ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AS AN ADAPTIVE
                           MOTIVATION TO SOCIAL EVALUATION
                           IN STUDENT TEACHERS

                           Alexandria Travis, Master of Arts, 2020

Thesis Directed By: Dr. Hedwig Teglasi, Ph.D
                           Department of Counseling, Higher Education,
                           and Special Education.

Early-career teacher stress, burnout and attrition are growing problems in the United States. The current study focused on the impact of social desirability on positive and negative constructs (i.e. positive-negative affect, coping-perceived stress reactivity) in a group of student-teachers beginning their teaching internships. Additionally, this research also proposed a new definition of social desirability, as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation, based on the patterns of relationships between social desirability and the aforementioned constructs. These definitions were assessed a sample of 61 student-teachers from the University of Maryland's teacher preparation program who were completing their senior year internship. As many forms of research rely on self-reports, social desirability's role as a validity confound has been widely documented, however, its relationship to individual well-being has not been investigated as widely. The bias perspective of social desirability was not consistent with the results of this study.

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AS AN ADAPTIVE MOTIVATION TO SOCIAL
EVALUATION IN STUDENT TEACHERS

by

Alexandria Travis

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2020

Advisory Committee:
 Professor Hedwig Teglasi, Chair
 Professor Cixin Wang
 Professor Andres De Los Reyes

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Social desirability and its connection to individual psychological well-being and professional efficacy presents a unique and untapped research opportunity, particularly with a group of student-teachers. Social desirability was originally conceived of as an impediment to the validation of self-reports in personality assessments (Ellis, 1946). Researchers and clinicians found that in response to personality assessments, individuals were prone to over-inflating their positive qualities (Ellis, 1946). At its inception the research on social desirability remained focused on personality assessment, despite Ellis' assertion that the inflation or "self-halo effect" could provide valuable clinical information to researchers and psychologists (Ellis, 1946). Over the past several decades there has been a shift in the focus of social desirability research. Currently, the research on social desirability tends to focus on social desirability's correlation to factors such as personality traits, self-reports of individual well-being, and self-reports of efficacy in academic and employment settings (Bardwell & Dimsdale, 2001; Kozma & Stones, 1987; Smeding, Dompnier, & Darnon, 2017). Social desirability may also reflect sensitivity to social situations; individuals alter their responses based on their appraisal of social etiquette and norms in that moment. Individual differences in the experience of social desirability are particularly important with student-teachers, as being a student-teacher requires navigation between several different roles across social contexts. The added stress, and individual stress reactivity, of navigating those social roles could contribute to several of the symptoms of burnout such as distancing oneself from students and fellow teachers and emotional exhaustion (Steinhardt, Smith-Jaggars, Faulk, & Gloria, 2011). Alternatively, the desire for positive social appraisal could influence prosocial behaviors that increase well-being through the promotion of overall social competence in the school context. Investigating the role of social desirability as a

positive aspect of social growth and an adaptive motivation to social evaluation may be helpful in conceptualizing how student-teachers function across multiple role contexts. Sustaining positive impressions is particularly crucial for student-teachers, who are evaluated frequently by their mentor teachers, colleagues, and students. Cultivating these favorable impressions could promote student teacher's self-esteem and positive self-efficacy, which could in turn promote positive supervisor ratings. Social desirability could be a critical component in the development or prevention of burnout and more research is needed to identify the exact role it plays. This study will investigate the potential role of social desirability in the development of burnout by exploring whether or not higher levels of social desirability relate to levels of perceived stress reactivity, positive and negative affect, coping and self-efficacy in a group of student-teachers.

