

THE STABILITY OF SOCIAL DESIRABILITY JUDGMENTS IN RELATION
TO ITEMS ON EDWARDS' PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

by

CAROL JEAN DIERS
B.A., B.A. in Ed., Western Washington College, 1956

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts

in the Department of

Psychology

We accept this thesis as conforming to the
required standards by Candidates for
the degree of Master of Arts

Members of the Department of Psychology

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

October, 1958

THE STABILITY OF SOCIAL DESIRABILITY JUDGMENTS IN RELATION
TO ITEMS ON EDWARDS' PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the stability of the social desirability scale values used by Edwards in the construction of his Personal Preference Schedule (PPS). The specific hypotheses were:

(a) The social desirability scale values determined for University of British Columbia students, Hungarian university students and Canadian female delinquents will correlate significantly with Edwards' scale values determined on American college students; and

(b) The social desirability scale values derived for these three groups, together with Edwards' scale data and the scale values derived on five other groups will all intercorrelate significantly. This hypothesis specifies that a common stereotype of what is socially desirable and undesirable will persist throughout the various groups.

Two additional problems were also investigated, namely, the extent to which the item pairs on the PPS were matched for social desirability for the groups tested, and how these three groups, together with Edwards' American sample, differed when the items on the PPS were grouped into the manifest needs that they purport to assess.

In order to investigate the hypotheses and problems, social desirability ratings were obtained from 226 University of British Columbia students, 70 male Hungarian university students and 40 female delinquents. The items rated for social desirability were those contained in the PPS. The obtained ratings were scaled by the method of successive intervals.

All intercorrelations were significant at the .01 level. Thus the two hypotheses were supported, suggesting that a common attitude of what is desirable and undesirable cuts across many different groups. The results of the intraclass correlations for matched pairs on the PPS suggested that the PPS would control for the social desirability variable on a group of UBC students, but not for the Hungarians or delinquents.

Analysis of variance techniques employed on the PPS items grouped in terms of the needs they measured indicated highly reliable group differences. The Canadian and American university students showed no significant differences in their need ratings. Compared with the American and Canadian students, the Hungarians appeared to evaluate positively the needs of order and aggression and to underevaluate the need for affiliation, and, comparatively, the delinquent group rated highly the needs of autonomy, change, heterosexuality and aggression and underrated the needs of achievement, order, introception and endurance. It was emphasized that it could not be assumed that a group possessed to a strong degree those needs to which they give high social desirability ratings.

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representative. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Psychology

The University of British Columbia,
Vancouver 8, Canada.

Date September 30, 1958

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author is indebted to Miss D. Johnstone, Treatment Director, Girls Industrial Home for permission to test the juvenile delinquent group and to Dean R. G. Roller of the Sopron School of Forestry for his authorization to test the Hungarian group. Dr. J. Huberman translated the items and administered the rating scale in Hungarian to that group.

A special thanks is due the University of British Columbia Computing Center under the direction of Dr. T. Hull for use of the ALWAC III-E to compute the scale values.

The author wishes to sincerely thank her advisor, Dr. D. T. Kenny, for his assistance and guidance throughout the course of this study.

CONTENTS

Chapter		page
	Abstract	iii
I	The Nature of the Problem	1
II	Review of the Literature	4
	Definition of the Social Desirability Variable	4
	Social Desirability and the Probability of Endorsement of Personality Statements	5
	Stability of the Social Desirability Ratings	8
III	Method	12
	Selection of Subjects	12
	Procedure for Obtaining Social Desirability Ratings	14
	Scaling the Statements by the Method of Successive Intervals	16
IV	Results	18
V	Discussion	27
VI	Summary and Conclusions	32
	References	35
	Appendix A	37
	Item Pool Scaled for Social Desirability	38
	Social Desirability Scale Values for UBC, Hungarian and Delinquent Groups	43
	Social Desirability Scale Values for Six Other Groups	47
	Appendix B	51
	Instructions for Rating Scale	52
	Sample Rating Schedule	53
	Hungarian Translation of Rating Schedule	54
	Hungarian Translation of Item Pool	55

Chapter	page
Appendix C	60
Summary of F Tests	61

TABLES

Table		page
1	Intercorrelations of the Social Desirability Scale Values Reported by Klett and Yaukey	11
2	Intercorrelations of Social Desirability Scale Values	19
3	Differences in Need Ratings, Comparing Edwards, Hungarian, UBC and Delinquent	23

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the stability of the social desirability scale values used by Edwards in the construction of his Personal Preference Schedule (PPS). It has been recognized for quite some time that an individual who is asked to complete a paper and pencil test of personality is likely to describe himself as possessing those characteristics which he considers socially desirable. Recent research has conclusively shown that the correlation between the probability of endorsement of a personality item and its social desirability rating is extremely high. As a result of this finding, Edwards attempted to control the social desirability factor in the construction of his PPS. The items in the PPS were first scaled for social desirability by the method of successive intervals, and two items, each representing a different personality variable, were then paired in terms of similar social desirability scale values. In taking the schedule, the testee is forced to make a choice between the paired items. It might be expected, however, that what is viewed as socially desirable or undesirable will be a function

of a specified cultural or subcultural group. If this were the case, then the item pairs would no longer be matched in terms of social desirability and the PPS would not control for the social desirability variable in groups different from that upon whom the scale values were computed. Nevertheless, on the basis of previous research in this area, it is hypothesized that items on the PPS will remain reasonably stable when determined for three different subcultural groups. While this statement represents the general guiding hypothesis of the study, the specific hypotheses to be investigated are as follows:

(a) The social desirability scale values determined for University of British Columbia students, Hungarian university students and Canadian female delinquents will correlate significantly with Edwards' scale values determined on American college students; and

(b) The social desirability scale values derived for these three groups, together with Edwards' scale data and the scale values derived on five other groups (21), will all intercorrelate significantly. While this hypothesis is not completely distinct from the preceding one, it does specify that a common stereotype of what is socially desirable and undesirable will persist throughout the various groups.

In addition to testing these hypotheses, this study is also concerned with two additional problems. Although the

intercorrelations of the scale values for the various groups might be substantial, it does not necessarily follow that the intraclass correlations between the paired items would be high enough to warrant the assumption that the PPS would control for social desirability for the particular groups. That is, while one item in a particular pair might be rated equally by Edwards' sample and a different group, the second item of the pair may receive quite different ratings from these two groups. For purposes of examining this possibility, the intraclass correlations for the UBC group, the delinquent sample and the Hungarian group will be calculated. Second, the items on the PPS will be grouped into their respective fifteen scales in order to determine if the social desirability ratings for these scales will significantly differentiate between Edwards' group, the UBC group, the delinquent sample and the Hungarian group. While it is expected that the groups will be differentiated on some of the scales, no attempt will be made to specify in advance where these differences might be.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Definition of the Social Desirability Variable

This study should be viewed as an extension of a series of research largely instigated by Edwards (4) on the social desirability variable in personality assessment. Since the present study operates within Edwards' twofold definition of this term, it seems worthwhile to indicate at the outset how he employs this term. On the one hand, he uses the term social desirability to refer to social desirability scale values of statements about personality. While in principle any of the traditional psychological scaling methods could be used to locate a personality statement on the social desirability continuum and thereby obtain its scale value, Edwards has largely used the method of successive intervals. On the other hand, Edwards (7, vi) refers to social desirability as "the tendency of subjects to attribute to themselves, in self-description, personality statements with socially desirable scale values and to reject those with socially undesirable scale values." The most frequent criticism of personality questionnaires, aside from the question of validity, has been their vulnerability to the operation of this biasing set on the part of

the testee. It is Edwards' contention that all personality statements may be represented on the social desirability continuum and that the effective construction of personality scales calls for the control of this everpresent factor.

Social Desirability and the Probability of Endorsement of Personality Statements

Edwards' (4) initial study in this area dealt with the relationship between the social desirability of a personality trait and the probability of its endorsement. Using the ratings of 152 college students as judges and computing scale values by the method of successive intervals, he scaled for social desirability 10 items for each of 14 of Murray's manifest needs. An independent sample of 140 college students then responded to the items in printed inventory form. On the basis of their reaction to the statements, he computed the proportion who attributed each statement to themselves. These proportions served as the probability of endorsement values. The correlation between the two variables was .871, indicating quite clearly that probability of endorsement of a personality statement is related to its desirability.

Since this original study by Edwards, several other investigators have obtained the same results with different groups of subjects and different sets of statements. Drawing samples of statements from the Depression and Schizophrenia scales of the

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Hanley (13) found a high relationship between social desirability scale values and probability of endorsement. The correlation between the two variables was .89 for the Schizophrenic Scale, .82 for the Depression Scale. Kenny (16) found a correlation of .82 between social desirability scale values and probability of endorsement of a set of 25 personality traits. Approaching the problem in a slightly different way, Rosen (24) had his subjects first take a shortened form of the Minnesota Multiphasic under the usual instructions to provide a self-appraisal. He then asked them to take the same test under the instructions to give their ideal representation of themselves. Although Rosen did not scale the statements on a continuum of desirability, he nevertheless found a correlation of .87 between the number of subjects saying "True" under the two sets of instructions.

Such studies indicate that the social desirability factor should be controlled in personality inventories. One new approach to this problem is that used by Edwards (3) in the construction of his Personality Preference Schedule (PPS). This schedule measures 15 of Murray's manifest needs, namely, achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, interception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggression. After obtaining social desirability scale values for all the personality statements that were to appear in the schedule, Edwards then paired

items of different needs but essentially similar scale values. The testee is forced to make a choice between the two paired items. It is thereby assumed that a subject's choice will not be unduly influenced by the social desirability factor. One of the primary purposes of this study is to determine how adequate Edwards' matching of item pairs will be for three subcultural groups.

Several studies have also investigated this general problem. Navran and Stauffacher (23) administered the PPS to 25 nurses and one month later had them rank order the 15 PPS personality variables for both self-description and social desirability. While the latter two variables correlated .90, the rank order of the needs based on the PPS scoring correlated with self-description and social desirability only -.03 and -.01, respectively. Such findings indicate that, at least for this specific group, Edwards was quite successful in controlling the social desirability factor in the schedule. Silverman (25) found only slight correlations between PPS scores and two independent measures of test defensiveness, namely, the K scale of the MMPI and a forced choice form of the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. Kelleher (15) obtained point biserial correlations between social desirability judgments and choice of one item pair over the other for all 210 items on the PPS. While there was a slightly greater than chance occurrence of significant correlations, the correlations were sufficiently low to warrant the conclusion that social desirability only plays

a minor role in the PPS. However, a recent study by Corah, et al. (1) does not support the belief that social desirability is controlled in the PPS. Since this study is open to question, its findings are only suggestive. The authors set up the hypothesis that each member of a pair should be chosen with equal frequency. Since the data lead to the rejection of the hypothesis, the authors suggested that the social desirability factor does operate in the PPS. The authors of this study recognize, however, that their data has other interpretations. They indicate that their findings might also be due either to the use of a very small sample of item pairs in the PPS (30 item pairs out of a total of 210) or the use of a non-representative group in terms of the standardization group. While the authors do not mention it, another genuine possibility exists. Since all the paired items were not employed, their subjects may have been able to maintain a "set" for choosing the more desirable item for a small group of items, but not for a larger set. That is, the study of Corah, et al. in no way indicates that each member of a pair is not chosen equally for the full PPS.

