based on a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from “very low social desirability” to “very high social desirability.” These responses were also recoded from one-to-five as previously explained.

Participants were instructed to work alone and not speak to each other about anything during the administration. The participants in all groups were then fully debriefed about the experiment and allowed to ask any questions. Finally, they were thanked for their participation and dismissed. The entire procedure lasted 15 to 30 minutes.
Chapter 3: Results

For each SNAP, NEO, and MPQ item, the following descriptive variables were calculated: (a) mean rating for True of Self (TOS), based on ratings of the item by 74 participants, (b) mean rating for True of Other People in General (TOG), based on ratings by 72 participants, (c) mean rating for True of Family and Friends (TFF), based on ratings by 70 participants, and (d) mean rating for Social Desirability (SD), based on ratings by 70 participants. The mean ratings for each item on these four dimensions are shown in Appendixes J, K, and L. In the remainder of the Results sections, the terms "TOS ratings," "TOG ratings," "TFF ratings" and "SD ratings" will refer to these mean ratings, unless otherwise specified.

Intercorrelation of Item Characteristics: SNAP and NEO

The central focus of the present study was on the interrelationships among TOS, TOG, TFF, and SD ratings. For example, it was hypothesized that TOS ratings would be highly related to TFF and SD ratings.

The Pearson correlations of TOS, TOG, TFF, and SD ratings for the 59 SNAP items are shown in Table 1 (for archival purposes, beta weights and intercepts for unstandardized simple regressions are also reported in Table 2). As predicted based on prior research in the 1950s, a high correlation ($r = .857, p < .01$) was found between TOS and SD ratings. In addition, TFF ratings exhibited high correlations with TOS ratings ($r = .881, p < .01$) and with SD ratings ($r = .828, p < .01$). In contrast, TOG ratings exhibited relatively low correlations with TOS ratings ($r = .368, p < .01$) and with TFF ratings ($r = .431, p < .01$), and a low nonsignificant correlation with SD ($r = .173, p < .01$). A matrix scatter plot showing the interrelationship of TOS, TOG, TFF, and SD ratings for SNAP items is shown in Figure 1.
Table 1. SNAP Items: *Intercorrelations of Mean Ratings for True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>TOS</th>
<th>TOG</th>
<th>TFF</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.881**</td>
<td>.857**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.828**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

Table 2. SNAP Items: *Beta Weights and Intercepts for Unstandardized Multiple Regression Formulas for True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Intercept (SE)</th>
<th>Beta (SE)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-.145 (.062)</td>
<td>.245 (.019)</td>
<td>12.583</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>.282 (.112)</td>
<td>.482 (.162)</td>
<td>2.984</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>.175 (.034)</td>
<td>.794 (.057)</td>
<td>14.033</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>-.049 (.045)</td>
<td>.977 (.070)</td>
<td>14.033</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-.261 (.075)</td>
<td>.262 (.024)</td>
<td>11.132</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>.122 (.121)</td>
<td>.627 (.174)</td>
<td>3.606</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>1.249 (.154)</td>
<td>3.005 (.239)</td>
<td>12.583</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>1.651 (.140)</td>
<td>2.615 (.235)</td>
<td>11.132</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>2.535 (.416)</td>
<td>.800 (.599)</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Matrix Scatterplots for SNAP Items Showing Intercorrelations of True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD).

The correlational findings were very similar for the 60 NEO items as shown in Table 3 (for archival purposes, beta weights and intercepts for unstandardized simple regressions are also reported in Table 4). Specifically a high correlation ($r = .810, p < .01$) was found between TOS ratings and SD ratings. In addition, TFF ratings exhibited high correlations with TOS ratings ($r = .885, p < .01$) and with SD ratings ($r = .803, p < .01$). In contrast, TOG ratings exhibited
relatively low correlations with TOS ratings \( r = .352, p < .01 \) and with TFF ratings \( r = .346, p < .05 \), and a negative nonsignificant correlation with SD \( r = -.011, p < .01 \). A matrix scatter plot showing the interrelationship of TOS, TOG, TFF, and SD ratings for NEO items is shown in Figure 2.

Table 3. NEO Items: *Intercorrelations of Mean Ratings for True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>TOS</th>
<th>TOG</th>
<th>TFF</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.885**</td>
<td>.810**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>−.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.803**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**\( p < .01 \)**
Table 4. NEO Items: *Beta Weights and Intercepts for Unstandardized Multiple Regression Formulas for True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Intercept (SE)</th>
<th>Beta (SE)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.293 (.190)</td>
<td>.615 (.058)</td>
<td>10.524</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>1.410 (.639)</td>
<td>.550 (.192)</td>
<td>2.861</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>.131 (.217)</td>
<td>.966 (.067)</td>
<td>14.510</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>.585 (.184)</td>
<td>.812 (.056)</td>
<td>14.510</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.447 (.177)</td>
<td>.559 (.054)</td>
<td>10.263</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>1.567 (.587)</td>
<td>.496 (.177)</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>-.301 (.334)</td>
<td>1.067 (.101)</td>
<td>10.524</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>-.555 (.366)</td>
<td>1.153 (.112)</td>
<td>10.263</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>3.216 (.899)</td>
<td>-.023 (.271)</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Matrix Scatterplots for NEO Items Showing Intercorrelation of True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD).

Multiple Regressions: Predictors of TOS ratings

Davis (2005) performed a multiple regression in which TOS ratings for 150 “Barnum” personality statements were the criteria and SD and “True of Other” (TOO) ratings were the predictors. She found that these two predictors accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in TOS ratings (R = .841, $R^2 = .708$, $p < .001$), with both SD (standardized beta = .601)
and TOO (standardized beta = .376) independently and significantly contributing to the predictive power of the regression equation ($p < .001$).

However, the interpretation of Davis’ finding is somewhat ambiguous, because she instructed participants in the TOO condition to “rate each item for how true it is of people in general... in other words, is the trait true of your friends, family and other people you know” (p. 86). As can be seen, these instructions asked participants to rate items simultaneously on what the present study has treated as two separate dimensions: “True of Other People in General” and “True of Family and Friends.”

To help clarify the findings of Davis (2005), a series of multiple regressions were carried out on the present SNAP and NEO ratings. In the first and second multiple regressions, SD and TOG were entered simultaneously as predictors of TOS. Results are shown in Tables 5 and 6. In the third and fourth multiple regressions, SD and TFF were entered simultaneously as predictors of TOS. Results are shown in Tables 7 and 8.

As can be seen, the results of the multiple regressions are fairly similar for both the SNAP and NEO items: (1) when SD and TOG are entered simultaneously as predictors of TOS, the beta weights for both predictors are statistically significant, although the standardized weight of SD is substantially larger than the standardized weight of TOG; (2) when SD and TFF are entered simultaneously as predictors of TOS, the beta weights for both predictors are statistically significant, although the standardized weight of TFF is moderately to substantially larger than the standardized weight of SD.
Table 5. SNAP Items: Multiple Regression with SD and TOG as Predictors and TOS as Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstdzd B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Stdzd B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.310</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>12.989</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>3.574</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .886$, $R^2 = .784$, $F (2, 56) = 101.909$, $p < .001$

Table 6. NEO Items: Multiple Regression with SD and TOG as Predictors and TOS as Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstdzd B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Stdzd B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.578</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>13.306</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>5.899</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .887$, $R^2 = .787$, $F (2, 57) = 105.042$, $p < .001$
Table 7. SNAP Items: Multiple Regression with SD and TFF as Predictors and TOS as Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstdzd B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Stdzd B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>4.137</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>5.497</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R = .910, R^2 = .828, F(2, 56) = 134.763, p < .001 \]

Table 8. NEO Items: Multiple Regression with SD and TFF as Predictors and TOS as Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstdzd B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Stdzd B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>6.857</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R = .901, R^2 = .812, F(2, 57) = 122.812, p < .001 \]

**Differences Between TOS, TFF, and TOG ratings**

Using simple subtraction, differences were calculated between TOS and TOG ratings (TOS - TOG), TFF and TOG ratings (TFF - TOG), and TOS and TFF ratings (TOS - TFF). The correlations of these differences with SD were then calculated, as shown in Table 9 for SNAP items and in Table 10 for NEO items. As can be seen in both tables, TOS - TOG exhibited large correlations with SD ratings \( r = .717 \) and \( .835 \), indicating that participants tended to rate themselves more highly than other people on socially desirable items. Similarly, TFF - TOG exhibited large correlations with SD ratings \( r = .755 \) and \( .809 \), indicating that participants tended to rate their family and friends more highly than other people on socially desirable items. However, TOS - TFF exhibited only small and non-significant correlations with SD ratings \( r = \)
-.115 and .159), indicating that participants showed little if any tendency to rate themselves more highly than their family and friends on socially desirable items.

Table 9. SNAP Items: Correlations of Difference Scores for True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), With Social Desirability (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOS - TOG</th>
<th>TFF - TOG</th>
<th>TOS - TFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.717**</td>
<td>.755**</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01. N = 59 items.

Table 10. NEO Items: Correlations of Difference Scores for True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), With Social Desirability (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOS - TOG</th>
<th>TFF - TOG</th>
<th>TOS - TFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.835**</td>
<td>.809**</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01. N = 60 items.

**MPQ Common Faults and Rare Virtues**

Exploratory analyses were performed on items from the MPQ-BF tentatively labeled as Common Fault and Rare Virtue items. On the basis of the prior research by Farley-Icard (2007), it was not expected that the tentatively labeled Common Fault items would produce the desired result of having low social desirability ratings while maintaining a high endorsement rate, or that items tentatively labeled as Rare Virtues would produce the desired result of having high social desirability ratings while maintaining a low endorsement rate.

In Table 11, mean ratings of the MPQ-BF Common Fault and Rare Virtue items on SD, TOS, TOG, and TFF are compared with ratings for regular SNAP items. The scatter plot in
Figure 3 compares the SD and TOS ratings of regular SNAP items with the SD and TOS ratings of the Common Fault (MPQ-CF) and Rare Virtue (MPQ-RV) items from the MPQ.

As can be seen in Figure 3, when compared with the regular SNAP items, most Common Fault items exhibited substantially higher endorsement rates than would be expected based on their social desirability. That is, the Common Fault items generally performed as Common Fault items are intended to perform (relatively high endorsement rate, relatively low social desirability). Similarly, when compared with the regular SNAP items, most Rare Virtue items in Figure 3 exhibited substantially lower endorsement rates than would be expected based on their social desirability. That is, the Rare Virtue items performed as Rare Virtue items are intended to perform (relatively high social desirability, relatively low endorsement rate). These findings were unexpected because they appeared inconsistent with the inability of Farley-Icard (2007) to create genuine Common Fault and Rare Virtue items.
Table 11. *Table Showing Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations of SNAP Items, Rare Virtue Items, and Common Fault Items for Social Desirability (SD), True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), and True of Friends and Family (TFF).*

Mean Ratings for SNAP, Rare Virtues, and Common Faults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD Mean (sd)</th>
<th>TOS Mean (sd)</th>
<th>TOG Mean (sd)</th>
<th>TFF Mean (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNAP</td>
<td>3.074 (0.764)</td>
<td>0.607 (0.218)</td>
<td>0.674 (0.166)</td>
<td>0.544 (0.242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>2.685 (0.155)</td>
<td>0.831 (0.081)</td>
<td>0.919 (0.035)</td>
<td>0.749 (0.136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>3.186 (0.292)</td>
<td>0.454 (0.181)</td>
<td>0.348 (0.117)</td>
<td>0.384 (0.208)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further exploratory analyses were performed to examine the characteristics of Common Fault and Rare Virtue items. First, intercorrelations of TOS, TFF, TOG, and SD were calculated for the Common Fault Items, as shown in Table 12 and the corresponding scatter plot matrix in Figure 4. The pattern of correlations for Common Fault items was similar in most respects to the pattern of correlations for the SNAP and NEO items. Specifically, SD, TOS, and TFF were all highly correlated with each other (all \( r_s > .75 \)). However, unlike the SNAP and NEO items, the
Common Fault items produced a substantial correlation between TOG and SD ($r = .777, p < .05$).