Individual differences in the experience of social desirability are particularly important with student-teachers, as part being a student-teacher includes a large number of evaluations across professional and social situations. Social desirability, operationalized as a desire to be viewed positively and approved of by others, has been investigated as a barrier to the validity of self-reports and as a correlate of well-being, personality traits, and affect (Bardwell & Dimsdale, 2001; Kozma & Stones, 1987; Smeding, Dompnier, & Darnon, 2017). This desire for approval can become particularly acute as student-teachers are consistently observed and evaluated by supervisors, fellow teachers, and in some cases students. A critical component of burnout is a self-evaluation component which includes feelings of incompetence and lack of individual professional achievement (Steinhardt, Smith-Jaggars, Faulk, & Gloria, 2011). These feelings of incompetence can accumulate and, as chronic work stress continues, teachers' interpretations of the demands placed on them professionally and their inability to cope with those demands become a source of burnout (Steinhardt, Smith-Jaggars, Faulk, & Gloria, 2011). As burnout

negatively impacts individual well-being, interpersonal well-being and self-efficacy as a teacher, social desirability emerges as another factor that could play a role in the development and prevention of burnout.

High levels of early-career teacher attrition and burnout are a substantial problem in American public-school systems. 40-50% of new teachers leave the teaching profession after three years due to stressors such as "role overload, disruptive students, non-supportive parents, lack of support from the administration, poor relationships with colleagues, being evaluated and high-stakes student testing" (Steinhardt, Smith-Jaggars, Faulk, & Gloria, 2011, p. 420). Burnout is operationalized as a psychological syndrome comprised of three interconnected components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Steinhardt, Smith-Jaggars, Faulk, & Gloria, 2011, p. 420). Teachers suffering burnout distance themselves from students and colleagues, are less productive in their work, and experience increased levels of physical and psychological health issues, contributing to high levels of teacher turnover in schools (Steinhardt, Smith-Jaggars, Faulk, & Gloria, 2011). This subsequently impacts student achievement in schools overall and accrues tens of thousands of dollars in financial costs per school per year (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019). High levels of teacher burnout impede teacher efficacy, which subsequently inhibits students' academic success and achievement (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019). Being able to identify teachers who are at risk of burnout early in their careers could allow for increased intervention and supports to help ease their distress. Targeting undergraduate teacher preparation programs for investigation and intervention presents a unique opportunity to explore which factors may play a role in future career success or future burnout and attrition. In the current study, I investigated whether social desirability could be a protective factor against burnout. This research ultimately aimed to

redefine how social desirability operates beyond biasing self-reports and instead argued that

social desirability reflected a tendency to want to give a positive impression and a sensitivity to

social evaluation.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The purpose of this research was to assess the role of social desirability as it related to positive and negative affect, perceived stress-reactivity, and efficacy in student-teachers during their senior-year teaching practicum. This study aimed to investigate a different way of framing social desirability, not only as a potential bias, but as an attitude of sensitivity and motivation toward social evaluation and interactions. An adaptive motivation to social evaluation goes beyond self-report validity and conceptualizes social desirability as a desire to gain social approval that is reflected in social competence and relationships, instead of being reflected in self or other-deception. This segment reviewed social desirability's history of complex correlations with other constructs, and how previous authors have conceptualized social desirability differently to align with their research. This review clarified gaps in the previous literature and explained how they were addressed in the current research, and provided background on the rationale for social desirability to be redefined as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation.

Social Desirability Definitions and Measures

Social desirability has historically been conceptualized as an obstacle to obtaining valid-self reports, however its measurement and definitions continue to be foci of study and debate among the psychological community. Social desirability was originally formulated as a response to individuals inflating self-reports in personality assessment and was described as, "a general over-estimation, or self-halo effect" (Ellis, 1946, p. 386). Social desirability research has now expanded to include self-reports across the fields of medicine, psychology and research. The central debate in social desirability research is whether or not social desirability represents a one-factor need for approval (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) or a two-factor construct of self-deception and impression management (Paulhus, 1984). Paulhus described the factor of self-deception as

5

the respondent believing their inflated positive self-reports, and impression management as the respondent consciously inflating their positive self-reports (Paulhus, 1984). Currently, the debate of what social desirability truly exemplifies is between the Marlowe-Crowne definition and the Paulhus definition, and its pattern of correlations differs depending on which definition is used. The following table describes the definitions that have been used to conceptualize social desirability since its inception, in chronological order.