Stability of the Social Desirability Ratings

Turning now to studies that are essentially similar to the present one, several investigations have compared Edwards' social desirability scale values with those collected on different groups from the American college group used originally by Edwards. These studies have consistently shown a high positive

relationship between Edwards' scale values and those calculated on the different samples. Fujita (11) found that 50 male and 50 female native-born Americans of Japanese immigrant parents gave similar social desirability ratings as Edwards' college students. The correlation between the scale values was .95. It should be noted, however, that Fujita's subjects were University of Washington students, as were Edwards' subjects. Lovass (22) reports, for a group of 50 male and 36 female gymnasium students in Norway, a correlation of .78 between the scale values of Norwegians and Edwards' American sample. Klett (19, 18) obtained scale values for 91 male and 115 female high school students and also 118 male neuropsychiatric patients. When he correlated the scale values for these groups with Edwards' group, he obtained a correlation of .94 with the high school sample and .88 for the patient sample. In light of the foregoing studies, Klett (20, p.9) hypothesized: "In view of the high stability of the social desirability scale values between different cultural groups and groups of different socio-economic status, it seems reasonable to assume that social desirability scale values obtained from other cultural sub-groups would not differ significantly from those obtained by Edwards."

Klett and Yaukey (21) have recently tested the validity of such a hypothesis. Employing a sample of 165 male and 33 female students at the American University of Beirut, Lebanon, they found a correlation of .86 between Edwards' scale values

and those of the Beirut students. Table 1, a reproduction of the intercorrelations reported by Klett and Yaukey (21) in their unpublished manuscript, summarizes the evidence to date. The relatively high intercorrelations suggest a consistent cultural judgment concerning the social desirability of the types of statements contained in the PPS. It is one of the purposes of this paper to explore further the degree to which three additional samples will agree among themselves and with the other groups specified in Table 1.

While the accumulated evidence to date suggests rather strongly that a common stereotype of what is desirable or undesirable may exist between certain groups, it would not be appropriate to conclude that Edwards' schedule could by virtue of this fact be used on a variety of groups with the knowledge that the social desirability variable is controlled. The actual matched items may not be as adequately paired as the correlations would suggest. An examination of the intraclass correlations between the desirability scale values for matched items is required before any such generalization could be made. Edwards obtained an intraclass correlation of .85 for the matched items in his schedule, indicating that social desirability is not entirely controlled. Klett (19) reported an intraclass correlation of only .69 for his high school sample, and Fujita (11) found an intraclass correlation of .76 for his Japanese-American college sample. A further examination of this problem will be made in the present study.

TABLE 1

Intercorrelations of the Social Desirability Scale Values (21)

	Nisei	Norway	Middle East	High School	Hospital
College	.96*	.82**	.86	.93	.88
Nisei		.77	.83	.93	.88
Norway			.80	.79	.74
Middle East				.81	.83
High School					.87

*While Klett and Yaukey report the correlation between the Nisei and Edwards' American college group to be .96, Fujita (11) indicates that it is .95.

**Lovass (22) reports this correlation to be .78.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Selection of Subjects

Social desirability judgments on the statements in Edwards' Personality Preference Schedule were obtained on three samples: (a) University of British Columbia students, males and females; (b) Hungarian immigrant University students, male; and (c) juvenile delinquents, female.

The Canadian university sample consisted of 123 males and 103 females enrolled in two sections of introductory psychology at the University of British Columbia. The age range for the 226 subjects was 17 to 36, with a mean age of 21.15 and a standard deviation of 3.83 for the males and a mean age of 18.78 and a standard deviation of 2.11 for the females.

The Hungarians were 70 male students who were part of the University of British Columbia, Faculty of Forestry, Sopron Division. Shortly after the Soviet occupation authorities employed armed force on November 4, 1956 to suppress the October 23, 1956 Hungarian revolution, the Faculty and students of the School of Forestry, located in Sopron, left Hungary as a group.

After a brief stay in Austria, this group immigrated to Canada and resumed their studies at the University of British Columbia. The major portion of their university classes are taught by the original Sopron faculty, and, except for special classes in English, the classes are taught in Hungarian. Since the group formed a discrete unit, the structure within the group has remained fairly stable. Retention of the internal group structure has no doubt retarded the assimilation of individual Hungarian students into Canadian society. The group had been in Canada 14 months at the time the social desirability scale values were obtained.

It is worth noting that the official policy at the Sopron School of Forestry was to admit 70 per cent of the students from the peasant and worker classes and 30 per cent from the intellectual and white collar classes. The immigrant group consisted of a slightly higher percentage of individuals from the latter classes than this expressed ideal (17). The age range of the 70 Hungarian students was from 20 to 32 years, with a mean of 22.70 and a standard deviation of 2.57.

The delinquent group consisted of 40 institutionalized females in the Girls Industrial Home, Vancouver, B.C. The most frequent charge against this sample is "incorrigibility," a legal term covering most types of misdemeanors, other than that of sex offenses, which is the second most frequent charge. According to the Treatment Director, Miss D. Johnstone, most of

the girls are from the lower socio-economic strata and about one-half are wards of the province or some private children's agency. The age range of the 40 delinquents was 13 to 18 years, with a mean of 15.73 and a standard deviation of 1.20.

Procedure for Obtaining Social Desirability Ratings

In order to obtain the social desirability ratings for the items on the PPS, all subjects rated the items on a nine-point rating scale of social desirability. The obtained results were then scaled by the method of successive intervals. In order to obtain comparable results to those of previous investigators, Edwards' procedure was duplicated as closely as possible.

Each subject was given a copy of the trait rating schedule and instructed to rate the personality statements on the nine-point rating scale which ranged from extremely socially undesirable to extremely socially desirable. A copy of the exact instructions, along with a specimen copy of the rating sheets, is contained in Appendix B. The Hungarian translation of the items and the rating sheet is also contained in Appendix B.

In essence, the administrator of the rating scale read the instructions aloud on the cover page and the subjects were told to follow along silently. If there were no questions, the administrator repeated the instruction to judge the trait as to how socially desirable or undesirable the rater would consider

that trait in others. Each item was read twice, the first time to form an opinion, the second to make the rating. After items 2, 3, 6, and 8 in the first block of 14 items, the administrator said, "How socially desirable or undesirable would you regard this trait in another person?" At the beginning of each block of 14 items, this was again emphasized by stating, "Remember, you are to rate these traits as to how socially desirable or undesirable you would consider them in others, not yourself." After all items were rated, the administrator offered to re-read any items which may have been missed.*

The only deviation from this pattern occurred in the juvenile delinquent group where, when requested, a synonym was substituted for a word which was not understood by the group.

The Canadian and Hungarian university students made their ratings during regular class hour periods. The juvenile delinquents' ratings were obtained in a special assembly which was called for that purpose. Instructions and statements were administered in Magyar to the Hungarian group.

The actual pool of personality statements judged consisted of 135 items that appear in the Edwards' PPS (3), 9 representing 15 of the manifest needs. The intercorrelations between the Canadian samples, and these three groups with the group from

*Messrs. Kenny and Huberman administered the items to the Canadian university students and Hungarians, respectively. The investigator administered the rating scale to the delinquents.

Norway (22) are based on the entire 135 items. However, the other investigators had not scaled the items from the need abasement scale. Hence, the intercorrelations between scale values for all other groups will be based on 126 items, 9 for each of the 14 manifest needs. A copy of the item pool may be found in Appendix A.

Scaling the Statements by the Method of Successive Intervals

After the judges have placed the items into the categories on the nine-point rating scale, a judgment or frequency distribution for every item is tabulated. This judgment distribution shows the number of raters who sorted the statement into each category.

In this case the response categories on the nine-point rating scale are viewed as being adjacent on an underlying continuum of social desirability, separated by the category boundaries. The scaling problem is to estimate the quantitative values of each category along the continuum and from these reference points to obtain a scale value for each stimulus. The model assumes that all statement judgments are normally distributed and that the standard deviations of the statements are equal. Edwards and Thurstone (9) have provided an internal check of consistency on the model assumption.

In brief, the actual steps used in obtaining scale values for the statements are as follows: The observed frequencies are

converted to proportions and they in turn are converted to normal deviates by the unit normal transformation. Interval widths are obtained by subtracting each interval value from the one following and the means of these differences is the difference between category boundaries. The scale value for each statement is taken to be the interpolated median of the several means.*

*A program for computing scale values by the method of successive intervals and for computation of the internal consistency check is available at the University of British Columbia computing center. The program is designed for an ALWAC III-E.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The social desirability scale values of the male and female UBC sample were computed separately and then correlated to see if it would be justified to combine the data for the two sexes. Since this correlation was .95, the ratings of the two sexes were combined and new social desirability scale values were determined. Hence, all analyses for the UBC sample are based on combined male and female subjects.

In order to test the model assumptions involved in the method of successive intervals, an internal consistency check (9) was performed separately for the UBC, Hungarian and delinquent groups. The internal consistency check gave values of .021, .037 and .045 for the UBC, Hungarian and delinquent groups, indicating that all these values are sufficiently close to zero to warrant the use of the method of successive intervals in scaling Edwards' personality statements.

The first column of Table 2 presents the necessary data to evaluate the first hypothesis which specified that the social desirability scale values determined for UBC students, Hungarian university students and Canadian female delinquents will correlate significantly with Edwards' scale values determined on

TABLE 2

Intercorrelations of Social Desirability Scale Values*

	Edwards	Hospital	High School	Beirut	Norway	Nisei	Delinquent	Hungarian
UBC	.95	.81	.90	.82	.80	.93	.54	.72
Hungarian	.71	.73	.65	.78	.71	.69	.47	
Delinquent	.58	.50	.62	.54	.62	.51		.47

*All correlations are significant at a $p < .01$.

American college students. Since all three of the correlations are significant at the .01 level of confidence, the hypothesis is confirmed.

The other results summarized in Table 2 substantiate the second hypothesis of this study which predicts that the social desirability scale values derived for the three groups in the present study, together with Edwards' scale data and the scale values derived on five other groups (21) will all intercorrelate significantly. That is, there will be a commonality between the various groups as to what is judged desirable or undesirable. The fact that all intercorrelations are significant at the .01 level of significance lends support to the second hypothesis.