Table 12. Intercorrelations of Mean Ratings of MPQ Common Fault Items for True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), and Social Desirability (SD).

MPO Common Fault Intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>TOS</th>
<th>TOG</th>
<th>TFF</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.794*</td>
<td>.761*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td></td>
<td>.777*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td>.842*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Similar analyses were then performed using the Rare Virtue items. Table 13 shows the intercorrelations of TOS, TOG, TFF, and SD for Rare Virtue items, and a corresponding scatter plot matrix is shown in Figure 5. The results were unexpected. SD did not correlate significantly with either TOS or TFF for Rare Virtue items, as would have been expected based on the analyses of regular items and Common Fault items.
Table 13. *Intercorrelations of Mean Ratings of MPQ Rare Virtue Items for True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), and Social Desirability (SD).*

**MPQ Rare Virtue Intercorrelations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>TOS</th>
<th>TOG</th>
<th>TFF</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.975**</td>
<td>.934**</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.889**</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01**
Figure 5. Matrix Scatterplots for MPQ Rare Virtue Items Showing Intercorrelations of True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD).

For ease of comparison, Figure 6 presents the patterns of intercorrelations of TOS, TFF, TOG, and SD for (a) the regular SNAP items in the present study, (b) the regular NEO items in the present study, (c) the Common Fault items, and (d) the Rare Virtue items. As shown in Figure 6, the Common Fault items generally performed similar to the SNAP and NEO items, however, the Rare Virtue items did not.
**Figure 6.** Matrix Scatterplots for MPQ Rare Virtue Items Showing Intercorrelations of True of Self (TOS), True of Other People in General (TOG), True of Friends and Family (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD).
Chapter 4: Discussion

Several findings of the present study are notable. First, as predicted, item ratings for true of self, true of friends and family, and social desirability were all strongly correlated with each other. Though it was predicted that there would be a correlation between ratings of “true of other people in general” and social desirability, the results indicated that this was not the case. In addition, the items taken from the Unlikely Virtues scale of the MPQ-BF produced surprising results. The true of self ratings exhibited a substantial correlation with social desirability ratings for the Common Fault items but not the Rare Virtue items. These findings are discussed more fully in the sections that follow.

4.1 The Relation of Social Desirability with Ratings of the Self

The present study found a very strong relation between the endorsement rate of items and their perceived social desirability for both the SNAP (\(r = .857, p < .01\)) and the NEO (\(r = .810, p < .01\)). These findings replicate results reported more than 50 years ago by Edwards (1953) and Hanley (1956), as well as findings reported more recently by Davis (2005) and Farley-Icard (2007). It is evident that even with the SNAP and NEO-FFI, two recently developed and commonly used self-report personality tests, respondents exhibited a marked tendency to answer items in a way consistent with the items’ social desirability.

The strong correlation between the endorsement rates of personality test items and the items’ social desirability is apparently due to what social psychologists refer to as “self-serving bias” (Breckler, Olson, & Wiggins, 2006; see also Dunning, Perie, & Story, 1991). That is, people tend to overestimate their positive traits and underestimate their negative traits. So, for this study, when participants felt the item represented a positive characteristic, they endorsed it
more often. When they felt the items represented a negative characteristic, they were less likely
to endorse it, thus supporting an inflated impression of the self (Breckler, Olson, & Wiggins,
2006).

4.2 The Relation of Social Desirability with Ratings of Other People

Edwards (1959) proposed that the relation between social desirability and endorsement
rate may not be due to the tendency to present oneself in a positive light. Instead, he suggested
that the relative social desirability of a trait is determined by the trait’s prevalence in society.
That is, traits common in society are seen as more socially desirable and are therefore more
likely to be endorsed.

Edwards’ (1959) view received apparent support from a study by Smith, Smith, and
Seymour (1993). After obtaining social desirability ratings for a set of items, the researchers
asked participants to rate the items based on an acquaintance. Specifically, they were asked to
think of someone of the same gender and approximately the same age as themselves whom they
knew very well. They were instructed to consider the items as descriptors of that person. The
researchers found that when participants were describing acquaintances, they showed a marked
tendency to endorse those items that were also considered to be more socially desirable ($r = .81,$
$p < .01$). The researchers interpreted their findings as supportive of Edwards’ view that social
desirability represents prevalence of a trait in society.

However, the present findings indicate that when people are asked to rate the personality
traits of others, the instructions can make a big difference. If people are asked to rate personality
traits of their friends and family, the ratings on average closely resemble the ratings that people
give to themselves. For instance, in the present study, the correlation between average item
ratings concerning the self (TOS) and average item ratings concerning family and friends (TFF) was .881, \( p < .01 \) for the SNAP and .885, \( p < .01 \) for the NEO-FFI.

However, if people are asked to rate the personality traits of other individuals “in general,” the ratings bear only a weak resemblance to the ratings that people give to themselves. For instance, in the present study, the correlation between average item ratings regarding the self (TOS) and average ratings regarding other people “in general” (TOG) was .368, \( p < .01 \) for the SNAP and .352, \( p < .01 \) for the NEO-FFI.

It also appears that when people rate the personality traits of their family and friends, these ratings are highly correlated with social desirability, though the same is not true when ratings are made of other people “in general.” For instance, in the present study the correlation of TFF with SD was .828, \( p < .01 \) for the SNAP and .803, \( p < .01 \) for the NEO. In contrast, the correlation of TOG with SD was much lower, only .174 for the SNAP and -.011 for the NEO. These findings thus directly contradict what was proposed by Edwards (1959) and Smith, Smith, and Seymour (1993). When participants are asked about someone they know, they tend to engage in socially desirable responding quite consistently. However, when asked about the general public, the correlation drops dramatically suggesting that socially desirable responding is not simply a reflection of common traits in society.

The high correlation of TFF with SD may be due to what social psychologists have called the “other-serving bias,” in which people portray others in a more positive way when they are seen as an extension of the self (Breckler, Olson, and Wiggins; 2006). This explanation is further supported by the low correlation between ratings of other people in general and social desirability. When people are specifically asked to rate the human race “in general,” perceived
social desirability does not appear to have a strong influence on the ratings. This might explain why both Davis (2005) and Farley-Icard (2007) found that ratings of “true of others” (TOO) were moderately to strongly related to social desirability. In these two studies, the participants who rated items for TOO were instructed to think of their “friends and family.”

4.3 Exploratory Findings Regarding Common Fault and Rare Virtue Items

Though the number of Common Fault and Rare Virtues items examined in this study was rather small (7 items of each type) the exploratory findings were unexpected and interesting. Prior research by Farley-Icard (2007) suggested that because social desirability and endorsement rates are so highly correlated, it may difficult or even impossible to create Common Fault and Rare Virtue items. However, the present study found that the items from the MPQ-BF Unlikely Virtues scale do perform in the way that Common Fault and Rare Virtue items are supposed to perform. That is, the 7 Common Fault items generally showed the expected pattern of having low social desirability but high endorsement rate, whereas the 7 Rare Virtue items exhibited relatively high social desirability and relatively low endorsement rate.

The present findings present something of a puzzle. Why was Farley-Icard (2007) unsuccessful in creating Rare Virtue and Common Fault items if, as the present findings show, such items do in fact exist? One explanation that suggests itself is that the descriptive content of Farley-Icard’s items was somehow inadequate. That is, the items perhaps failed to describe personality attributes and behaviors that were truly “rare virtues” or “common faults.”

However, this explanation does not seem to fit the facts very well. Specifically, the descriptive content of the Rare Virtue items that “failed” in Farley-Icard’s (2007) study does not appear to have been much different from the content of the Rare Virtue items that “succeeded” in
the present study. For instance, three Rare Virtue items included in Farley-Icard’s study were as follows:

“You are extraordinarily courteous to others.”

“You are a remarkably charitable person.”

“You’re exceptionally honest making every attempt not to deceive others.”

Compare the preceding three items with the following three MPQ-BF Rare Virtue items, which were used in the present study:

“My opinions are always completely reasonable.”

“I have always been completely fair to others.”

“I always tell the entire truth.”

As can be seen, the descriptive content of Rare Virtue items was similar in the Farley-Icard (2007) and present studies, and thus probably does not account for the different results of the two studies. However, three other possible explanations suggest themselves. First, as the preceding examples show, Farley-Icard’s Rare Virtue items were written in the second person singular (‘‘You are....’’) whereas the Rare Virtue items in the present study were written in the first person singular (‘‘I have always....’’). It is possible that the second-person and first-person format of the items drastically affected their properties as Rare Virtue items. Thus respondents may be relatively more willing to attribute rare virtues to themselves if the response format is second person singular (as in the Farley-Icard study), but respondents may be relatively less willing to attribute such virtues to themselves if the format is first person singular (as in the present study).
A second possible explanation concerns the way that Rare Virtues were characterized in the two studies. Farley-Icard’s (2007) Rare Virtue items tended to characterize the virtues as *normatively exceptional* (“extraordinarily courteous,” “exceptionally honest”), whereas the Rare Virtue Items in the present study tended to characterize the virtues as *persistent and consistent over time* (“always completely fair,” “always completely reasonable”). It is possible that respondents are relatively more likely to attribute rare virtues to themselves when the virtues are characterized as normatively exceptional (as in the Farley-Icard study), and that respondents are relatively less likely to attribute the virtues to themselves when the virtues are characterized as persistent and consistent over time (as in the present study).

A third possible explanation concerns the format used to collect ratings in the two studies. In Farley-Icard’s (2007) study, Rare Virtue and Common Fault items were rated on a Likert scale, whereas in the present study these items were rated as “True” or “False.” It may be that endorsement rates of Rare Virtue items are lower and the endorsement rates of Common Fault items is higher, if the ratings are made using a “True/False” rather than a Likert response format.