Table 1

Major Definitions of Social desirability

Definition	Who created the definition	Year Definition Was Created	What measures are associated with the definition	Reliability/Validity of Measures Associated	Additional Information
The Halo Effect	Albert Ellis	1946	None	N/A	• Cultural factors influence validity • Motivation for falsifying answers on personality questionnaires may provide clinical material
The tendency to give socially desirable responses	Allen Edwards	1953	The Edwards Scale (The first scale of social desirability) (SD)	• Zero-order correlation between SD and the proportion responses rated as socially desirable in	• 140 personality trait items from the MMPI were rated on their desirability, and a 39-

6

				the MMPI was .92	item scale was created
				• Correlation of .22 with the MMPI Lie Scale designed to measure faking	
The (one-factor) need for approval, the need for individuals to respond in culturally sanctioned ways	Douglas Crowne and David Marlowe	1960	The Marlowe-Crowne Scale (The most used scale of SD)	• Internal consistency of .88 using the Kuder-Richardson formula • Correlation of .35, which was significant at $p < .01$ between MC and Edwards Scale • Correlation of .54 with the MMPI Lie Scale designed to measure faking	• 33 True or False items • Sought to minimize correlations with MMPI
The desire to appear socially acceptable	Virginia Crandall, Vaughn Crandall, and Walter Katkovsky	1965	Children's Social desirability Scale	• Uncorrected split-half reliability coefficients range from .69 to .90 • Corrected by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, correlations ranged	• Modeled after the Marlowe-Crowne Scale

					between .82 and .95
Overall need for social approval	Harry J. Martin	1984	Martin-Larsen Approval Motivation Scale	• Stability coefficients ranged from .84-.94 for a control group and from .73-.93 for an experimental group (where scale items were reversed when administered for the second time)	• Author stated that his scale measured need for approval and Marlowe-Crowne measured defensive denial. This view of Marlowe-Crowne has not been replicated in any literature since
A two-factor model of socially desirable responding impression management and self-deception	Delroy Paulhus	1984	The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR)	• Internal consistency ranging between .68-.86	• Marlowe-Crowne Scale loaded strongly on both factors • Edwards scale loaded strongly on self-deception factor

The Marlowe-Crowne definition of social desirability as an overall need for approval is the most all-encompassing definition of social desirability and was the definition most often referenced in this research. However, it still may not capture all of the facets of social desirability, as demonstrated in the literature. The Marlowe-Crowne scale has exhibited test-retest reliability for at least one month (Andrews & Meyer, 2003; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Miller et. al, 2015). Social desirability has also been shown to correlate with measures of subjective well-being,

personality variables, and affect, but only when combined with the influence of other constructs (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011; Perinelli & Gremigni, 2016; Uziel, 2010; Uziel, 2010b). When the construct of social desirability was established, its potential impact on clinical (psychological) material was addressed very generally (Ellis, 1946). This impact on clinical material such as well-being and depression has now been established in the research, but there remains a gap in the literature as to how exactly social desirability impacts clinical material, outside of self-report validity. Clarifying the definition of social desirability could explain its true conceptualization and relationship to other constructs like personality, and individual well-being.

The Marlowe-Crowne definition of social desirability is the most general definition of social desirability, but it still does not fully capture the motivation behind an individual displaying social desirability. The Paulhus definition, while more specific than the Marlowe-Crowne definition, still ascribes a negative connotation to social desirability, with the self-deception factor. This research proposed a new definition of social desirability that further clarified the purpose behind the response alteration in self-reports. This research proposed that a new definition of social desirability be considered: an adaptive motivation to social evaluation. This new proposed definition was a valuable refinement to the construct of social desirability because it ascribed a reason to the conscious or unconscious processes that led to social desirability in self-reports: sensitivity to social evaluation and a motivation to avoid social disapproval. This definition also demonstrated how social desirability may act as a protective factor in student-teachers. Greater levels of social desirability, under the new definition, could lead to stronger social skills. Those who were concerned about the approval of others, and sensitive to public conditions may perform better in social situations. As student-teachers juggle many different social roles across an array of contexts, an adaptive motivation to social

evaluation may be a valuable asset to have, in navigating the daily pressures they face. The forthcoming review of the literature explored the different patterns of correlations of social desirability across several constructs related to mental health and well-being and rationalized the proposal for this new definition of social desirability.