Although the preceding two analyses of the data show that there is a high agreement between the groups in terms of how they judge the items for social desirability, they do not indicate how well the item pairs in the PPS are matched for desirability. In order to answer this problem, intraclass correlations between the matched items were calculated for the three groups used in this study. The intraclass correlation between the 210 matched pairs in the PPS is .73 for the UBC group, .38 for the Hungarian students, and .35 for the delinquent group. While all these values are significant at the .01 level, the results indicate that one would be justified in assuming that the item pairs are adequately equated for only the UBC group.

The results obtained in testing the second hypothesis show a considerable agreement between Edwards' sample, the UBC, Hungarian and delinquent groups for all the items in terms of rated desirability. Such an analysis is, however, only concerned with the items as a whole and not with the question as to whether these groups might differ amongst themselves when items on the PPS are classified into the manifest needs that they measure. The answer to this possibility was obtained by grouping the respective scale values according to the 14 needs they assess and employing an analysis of variance for each need separately. In order to eliminate possible rating scale bias, the scale values for Edwards, the UBC, Hungarian and delinquent groups were transformed into normal deviates with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. The four groups were thus equated for means and variances on the entire set of items, but the individual item placement was free to vary. The analyses of variance were performed on the transformed scores and would permit one to conclude whether the differences in item ratings were confined to specific needs or could be accounted for in terms of random variation. Appendix C shows the results of the 14 separate analyses of variance. Inspection of the data contained in Appendix C shows that there are significant differences between the groups on eleven of the fourteen variables. Three of the needs, succorance, nurturance and deference, showed no significant differences in terms of group desirability ratings.

Duncan's (2) multiple range test was used to determine where the group differences lay on the eleven needs that resulted in significant F-ratios. Table 3 presents the means for the four groups and summarizes where the significant sources of variance occurred.

When one compares the groups on need achievement, one finds that the Hungarians, UBC and Edwards samples gave similar desirability ratings on this need, but that the UBC and Edwards groups differed significantly from the delinquent group at the .01 level of significance. Thus, on need achievement, the delinquent group does not view it as desirable as to UBC and American college students.

The analysis of the data for need order shows all groups rate this need as more socially desirable than do the delinquent group. In addition, the Hungarian group rated need order more highly than all other three groups.

The mean rating for need exhibitionism is significantly higher in the delinquent group than in the UBC and Hungarian group. However, there are no differences between the Hungarian, UBC and Edwards groups on this personality variable, indicating that they all view it in the same manner.

Although the mean differences are not significant between the UBC and Edwards samples on need autonomy, the Hungarian group rates this need significantly more desirable than do the UBC group. The delinquent group rates this need more desirable than

TABLE 3

Differences in Need Ratings, Comparing
Edwards, Hungarian, UBC and Delinquent

<u>Need</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>p values of differences*</u>	
			<u>.05</u>	<u>.01</u>
achievement	Delinquent	49.07		
	Hungarian	52.38		
	UBC	54.97		> Del.
	Edwards	55.97		> Del.
order	Delinquent	48.36		
	UBC	53.01		> Del.
	Edwards	53.81		> Del.
	Hungarian	60.60		> Del., UBC, Edw.
exhibitionism	Hungarian	38.71		
	UBC	40.85		
	Edwards	42.09		
	Delinquent	45.61	> UBC	> Hung.
autonomy	UBC	43.53		
	Edwards	45.35		
	Hungarian	48.07	> UBC	
	Delinquent	51.33		> UBC, Edw.
affiliation	Hungarian	56.36		
	Delinquent	58.95		
	Edwards	59.75	> Hung.	
	UBC	60.85		> Hung.
intraception	Delinquent	48.13		
	Edwards	51.34	> Del.	
	UBC	52.16		> Del.
	Hungarian	52.96		> Del.
dominance	Hungarian	37.85		
	Delinquent	39.02		
	Edwards	42.20		
	UBC	46.02	> Del.	> Hung.
change	Hungarian	51.70		
	UBC	53.61		
	Edwards	54.31		
	Delinquent	60.44		> Hung., UBC, Edw.

TABLE 3 (continued)

<u>Need</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Mean</u>	p values of differences*	
			<u>.05</u>	<u>.01</u>
endurance	Delinquent	48.78		
	Edwards	53.88	> Del.	
	UBC	56.58		> Del.
	Hungarian	57.97		> Del.
hetero- sexuality	Hungarian	47.85		
	UBC	48.52		
	Edwards	51.42		
	Delinquent	54.75		> Hung., UBC
aggression	Edwards	30.99		
	UBC	32.19		
	Hungarian	42.68	> Edw., UBC	
	Delinquent	48.87		> Edw., UBC

*Read, for example, as follows: For the need exhibitionism, the Delinquent group has a mean of 45.61 which is significantly greater than the Hungarians with a mean of 38.71 and UBC with a mean of 40.85 ($p < .05$) and greater than the Hungarians ($p < .01$).

do either the UBC or American college groups.

On need affiliation there are no differences between the delinquent, UBC and Edwards' groups. However, the UBC and Edwards' groups rated it as more desirable than did the Hungarian university students.

The UBC, Hungarian and Edwards' samples rate the need intraception significantly more desirable than do the delinquent group, and the three former groups show no differentiations between their evaluations of the need.

Mean desirability ratings on need dominance do not differ between the Hungarian, delinquent and Edwards' groups. However, the UBC group appraises this need significantly more desirable than do either the delinquents or Hungarians.

Significant differences are found between the delinquents and the other three groups on need change, with the delinquents regarding this need as more desirable than do the other groups. The ratings for the other groups do not differ among themselves.

The delinquent groups also differ from all other groups on need endurance, viewing this need as less desirable than do the other three groups who rate this trait similarly in terms of social desirability.

In addition, the delinquents rate the need heterosexuality significantly more desirable than do the Hungarians and UBC students. No rating differences occurred between the UBC, Edwards and Hungarian groups on this need.

Finally, both the Hungarians and delinquents regard the need aggression as more desirable than do American and Canadian college students. The latter two groups appear homogenous in their judgment of this need.

The foregoing results on group differences may be summarized as follows. The results show that, for all manifest needs, the American and Canadian college students do not differ in their ratings. In addition, the Hungarian, UBC and American college students regard the needs of achievement, exhibitionism, intraception, change, endurance and heterosexuality in a similar manner. Delinquents view the needs achievement, order, intraception and endurance as less desirable than do UBC and American college students, and, with the exception of achievement, the delinquents view these needs as less desirable than do all other three groups. The needs exhibitionism, autonomy, change, heterosexuality and aggression are rated as more desirable by the delinquents than by the UBC group. However, of these five needs, the delinquents view only the needs autonomy, change and aggression as more desirable than do the American college students, and the needs exhibitionism, change and heterosexuality as more desirable than do the Hungarians. The Hungarian students regard the need affiliation as less desirable than do the American and Canadian college students. Hungarians also rate the need dominance as less desirable than do UBC students. On the other hand, need order is rated significantly higher by the Hungarian group than by any other group.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The results of this study confirm the two hypotheses tested and, in the main, substantiate the findings of previous investigations that a significant correlation exists between the social desirability scale values for different subcultural groups. The intraclass correlations for the three groups would seem to indicate that the social desirability variable would be fairly well controlled on the PPS for a group of Canadian college students, but not for Hungarian university students, nor for Canadian female juvenile delinquents. It would also appear that the delinquent group is the most deviant group in their ratings of the desirability of various manifest needs.

To the extent that the UBC, Hungarian and delinquent groups gave social desirability scale values similar to Edwards' American sample, the first hypothesis is supported. Since the intercorrelations of the scale values for the different groups are significant, the second hypothesis is also substantiated. It is worth mentioning in connection with the second hypothesis that the highest correlation between scale values are those of UBC students with the two American university groups, Edwards and the Nisei groups. This finding is probably not too

surprising when one keeps in mind that they are all college students of roughly the same age and in very close geographic proximity. On the other hand, the UBC group correlates lowest with the other two groups living in Canada, namely, the delinquents and the Hungarians. In fact, the latter two groups provide the lowest correlation of all groups reported, including those of Klett and Yaukey. Of course, a characteristic of delinquent groups is that they deviate from the standard social norms, and as such would be expected to express desirability ratings differing from those expressed by the "normal" groups in a society. The highest correlations for the delinquent group are those with American high school students and Norwegian gymnasia students, the only other samples of comparable age range.

The three groups used in this study may be rank ordered on the basis of similar social desirability ratings with all other groups. Excluding Hungarian and delinquent samples, the range of UBC correlations is .80 to .95. Excluding the delinquents, the Hungarian correlations range from .65 to .78, indicating a somewhat lower relationship to other groups than that of UBC. It is not known to what extent possible errors in translation of the original English statements to Hungarian might have lowered the Hungarian correlations. Undoubtedly, such a factor might have been operative in this study. The delinquent group is the most deviant group studied, with a range

of correlations, .47 to .62.

Considering all the intercorrelations, it might be hypothesized that the educational level of the subjects is an important factor determining the degree of agreement between groups. Seven of the nine groups reported on in this research were in school at the time their ratings were obtained, five in college and two in secondary school. The finding that the delinquents is the most deviant group suggests that the social desirability stereotype may not persist in subcultural groups that vary markedly in educational and/or age level. In addition, a personality variable may be in operation for the delinquent group. Considerable research will be required before the exact factors producing the differences in social desirability ratings will be determined.

The matched pair correlations indicate the degree to which the forced choice items would be equated for the social desirability variable if the PPS were used on these populations. The intraclass correlation of .75 for the UBC group suggests that the PPS could be used on this university group. However, the pairing is not as adequate as the original intraclass correlations of .85 reported by Edwards (3) on his American sample. The shrinkage in the intraclass correlation for the Canadian students is probably no greater than if Edwards were to calculate social desirability scale values on another new American sample. The intraclass correlation of .38 for the Hungarian

group and .35 for the delinquents does not seem adequate to warrant the use of the PPS on these groups with the assumption that the social desirability factor would be controlled.