In another unexpected set of results, the present study found that the interrelationships of TOS, TFF, TOG, and SD ratings were quite different for Common Fault items than for Rare Virtue items. For Common Fault items, (a) TOS, TFF, and SD were all strongly correlated with each other (a pattern also seen with regular SNAP and NEO items), but (b) TOG was also strongly related to SD (an unusual pattern not seen with regular SNAP and NEO items). In contrast, for Rare Virtue items TOS, TFF, and TOG were all strongly correlated with each other, but not with SD.
Because the patterns of intercorrelations for Common Fault and Rare Virtue items are based on only a few items, any attempt to interpret these findings would be risky. However, future research should examine whether these patterns replicate in larger pools of items. It may be that such research could expand our understanding of the way that social desirability influences personality ratings.
Limitations of the Study

The present study had several limitations. First, the sample in this study was largely Hispanic and consisted mostly of people age 20 and younger. It could be questioned as to whether the present findings from a predominately Hispanic sample would generalize to non-Hispanic Americans. Specifically, the results might be different with a less collectivistic sample. This is likely a non-issue for two reasons: Even with a more collectivistic sample it has been shown that the correlation between social desirability and endorsement rate through lower is still significant. Iwawki, Fukuhara, & Hidano (1966) found correlations of .75 for males and .65 for females with a Japanese sample. Secondly, it has been shown that people from a Mexican background are not much more collectivistic than European Americans (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeir, 2002). However, it is possible that using an older and more ethnically diverse sample would produce different results.

A second limitation of the present study was its use of relatively few Common Fault and Rare Virtue items. Because the number of such items was small, the correlations observed in this study were suggestive but not definitive. It would have been desirable if the present study had also included a greater number of such items, for example the items of the Rare Virtues scale of the SNAP. The inclusion of a larger pool of items would have provided a better sense of their characteristics.

A third limitation of the present study was its presentation of all 14 Rare Virtue and Common Fault items at the end of the SNAP. It might have been better to disperse the Rare Virtue and Common Fault Items randomly alongside the items of the SNAP rather than clustering them together.
**Practical Implications**

The present findings suggest implications for the field of personality assessment and psychological testing as a whole. To begin with, the results show a correlation between social desirability and endorsement rate but because means and not individual scores were used, it does not definitively indicate the presence of individual differences in socially desirable responding. However, the results indicate that the influence of social desirability is an important consideration when using self-report personality questionnaires.

Also, there are implications for future test construction. Specifically, using methods that reduce the influence of social desirability rather than simply attempting to account for it. For example, finding a way to equalize social desirability of test items might help.

Finally, the results suggest that there is an influence of social desirability on the ratings people provide for their friends and family. This is important in clinical settings where inventories using description of others are used, such as the Achembach Behavioral Checklist and other measures where parents are asked to rate their children.
Future Directions

These findings raise questions that necessitate further research. It would be interesting to do the same study with a different sample. This might provide information about the motivation behind socially desirable responding. An older sample group might be less likely to engage in socially desirable responding due perhaps to maturity and greater self-awareness.

It would also be interesting to make items designed to measure social desirability more generic by removing reference to any person at all. For example the item “Rosa would never start a fist fight” could be changed to “Never starting fist fights” and participants could be asked how socially desirable they believe it is. This could remove any influence that proper names might cause.

Another future direction would be to include the social desirability scales of the measures being used. For example, the SNAP includes a scale of Rare Virtue items, and future research on social desirability and endorsement rates might include that scale. It would be informative to see how the items of such social desirability scales perform when they are presented as they would be during normal administration of the personality tests. Firstly, there would be more Rare Virtue and Common Fault items for analysis and it would be of interest to see how the correlations change. Also, this would more closely mimic the use of the tests in the field making the results more easily generalized to the population being tested with these inventories.

The results of the present study show that items that behave as true Common Fault and Rare Virtue items do exist, contrary to the conclusions of Farley-Icard (2007). It would be interesting to write items that more closely resemble the Unlikely Virtues scale of the MPQ-BF. To begin with, the items could be written in the first-person. Secondly, the response format could
make a difference. Using a true / false format rather than a Likert-type format may change the way the items perform. Finally, the presentation of the traits being asked about could make a difference. If the items were written as persistent and consistent rather than normatively exceptional, participants might be less likely to endorse the items as true of self. A future study could be done using the items created by Farley-Icard (2007) but having made all the aforementioned changes.

Also of interest would be whether or not the Rare Virtue and Common Fault results could be replicated using other samples of items. It could be possible that the intercorrelations for TOS, TFF, and TOG might be different using a more diverse sample of items.
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Appendix A

Items of the NEO-FFI Used in the Present Study

1. I am not a worrier.
2. I like to have a lot of people around me.
3. I don’t like to waste my time daydreaming.
4. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.
5. I keep my belongings clean and neat.
6. I often feel inferior to others.
7. I laugh easily.
8. Once I find the right way to do something I stick to it.
9. I often get into arguments with my friends and family.
10. I’m pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.
11. When I’m under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I’m going to pieces.
12. I don’t consider myself especially “light-hearted.”
13. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.
14. Some people think I’m selfish and egotistical.
15. I am not a very methodical person.
16. I rarely feel lonely or blue.
17. I really enjoy talking to people.
18. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them.
19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.
20. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously.
21. I often feel tense and jittery.

22. I like to be where the action is.

23. Poetry has little or no effect on me.

24. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others’ intentions.

25. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.

26. Sometimes I feel completely worthless.

27. I usually prefer to do things alone.

28. I often try new and foreign foods.

29. I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.

30. I waste a lot of time before settling down to work.

31. I rarely feel fearful or anxious.

32. I often feel as if I’m bursting with energy.

33. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.

34. Most people I know like me.

35. I work hard to accomplish my goals.

36. I often get angry at the way people treat me.

37. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person.

38. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.

39. Some people think of me as cold and calculating.

40. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.

41. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.

42. I am not a cheerful optimist.
43. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.

44. I’m hard-headed and tough-minded in my attributes.

45. Sometimes I’m not as dependable or reliable as I should be.

46. I am seldom sad or depressed.

47. My life is fast-paced.

48. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.

49. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.

50. I am a productive person who always gets the job done.

51. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.

52. I am a very active person.

53. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.

54. If I don’t like people, I let them know it.

55. I never seem to be able to get organized.

56. At times I have been so ashamed that I just wanted to hide.

57. I would rather go my own way than be leader of others.

58. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.

59. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.

60. I strive for excellence in everything I do.
Appendix B

Items of the SNAP Used in the Present Study.

1. I like to keep my dignity at all costs.
2. As a kid, I was always getting into trouble for breaking the rules at home or at school.
3. I hate it when the topic of conversation turns to me.
4. Most people make friends because they expect friends to be useful.
5. People seem to think I’m odd.
6. I find that different odors have different colors.
7. I like people to notice how I look when I go out in public.
8. I don’t like to be noticed when I walk into a room.
9. I am a very special person.
10. Sometimes I hit people who have done something to deserve it.
11. I am very level-headed and always like to “keep my feet on the ground.
12. Even when I have done something very well, I usually demand that I do better the next time.
13. I sometimes feel unreal, or as if I am looking at myself from outside.
14. I would never start a fist fight.
15. I feel a strong need to have others approve of me.
16. I am not unusually talented.
17. Sometimes I know that something will happen before it actually does.
18. I base many of my decisions on what other people think.
19. It’s fun to take advantage of others’ weak points.
20. People say that I drive myself hard.
21. I often keep working on a problem long after others have given up.
22. People sometimes try to make me look foolish.
23. I frequently check with others to see if I’m doing OK.
24. I am a cautious person.
25. I rarely get so angry that I lose control.
26. I always try to be fully prepared before I begin working on anything.
27. I rarely look to others to help me make decisions.
28. It’s safer to keep things to yourself.
29. I seldom feel like hitting anyone.
30. I’ve wasted a lot of my life.
31. Higher standards of conduct are what this country needs most.
32. At times I somehow feel the presence of someone who is not really there.
33. I enjoy working hard.
34. I love to flirt.
35. I am a “people person.”
36. No matter how busy I am, I always find some time to have fun.
37. I sometimes rush from one activity to another without stopping to rest.
38. I lead an active life.
39. I lead a very interesting life.
40. My anger frequently gets the better of me.
41. Little things upset me too much.
42. I can’t stand being alone for any length of time.
43. I deserve the best.
44. If I had to choose, I would prefer being in a flood to unloading a ton of newspapers from a truck.
45. I put a lot of energy into everything I do.
46. I often worry about things I have done or said.
47. I am always on the lookout for fun.
48. I often have trouble sleeping because of my worries.
49. Sometimes I feel “on edge” all day.
50. I often feel personally or socially inadequate.
51. I get pretty excited when I’m starting a new project.
52. I have a very hard time getting over relationships that have ended.
53. I’m not sure anyone can understand my problems.
54. I spend a good deal of my time just having fun.
55. When I’m alone, I often worry about whether I’ll be able to handle things.
56. For me life is a great adventure.
57. It takes someone really special to understand and appreciate me.
58. I worry a great deal about embarrassing myself in front of others.
59. I don’t pay much attention when people praise or criticize me.
Appendix C

MPQ Items: Rare Virtues and Common Faults

**Rare Virtue Items**

63. I have always been extremely courageous in facing difficult situations.

65. My opinions are always completely reasonable.

67. I have always been completely fair to others.

69. I always tell the entire truth.

73. I have never felt that I was better than someone else.

74. Never in my whole life have I wished for anything that I was not entitled to.

71. Never in my whole life have I taken advantage of anyone.

**Common Fault Items**

61. I have occasionally felt discouraged about something.

62. My table manners are not always perfect.

64. At times, I have been envious of someone.

66. I have at times eaten too much.

68. I have at times been angry with someone.

70. Sometimes I’m a bit lazy.

72. I have sometimes felt slightly hesitant about helping someone who asked me to.
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

I am being asked to participate in a research study that will contribute to a better understanding of college students’ personality traits. My participation will involve a single session that will take 15 to 30 minutes. I will not be called back for any further participation. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Texas at El Paso.

PROCEDURES

At the session I will complete a paper and pencil questionnaire that is designed to obtain a better understanding about personality traits. This questionnaire will then be scored by the experimenter. If I feel anxious, uncomfortable or embarrassed about answering anything, I do not have to answer that question.

BENEFITS

My participation will contribute to better understanding of personality. I will receive 1/2 hour of experimental credit. There are no risks involved. If I decide not to participate, I can contact my Psychology professor for information on how to satisfy the research credit by other means.

CONFIDENTIALITY

My identity in this study will be kept confidential. My test results will be assigned an identification number that will be known only by the researchers. No other identifying information will be recorded.

QUESTIONS

If I have any questions about this study, I may contact Dr. James Wood at 915-747-6570 or Lola Norton, IRB Administrator at the University of Texas at El Paso at 915-747-8841 or irb.orsp@utep.edu, to answer questions regarding research participants’ rights.

CONSENT

By signing this consent form, I acknowledge that the study has been explained to me. I have read the entire consent form and have spoken to the investigator or his/her representative and have had my questions answered to my satisfaction. My signature on this form indicates I voluntarily consent to participate in this study.

___________________________________________        _____________________
Participant’s Signature                                                          Date
Appendix E

Demographic Questionnaire

What is your age? __________

What is your gender? Male Female

Please indicate the ethnic group(s) to which you belong:

_____Mexican National  _____Mexican American

_____Other Hispanic/Latin ethnic group (please specify) _______________________

_____Anglo  _____African American

_____Asian American  _____Native American

_____Other (please specify) __________________________

What is your first language? English Spanish Other __________
Appendix F

True of Self Questionnaire (SNAP and MPQ Items)

Read each statement carefully. Then determine whether it is true or false for you. Select “T” if it is mostly true and “F” if it is mostly false.