Correlations of Social Desirability with Positive and Negative Affect

Positive and negative affect represent opposite dimensions of self-reported mood that are critical for well-being and coping (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Positive affect reflects a state of enthusiasm, activity and alertness, while negative affect reflects a state of subjective sadness and a lack of energy (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Positive and negative affect can also affect mood in general, as they both relate to anxiety, depression, and "general psychological dysfunction" (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988, p. 1067). Since positive and negative affect are self-reported, they're subject to social desirability as a potential confound to their reported validity. There are concerns about whether or not social desirability's independent role can be separated out of positive and negative affect. Social desirability is so intertwined with self-reports that completely disentangling the relationship might not be possible. Completely disentangling the relationship between social desirability and negative affect is not the goal; social desirability should not be removed from self-reports, as it can provide valid clinical information (Ellis, 1946). Social desirability and negative affect have also exhibited an inverse relationship, where higher levels of social desirability have correlated with lower levels of negative affect, while social desirability and positive affect have not had a significant relationship (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011). One hypothesis for the difference in social desirability's impact on positive and negative affect could stem from the theory of positive-negative asymmetry. Positive-negative asymmetry occurs when individuals demonstrate

a tendency to form a strong attentiveness and sensitivity to negative material as opposed to positive material (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 1995). This asymmetry can also be reflected in social situations, as negative personality characteristics were demonstrated to have more informational value than positive characteristics (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 1995). The amount of response distortion in positive-negative asymmetry is unclear, but it suggests that perhaps impression management, and bias in self-reports could stem from a desire to minimize negative evaluation as opposed to a desire to promote positive evaluation.

One theory of positive-negative asymmetry is that it reflects an adaptive behavioral mechanism where positivity, while functional, is risky, so individuals compensate by overemphasizing negative information to avoid the possibility of unexpected negative outcomes (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 1995). This theory has been displayed in the literature on social desirability and affect, where social desirability is inversely correlated with negative affect but shows no significant relationship with positive affect. Low negative affect is conceptualized as a state of calmness and serenity (Watson, Clark, & Tellegan, 1988, p. 1067). Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, and Lipovčan studied the relationship between social desirability, affect, and well-being. The researchers found that self-reports of the absence [the authors' way of describing lower levels] of negative affect, and other dimensions of well-being were correlated with social desirability (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011). The authors of the study stated that, "social desirability does not enhance the predictive capacity over life satisfaction and positive affect, but together with personality traits, it accounts for 52% of variance on absence of negative affect" (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011, p. 267). Their statement implied that the experience of negative emotions, or negative affect, was not considered socially desirable, but positive affect, which would likely be considered socially desirable, was not influenced by social

desirability, as investigated in this study. The authors did not further explain this discrepancy, but this result could be a reflection of the relationship between positive and negative affect. It is possible then that having lower levels of negative affect elicits a higher social desirability response than having higher levels of positive affect, but the reason behind this is unclear. Ultimately, Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, and Lipovčan concluded that social desirability can exert an effect through its interaction with other factors such as personality traits, but not independently of other constructs.