The final part of this study consists of a comparison of the UBC, Edwards, Hungarian and delinquent groups on their desirability ratings of fourteen manifest needs. There are no significant differences between American and Canadian students on their desirability rating for any of the 14 needs. Using the American and Canadian university students as the referent for comparative purposes, the Hungarian group has more positive evaluation of the needs order and aggression. They also tend not to evaluate positively the need of affiliation. It might be interesting to speculate that the Hungarians also must have strong needs of order and aggression and low need for affiliation because of the way they judge these needs in terms of social desirability. There is, nevertheless, no independent evidence in this study to test such an inference from the present data. Again taking American and Canadian samples as convenient centering points, it would appear that the female delinquents view the needs of exhibitionism, autonomy, change, heterosexuality and aggression as most desirable. The delinquents underevaluate the desirability of the needs for achievement, order, intraception and endurance. It should be noted again, that, like the Hungarian sample, the present data does not prove that the delinquents do have strong needs for aggression and the like or low needs for

achievement. The data show only that they view certain needs as being more desirable than other needs. It would be an unwarranted speculation to hypothesize that a given group has strong needs for aggression simply because they evaluate it positively. Unless one wishes to make the assumption of an isomorphic relationship between strength of actual need and ratings of social desirability, the present data cannot be used in testing such speculations.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate two hypotheses about the social desirability variable in personality assessment. The first hypothesis predicted that Canadian university students, Hungarian university students and Canadian female juvenile delinquents would give similar social desirability ratings to those obtained by Edwards on a group of American college students. The second hypothesis predicted that the social desirability scale values for the Canadian university, Hungarian and delinquent samples, together with Edwards' scale value and the scale values derived from five other groups would all intercorrelate significantly. Two additional problems were also investigated, namely, the extent to which the item pairs on the Personal Preference Schedule (PPS) are matched for social desirability for the UBC, Hungarian and delinquent samples and how these three groups, together with Edwards' American sample, differ when the items on the PPS are grouped into the manifest needs that they purport to assess.

In order to investigate the hypotheses and problems, social desirability ratings were obtained from 226 University

of British Columbia students, 70 male Hungarians and 40 female delinquents. The items rated for desirability were those contained in the PPS. The obtained ratings were scaled by the method of successive intervals.

The findings strongly support the two hypotheses, suggesting that while the groups are not in perfect agreement on how they judge personality statements for social desirability, a common attitude of what is desirable and undesirable cuts across many different groups.

On the basis of the results dealing with the intraclass correlations for matched pairs on the PPS, it was suggested that the PPS would control the social desirability variable quite well on a UBC sample of students. However, the findings for the Hungarians and delinquents indicated that a similar assumption could not be made for these groups.

Highly reliable group differences occurred when the items on the PPS were grouped in terms of the needs they measured and analysis of variance techniques were employed to determine if the groups differed in their ratings on these needs. These results showed that Canadian and American university students judge their needs on the PPS in a similar fashion. The data further indicates then that the Hungarian group regards quite positively the needs of order and aggression and under-evaluate the desirability of the need for affiliation. Comparatively, the delinquent group appeared to evaluate positively the

needs of autonomy, change, heterosexuality and aggression and to underevaluate the needs of achievement, order, intraception and endurance. While it might be interesting to speculate that the Hungarians or delinquents possess to a strong degree those needs to which they profess high social desirability ratings, it was emphasized that the data of the present study cannot be used to test such hypotheses.

REFERENCES

1. Corah, N.L., Feldman, M.J., Cohen, Ira S., Gruen, W., Meadow, A., Ringwall, E.A. Social desirability as a variable in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 70-72.
2. Duncan, D.B. Multiple range and multiple F tests. Biometrics, 1955, 11, 1-42.
3. Edwards, A.L. Manual for the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: Psychol. Corp., 1954.
4. Edwards, A.L. The relationship between the judged desirability of a trait and the probability that the trait will be endorsed. J. appl. Psychol., 1933, 37, 90-93.
5. Edwards, A.L. The scaling of stimuli by the method of successive intervals. J. appl. Psychol., 1952, 36, 118-122.
6. Edwards, A.L. Social desirability and Q sorts. J. consult. Psychol., 1955, 19, 462.
7. Edwards, A.L. The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. New York: Dryden, 1957.
8. Edwards, A.L. Techniques of attitude scale construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
9. Edwards, A.L., and Thurstone, L.L. An internal consistency check for scale values determined by the method of successive intervals. Psychometrika, 1952, 17, 169-180.
10. Fordyce, W.E. Social desirability in the MMPI. J. consult. Psychol., 1956, 20, 171-175.
11. Fujita, B. An investigation of the applicability of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to a cultural subgroup. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Washington, 1956.
12. Guilford, J.P. Psychometric methods. New York, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill, 1954, 2nd ed.

13. Hanley, C. Judged social desirability and probability of endorsement of items on the MMPI Sc and D scales. Amer. Psychol., 1955, 10, 404-405, (abstract).
14. Hanley, C. Social desirability and responses to items from three MMPI scales: D, Sc, and K. J. appl. Psychol., 1956, 40, 324-328.
15. Kelleher, D. The social desirability factor in Edwards' PPS. J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 100.
16. Kenny, D.T. The influence of social desirability on discrepancy measures between real self and ideal self. J. consult. Psychol., 1956, 20, 315-318.
17. Kruytbosch, C. Flight and resettlement of the Sopron forestry faculty: A study of group integration and disintegration. Unpublished master's thesis, University of British Columbia, 1958.
18. Klett, J.C. The social desirability stereotype in a hospital population. J. consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 419-421.
19. Klett, J.C. The stability of the social desirability scale values in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. J. consult. Psychol., 1957, 2, 183-185.
20. Klett, J.C. A study of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule in relation to socio-economic status. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1956.
21. Klett, C.J. and Yaukey, D.L. A cross-cultural comparison of judgments of social desirability. Unpublished manuscript, 1958.
22. Lovass, O.I. Social desirability ratings of personality variables by Norwegian and American college students. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1958, 57, 124-125.
23. Navran, L., and Stauffacher, J.D. Social desirability as a factor in Edwards Personal Preference Schedule performance. J. consult. Psychol., 1954, 18, 442.
24. Rosen, E. Self-appraisal, personality desirability, and perceived social desirability of personality traits. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 52, 151-158.
25. Silverman, R.E. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and social desirability. J. consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 402-404.

APPENDIX A

ITEM POOL SCALED FOR SOCIAL DESIRABILITY

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES FOR UBC,
HUNGARIAN AND DELINQUENT GROUPS

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE VALUES FOR SIX
OTHER GROUPS.

Item Pool Scaled for Social Desirability

1. To like to solve puzzles and problems that other people have difficulty with.
2. To like to find out what great men have thought about various problems in which you are interested.
3. To like to have any written work that you do be precise, neat, and well-organized.
4. To like to tell amusing stories and jokes at parties.
5. To like to be able to come and go as you want to.
6. To like to be loyal to your friends.
7. To like to observe how another individual feels in a given situation.
8. To like your friends to encourage you when you meet with failure.
9. To like to be one of the leaders in the organizations and groups to which you belong.
10. When things go wrong with you, to feel that you are more to blame than anyone else.
11. To like to help your friends when they are in trouble.
12. To like to travel and to see the country.
13. To like to work hard at any job you undertake.
14. To like to go out with attractive persons of the opposite sex.
15. To like to read newspaper accounts of murders and other forms of violence.
16. To like to be a recognized authority in some job, profession, or field of specialization.
17. To like to conform to custom and to avoid doing things that people you respect might consider unconventional.
18. To like to plan and organize the details of any work that you have to undertake.
19. To like people to notice and comment upon your appearance when you are out in public.
20. To like to avoid situations where you are expected to do things in a conventional way.
21. To like to do things for your friends.
22. To like to put yourself in someone else's place and to imagine how you would feel in the same situation.
23. To like your friends to be sympathetic and understanding when you have problems.
24. When serving on a committee, to like to be appointed or elected chairman.
25. If you do something that is wrong, to feel that you should be punished for it.
26. To like to do small favors for your friends.
27. To like to experience novelty and change in your daily routine.

28. To like to stay up late working in order to get a job done.
29. To like to become sexually excited.
30. To feel like getting revenge when someone has insulted you.
31. To like to be able to do things better than other people can.
32. To like to praise someone you admire.
33. To like to have your life so arranged that it runs smoothly and without much change in plans.
34. To like to tell other people about adventures and strange things that have happened to you.
35. To like to be independent of others in deciding what you want to do.
36. To like to share things with your friends.
37. To like to understand how your friends feel about various problems they have to face.
38. To like your friends to treat you kindly.
39. To like to be regarded by others as a leader.
40. To feel that the pain and misery that you have suffered has done you more good than harm.
41. To like to be generous with your friends.
42. To like to meet new people.
43. To like to finish any job or task that you begin.
44. To like to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex.
45. To like to tell other people what you think of them.
46. To like to accomplish tasks that others recognize as requiring skill and effort.
47. To like to follow instructions and to do what is expected of you.
48. To like to keep your letters, bills, and other papers neatly arranged and filed according to some system.
49. To like to ask questions which you know no one will be able to answer.
50. To like to criticize people who are in a position of authority.
51. To like to have strong attachments with your friends.
52. To like to think about the personalities of your friends and to try to figure out what makes them as they are.
53. To like your friends to make a fuss over you when you are hurt or sick.
54. To like to tell other people how to do their jobs.
55. To feel timid in the presence of other people you regard as your superiors.
56. To like to show a great deal of affection toward your friends.
57. To like to try new and different jobs--rather than to continue doing the same old things.
58. To like to stick at a job or problem even when it may seem as if you are not getting anywhere with it.

59. To like to read books and plays in which sex plays a major part.
60. To feel like blaming others when things go wrong for you.
61. To like to be successful in things undertaken.
62. To like to accept the leadership of people you admire.
63. To like to have your meals organized and a definite time set aside for eating.
64. To like to say things that are regarded as witty and clever by other people.
65. To like to feel free to do what you want to do.
66. To like to do things with your friends rather than by yourself.
67. To like to study and analyze the behavior of others.
68. To like your friends to feel sorry for you when you are sick.
69. To like to supervise and direct the actions of other people whenever you can.
70. To like to feel that you are inferior to others in most respects.
71. To like to sympathize with your friends when they are hurt or sick.
72. To like to eat in new and strange restaurants.
73. To like to complete a single job or task at a time before starting on others.
74. To like to participate in discussions about sex and sexual activities.
75. To get so angry that you feel like throwing and breaking things.
76. To like to write a great novel or play.
77. When planning something, to like to get suggestions from other people whose opinions you respect.
78. To like to make a plan before starting in to do something difficult.
79. To like to be the center of attention in a group.
80. To like to avoid responsibilities and obligations.
81. To like to form new friendships.
82. To like to analyze your own motives and feelings.
83. To like your friends to help you when you are in trouble.
84. To like to argue for your point of view when it is attacked by others.
85. To feel guilty whenever you have done something you know is wrong.
86. To like to forgive your friends who may sometimes hurt you.
87. To like to do new and different things.
88. When you have an assignment to do, to like to start in and keep working on it until it is completed.
89. To like to engage in social activities with persons of the opposite sex.