1. I like to keep my dignity at all costs. T F
2. As a kid, I was always getting into trouble for
   breaking the rules at home or at school. T F
3. I hate it when the topic of conversation turns to me. T F
4. Most people make friends because they expect friends to be useful. T F
5. People seem to think I’m odd. T F
6. I find that different odors have different colors. T F
7. I like people to notice how I look when I go out in public. T F
8. I don’t like to be noticed when I walk into a room. T F
9. I am a very special person. T F
10. Sometimes I hit people who have done something to deserve it. T F
11. I am very level-headed and always like to “keep my feet on the ground.” T F
12. Even when I have done something very well, I usually demand that I do better the next time. T F
13. I sometimes feel unreal, or as if I am looking at myself from outside. T F
14. I would never start a fist fight. T F
15. I feel a strong need to have others approve of me. T F
16. I am not unusually talented. T F
17. Sometimes I know that something will happen before it actually does. T F
18. I base many of my decisions on what other people think. T F
19. It’s fun to take advantage of others’ weak points. T F
20. People say that I drive myself hard. T F
21. I often keep working on a problem long after others have given up. T F
22. People sometimes try to make me look foolish. T F
23. I frequently check with others to see if I’m doing OK. T F
24. I am a cautious person. T F
25. I rarely get so angry that I lose control. T F
26. I always try to be fully prepared before I begin working on anything. T F
27. I rarely look to others to help me make decisions. T F
28. It’s safer to keep things to yourself. T F
29. I seldom feel like hitting anyone. T F
30. I’ve wasted a lot of my life. T F
31. Higher standards of conduct are what this country needs most. T F
32. At times I somehow feel the presence of someone who is not
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. I enjoy working hard.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I love to flirt.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am a “people person.”</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. No matter how busy I am, I always find some time to have fun.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I sometimes rush from one activity to another without stopping to rest.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I lead an active life.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I lead a very interesting life.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My anger frequently gets the better of me.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Little things upset me too much.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I can’t stand being alone for any length of time.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I deserve the best.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. If I had to choose, I would prefer being in a flood to unloading a ton of newspapers from a truck.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I put a lot of energy into everything I do.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I often worry about things I have done or said.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I am always on the lookout for fun.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I often have trouble sleeping because of my worries.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Sometimes I feel “on edge” all day.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I often feel personally or socially inadequate.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I get pretty excited when I’m starting a new project.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I have a very hard time getting over relationships that have ended.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I’m not sure anyone can understand my problems.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I spend a good deal of my time just having fun.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. When I’m alone, I often worry about whether I’ll be able to handle things.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. For me life is a great adventure.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. It takes someone really special to understand and appreciate me.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. I worry a great deal about embarrassing myself in front of others.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. I don’t pay much attention when people praise or criticize me.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I have occasionally felt discouraged about something.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. My table manners are not always perfect.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. I have always been extremely courageous in facing difficult situations.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. At times, I have been envious of someone.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. My opinions are always completely reasonable.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. I have at times eaten too much.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. I have always been completely fair to others.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. I have at times been angry with someone.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. I always tell the entire truth.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Sometimes I’m a bit lazy.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Never in my whole life have I taken advantage of anyone.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. I have sometimes felt slightly hesitant about helping someone who asked me to.</td>
<td>T   F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
73. I have never felt that I was better than someone else.  
74. Never in my whole life have I wished for anything that I was not entitled to.

T  F  
T  F
Appendix F cont’d

True of Self Questionnaire (NEO Items)

Read each statement carefully. Then circle one of the following answer choices.

**SD** if you strongly disagree  
**D** if you disagree or it is mostly false  
**N** for neutral  
**A** if you agree or it is mostly true  
**SA** if you strongly agree

1. I am not a worrier.  
2. I like to have a lot of people around me.  
3. I don’t like to waste my time daydreaming.  
4. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.  
5. I keep my belongings clean and neat.  
6. I often feel inferior to others.  
7. I laugh easily.  
8. Once I find the right way to do something I stick to it.  
9. I often get into arguments with my friends and family.  
10. I’m pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.  
11. When I’m under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I’m going to pieces.  
12. I don’t consider myself especially “light-hearted.”  
13. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.  
14. Some people think I’m selfish and egotistical.  
15. I am not a very methodical person.  
16. I rarely feel lonely or blue.  
17. I really enjoy talking to people.  
18. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them.  
19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.  
20. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously.  
21. I often feel tense and jittery.  
22. I like to be where the action is.  
23. Poetry has little or no effect on me.  
24. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others’ intentions.  
25. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.  
26. Sometimes I feel completely worthless.
27. I usually prefer to do things alone.  SD  D  N  A  SA
28. I often try new and foreign foods.  SD  D  N  A  SA
29. I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.  SD  D  N  A  SA
30. I waste a lot of time before settling down to work.  SD  D  N  A  SA
31. I rarely feel fearful or anxious.  SD  D  N  A  SA
32. I often feel as if I’m bursting with energy.  SD  D  N  A  SA
33. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.  SD  D  N  A  SA
34. Most people I know like me.  SD  D  N  A  SA
35. I work hard to accomplish my goals.  SD  D  N  A  SA
36. I often get angry at the way people treat me.  SD  D  N  A  SA
37. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person.  SD  D  N  A  SA
38. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.  SD  D  N  A  SA
39. Some people think of me as cold and calculating.  SD  D  N  A  SA
40. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.  SD  D  N  A  SA
41. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.  SD  D  N  A  SA
42. I am not a cheerful optimist.  SD  D  N  A  SA
43. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.  SD  D  N  A  SA
44. I’m hard-headed and tough-minded in my attributes.  SD  D  N  A  SA
45. Sometimes I’m not as dependable or reliable as I should be.  SD  D  N  A  SA
46. I am seldom sad or depressed.  SD  D  N  A  SA
47. My life is fast-paced.  SD  D  N  A  SA
48. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.  SD  D  N  A  SA
49. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.  SD  D  N  A  SA
50. I am a productive person who always gets the job done.  SD  D  N  A  SA
51. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.  SD  D  N  A  SA
52. I am a very active person.  SD  D  N  A  SA
53. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.  SD  D  N  A  SA
54. If I don’t like people, I let them know it.  SD  D  N  A  SA
55. I never seem to be able to get organized.  SD  D  N  A  SA
56. At times I have been so ashamed that I just wanted to hide.  SD  D  N  A  SA
57. I would rather go my own way than be leader of others.  SD  D  N  A  SA
58. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.  SD  D  N  A  SA
59. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.  SD  D  N  A  SA
60. I strive for excellence in everything I do.
Appendix G

True of Others in General Questionnaire (SNAP and MPQ Items)

Read each statement carefully. Then determine whether it is true or false for other people in general.
Select “T” if it is mostly true and “F” if it is mostly false.

1. Most people like to keep their dignity at all costs. T F
2. As kids, most people always got into trouble for breaking the rules at home or at school. T F
3. Most people hate it when the topic of conversation turns to them. T F
4. Most people make friends because they expect friends to be useful. T F
5. Most people seem to think others believe they are odd. T F
6. Most people find that different odors have different colors. T F
7. Most people like others to notice how they look when they go out in public. T F
8. Most people don’t like to be noticed when they walk into a room. T F
9. Most people consider themselves to be a very special person. T F
10. Most people will sometimes hit someone who has done something to deserve it. T F
11. Most people are very level-headed and always like to “keep their feet on the ground.” T F
12. Even when someone has done something very well, they usually demand that they do better the next time. T F
13. Most people sometimes feel unreal, or as if they are looking at themselves from outside. T F
14. Most people would never start a fist fight. T F
15. Most people feel a strong need to have others approve of them. T F
16. Most people are not unusually talented. T F
17. Most people sometimes know that something will happen before it actually does. T F
18. Most people base many of their decisions on what other people think. T F
19. Most people think it’s fun to take advantage of others’ weak points. T F
20. Most people drive themselves hard. T F
21. Most people often keep working on a problem long after others have given up. T F
22. People sometimes try to make others look foolish. T F
23. Most people frequently check with others to see if they’re doing OK. T F
24. Most people are cautious. T F
25. Most people rarely get so angry that they lose control. T F
26. Most people always try to be fully prepared before they begin working on anything. T F
27. Most people rarely look to others to help them make decisions. T F
28. Most people feel it’s safer to keep things to themselves. T
29. Most people seldom feel like hitting anyone. T
30. Most people have wasted a lot of their lives. T
31. Most people believe higher standards of conduct are what this country needs most. T
32. At times most people somehow feel the presence of someone who is not really there. T
33. Most people enjoy working hard. T
34. Most people love to flirt. T
35. Most people are “people persons.” T
36. No matter how busy they are, most people try to find time to have fun. T
37. Most people sometimes rush from one activity to another without stopping to rest. T
38. Most people lead active lives. T
39. Most people lead very interesting lives. T
40. Most people’s anger frequently gets the better of them. T
41. Little things upset most people too much. T
42. Most people can’t stand being alone for any length of time. T
43. Most people deserve the best. T
44. If they had to choose, most people would prefer being in a flood to unloading a ton of newspapers from a truck. T
45. Most people put a lot of energy into everything they do. T
46. Most people often worry about things they have done or said. T
47. Most people are always on the lookout for fun. T
48. Most people often have trouble sleeping because of their worries. T
49. Most people sometimes feel “on edge” all day. T
50. Most people often feel personally or socially inadequate. T
51. Most people get pretty excited when they’re starting a new project. T
52. Most people have a very hard time getting over relationships that have ended. T
53. Most people are not sure anyone can understand their problems. T
54. Most people spend a good deal of time just having fun. T
55. When people are alone, they often worry about whether they will be able to handle things. T
56. Most people worry a great deal about embarrassing themselves in front of others. T
57. Most people don’t pay much attention when others praise or criticize them. T
58. Most people have occasionally felt discouraged about something. T
59. Most people’s table manners are not always perfect. T
63. Most people are always extremely courageous in facing difficult situations. T F
64. At times, most people have been envious of someone. T F
65. Most people’s opinions are always completely reasonable. T F
66. Most people have at times eaten too much. T F
67. Most people are always completely fair to others. T F
68. Most people have at times been angry with someone. T F
69. Most people always tell the entire truth. T F
70. Most people sometimes are a bit lazy. T F
71. Most people have never in their whole lives taken advantage of anyone. T F
72. Most people have sometimes felt slightly hesitant about helping someone who asked them to. T F
73. Most people have never felt that they were better than someone else. T F
74. Most people have never in their whole lives wished for anything that they were not entitled to. T F
Appendix G cont’d

True of Others in General Questionnaire (NEO Items)

Read each statement carefully. Then circle one of the following answer choices.