Thomsen, Jorgensen, Mehlsen, and Zachariae also studied the relationship between social desirability, negative affect, stress, and anxiety and found modest correlations to indicate that social desirability was related to lower levels of negative affect, concurrent with the aforementioned Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, and Lipovčan study (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011; Thomsen, Jorgensen, Mehlsen, & Zachariae, 2004). Negative affect and Marlowe-Crowne (SD) scale scores were inversely correlated ($r = -.56$, $p < .05$), and post-hoc tests revealed no differences between a high Marlowe-Crowne Scale (SD) group and low Emotional Control (ECQ) group versus a low Marlowe-Crowne (SD) group and high ECQ group (Thomsen, Jorgensen, Mehlsen, and Zachariae, 2004). However, there were (non-stated) differences in stress and anxiety between a high Marlowe-Crowne (SD) and low emotional control group versus a high Marlowe-Crowne (SD) high emotional control group (Thomsen, Jorgensen, Mehlsen, and Zachariae, 2004). These results are notable, because they demonstrate the ways that social desirability, as measured through the Marlowe-Crowne scale can interact with positive and negative affect, and other emotional constructs to influence self-rated levels of stress and anxiety. However, these results, as well as the aforementioned ones, indicate that social desirability can only exert an effect through its interaction with other factors.

Negative affect is related to self-reported stress, poor coping skills, and self-reported frequency of negative events (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk, & Gloria, 2011; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). "Stressful experiences are construed as transactions between the environment and the individual" (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk & Gloria, 2011). In these transactions, social desirability plays a large role in the framing of the event, and the role that individuals believe that they are playing in the event's outcome. An important aspect of burnout in teachers is this self-evaluation component; as a sense of personal accomplishment decreases, a lack of productivity and achievement increases, causing teachers to feel indifferent and even cynical to others (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk and Gloria, 2011). Teachers experiencing feelings of burnout often distance themselves from their students and colleagues, reducing their social support systems in their schools. Teachers receiving more social support are less likely to experience high levels of emotional exhaustion, and subsequently are less likely to burn out of teaching (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk and Gloria, 2011). Therefore, reducing negative affect in teachers should increase their coping skills, and provide them with the motivation to seek out social support in their schools. If negative affect is inversely related to social desirability, then lower negative affect should also be associated with higher adaptive motivation.

Correlations of Social Desirability with Subjective Well-Being

Investigations of social desirability and subjective well-being have yielded contradictory results about their relationship (Kozma & Stones, 1987). These contradictory results are attributed to several distinct definitions being used to stand in for subjective well-being. Life satisfaction (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011; Fastame, Penna, & Hitchcott, 2014), quality of life (Fastame, Penna, & Hitchcott, 2014; Perinelli & Gremigni, 2016), and a lack of pathology (Kozma & Stones, 1987) have all been conceptualized as well-being when measured

with social desirability. Several studies reported that social desirability influences reports of individual subjective well-being when combined with personality traits and psychological disorders (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011; Kozma & Stones, 1987; Latkin, Edwards, Davey-Rothwell, & Tobin, 2017; Perinelli & Gremigni, 2016). The relationship between social desirability and subjective well-being can also differ depending on the scale used to measure social desirability, for example social desirability and well-being measures have a higher correlation when the Edwards Scale is used versus the Marlowe-Crowne Scale (Kozma & Stones, 1987). This overlap has been explained by the degree of content similarity between the Edwards Scale and measures of well-being, since the Edwards Scale was developed from the MMPI (Edwards, 1961; Kozma & Stones, 1987). With several different definitions of well-being used in the research, and several different scales of social desirability, the true relationship between social desirability and well-being is muddled. Clarifying an individual's reasoning for socially desirable responding can give researchers, clinicians, and physicians further information about individual mental health and well-being. For the purposes of this research, we reviewed several studies investigating well-being and social desirability and defined well-being as life satisfaction going forward, as that has been the most common definition used in the literature reviewed for this research.