90. To like to attack points of view that are contrary to yours.
91. To like to do your very best in whatever you undertake.
92. When you are in a group, to like to accept the leadership of someone else in deciding what the group is going to do.
93. To like to have your work organized and planned before beginning it.
94. To like to use words which other people often do not know the meaning of.
95. To like to say what you think about things.
96. To like to participate in groups in which the members have warm and friendly feelings towards one another.
97. To like to judge people by why they do something--not by what they actually do.
98. To like your friends to do many small favors for you cheerfully.
99. When with a group of people, to like to make the decisions about what you are going to do.
100. To feel better when you give in and avoid a fight, than you would if you tried to have your own way.
101. To like to treat other people with kindness and sympathy.
102. To like to experiment and try new things.
103. To like to keep working at a puzzle or problem until it is solved.
104. To like to kiss attractive persons of the opposite sex.
105. To feel like making fun of people who do things you regard as stupid.
106. To like to be able to say that you have done a difficult job well.
107. To like to read about the lives of great men.
108. If you have to make a trip, to like to have things planned in advance.
109. To sometimes like to do things, just to see what effect it will have on others.
110. To like to do things that other people regard as unconventional.
111. To like to write letters to your friends.
112. To like to analyze the feelings and motives of others.
113. To like your friends to sympathize with you and cheer you up when you are depressed.
114. To like to be called upon to settle arguments and disputes between others.
115. To feel that you should confess the things that you have done that you regard as wrong.
116. To like to help other people who are less fortunate than you are.
117. To like to move about the country and to live in different places.
118. To like to avoid being interrupted while at your work.

119. To like to be in love with someone of the opposite sex.
120. To feel like criticizing someone publicly if he deserves it.
121. To like to accomplish something of great significance.
122. To like to tell your superiors that they have done a good job on something when you think they have.
123. To like to keep your things neat and orderly on your desk or work space.
124. To like to talk about your achievements.
125. To like to do things in your own way and without regard to what others may think.
126. To like to make as many friends as you can.
127. To like to observe how your friends will act in various situations.
128. To like your friends to show a great deal of affection toward you.
129. To like to be able to persuade and influence others to do what you want.
130. To feel depressed by your own inability to handle various situations.
131. To like your friends to confide in you and to tell you their troubles.
132. To like to participate in new fads and fashions.
133. To like to put in long hours of work without being distracted.
134. To like to listen to or to tell jokes in which sex plays a major part.
135. To feel like telling other people off when you disagree with them.
- 136.* To like to observe people in restaurants and other places and try to figure out what they are really like.
137. To like to be friendly with other people.
138. To like to make fun of the mistakes by others.
139. To like to work toward some goal you have set for yourself.
140. To like to be strongly motivated to achieve your goals.
141. To like to have someone you can talk to about your misfortunes and difficulties.
142. To like to go to new places.
143. To disregard rules and regulations.
144. To like to convince others that your opinions are right.
145. To like to talk to others about yourself.
146. To like to encourage your friends when they meet with failure.
147. To like to have clothes arranged neat and orderly in your closets and chests.
148. To like to perform little services for people that you admire.
149. To like to make love to members of the opposite sex.

*Last 14 items not scaled by UBC, Hungarian and delinquent groups.

Social Desirability Scale Values for
UBC, Hungarian and Delinquent Groups

	University of British Columbia			Hungarian	Delinquent
	Male	Female	Combined		
1.	3.35	3.86	3.55	2.52	2.14
2.	3.76	4.05	3.86	2.39	1.57
3.	4.36	4.88	4.57	3.69	2.60
4.	3.56	4.06	3.76	2.51	2.57
5.	3.98	4.15	4.02	3.19	3.16
6.	4.91	5.56	5.20	3.75	2.93
7.	3.35	4.02	3.63	2.49	2.01
8.	3.65	4.34	3.93	2.40	2.71
9.	3.77	4.09	3.88	1.37	2.06
10.	2.84	3.41	3.08	1.78	1.00
11.	4.63	5.36	4.95	3.61	2.89
12.	3.95	4.61	4.22	3.49	3.02
13.	4.65	5.16	4.86	3.57	2.40
14.	4.29	4.14	4.20	2.81	3.27
15.	2.02	2.01	1.98	0.70	2.76
16.	3.89	4.01	3.90	1.97	1.82
17.	2.50	3.05	2.75	2.32	2.11
18.	3.77	4.26	3.96	3.40	1.91
19.	2.54	2.99	2.73	1.34	2.16
20.	2.30	2.33	2.34	1.59	1.22
21.	4.41	5.20	4.76	3.18	2.78
22.	3.31	4.24	3.71	2.19	1.93
23.	3.27	3.97	3.56	2.72	1.80
24.	3.11	3.31	3.17	1.05	0.54
25.	2.87	3.40	3.09	2.78	1.07
26.	3.96	4.84	4.32	2.75	2.66
27.	3.90	4.35	4.07	2.98	2.89
28.	3.41	3.99	3.65	3.12	1.76
29.	2.87	2.84	2.77	1.53	1.36
30.	1.44	1.35	1.42	1.00	2.13
31.	3.43	3.21	3.31	2.24	1.81
32.	3.35	4.22	3.74	1.92	2.02
33.	2.47	2.84	2.63	2.21	0.48
34.	2.91	3.49	3.16	1.69	2.20
35.	4.09	4.31	4.13	3.11	2.20
36.	3.94	4.82	4.29	2.90	2.59
37.	3.65	4.57	4.03	2.64	2.30
38.	3.69	4.29	3.93	2.35	2.55
39.	3.31	3.61	3.43	0.73	1.22
40.	2.97	3.56	3.21	2.11	1.60

	University of British Columbia			Hungarian	Delinquent
	Male	Female	Combined		
41.	3.86	4.82	4.23	2.33	2.40
42.	4.23	5.16	4.64	2.73	3.28
43.	4.29	4.88	4.53	3.67	2.78
44.	3.47	3.70	3.55	2.03	2.14
45.	2.37	2.22	2.27	2.99	2.34
46.	3.63	3.88	3.73	2.22	2.52
47.	3.55	4.23	3.83	2.38	2.30
48.	3.46	3.91	3.63	2.81	2.04
49.	1.47	1.71	1.60	0.76	1.35
50.	1.78	1.53	1.66	1.78	2.15
51.	3.99	4.28	4.08	2.95	2.77
52.	3.12	3.73	3.37	2.67	2.12
53.	2.07	2.49	2.25	1.56	0.69
54.	1.57	1.42	1.52	1.11	0.65
55.	1.58	1.94	1.76	0.88	1.12
56.	3.12	3.64	3.34	2.77	2.59
57.	2.96	3.31	3.12	2.35	2.42
58.	3.52	4.29	3.85	0.96	1.96
59.	2.47	2.60	2.52	1.57	2.15
60.	1.12	1.42	1.15	0.69	1.03
61.	4.21	4.67	4.38	2.86	2.25
62.	3.49	4.43	3.90	1.41	1.82
63.	2.57	2.99	2.74	3.09	1.47
64.	2.90	3.52	3.16	1.98	1.44
65.	3.85	3.94	3.88	2.75	3.24
66.	3.80	4.42	4.05	2.35	2.74
67.	2.92	3.42	3.13	2.24	1.61
68.	2.08	2.36	2.18	1.99	0.65
69.	2.67	2.43	2.58	0.76	1.05
70.	0.85	1.49	1.32	0.77	0.96
71.	3.34	4.18	3.69	2.87	1.73
72.	2.68	3.51	3.05	1.53	2.44
73.	3.69	4.35	3.97	3.24	2.46
74.	2.65	2.73	2.66	1.87	1.85
75.	1.07	1.26	1.17	0.53	3.20
76.	2.66	3.40	2.99	1.93	0.74
77.	3.83	4.58	4.12	2.48	2.39
78.	5.74	4.24	3.94	3.43	2.36
79.	2.32	2.28	2.25	0.84	0.79
80.	1.14	1.22	1.06	0.74	1.05
81.	4.06	4.89	4.39	2.44	2.51
82.	3.39	3.96	3.62	2.90	1.89
83.	3.39	3.80	3.55	2.31	2.55
84.	3.85	3.90	3.84	3.04	2.52

	University of British Columbia			Hungarian	Delinquent
	Male	Female	Combined		
85.	3.09	3.63	3.31	3.17	1.78
86.	3.69	4.67	4.08	2.98	2.51
87.	3.81	4.45	4.07	2.56	2.88
88.	3.87	4.38	4.07	3.55	2.18
89.	3.96	4.33	4.09	2.64	2.44
90.	2.93	3.20	3.03	2.48	1.68
91.	4.53	5.19	4.81	3.77	2.54
92.	2.50	3.32	2.85	1.83	1.65
93.	3.68	4.18	3.88	3.48	2.04
94.	1.57	1.88	1.73	0.90	1.74
95.	3.44	3.52	3.43	3.30	2.83
96.	4.17	4.88	4.46	3.21	2.52
97.	3.38	4.25	3.78	2.54	1.78
98.	2.79	3.47	3.07	1.82	2.04
99.	2.69	2.82	2.74	0.95	1.65
100.	2.57	3.66	3.11	2.16	1.28
101.	3.97	4.99	4.39	3.22	1.99
102.	3.69	4.46	4.01	3.00	2.78
103.	3.85	4.21	3.98	3.02	1.93
104.	2.84	3.31	3.04	2.76	3.24
105.	1.41	1.51	1.35	1.23	1.06
106.	3.45	3.86	3.60	1.91	2.30
107.	2.80	3.06	2.85	2.78	1.28
108.	3.33	3.75	3.50	3.14	1.99
109.	2.24	2.37	2.28	1.33	2.34
110.	2.39	2.48	2.47	1.15	1.65
111.	3.07	4.18	3.58	2.41	2.40
112.	3.06	3.64	3.30	2.28	1.94
113.	2.88	3.39	3.10	2.16	0.99
114.	3.01	3.29	3.11	1.61	1.16
115.	2.78	3.68	3.17	3.01	0.60
116.	3.98	5.23	4.54	3.18	2.62
117.	2.72	3.53	3.09	1.53	3.00
118.	3.05	3.48	3.22	2.90	1.65
119.	3.78	4.06	3.86	2.17	3.30
120.	2.53	1.69	2.08	2.22	0.99
121.	3.95	4.06	3.95	2.95	2.04
122.	3.09	4.05	3.51	0.98	2.01
123.	3.57	4.13	3.79	3.29	2.85
124.	2.23	2.26	2.17	0.76	1.52
125.	1.96	2.07	2.01	1.52	2.00
126.	3.77	4.69	4.14	2.17	2.78
127.	2.82	3.44	3.08	2.32	2.02
128.	2.71	3.29	2.96	1.86	1.60