SD if you strongly disagree
D if you disagree or it is mostly false
N for neutral
A if you agree or it is mostly true
SA if you strongly agree

1. Other people in general are not worriers. SD D N A SA
2. Most people generally like to have people around them. SD D N A SA
3. Most people don’t like to waste time daydreaming. SD D N A SA
4. Most people try to be courteous to everyone they meet. SD D N A SA
5. Most people keep their belongings clean and neat. SD D N A SA
6. Most people often feel inferior to others. SD D N A SA
7. People generally laugh easily. SD D N A SA
8. Once people find the right way to do something they stick to it. SD D N A SA
9. People often get into arguments with friends and family. SD D N A SA
10. Most people are pretty good about pacing themselves so as to get things done on time. SD D N A SA
11. When people are under a great deal of stress, sometimes they feel like they are going to pieces. SD D N A SA
12. Most people don’t consider themselves especially “light-hearted.” SD D N A SA
13. Most people are intrigued by the patterns they find in art and nature. SD D N A SA
14. Most people see others as selfish and egotistical. SD D N A SA
15. Most people are not very methodical. SD D N A SA
16. Most people rarely feel lonely or blue. SD D N A SA
17. Most people enjoy talking to others. SD D N A SA
18. Most people believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them. SD D N A SA
19. Most people would rather cooperate with others than compete with them. SD D N A SA
20. Most people try to perform all the tasks assigned to them conscientiously. SD D N A SA
21. Most people often feel tense and jittery. SD D N A SA
22. Most people like to be where the action is. SD D N A SA
23. Poetry has little or no effect on most people. SD D N A SA
24. Most people tend to be cynical and skeptical of others’ intentions.  
25. Most people have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.  
26. Most people feel completely worthless sometimes.  
27. Most people usually prefer to do things alone.  
28. Most people often try new and foreign foods.  
29. Most people believe that others will take advantage of them if they let them.  
30. Most people waste a lot of time before settling down to work.  
31. Most people rarely feel fearful or anxious.  
32. Most people often feel as if they are bursting with energy.  
33. Most people seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.  
34. Most people believe they are liked by most everyone else.  
35. Most people work hard to accomplish their goals.  
36. Most people often get angry at the way others treat them.  
37. Most people are cheerful and high-spirited.  
38. Most people believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.  
39. Most people think that some others think of them as cold and calculating.  
40. When most people make a commitment, they can always be counted on to follow through.  
41. Too often, when things go wrong, most people get discouraged and feel like giving up.  
42. Most people are not cheerful optimists.  
43. Sometimes when reading poetry or looking at a work of art, most people feel a chill or wave of excitement.  
44. Most people are hard-headed and tough-minded in their attributes.  
45. Sometimes most people are not as dependable or reliable as they should be.  
46. Most people are seldom sad or depressed.  
47. Most people’s lives are fast-paced.  
48. Most people have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.  
49. Most people generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.  
50. Most people are productive people who always get the

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>39.</td>
<td>40.</td>
<td>41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>49.</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
job done. SD D N A SA
51. Most people often feel helpless and want someone else to solve their problems. SD D N A SA
52. Most people are very active. SD D N A SA
53. Most people have a lot of intellectual curiosity. SD D N A SA
54. Most people generally let others know if they don’t like them. SD D N A SA
55. Most people never seem to be able to get organized. SD D N A SA
56. At times most people have been so ashamed that they just wanted to hide. SD D N A SA
57. Most people would rather go their own way than be leaders of others. SD D N A SA
58. Most people often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas. SD D N A SA
59. If necessary, most people are willing to manipulate people to get what they want. SD D N A SA
60. Most people strive for excellence in everything they do. SD D N A SA
Appendix H

True of Friends and Family Questionnaire (SNAP and MPQ Items)

Read each statement carefully. Then determine whether it is true or false for your friends and family.

Select “T” if it is mostly true and “F” if it is mostly false.

1. My friends and family like to keep their dignity at all costs. T F
2. As kids, my friends and family always got into trouble for breaking the rules at home or at school. T F
3. My friends and family hate it when the topic of conversation turns to them. T F
4. My friends and family tend to make friends because they expect friends to be useful. T F
5. My friends and family seem to think others believe they are odd. T F
6. My friends and family find that different odors have different colors. T F
7. My friends and family like others to notice how they look when they go out in public. T F
8. My friends and family don’t like to be noticed when they walk into a room. T F
9. My friends and family consider themselves to be very special people. T F
10. My friends and family will sometimes hit someone who has done something to deserve it. T F
11. My friends and family are very level-headed and always like to “keep their feet on the ground.” T F
12. Even when they have done something very well, my friends and family usually demand that they do better the next time. T F
13. My friends and family sometimes feel unreal, or as if they are looking at themselves from outside. T F
14. My friends and family would never start a fist fight. T F
15. My friends and family feel a strong need to have others approve of them. T F
16. My friends and family are not unusually talented. T F
17. My friends and family sometimes know that something will happen before it actually does. T F
18. My friends and family base many of their decisions on what other people think. T F
19. My friends and family think it’s fun to take advantage of others’ weak points. T F
20. My friends and family drive themselves hard. T F
21. My friends and family often keep working on a problem long after others have given up. T F
22. My friends and family sometimes try to make others look foolish. T F
23. My friends and family frequently check with others to see if they’re doing OK.  T  F
24. My friends and family are cautious.  T  F
25. My friends and family rarely get so angry that they lose control.  T  F
26. My friends and family always try to be fully prepared before they begin working on anything.  T  F
27. My friends and family rarely look to others to help them make decisions.  T  F
28. My friends and family feel it’s safer to keep things to themselves.  T  F
29. My friends and family seldom feel like hitting anyone.  T  F
30. My friends and family have wasted a lot of their lives.  T  F
31. My friends and family believe higher standards of conduct are what this country needs most.  T  F
32. At times my friends and family somehow feel the presence of someone who is not really there.  T  F
33. My friends and family enjoy working hard.  T  F
34. My friends and family love to flirt.  T  F
35. My friends and family are “people persons.”  T  F
36. No matter how busy they are, my friends and family try to find time to have fun.  T  F
37. My friends and family sometimes rush from one activity to another without stopping to rest.  T  F
38. My friends and family lead active lives.  T  F
39. My friends and family lead very interesting lives.  T  F
40. My friends and family frequently let anger get the better of them.  T  F
41. Little things upset my friends and family too much.  T  F
42. My friends and family can’t stand being alone for any length of time.  T  F
43. My friends and family deserve the best.  T  F
44. If they had to choose, my friends and family would prefer being in a flood to unloading a ton of newspapers from a truck.  T  F
45. My friends and family put a lot of energy into everything they do.  T  F
46. My friends and family often worry about things they have done or said.  T  F
47. My friends and family are always on the lookout for fun.  T  F
48. My friends and family often have trouble sleeping because of their worries.  T  F
50. My friends and family sometimes feel “on edge” all day.  T  F
51. My friends and family often feel personally or socially inadequate.  T  F
52. My friends and family get pretty excited when they’re starting a new project.  T  F
53. My friends and family have a very hard time getting over relationships that have ended.  T  F
54. My friends and family are not sure anyone can understand their problems.  T  F
55. My friends and family spend a good deal of time just having fun.  T  F
56. When they are alone, my friends and family often worry about whether they will be able to handle things.  T  F
57. For my friends and family, life is a great adventure.  T  F
58. It takes someone really special to understand and appreciate my friends and family.  T  F
59. My friends and family worry a great deal about embarrassing themselves in front of others.  T  F
60. My friends and family don’t pay much attention when others praise or criticize them.  T  F
61. My friends and family have occasionally felt discouraged about something.  T  F
62. My friends’ and family’s table manners are not always perfect.  T  F
63. My friends and family are always extremely courageous in facing difficult situations.  T  F
64. At times, my friends and family have been envious of someone.  T  F
65. My friends’ and family’s opinions are always completely reasonable.  T  F
66. My friends and family have at times eaten too much.  T  F
67. My friends and family are always completely fair to others.  T  F
68. My friends and family have at times been angry with someone.  T  F
69. My friends and family always tell the entire truth.  T  F
70. My friends and family sometimes are a bit lazy.  T  F
71. My friends and family have never in their whole lives taken advantage of anyone.  T  F
72. My friends and family have sometimes felt slightly hesitant about helping someone who asked them to.  T  F
73. My friends and family have never felt that they were better than someone else.  T  F
74. My friends and family have never in their whole lives wished for anything that they were not entitled to.  T  F
Appendix H cont’d

True of Friends and Family Questionnaire (NEO Items)

Read each statement about your friends and family carefully. Then circle one of the following answer choices.

Determine whether you agree or disagree with these statements about your friends and family.

SD if you strongly disagree
D if you disagree or it is mostly false
N for neutral
A if you agree or it is mostly true
SA if you strongly agree

1. In general, my friends and family are not worriers. SD D N A SA
2. My friends and family generally like to have people around them. SD D N A SA
3. My friends and family don’t like to waste time daydreaming. SD D N A SA
4. My friends and family try to be courteous to everyone they meet. SD D N A SA
5. My friends and family keep their belongings clean and neat. SD D N A SA
6. My friends and family often feel inferior to others. SD D N A SA
7. My friends and family generally laugh easily. SD D N A SA
8. Once my friends and family find the right way to do something they stick to it. SD D N A SA
9. My friends and family often get into arguments with each other. SD D N A SA
10. My friends and family are pretty good about pacing themselves so as to get things done on time. SD D N A SA
11. When my friends and family are under a great deal of stress, sometimes they feel like they are going to pieces. SD D N A SA
12. My friends and family don’t consider themselves especially “light-hearted.” SD D N A SA
13. My friends and family are intrigued by the patterns they find in art and nature. SD D N A SA
14. My friends and family see others as selfish and egotistical. SD D N A SA
15. My friends and family are not very methodical. SD D N A SA
16. My friends and family rarely feel lonely or blue. SD D N A SA
17. My friends and family enjoy talking to others. SD D N A SA
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. My friends and family believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My friends and family would rather cooperate with others than compete with them. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My friends and family try to perform all the tasks assigned to them conscientiously. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My friends and family often feel tense and jittery. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My friends and family like to be where the action is. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Poetry has little or no effect on my friends and family. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My friends and family tend to be cynical and skeptical of others’ intentions. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My friends and family have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My friends and family feel completely worthless sometimes. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My friends and family usually prefer to do things alone. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My friends and family often try new and foreign foods. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My friends and family tend to believe that others will take advantage of them if they let them. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My friends and family waste a lot of time before settling down to work. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. My friends and family rarely feel fearful or anxious. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My friends and family often tend to feel as if they are bursting with energy. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. My friends and family seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. My friends and family believe they are liked by most everyone else. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My friends and family work hard to accomplish their goals. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My friends and family often get angry at the way others treat them. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. My friends and family are cheerful and high-spirited. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. My friends and family tend to believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. My friends and family tend to think that some others think of them as cold and calculating. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. When my friends and family make a commitment, they can always be counted on to follow through. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Too often, when things go wrong, my friends and family tend to get discouraged and feel like giving up. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. My friends and family are not cheerful optimists. SD D N A SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Sometimes when reading poetry or looking at a work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of art, my friends and family can feel a chill or wave of excitement.  
44. My friends and family are hard-headed and tough-minded in their attributes.  
45. Sometimes my friends and family are not as dependable or reliable as they should be.  
46. My friends and family are seldom sad or depressed.  
47. My friends and family have lives that are fast-paced.  
48. My friends and family have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.  
49. My friends and family generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.  
50. My friends and family are productive people who always get the job done.  
51. My friends and family often feel helpless and want someone else to solve their problems.  
52. My friends and family are very active.  
53. My friends and family have a lot of intellectual curiosity.  
54. My friends and family generally let others know if they don’t like them.  
55. My friends and family never seem to be able to get organized.  
56. At times my friends and family have been so ashamed that they just wanted to hide.  
57. My friends and family would rather go their own way than be leaders of others.  
58. My friends and family often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.  
59. If necessary, my friends and family are willing to manipulate people to get what they want.  
60. My friends and family strive for excellence in everything they do.
Appendix I

Social Desirability Questionnaire (SNAP and MPQ Items)

Below are statements about people who have different personality characteristics. Read each statement carefully then determine how socially desirable the personality characteristic is. That is, determine whether the characteristic is good to have or bad to have. The higher the social desirability, the better it is to have.