	University of British Columbia			Hungarian	Delinquent
	Male	Female	Combined		
129.	2.78	2.58	2.74	0.84	1.35
130.	1.50	1.81	1.66	0.97	1.20
131.	3.14	3.74	3.39	2.51	2.01
132.	2.53	3.32	2.85	1.69	2.19
133.	3.25	3.64	3.38	2.53	0.87
134.	2.40	2.14	2.33	1.59	1.78
135.	1.51	1.24	1.42	3.25	2.85

Social Desirability Scale Values
For Six Other Groups*

	Hospital	High School	American College	Beirut	Norway	Nisei
1.	2.30	2.46	2.91	2.68	2.83	3.25
2.	3.15	2.50	3.34	3.27	3.06	3.52
3.	3.14	3.20	3.56	3.35	3.76	4.12
4.	2.21	2.19	2.84	2.28	2.80	3.08
5.	3.59	3.10	3.57	3.15	2.52	3.12
6.	3.42	3.44	4.14	3.44	4.00	4.34
7.	2.84	2.23	3.22	2.60	2.53	2.76
8.	3.05	3.31	3.63	3.13	3.29	3.90
9.	2.27	2.31	2.80	2.60	1.97	2.99
10.					1.37	
11.	3.12	3.33	3.96	3.33	3.81	4.28
12.	3.36	3.61	3.66	3.89	3.60	4.07
13.	3.27	3.06	3.46	3.19	2.32	4.10
14.	2.78	3.27	3.66	3.07	3.85	3.92
15.	1.52	1.62	1.81	1.59	1.43	1.84
16.	2.79	2.73	3.48	3.05	2.96	3.70
17.	2.51	1.90	2.30	2.06	2.54	2.89
18.	3.12	2.72	3.30	3.03	3.09	3.70
19.	1.92	2.42	2.45	1.45	1.78	2.64
20.	1.75	1.75	1.84	1.65	1.86	1.70
21.	3.24	3.38	3.90	3.08	3.76	4.06
22.	2.08	1.95	3.00	2.82	2.58	3.22
23.	2.44	2.60	3.00	2.76	3.20	3.06
24.	1.78	1.74	2.30	2.02	2.07	2.26
25.					2.22	
26.	4.53	3.24	3.47	2.76	3.16	3.56
27.	2.72	2.84	3.64	2.83	3.46	3.81
28.	2.57	2.15	2.92	2.67	1.98	3.26
29.	1.91	2.20**	2.50**	2.32**	2.70	2.52
30.	1.49	1.08	1.07	2.03	1.58	0.90
31.	2.69	2.27	2.79	3.18	2.70	2.99
32.	2.74	2.70	3.17	2.48	2.39	3.39
33.	2.53	1.92	1.88	1.85	1.26	2.54
34.	2.24	2.49	2.57	1.88	2.73	2.70
35.	2.85	2.83	3.44	3.06	3.10	3.37
36.	2.90	3.16	3.53	2.67	3.01	3.75
37.	2.30	2.74	3.11	2.43	2.39	3.14

*Personal communication from C. J. Klett, 1958.

	Hospital	High School	American College	Beirut	Norway	Nisei
38.	2.96	3.01	3.54	2.70	3.37	3.75
39.	2.53	2.41	2.74	2.40	1.78	3.12
40.					2.77	
41.	2.81	3.06	3.40	3.04	2.98	3.75
42.	2.90	3.37	3.68	2.92	3.50	3.75
43.	3.31	3.17	3.64	3.21	3.41	4.16
44.	2.30	2.87	3.28	2.44	2.78	3.42
45.	1.56	1.45	1.42	2.32	1.81	1.36
46.	2.91	2.92	3.61	2.93	3.10	4.01
47.	3.14	3.10	3.19	2.91	2.46	3.83
48.	3.33	3.12	3.28	3.25	2.49	3.88
49.	1.31	1.38	1.41	1.25	1.55	1.34
50.	1.38	1.18	1.39	1.91	1.70	1.22
51.	2.77	2.45	3.25	3.15	2.60	3.75
52.	2.24	2.51	2.71	2.56	2.08	2.62
53.	1.61	1.16	1.71	1.14	2.75	1.55
54.	1.26	0.83	1.05	1.46	1.61	1.07
55.					0.69	
56.	2.69	2.59	2.77	2.50	3.08	2.76
57.	2.36	2.58	2.74	2.35	2.52	2.55
58.	2.30	2.67	2.69	1.26	2.29	3.05
59.	1.81	1.88**	2.10**	2.03**	1.93	2.18
60.	1.32	0.78	0.60	0.93	0.90	0.64
61.	3.48	3.29	3.80	3.68	3.48	4.12
62.	2.70	2.72	3.09	2.59	2.71	3.46
63.	2.61	2.54	2.54	2.32	2.11	3.38
64.	2.20	2.46	3.07	2.38	2.82	3.18
65.	3.58	3.10	3.42	3.40	3.43	3.54
66.	2.58	3.39	3.48	2.30	3.16	3.46
67.	2.61	2.11	2.88	2.44	2.07	2.60
68.	2.00	1.40	1.87	1.74	2.26	1.95
69.	2.05	1.78	1.87	2.41	1.82	2.61
70.					0.90	
71.	3.00	2.66	3.28	2.89	2.79	3.66
72.	2.33	2.23	2.79	1.94	2.09	2.85
73.	3.17	2.95	3.12	2.77	3.14	3.65
74.	1.83	2.03**	2.29**	2.16**	2.05	2.69
75.	0.90	0.74	0.64	0.97	1.06	0.59
76.	1.87	1.48	2.30	2.05	2.17	2.19
77.	3.14	3.02	3.58	2.95	2.85	3.75
78.	3.51	2.79	3.56	3.14	3.13	4.16
79.	1.60	1.71	1.66	2.21	1.90	1.63
80.	1.26	1.45	0.68	1.07	1.04	0.86
81.	3.08	3.51	3.80	2.89	3.07	4.37
82.	2.89	2.40	3.27	3.08	2.84	3.19
83.	3.00	3.19	3.76	2.98	2.74	3.96

	Hospital	High School	American College	Beirut	Norway	Nisei
84.	2.63	2.54	2.97	3.03	3.37	2.99
85.					2.40	
86.	2.81	2.76	3.68	2.71	2.59	4.26
87.	3.03	3.46	3.76	3.17	3.35	3.94
88.	3.44	2.92	3.80	3.05	2.90	4.19
89.	2.72	3.21	3.65	2.74	3.18	3.85
90.	2.07	2.10	2.15	2.17	2.61	2.00
91.	3.51	3.54	4.07	3.51	3.52	4.39
92.	2.55	1.94	1.70	1.37	2.00	2.16
93.	3.16	2.94	3.38	3.11	2.91	3.96
94.	1.26	1.33	1.47	1.11	1.64	1.31
95.	3.23	3.05	3.60	3.41	3.02	3.25
96.	3.15	3.42	3.99	3.47	3.50	4.41
97.	2.03	1.97	3.08	2.29	1.87	2.71
98.	2.55	2.53	2.76	2.40	2.78	3.28
99.	2.09	1.70	1.91	2.17	1.98	2.00
100.					1.52	
101.	3.26	2.96	3.80	3.08	3.34	4.21
102.	2.84	2.99	3.40	3.03	3.27	3.43
103.	2.93	2.74	3.24	2.86	3.06	3.48
104.	2.69	2.81	3.41	3.16	3.10	2.89
105.	0.90	0.61	0.60	0.95	1.60	0.66
106.	3.79	2.74	3.38	2.37	2.07	3.18
107.	2.79	2.07	2.49	2.66	2.76	2.56
108.	3.15	3.30	3.30	3.06	2.44	4.10
109.	1.61	1.79	2.03	1.98	1.89	1.65
110.	1.52	1.70	2.02	1.67	1.46	1.92
111.	2.25	2.58	2.99	2.41	2.19	3.24
112.	2.16	2.14	2.63	2.39	2.22	2.58
113.	2.56	2.44	2.72	2.64	2.79	3.02
114.	1.88	1.89	1.88	2.14	2.00	2.18
115.					2.04	
116.	3.14	3.40	3.84	3.14	3.13	4.05
117.	2.25	2.37	2.66	2.82	3.31	2.56
118.	2.74	2.65	2.64	2.95	2.59	2.94
119.	3.16	3.02**	3.49**	3.00**	3.02	4.01
120.	1.52	1.13	1.17	1.87	1.97	0.86
121.	2.87	2.98	3.46	3.32	3.04	4.00
122.	2.53	2.86	3.15	2.55	2.53	3.46
123.	3.36	3.24	3.36	3.32	3.10	4.07
124.	2.09	2.07	1.75	1.80	1.78	1.72
125.	1.79	1.55	1.77	2.31	2.57	1.31
126.	2.88	3.74	3.59	2.89	2.84	4.01
127.	1.97	1.86	2.38	2.41	1.97	2.23
128.	2.57	2.71	2.77	2.30	2.52	2.99
129.	1.80	1.57	1.82	1.94	2.19	1.76
130.					1.49	

	Hospital	High School	American College	Beirut	Norway	Nisei
131.	2.19	2.57	2.61	2.67	2.96	2.89
132.	1.90	2.77	2.21	1.92	2.28	2.79
133.	2.42	2.26	2.70	2.52	2.09	3.12
134.	1.70	1.76**	1.96**	1.93**	1.76	2.02
135.	1.62	1.22	1.36	2.35	2.45	0.80
136.	2.16	2.08	2.59	1.62	2.21**	2.13
137.	3.41	3.71	4.22	3.55	3.42**	4.68
138.	0.97**	0.41	0.50	1.12**	1.19**	0.62
139.	3.41	3.33	3.91	3.60	3.31**	4.42
140.	2.36	2.58	3.31	3.22	2.82**	3.61
141.	2.43	2.44	2.72	2.44	2.52**	2.80
142.	3.24	3.38	3.42	3.39	3.10**	3.54
143.	0.93	0.60	1.12	1.28**	1.41**	0.83
144.	2.27	1.98	1.64	2.35	2.18**	1.80
145.	2.05	1.22	1.60	1.07	1.78**	1.42
146.	3.91	3.04	3.91	3.24	3.22**	3.82
147.	3.20	2.53	3.36	3.17	2.96**	3.81
148.	2.93	2.78	3.13	2.71	2.77**	3.04
149.	2.79	2.64**	3.12**	2.75**	2.78**	4.38**

**Scale value estimated by the average regression of social desirability scale values on probability of endorsement.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING SCALE

SAMPLE RATING SCHEDULE

HUNGARIAN TRANSLATION OF TRAIT RATING
SCHEDULE

HUNGARIAN TRANSLATION OF ITEM POOL

Instructions For Rating Scale

1. Ask their co-operation in a scientific study.
2. Say: "Would you please put Roman numerals from I to X on the blocks so that I can refer to them by numbers?"
3. Say: "Please read silently to yourselves the cover page. I shall read it out loud and you should follow me."
4. After reading it, ask: "Are there any questions?"
5. Then say:
"You are to rate these traits as to how socially desirable or undesirable you would consider them in others, not yourself."
6. Then say:
"I will read each trait twice. The first time I read it, you are to listen and form an opinion. I will then read it again and this time you are to make your rating."
7. After reading first item, say:
"How socially desirable or undesirable would you regard this trait in another person."
8. Repeat the above statement after reading items 2, 3, 6 and 8 in the first block.
9. Call attention to Ss about off balancing in second block.
10. At start of each block after the first block say:
"Remember, you are to rate these traits as to how socially desirable or undesirable you would consider them in others, not yourself."
11. After all items have been read, say:
"Now, are there any items that you want me to read over again? You may have missed an item at some point. I will read over again any items that you wish me to."

Ask for block number and item number and read over again any item that is requested.

Allen L. Edwards
The University of Washington

Examiner: _____

TRAIT RATING SCHEDULE

Your Name: _____ Age: _____ Sex: _____

Below you will find an example of four things that a person says that he likes or would like to do. These likes are called traits. Underneath the list of four traits and opposite the numbers corresponding to each of the traits are nine boxes. These boxes represent different degrees of desirability or undesirability of each trait as it appears in others, as indicated by the adjective at the top. A judge, such as yourself, has made an estimate of the degree of desirability or undesirability of these traits in people by placing an X in the box opposite each trait.

EXAMPLE: 1. To like to punish your enemies.

2. To like to read psychological novels.

3. To like to make excuses for your friends.

4. To like to go out with your friends.

Trait	UNDESIRABLE				DESIRABLE				
	Extreme	Strong	Moderate	Mild	NEUTRAL	Mild	Moderate	Strong	Extrem
1.		X							
2.					X				
3.							X		
4.								X	

The person who judged these traits believes that "to like to punish your enemies" is a definitely undesirable trait in others, "to like to read psychological novels" is neither desirable nor undesirable, "to like to make excuses for your friends" is moderately desirable, and "to like to go out with your friends" is quite a desirable trait in other people.

Indicate your own judgments of the desirability or undesirability of the traits which will be given to you by the examiner in the same manner. Remember that you are to judge the traits in terms of whether you consider them desirable or undesirable in others. Be sure to make a judgment about each trait.

Hungarian Translation of Trait Rating Schedule

Az Ön neve: Kora /éves/ Nem:

Az alanti példában négy dolgot fog találni, amiről valaki azt állítja, hogy szereti, vagy szeretné csinálni. Ezt a tetszést/vagy nem-tetszést/ nevezzük "jellemvonásoknak".

A négy jellemvonás alatt / és szemben e jellemvonásokra vonatkozó számokkal/ kilenc négyszög van. Ezek a négyszögek egy-egy jellemvonásnak különböző fokú társadalmi kívánatosságát" vagy "nem-kívánatosságát" jelzik, amint azt a négyszög feletti jelző mutatja.

Egy bíró, mint Ön következőképpen értékelt négy jellemvonás "társadalmi kívánatosságát" / vagy nem kívánatosságát/ másokban amennyiben X-et tett a megfelelő négyszögbe:

Példa:

1. Szereti megbüntetni az ellenségeit
2. Szeret pszichológiai novellákat olvasni
3. Szeret barátaiért " talpra állni"
4. Szeret barátaival gyakran együtt lenni.

Jellem- vonás	Nem kívánatos				Kívánatos				
	Igen erő- sen	Erő- sen	közép erő- sen	kissé	neutra- lis	kissé	közép erő- sen	erő- sen	Igen erő- sen
1		X							
2					X				
3							X		
4								X	

A bíró aki ezeket a jellemvonásokat bírálta, úgy érzi, hogy "megbüntetni az ellenséget" erősen nem-kívánatos jellemvonás másokban; pszichológiai novellákat szeretni neutrális; "barátokért talpra állni" közepesen társadalmilag kívánatos; és szeretni barátokkal gyakran együtt lenni erősen társadalmilag kívánatos másokban.

Kérjük jelezze az Ön bírálatát hasonlóképpen a jellemvonásokról, amelyeket valaki most olvasni fog.

Ne felejtse el, hogy azt bírálja hogy ezeket a jellemvonásokat másokban kívánatosnak tartja-e vagy sem, és milyen mértékben.

Nagyon fontos, hogy minden egyes jellemvonást bíráljon el.

HOURS

Sept 5 —

ASIAN STUDIES LIBRARY

Mon-Thurs 8:30am-8pm
Friday 8:30am-5pm
Saturday 12noon-5pm

CRANE LIBRARY

Mon-Thurs 9am-9pm
Friday 9am-5pm

CURRICULUM LAB

Mon-Thurs 8am-10pm
Friday 8am-6pm
Sat, Sun 12noon-5pm

DATA LIBRARY

Monday-Friday 9am-4pm

FILM LIBRARY

Mon-Fri 8:30am-4:30pm

FINE ARTS LIBRARY

Mon-Thurs 8am-10pm
Friday 8am-6pm
Saturday 12noon-5pm
Sunday 12noon-8pm

LAW LIBRARY

Mon-Thurs 8am-10pm
Friday 8am-6pm
Saturday 9am-5pm
Sunday 12noon-10pm

MACMILLAN LIBRARY

Mon-Thurs 8am-10pm
Friday 8am-5pm
Sat, Sun 12noon-5pm

MAIN LIBRARY

Mon-Thurs 8am-10pm
Friday 8am-6pm
Saturday 12noon-5pm
Sunday 12noon-8pm



MAP LIBRARY

Monday-Friday 9am-5pm
Saturday 12noon-5pm

MATH LIBRARY

Monday-Thursday 8am-9pm
Friday 8am-5pm
Saturday 12noon-5pm

MUSIC LIBRARY

Mon-Thurs 8am-10pm
Friday 8am-5pm
Sat, Sun 12noon-5pm

SEDGEWICK LIBRARY

Monday-Friday 8am-11pm
Sat, Sun 10am-11pm

SOCIAL WORK LIBRARY

Monday-Thursday 9am-8pm
Friday 9am-5pm
Sat, Sun 12noon-5pm

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm
Saturday 12noon-5pm

WILSON RECORDINGS

Monday-Thursday 9am-9pm
Friday 9am-5pm
Sat, Sun 12noon-5pm

WOODWARD LIBRARY

Mon-Thurs 8am-10pm
Friday 8am-6pm
Sat, Sun 12noon-6pm

HOSPITAL LIBRARIES*

Mon-Thurs 8am-11pm
Friday 8am-5pm
Saturday 12noon-5pm
Sunday 12noon-10pm

*HOLIDAY HOURS POSTED

**ALL CAMPUS LIBRARIES
CLOSED
OCTOBER 9
NOVEMBER 13**

Hungarian Translation of Item Pool

1. Szeret rejtvényeket és problémákat megfejtteni, amelyekkel másoknak nehézségei vannak.
2. Szereti kitalálni, hogy nagy /hires/ emberek mit gondoltak különböző problémákról, amelyek őt érdeklik.
3. Szereti ha minden írott munkája precíz, rendes és intelligens van megszerkesztve.
4. Szeret adomákat és vicceket leadni társaságban.
5. Szeret szabadon menni és jönni ahogy kedve van.
6. Szeret hü lenni barátaihoz.
7. Szereti megfigyelni, hogy mások hogy viselkednek adott helyzetekben.
8. Szereti ha barátai bátorítják ha dolguk nem sikerülnek.
9. Szeret egyike lenni a vezéreknek szervezetekben és csoportokban amelyeknek tagja.
10. Ha a dolgok rosszul mennek; szereti úgy érezni, hogy ez inkább az Ön mint másoknak a hibája.
11. Szeret segíteni a barátainak ha bajban vannak.
12. Szeret utazni és világot látni.
13. Szeret komolyan dolgozni bármilyen munkán, amit átvett.
14. Szeret randevura menni csinos partnerrel.
15. Szeret ujság riportokat olvasni gyilkosságokról, verekedésekről és hasonló erőszakosságokról.
16. Szeret elismert tekintély lenni, valamilyen munkában, hivatásban, vagy specialista területen.
17. Szeret alkalmazkodni társadalmi szokásokhoz és elkerülni olyan dolgokat, amelyeket mások, akiket respektál, esetleg szokatlannak tartanak.
18. Szeret részletesen kitervezni és megszervezni minden munkát, amelyet el kell vállalnia.
19. Szereti ha mások észreveszik és kellemes megjegyzéseket tesznek a megjelenéséről, amikor társaságban van.
20. Szeret elkerülni olyan helyzeteket, amelyekben mások elvárják, hogy convenciónálisan viselkedjék.
21. Szeret dolgokat tenni barátaiért.
22. Szereti saját magát másnak a helyzetében elképzelni hogy hogy érezné magát abban a helyzetben.
23. Szereti ha barátai szimpátiájukat fejezik ki és megértőnek bizonyulnak, ha nehézségei vannak.
24. Szereti ha elnöknek választják, vagy kinevezik, ha egy bizottságban dolgozik.

- 25.Szereti érezni,hogy büntetést érdemel ha valami rosszat tesz.
- 26.Szeret apró szivességeket tenni barátainak.
- 27.Szeret újdonságokat és változékonyságot napi rutinjában.
- 28.Szeret későig fennmaradni és dolgozni,hogy befejezzon egy munkát.
- 29.Szeret nemileg felizgulni.
- 30.Szeret "revansot" venni ha valaki megsértette.
- 31.Szeret képesnek lenni dolgokat jobban csinálni mint mások.
- 32.Szeret dicsérni valakit akit szeret.
- 33.Szereti ha élete úgy van berendezve,hogy simán folyik és ritkán kell terveit megváltoztatni.
- 34.Szeret másoknak beszélni kalandjairól és szokatlan dolgokról, amelyek Önnel kapcsolatban történtek.
- 35.Szeret független lenni másoktól, amikor elhatározza,hogy mit akar csinálni.
- 36.Szeret dolgokat a barátaival megosztani.
- 37.Szereti megérteni,hogy barátai hogyan reagálnak nehézségekre,melyekkel szemben állnak.
- 38.Szereti, ha barátai kedvesen bánnak Önnel.
- 39.Szereti,ha mások vezérnek tekintik.
- 40.Szereti úgy érezni,hogy a fájdalom és a nyomor,melyet elszenvedett, több jót,mint bajt okozott Önnek.
- 41.Szeret bőkezű lenni barátaival.
- 42.Szeret új emberekkel találkozni.
- 43.Szeret befejezni bármilyen munkát,amelyet elkezdett.
- 44.Szereti ha a másik nem,fizikailag vonzónak tartja.
- 45.Szereti másoknak megmondani, amit róluk gondol.
- 46.Szeret dolgokat teljesíteni, amiről mások azt gondolják, hogy ügyességet és kitartást igényel.
- 47.Szeret utasításokat követni és kötelességét teljesíteni.
- 48.Szereti a leveleit,számláit és más papírjait rendszeres módon tárolni és elrakni.
- 49.Szeret kérdéseket feltenni,amelyekről tudja,hogy senki nem lesz képes megválaszolni.
- 50.Szeret kritizálni feletteseket.
- 51.Szeret barátaival erős személyes kapcsolatban lenni.
- 52.Szeret barátainak személyiségéről gondolkodni, és kisütetni hogy mi alakította őket.
- 53.Szereti, ha barátai sűrőnek,forognak körülötte; ha beteg vagy megsebesült.