1 very low social desirability
2 low social desirability
3 neutral
4 high social desirability
5 very high social desirability

1. John likes to keep his dignity at all costs.
2. Angelica was always getting into trouble as a kid, for breaking the rules at home or at school.
3. Debbie hates it when the topic of conversation turns to her.
4. Juan makes friends because he expects friends to be useful.
5. People seem to think Christopher is odd.
6. Adriana finds that different odors have different colors.
7. Christy likes people to notice how she looks when she goes out in public.
8. Carlos doesn’t like to be noticed when he walks into a room.
9. Eliot considers himself to be a very special person.
10. Marisol sometimes hits people who have done something to deserve it.
11. Linda considers herself to be very level-headed and always likes to “keep her feet on the ground.”
12. Even when he has done something very well, Enrique usually demands that he do better the next time.
13. Ivan sometimes feels unreal, or as if he is looking at himself from outside.
14. Rosa would never start a fist fight.
15. Nicole feels a strong need to have others approve of her.
16. Jose does not consider himself be unusually talented.
17. Ted believes that he sometimes knows that something will happen before it actually does.
18. Alicia bases many of her decisions on what other people think.
19. Andrea finds it fun to take advantage of others’ weak points.
20. People say that Andres drives himself hard.  
21. Ray often continues to work on a problem long after others have given up.  
22. Carla believes that people sometimes try to make her look foolish.  
23. Erika frequently checks with others to see if she is doing OK.  
24. Miguel considers himself a cautious person.  
25. Vincent rarely gets so angry that he loses control.  
26. Lucia always tries to be fully prepared before she begins working on anything.  
27. Katie rarely looks to others to help her make decisions.  
28. Raul thinks it’s safer to keep things to himself.  
29. Junior seldom feels like hitting anyone.  
30. Paula thinks she has wasted a lot of her life.  
31. Sophie believes higher standards of conduct are what this country needs most.  
32. At times, Eduardo somehow feels the presence of someone who is not really there.  
33. Matt enjoys working hard.  
34. Gabriela loves to flirt.  
35. Jennifer considers herself a “people person.”  
36. No matter how busy he is, Ricardo always finds some time to have fun.  
37. Eric sometimes rushes from one activity to another without stopping to rest.  
38. Martha leads an active life.  
39. Amanda believes she leads a very interesting life.  
40. Luis’s anger frequently gets the better of him.  
41. Little things upset Brad too much.  
42. Margarita is not able to stand being alone for any length of time.  
43. Janet believes she deserves the best.  
44. If Roberto has to choose, he would prefer being in a flood to unloading a ton of newspapers from a truck.  
45. Mark puts a lot of energy into everything he does.  
46. Maria often worries about things she has done or said.  
47. Samantha is always on the lookout for fun.  
48. Orlando often has trouble sleeping because of his worries.  
49. Adam sometimes feels “on edge” all day.  
50. Delia often feels personally or socially inadequate.  
51. Tina gets pretty excited when she is starting a new project.  
52. Mando has a very hard time getting over relationships that have ended.  
53. Charles is not sure anyone can understand his problems.
55. Isabel spends a good deal of time just having fun. 1 2 3 4 5
56. When alone, Antonio often worries about whether he will be able to handle things. 1 2 3 4 5
57. For Brandon, life is a great adventure. 1 2 3 4 5
58. Valeria thinks it takes someone really special to understand and appreciate her. 1 2 3 4 5
59. Madeline worries a great deal about embarrassing herself in front of others. 1 2 3 4 5
60. Daniel does not pay much attention when people praise or criticize him. 1 2 3 4 5
61. Liliana has occasionally felt discouraged about something. 1 2 3 4 5
62. Adrian’s table manners are not always perfect. 1 2 3 4 5
63. Pablo has always been extremely courageous in facing difficult situations. 1 2 3 4 5
64. At times, Marie has been envious of someone. 1 2 3 4 5
65. Norma’s opinions are always completely reasonable. 1 2 3 4 5
66. Jack has at times eaten too much. 1 2 3 4 5
67. Oscar has always been completely fair to others. 1 2 3 4 5
68. Danielle has at times been angry with someone. 1 2 3 4 5
69. Gloria always tells the entire truth. 1 2 3 4 5
70. Sometimes Peter is a bit lazy. 1 2 3 4 5
71. Never in his whole life has Jaime taken advantage of anyone. 1 2 3 4 5
72. Yvette has sometimes felt slightly hesitant about helping someone who asked her to. 1 2 3 4 5
73. Andrew has never felt that he was better than someone else. 1 2 3 4 5
74. Never in her whole life has Claire wished for anything that she was not entitled to. 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix I cont’d

Social Desirability Questionnaire (NEO Items)

Below are statements about people who have different personality characteristics. Read each statement carefully then determine how socially desirable the personality characteristic is. That is, determine whether the characteristic is good to have or bad to have. The higher the social desirability, the better it is to have.

1 very low social desirability
2 low social desirability
3 neutral
4 high social desirability
5 very high social desirability

1. John isn’t a worrier. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Angelica doesn’t like to have a lot of people around her. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Debbie doesn’t like to waste her time daydreaming. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Juan tries to be courteous to everyone he meets. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Christopher keeps his belongings clean and neat. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Adriana often feels inferior to others. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Christy laughs easily. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Once Carlos finds the right way to do something he sticks to it. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Eliot often gets into arguments with his friends and family. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Marisol is pretty good about pacing herself so as to get things done on time. 1 2 3 4 5
11. When under a great deal of stress, Linda sometimes feels like she is going to pieces. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Enrique is not especially “light-hearted.” 1 2 3 4 5
13. Ivan is intrigued by the patterns he finds in art and nature. 1 2 3 4 5
14. Some people think Rosa is selfish and egotistical. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Nicole is not a very methodical person. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Jose rarely feels lonely or blue. 1 2 3 4 5
17. Ted really enjoys talking to people. 1 2 3 4 5
18. Alicia believes letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them. 1 2 3 4 5
19. Andrea prefers to cooperate with others rather than compete with them. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Andres tries to perform all the tasks assigned to him conscientiously. 1 2 3 4 5
21. Ray often feels tense and jittery. 1 2 3 4 5
22. Carla likes to be where the action is.
23. Poetry has little or no effect on Erika.
24. Miguel tends to be cynical and skeptical of others’ intentions.
25. Vincent has a clear set of goals and works toward them in an orderly fashion.
26. Lucia sometimes feels completely worthless.
27. Sophie usually prefers to do things alone.
28. Raul often tries new and foreign foods.
29. Junior believes that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.
30. Paula wastes a lot of time before settling down to work.
31. Jennifer rarely feels fearful or anxious.
32. Eduardo often feels as if he is bursting with energy.
33. Matt seldom notices the moods or feelings that different environments produce.
34. Gabriela says most people she knows like her.
35. Amanda works hard to accomplish her goals.
36. Ricardo often gets angry at the way people treat him.
37. Eric is a cheerful, high-spirited person.
38. Martha believes we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.
39. People think of Janet as cold and calculating.
40. When Luis makes a commitment, he can always be counted on to follow through.
41. Too often, when things go wrong, Brad gets discouraged and feels like giving up.
42. Margarita is not a cheerful optimist.
43. Sometimes when reading poetry or looking at a work of art, Samantha feels a chill or wave of excitement.
44. Roberto is hard-headed and tough-minded in his attributes.
45. Sometimes Mark is not as dependable or reliable as he should be.
46. Maria is seldom sad or depressed.
47. Daisy has a life that is fast-paced.
48. Orlando has little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.
49. Adam generally tries to be thoughtful and considerate.
50. Delia is a productive person who always gets the job done.
51. Tina often feels helpless and wants someone else to solve her problems.
52. Mando is a very active person.
53. Brandon has a lot of intellectual curiosity.  1 2 3 4 5
54. If Isabel doesn’t like people, she lets them know it.  1 2 3 4 5
55. Madeline never seems to be able to get organized.  1 2 3 4 5
56. At times, Daniel has been so ashamed that he just wanted to hide.  1 2 3 4 5
57. Charles prefers to go his own way rather than be a leader of others.  1 2 3 4 5
58. Valeria often enjoys playing with theories or abstract ideas.  1 2 3 4 5
59. If necessary, Katie is willing to manipulate people to get what she wants.  1 2 3 4 5
60. Antonio strives for excellence in everything he does.  1 2 3 4 5
Appendix J