- 54.Szeret másoknak utasításokat adni,munkájukra vonatkozólag.
- 55.Szereti félénknek érezni magát,mások jelenlétében,akiket feletteseknek tekint.
- 56.Szeret sok szeretetet nyilvánítani, barátaival szemben.
- 57.Szeret új munkákat kipróbálni,mintsem régi.,ismert munkában dolgozni.
- 58.Szeret egy munka vagy probléma mellett kitartani akkor is ha úgy érzi,hogy semmire sem megy vele.
- 59.Szeret könyveket olvasni és szindarabokat látni,amelyekben nemi kérdések nagyobb szerepet játszanak.
- 60.Szeret másokat okolni,ha a dolgok rosszul mennek űnek.
- 61.Szeret sikeres dolgokban ,amiket elvállal.
- 62.Szeret vezető szerepet vállalni olyan emberekkel, akiket nagyra tart.
- 63.Szereti,hogy étkezései jól legyenek megszervezve és határozott idő legyen meghatározva számukra.
- 64.Szeret dolgokat mondani amelyet mások ügyesnek és viccesnek tartanak.
- 65.Szereti szabadnak érezni magát, azt csinálni, amit épen akar.
- 66.Szeret dolgokat másokkal együtt csinálni inkább mint egyedül.
- 67.Szereti másoknak a viselkedését tanulmányozni és analizálni.
- 68.Szereti ha barátai szimpatizálnak,ha beteg.
- 69.Szeret másokra felügyelni és utasítani ha csak lehet.
- 70.Vannak-e alsóbbrendű érzései.
- 71.Szeret szimpatizálni barátaival ha sebesültek, vagy betegek.
- 72.Szeret új és szokatlan éttermekben enni.
- 73.Szeret befejezni egy dolgot,va gy egy munkát mielőtt egy másikba fog bele.
- 74.Szeret nemi kérdésekről és ügyekről való beszélgetésben részt venni.
- 75.Annyira haragudni,hogy kedve volna dolgokat eltörni, vagy hajigálni.
- 76.Egy nagyszerű regényt, vagy szindarabot írni.
- 77.Amikor valamit tervez, ideákat kapni másoktól, akiknek véleményét nagyra becsüli.
- 78.Tervet készíteni, mielőtt belefog egy nehéz munkába.
- 79.Szeret a csoport figyelmének középpontjában lenni.

- 80.Szereti elkerülni a felelősséget.
- 81.Szeret új barátságokat kötni.
- 82.Szereti saját érzéseit és indokait analizálni.
- 83.Szereti ha barátai segítik, ha bajban van.
- 84.Szeret egy nézet érdekében vitatkozni, ha mások ezt támadják.
- 85.Bűnösnek érezni magát, ha tudatosan valami rosszat tett.
- 86.Megbocsájtani barátainak, akik néha talán megbántják.
- 87.Szeret új változatos tevékenységet.
- 88.Ha valamilyen munkát kap;belekezdeni és dolgozni rajta amíg be van fejezve.
- 89.Szeret társadalmilag érintkezni a másik nemmel.
- 90.Szeret megtámadni nézeteket,amelyek saját nézetével ellenkeznek.
- 91.Szeret mindent, amibe belekezd, tehetségéhez képest legjobban elintézni.
- 92.Ha egy csoportban van: szereti másnak a vezetését elfogadni hogy a csoport mit csináljon.
- 93.Szereti a saját munkáját megszervezni és kitervezni mielőtt elkezdí.
- 94.Szeret szavakat használni, amelyeknek értelmét mások gyakran nem ismerik.
- 95.Szereti nyíltan megmondani,hogy mit gondol dolgokról.
- 96.Szeret résztvenni csoportokban, amelyeknek tagjai, meleg barátságos érzelmeket táplálnak egymás iránt.
- 97.Szeret másokat aszerint megítélni,hogy miért teszik ezt,vagy azt, nem aszerint, hogy mit tesznek.
- 98.Szereti ha barátai örömmel és gyakran tesznek apró szíveségeket Önnek.
- 99.Ha egy csoportban van,szereti maga elhatározni,hogy mit csináljon.
- 100.Jobban érzi magát,ha lemondott egy előmyről, ha ezáltal elkerült egy komoly nézeteltérést,mintha megpróbálta volna saját érdekét megvédeni.
- 101.Szeret szeretettel és megértéssel bánni másokkal.
- 102.Szeret új dolgokat és szeret kísérletezni.
- 103.Szeret egy rejtvényen, vagy problémán dolgozni,amíg megoldja.
- 104.Szeret megcsókolni egy csinos személyt.
- 105.Szereti azt az érzést, hogy jó volna nevetségessé tenni embereket, akik /az ön véleményében/ ostoba dolgokat tesznek.
- 106.Szereti azt mondhatni,hogy egy nehéz munkát jól végzett el.

- 107.Szeret nagy emberek életéről olvasgatni.
- 108.Ha utaznia kell:szeret dolgokat előre kitervezni.
- 109.Szeret időnként dolgokat csinálni, csak azért,hogy lássa hogy milyen hatása lesz másokra.
- 110.Szeret olyan dolgokat csinálni,amit mások szokatlannak tartanak.
- 111.Szeret barátainak levelet írni.
- 112.Szereti másoknak az érzéseit és motivációit analizálni.
- 113.Szereti ha barátai együtt éreznek Önnel és felderítik ha le van sujtva.
- 114.Szereti ha megkérlik,hogy mások vitáit elsimítsa.
- 115.Ugy érezni,hogy helyes volna bevallani,ha valami olyat tett amit rossznak tekintett.
- 116.Szereti,ha segíthet másokon, akik kevésbé szerencsések.
- 117.Szeret ide-oda költözködni az országban és különböző helyeken lakni.
- 118.Szereti elkerülni, hogy félbeszakítsák munka közben.
- 119.Szeret szerelmesnek lenni.
- 120.Szeret úgy érezni,hogy jó volna valakit nyilvánosan kritizálni ha megérdemli.
- 121.Szeret valamit teljesíteni,ami nagyon fontos.
- 122.Szereti megemlíteni feletteseinek,hogy ők jó munkát végeztek,ha úgy érzi,hogy megérdemelték.
- 123.Szereti a dolgait rendben tartani az íróasztalán, va gy a munkahelyén.
- 124.Szeret sikereiről beszélni.
- 125.Szeret dolgokat a saját módszere szerint végezni,tekintet nélkül arra,hogy mások mit gondolnak erről.
- 126.Szeret annyi barátot szerezni, amennyit csak lehet.
- 127.Szereti megfigyelni,hogy barátai hogy viselkednek különböző helyzetekben.
- 128.Szereti ha barátai sok kedvességet nyilvánítanak irányában.
- 129.Szeret képesnek lenni, rábeszélni és befolyásolni másokat hogy azt tegyék amit akar.
- 130.Lesujtva érezni magát annak következtében,hogy képtelen különböző helyzeteket kezelni.
- 131.Szereti hogy barátai megbiznak Önben és előadják Önnek a nehézségeiket.
- 132.Szeret résztvenni új divatokban és mozgalmakban.
- 133.Szeret órák hosszat dolgozni, félbeszakítás nélkül.
- 134.Szeret tréfákat hallani, vagy mesélni,amelyekben sexuális vonatkozások játszóak a főszerepet.
- 135.Szereti másoknak kereken megmondani a véleményét ha különböző nézetei vannak.

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF F TESTS

Summary of F Tests

<u>Need</u>	<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Variance Estimate</u>	<u>F</u>
achievement	Groups	256.64	3	85.55	5.71**
	Statements	1266.03	8		
	Interaction	359.21	24	14.97	
	Total	1881.88	35		
deference	Groups	141.30	3	47.10	1.53
	Statements	563.91	8		
	Interaction	737.30	24	30.72	
	Total	1442.51	35		
order	Groups	687.13	3	229.04	18.55**
	Statements	1524.99	8		
	Interaction	296.31	24	12.35	
	Total	2508.43	35		
exhibitionism	Groups	225.66	3	75.22	4.41*
	Statements	1562.25	8		
	Interaction	409.31	24	17.05	
	Total	2197.22	35		
autonomy	Groups	311.81	3	103.94	5.72**
	Statements	4429.85	8		
	Interaction	435.81	24	18.16	
	Total	5177.47	35		
affiliation	Groups	98.28	3	32.76	3.69*
	Statements	510.86	8		
	Interaction	212.86	24	8.87	
	Total	822.00	35		
introception	Groups	123.16	3	41.05	5.90**
	Statements	174.71	8		
	Interaction	167.01	24	6.96	
	Total	464.88	35		
succorance	Groups	159.61	3	53.20	2.56
	Statements	1858.64	8		
	Interaction	498.90	24	20.79	
	Total	2517.15	35		
dominance	Groups	362.15	3	120.72	4.63*
	Statements	1668.18	8		
	Interaction	625.81	24	26.08	
	Total	2656.14	35		

<u>Need</u>	<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Variance Estimate</u>	<u>F</u>
nurturance	Groups	73.80	3	24.60	1.92
	Statements	674.91	8		
	Interaction	306.86	24	12.79	
	Total	1055.57	35		
change	Groups	385.45	3	128.48	10.93**
	Statements	1311.37	8		
	Interaction	282.35	24	11.76	
	Total	1979.17	35		
endurance	Groups	443.04	3	147.68	5.67**
	Statements	1215.24	8		
	Interaction	624.83	24	26.03	
	Total	2283.11	35		
hetero- sexuality	Groups	268.20	3	89.40	4.92**
	Statements	1895.81	8		
	Interaction	436.38	24	18.18	
	Total	2600.39	35		
aggression	Groups	1989.71	3	663.24	8.09**
	Statements	1401.70	8		
	Interaction	1967.33	24	81.97	
	Total	5358.74	35		

*p < .05

**p < .01