NEO Items

Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings of True of Self (TOS), True of Others in General (TOG), True of Family and Friends (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TOS Mean (sd)</th>
<th>TOG Mean (sd)</th>
<th>TFF Mean (sd)</th>
<th>SD Mean (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am not a worrier.</td>
<td>2.514 (1.347)</td>
<td>2.431 (0.819)</td>
<td>2.871 (1.141)</td>
<td>3.391 (1.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I like to have a lot of people around me.</td>
<td>3.230 (1.211)</td>
<td>3.944 (1.005)</td>
<td>4.029 (0.884)</td>
<td>2.116 (0.900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Don't like to waste my time daydreaming.</td>
<td>2.689 (1.109)</td>
<td>2.889 (0.912)</td>
<td>3.043 (0.892)</td>
<td>3.159 (1.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.</td>
<td>4.608 (0.615)</td>
<td>3.625 (1.027)</td>
<td>4.357 (0.660)</td>
<td>4.449 (0.718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I keep my belongings clean and neat.</td>
<td>3.554 (1.148)</td>
<td>2.806 (0.959)</td>
<td>3.586 (1.000)</td>
<td>3.928 (0.944)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I often feel inferior to others.</td>
<td>2.365 (1.189)</td>
<td>2.986 (0.927)</td>
<td>2.114 (1.084)</td>
<td>2.015 (1.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I laugh easily.</td>
<td>4.351 (0.898)</td>
<td>3.556 (0.963)</td>
<td>4.329 (0.793)</td>
<td>4.058 (0.765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Once I find the right way to do something I stick to it.</td>
<td>4.149 (0.932)</td>
<td>4.083 (0.868)</td>
<td>3.886 (0.925)</td>
<td>3.824 (0.961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Often get into arguments with friends and family.</td>
<td>2.603 (1.102)</td>
<td>3.833 (0.787)</td>
<td>3.243 (1.268)</td>
<td>2.304 (1.204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Good about pacing self to get things done on time.</td>
<td>3.260 (1.143)</td>
<td>3.056 (1.033)</td>
<td>3.443 (0.942)</td>
<td>4.088 (0.876)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When under a great stress, feel like going to pieces.</td>
<td>3.365 (1.288)</td>
<td>3.986 (1.000)</td>
<td>3.343 (0.961)</td>
<td>2.174 (0.874)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Don't consider self especially &quot;light-hearted.&quot;</td>
<td>2.699 (1.037)</td>
<td>3.069 (0.775)</td>
<td>2.757 (0.788)</td>
<td>2.420 (0.930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.</td>
<td>3.405 (1.204)</td>
<td>3.083 (0.960)</td>
<td>3.143 (0.952)</td>
<td>3.522 (1.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical.</td>
<td>2.459 (1.184)</td>
<td>2.972 (1.021)</td>
<td>2.400 (0.923)</td>
<td>1.841 (1.052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I’m not a very methodical person.</td>
<td>2.676 (0.938)</td>
<td>3.056 (0.729)</td>
<td>3.014 (0.825)</td>
<td>2.768 (0.750)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I rarely feel lonely or blue.</td>
<td>3.365 (1.142)</td>
<td>2.583 (1.004)</td>
<td>3.371 (1.024)</td>
<td>3.696 (1.252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I really enjoy talking to people.</td>
<td>4.041 (0.784)</td>
<td>4.167 (0.805)</td>
<td>4.071 (1.040)</td>
<td>4.435 (0.813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Controversial speakers confuse/mislead students.</td>
<td>2.189 (1.043)</td>
<td>2.514 (1.075)</td>
<td>2.243 (1.055)</td>
<td>2.551 (1.182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Rather cooperate with others than compete with them.</td>
<td>3.425 (1.066)</td>
<td>3.153 (1.171)</td>
<td>3.400 (1.082)</td>
<td>3.768 (0.972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Perform all tasks assigned to me conscientiously.</td>
<td>4.459 (4.726)</td>
<td>3.486 (0.822)</td>
<td>3.714 (0.764)</td>
<td>3.826 (0.857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I often feel tense and jittery.</td>
<td>2.919 (1.132)</td>
<td>3.000 (0.839)</td>
<td>2.800 (0.957)</td>
<td>2.275 (0.953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Like to be where the action is.</td>
<td>3.514 (1.024)</td>
<td>3.736 (0.904)</td>
<td>3.457 (0.863)</td>
<td>3.841 (0.885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Poetry has little or no effect on me.</td>
<td>2.703 (1.279)</td>
<td>2.986 (1.014)</td>
<td>3.100 (1.194)</td>
<td>2.594 (0.863)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tend to be cynical/ skeptical of others' intentions.</td>
<td>2.905 (1.125)</td>
<td>3.306 (1.030)</td>
<td>2.971 (1.063)</td>
<td>2.261 (1.159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Have clear set of goals work toward in orderly fashion.</td>
<td>3.703 (0.989)</td>
<td>3.282 (0.974)</td>
<td>3.614 (1.026)</td>
<td>3.942 (1.247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sometimes feel completely worthless.</td>
<td>2.392 (1.269)</td>
<td>2.986 (0.957)</td>
<td>2.229 (1.106)</td>
<td>1.609 (0.988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Usually prefer to do things alone.</td>
<td>3.297 (1.082)</td>
<td>2.986 (1.028)</td>
<td>2.757 (0.955)</td>
<td>2.667 (1.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Often try new and foreign foods.</td>
<td>3.378 (1.279)</td>
<td>3.181 (1.105)</td>
<td>3.586 (1.070)</td>
<td>3.986 (0.883)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Believe most people take advantage if you let them.</td>
<td>3.797 (1.110)</td>
<td>4.000 (0.888)</td>
<td>3.371 (1.119)</td>
<td>2.609 (1.127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Waste a lot of time before settling down to work.</td>
<td>3.365 (1.361)</td>
<td>3.625 (1.013)</td>
<td>2.829 (0.963)</td>
<td>2.406 (1.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Rarely feel fearful or anxious.</td>
<td>2.932 (1.127)</td>
<td>2.542 (0.887)</td>
<td>2.829 (0.916)</td>
<td>3.754 (0.961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Often feel as if I'm bursting with energy.</td>
<td>3.311</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.081</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Seldom notice moods/feelings diff. environments produce.</td>
<td>2.743</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>3.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Most people I know like me.</td>
<td>4.122</td>
<td>3.292</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>3.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I work hard to accomplish my goals.</td>
<td>4.095</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>4.329</td>
<td>4.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Often get angry at the way people treat me.</td>
<td>2.932</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td>3.443</td>
<td>2.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person.</td>
<td>3.905</td>
<td>3.361</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Should look to religious authorities for moral decisions.</td>
<td>3.110</td>
<td>3.153</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>3.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Some think of me as cold and calculating.</td>
<td>2.257</td>
<td>2.819</td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>2.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. When make commitment, can be counted on to follow through.</td>
<td>4.068</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>3.829</td>
<td>4.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. When things go wrong, get discouraged feel like giving up.</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.529</td>
<td>2.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I'm not a cheerful optimist.</td>
<td>2.216</td>
<td>2.972</td>
<td>2.257</td>
<td>2.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Reading poetry or looking at art, feel chill/wave of excitement.</td>
<td>3.365</td>
<td>3.028</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I'm hard-headed and tough-minded in attributes.</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>3.278</td>
<td>3.314</td>
<td>2.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Sometimes not as dependable or reliable as I should be.</td>
<td>2.784</td>
<td>3.764</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>2.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I'm seldom sad or depressed.</td>
<td>2.811</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>2.957</td>
<td>2.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. My life is fast-paced.</td>
<td>3.630</td>
<td>3.556</td>
<td>3.243</td>
<td>3.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>4.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Little interest speculating nature universe/human condition.</td>
<td>2.378</td>
<td>3.493</td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>2.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.</td>
<td>4.378 (0.855)</td>
<td>3.347 (1.077)</td>
<td>4.159 (0.720)</td>
<td>4.217 (0.802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I’m a productive person always get the job done.</td>
<td>3.797 (0.811)</td>
<td>3.139 (0.983)</td>
<td>3.971 (0.816)</td>
<td>4.188 (1.102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Often feel helpless want someone else to solve problems.</td>
<td>2.122 (1.097)</td>
<td>3.389 (1.001)</td>
<td>2.257 (1.125)</td>
<td>1.797 (1.092)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I am a very active person.</td>
<td>3.811 (1.119)</td>
<td>3.014 (1.055)</td>
<td>3.757 (0.939)</td>
<td>4.147 (0.778)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.</td>
<td>4.189 (0.676)</td>
<td>3.361 (1.066)</td>
<td>3.857 (0.856)</td>
<td>4.029 (0.954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. If I don’t like people, I let them know it.</td>
<td>2.716 (1.067)</td>
<td>2.986 (1.181)</td>
<td>3.143 (1.053)</td>
<td>2.884 (1.219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I never seem to be able to get organized.</td>
<td>2.432 (1.217)</td>
<td>3.278 (1.078)</td>
<td>2.386 (1.094)</td>
<td>2.174 (0.907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. At times have been so ashamed just wanted to hide.</td>
<td>2.630 (1.208)</td>
<td>3.667 (0.904)</td>
<td>2.319 (1.078)</td>
<td>2.087 (0.981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Would rather go my own way than be leader of others.</td>
<td>3.014 (1.161)</td>
<td>3.403 (1.030)</td>
<td>2.829 (1.076)</td>
<td>2.681 (0.962)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.</td>
<td>3.514 (1.162)</td>
<td>3.167 (0.934)</td>
<td>3.143 (1.094)</td>
<td>3.739 (0.918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Willing to manipulate people to get what I want.</td>
<td>2.425 (1.301)</td>
<td>3.833 (1.048)</td>
<td>2.343 (1.166)</td>
<td>2.159 (1.244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I strive for excellence in everything I do.</td>
<td>4.216 (0.848)</td>
<td>3.528 (1.278)</td>
<td>4.286 (0.663)</td>
<td>4.435 (0.776)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

SNAP Items

Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings of True of Self (TOS), True of Others in General (TOG), True of Family and Friends (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TOS</th>
<th>TOG</th>
<th>TFF</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
<td>Mean (sd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Like to keep my dignity at all costs.</td>
<td>0.905 (0.338)</td>
<td>0.889 (0.519)</td>
<td>0.800 (0.403)</td>
<td>3.652 (0.998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As a kid was always getting into trouble.</td>
<td>0.243 (0.592)</td>
<td>0.861 (0.348)</td>
<td>0.414 (0.496)</td>
<td>2.000 (0.955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hate it when topic of conversation is me.</td>
<td>0.284 (0.454)</td>
<td>0.514 (0.531)</td>
<td>0.214 (0.413)</td>
<td>2.246 (0.864)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People make friends because expect them to be useful.</td>
<td>0.378 (0.566)</td>
<td>0.500 (0.581)</td>
<td>0.357 (0.483)</td>
<td>2.706 (1.147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People think I'm odd.</td>
<td>0.392 (0.492)</td>
<td>0.431 (0.526)</td>
<td>0.200 (0.403)</td>
<td>2.507 (0.949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Different odors have different colors.</td>
<td>0.392 (0.637)</td>
<td>0.431 (0.526)</td>
<td>0.286 (0.455)</td>
<td>3.102 (0.860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Like people to notice look when go out in public.</td>
<td>0.743 (0.684)</td>
<td>0.917 (0.403)</td>
<td>0.729 (0.448)</td>
<td>3.536 (1.106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Don't like to be noticed when I walk into a room.</td>
<td>0.432 (0.499)</td>
<td>0.431 (0.526)</td>
<td>0.271 (0.448)</td>
<td>2.420 (0.961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am a very special person.</td>
<td>0.839 (0.645)</td>
<td>0.736 (0.531)</td>
<td>0.714 (0.455)</td>
<td>3.638 (0.999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sometimes hit people who deserve it.</td>
<td>0.405 (0.639)</td>
<td>0.486 (0.503)</td>
<td>0.300 (0.462)</td>
<td>2.217 (1.211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Am very level-headed always &quot;keep my feet on the ground.&quot;</td>
<td>0.973 (0.548)</td>
<td>0.708 (0.701)</td>
<td>0.800 (0.403)</td>
<td>3.899 (0.972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When I have done very well, demand better the next time.</td>
<td>0.797 (0.496)</td>
<td>0.736 (0.475)</td>
<td>0.686 (0.468)</td>
<td>3.456 (1.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sometimes feel unreal, as if looking at self from outside.</td>
<td>0.608 (0.519)</td>
<td>0.500 (0.581)</td>
<td>0.229 (0.423)</td>
<td>2.812 (0.928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>TOS Mean (sd)</td>
<td>TOG Mean (sd)</td>
<td>TFF Mean (sd)</td>
<td>SD Mean (sd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Would never start fist fight.</td>
<td>0.702 (0.542)</td>
<td>0.694 (0.705)</td>
<td>0.643 (0.483)</td>
<td>4.000 (1.225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Feel strong need to have others approve of me.</td>
<td>0.459 (0.645)</td>
<td>0.819 (0.422)</td>
<td>0.386 (0.490)</td>
<td>2.652 (0.968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I’m not unusually talented.</td>
<td>0.459 (0.578)</td>
<td>0.486 (0.581)</td>
<td>0.261 (0.442)</td>
<td>2.667 (0.852)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sometimes know something will happen before does.</td>
<td>0.712 (0.612)</td>
<td>0.583 (0.575)</td>
<td>0.671 (0.473)</td>
<td>3.159 (0.901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Base many of my decisions on what other people think.</td>
<td>0.324 (0.622)</td>
<td>0.861 (0.387)</td>
<td>0.300 (0.462)</td>
<td>2.162 (1.141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It's fun to take advantage of others' weak points.</td>
<td>0.176 (0.479)</td>
<td>0.514 (0.503)</td>
<td>0.129 (0.337)</td>
<td>1.826 (1.137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. People say I drive myself hard.</td>
<td>0.608 (0.637)</td>
<td>0.597 (0.522)</td>
<td>0.714 (0.455)</td>
<td>3.231 (1.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Keep working on problem long after others have given up.</td>
<td>0.784 (0.580)</td>
<td>0.528 (0.649)</td>
<td>0.814 (0.392)</td>
<td>3.942 (1.174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. People sometimes try to make me look foolish.</td>
<td>0.500 (0.530)</td>
<td>0.736 (0.475)</td>
<td>0.186 (0.392)</td>
<td>2.580 (0.898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Frequently check with others to see if I'm doing OK.</td>
<td>0.608 (0.718)</td>
<td>0.736 (0.475)</td>
<td>0.843 (0.367)</td>
<td>2.870 (1.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I am a cautious person.</td>
<td>0.838 (0.469)</td>
<td>0.722 (0.610)</td>
<td>0.886 (0.320)</td>
<td>3.710 (0.842)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I rarely get so angry that I lose control.</td>
<td>0.892 (0.512)</td>
<td>0.667 (0.712)</td>
<td>0.671 (0.473)</td>
<td>3.725 (1.305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Always try to be prepared before working on anything.</td>
<td>0.757 (0.592)</td>
<td>0.611 (0.640)</td>
<td>0.771 (0.423)</td>
<td>4.174 (0.785)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Rarely look to others to help make a decision.</td>
<td>0.575 (0.725)</td>
<td>0.417 (0.645)</td>
<td>0.300 (0.462)</td>
<td>3.275 (1.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It's safer to keep things to yourself.</td>
<td>0.703 (0.489)</td>
<td>0.819 (0.484)</td>
<td>0.529 (0.503)</td>
<td>2.957 (0.977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I seldom feel like hitting anyone.</td>
<td>0.662 (0.556)</td>
<td>0.417 (0.496)</td>
<td>0.657 (0.478)</td>
<td>3.174 (1.495)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>TOS</td>
<td>TOG</td>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sd)</td>
<td>(sd)</td>
<td>(sd)</td>
<td>(sd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I've wasted a lot of my life.</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>1.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.477)</td>
<td>(0.494)</td>
<td>(0.320)</td>
<td>(0.947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Higher standards of conduct what this country needs most.</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>3.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.618)</td>
<td>(0.712)</td>
<td>(0.487)</td>
<td>(1.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. At times I feel presence of someone not really there.</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>2.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.645)</td>
<td>(0.531)</td>
<td>(0.498)</td>
<td>(1.142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I enjoy working hard.</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>4.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.436)</td>
<td>(0.650)</td>
<td>(0.337)</td>
<td>(0.776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I love to flirt.</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>3.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.688)</td>
<td>(0.442)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(1.129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am a &quot;people person.&quot;</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>4.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.649)</td>
<td>(0.692)</td>
<td>(0.367)</td>
<td>(0.902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. No matter how busy always find time to have fun.</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>4.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.560)</td>
<td>(0.446)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
<td>(0.719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Rush from one activity to another without rest.</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>3.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.598)</td>
<td>(0.432)</td>
<td>(0.473)</td>
<td>(0.930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I lead an active life.</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>4.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.459)</td>
<td>(0.547)</td>
<td>(0.320)</td>
<td>(0.862)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I lead an interesting life.</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>4.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.573)</td>
<td>(0.547)</td>
<td>(0.403)</td>
<td>(0.856)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My anger frequently gets the better of me.</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>2.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.625)</td>
<td>(0.494)</td>
<td>(0.478)</td>
<td>(1.474)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Little things upset me too much.</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>1.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.529)</td>
<td>(0.682)</td>
<td>(0.496)</td>
<td>(1.119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Can't stand being alone for any length of time.</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>2.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.565)</td>
<td>(0.475)</td>
<td>(0.483)</td>
<td>(1.119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I deserve the best.</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>3.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.522)</td>
<td>(0.548)</td>
<td>(0.168)</td>
<td>(1.200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Would prefer being in flood to unloading newspapers.</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>2.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.448)</td>
<td>(0.512)</td>
<td>(0.302)</td>
<td>(1.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I put a lot of energy into everything I do.</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>4.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.573)</td>
<td>(0.646)</td>
<td>(0.320)</td>
<td>(0.757)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I often worry about things I have done or said.</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>2.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.679)</td>
<td>(0.442)</td>
<td>(0.498)</td>
<td>(1.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I am always on the lookout for fun.</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>3.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.466)</td>
<td>(0.387)</td>
<td>(0.483)</td>
<td>(0.976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>TOS Mean (sd)</td>
<td>TOG Mean (sd)</td>
<td>TFF Mean (sd)</td>
<td>SD Mean (sd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I often have trouble sleeping because of my worries.</td>
<td>0.541 (0.645)</td>
<td>0.847 (0.362)</td>
<td>0.471 (0.503)</td>
<td>1.957 (0.830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Sometimes I feel &quot;on edge&quot; all day.</td>
<td>0.608 (0.718)</td>
<td>0.653 (0.479)</td>
<td>0.414 (0.496)</td>
<td>2.362 (1.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I often feel personally or socially inadequate.</td>
<td>0.392 (0.637)</td>
<td>0.583 (0.496)</td>
<td>0.257 (0.440)</td>
<td>2.130 (1.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I get pretty excited when starting a new project.</td>
<td>0.757 (0.592)</td>
<td>0.667 (0.628)</td>
<td>0.829 (0.380)</td>
<td>3.971 (0.891)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Hard time getting over relationships that have ended.</td>
<td>0.568 (0.643)</td>
<td>0.847 (0.362)</td>
<td>0.557 (0.500)</td>
<td>2.188 (1.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I'm not sure anyone can understand my problems.</td>
<td>0.392 (0.718)</td>
<td>0.833 (0.375)</td>
<td>0.371 (0.487)</td>
<td>2.290 (1.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I spend a good deal of my time just having fun.</td>
<td>0.541 (0.725)</td>
<td>0.792 (0.502)</td>
<td>0.600 (0.493)</td>
<td>3.435 (1.194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. When alone, often worry about whether able to handle things.</td>
<td>0.575 (0.575)</td>
<td>0.861 (0.348)</td>
<td>0.536 (0.502)</td>
<td>2.449 (0.948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Life is a great adventure.</td>
<td>0.960 (0.560)</td>
<td>0.764 (0.517)</td>
<td>0.814 (0.392)</td>
<td>4.159 (0.851)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Takes someone special to understand and appreciate me.</td>
<td>0.622 (0.716)</td>
<td>0.847 (0.548)</td>
<td>0.643 (0.483)</td>
<td>3.391 (0.988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Worry about embarrassing self in front of others.</td>
<td>0.405 (0.494)</td>
<td>0.831 (0.414)</td>
<td>0.429 (0.498)</td>
<td>2.522 (1.119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Don't pay attention when people praise or criticize me.</td>
<td>0.554 (0.644)</td>
<td>0.380 (0.517)</td>
<td>0.443 (0.500)</td>
<td>2.971 (1.071)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L

MPQ Items
Means and Standard Deviation for Ratings of True of Self (TOS), True of Others in General (TOG), True of Family and Friends (TFF), and Social Desirability (SD)

**Rare Virtues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TOS Mean (sd)</th>
<th>TOG Mean (sd)</th>
<th>TFF Mean (sd)</th>
<th>SD Mean (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Always courageous in difficult situations.</td>
<td>0.730 (0.604)</td>
<td>0.528 (0.731)</td>
<td>0.771 (0.423)</td>
<td>4.014 (0.931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My opinions are always completely reasonable.</td>
<td>0.622 (0.566)</td>
<td>0.486 (0.731)</td>
<td>0.443 (0.500)</td>
<td>3.841 (0.797)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Always been completely fair to others.</td>
<td>0.527 (0.646)</td>
<td>0.361 (0.718)</td>
<td>0.429 (0.498)</td>
<td>4.101 (0.987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I always tell the entire truth.</td>
<td>0.257 (0.525)</td>
<td>0.236 (0.682)</td>
<td>0.200 (0.403)</td>
<td>3.797 (1.092)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Never have I taken advantage of anyone.</td>
<td>0.257 (0.598)</td>
<td>0.250 (0.687)</td>
<td>0.157 (0.367)</td>
<td>4.087 (1.197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Never felt that I was better than someone.</td>
<td>0.419 (0.641)</td>
<td>0.306 (0.705)</td>
<td>0.429 (0.498)</td>
<td>3.536 (1.079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Never wished for anything not entitled to.</td>
<td>0.365 (0.563)</td>
<td>0.268 (0.696)</td>
<td>0.257 (0.440)</td>
<td>3.319 (1.050)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common Faults**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TOS Mean (sd)</th>
<th>TOG Mean (sd)</th>
<th>TFF Mean (sd)</th>
<th>SD Mean (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have occasionally felt discouraged.</td>
<td>0.865 (0.382)</td>
<td>0.931 (0.387)</td>
<td>0.700 (0.462)</td>
<td>2.721 (0.730)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My table manners are not always perfect.</td>
<td>0.726 (0.534)</td>
<td>0.944 (0.371)</td>
<td>0.700 (0.462)</td>
<td>2.623 (0.688)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. At times, I have been envious of someone.</td>
<td>0.797 (0.437)</td>
<td>0.903 (0.342)</td>
<td>0.643 (0.483)</td>
<td>2.507 (1.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have at times eaten too much.</td>
<td>0.838 (0.550)</td>
<td>0.917 (0.402)</td>
<td>0.871 (0.337)</td>
<td>2.725 (0.838)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have at times been angry with someone.</td>
<td>0.946 (0.366)</td>
<td>0.972 (0.335)</td>
<td>0.943 (0.234)</td>
<td>2.986 (0.813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sometimes I'm a bit lazy.</td>
<td>0.904 (0.505)</td>
<td>0.903 (0.342)</td>
<td>0.829 (0.380)</td>
<td>2.696 (0.944)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Felt hesitant helping someone.</td>
<td>0.743 (0.470)</td>
<td>0.861 (0.387)</td>
<td>0.557 (0.500)</td>
<td>2.565 (0.947)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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