Kozma and Stones investigated the relationship between well-being and social desirability in a sample of 330 people from a mixture of clinical and community samples (Kozma & Stones, 1987). Using self-reports of well-being and other-reports of happiness from spouses, confidants, and psychological ward staff members, results revealed significant correlations between three self-reports of well-being and the Edwards Scale of Social desirability, across the groups investigated (young, middle-aged, and old) (Kozma & Stones,

1987). Conversely, there were only modest correlations between the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and the self-report measures of well-being (Kozma & Stones, 1987). The authors hypothesized that the higher correlations between the Edwards Scale and the measures of well-being could be due to the content overlap between the two measures, and not due to social desirability (Kozma & Stones, 1987). The Edwards Scale correlated highly with measures of subjective well-being, as it was developed by taking questions from the depression, physical health, and paranoia scales of the MMPI (Edwards, 1961). Due to this overlap, the Edwards scale may not be the most effective scale of social desirability to use with measures of subjective individual well-being. The other-reported measure of happiness was correlated between .80-.92 with the self-reports of well-being (Kozma & Stones, 1987). These results are important to consider on several fronts. First a lack of pathology being associated with higher levels of social desirability fit in with the hypothesis that lower levels of negative affect and perceived stress reactivity would correlate with higher levels of social desirability defined as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation. The strong correlation between the other-reported measure of happiness and the self-reports of well-being show that significant others in an individual's life are consistent with self-reports, and that these measures can provide additional information on individual functioning, in addition to self-reports. If well-being is related to social desirability, then promoting well-being should also increase social desirability and subsequently foster positive evaluations from other-reports, as the motivation to social evaluation is increased.

Social Desirability and Personality. Perinelli and Gremigni reviewed 35 studies focused on the use of social desirability scales in clinical contexts and found associations between social desirability and attitude, knowledge, health behaviors, physical symptoms, psychological symptoms, quality of life, well-being, and treatment outcomes (Perinelli &

Gremigni, 2016). However, the four studies included in the review that accounted for personality acknowledged that personality variables had a suppressor role on social desirability (Perinelli & Gremigni, 2016). These results may indicate that social desirability functions as a personality variable. Personality traits inhibited the effect of social desirability on well-being, implying that personality traits and social desirability are overlapping constructs. Of those four studies, three found that when personality variables were controlled for, social desirability had no impact on self-reports of well-being (Perinelli & Gremigni, 2016). As personality variables suppressed the effects of social desirability alone, the authors suggested controlling for personality variables when trying to ascertain the impact of social desirability on individual well-being (Perinelli & Gremigni, 2016). This suggestion provides further support for the idea that social desirability is a dimension of personality, which fits in well with the redefinition of social desirability as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation, an attitude toward social experiences. One way future research could elucidate the suppressive relationship between personality variables and social desirability would be by administering personality assessments together with social desirability scales and determining how much overlapping variance is present (Perinelli & Gremigni, 2016). By examining the effects of social desirability and personality variables separately, as well as together, it would be possible to clarify the levels of overlap in their variance in well-being scales. This clarification could help inform future research on the relationship between well-being and social desirability, if interventions that promoted changes in well-being also showed changes in social desirability.

  Social Desirability and Interpersonal Well-Being. Social desirability has also been considered as a factor in interpersonal well-being and interpersonal self-control. The factor of impression management, defined as a predisposition towards portraying an overly positive image

in public settings, was found to potentially reflect sensitivity to changes in social situations as opposed to social desirability (Uziel, 2010; Uziel, 2010b). Using the Marlowe-Crowne Scale, BIDR and the Lie Scale of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire, this sensitivity was theorized to mean that individuals high in impression management have stronger social skills in public social contexts because of higher levels of interpersonal self-control (Uziel, 2010; Uziel, 2010b). Impression management was correlated with agreeableness but not extraversion, which can be considered a desirable trait, therefore impression management may be more of a personality trait that could positively impact individual interpersonal conduct (Uziel, 2010b). In public social contexts (such as being recorded with a camcorder while doing a simple task), individuals higher in impression management showed ego replenishment (restoration of diminished self-control), demonstrating that individuals with higher impression management have more resources to maintain self-control in public situations than those low in impression management (Uziel, 2010b). As impression management is considered a dimension of social desirability, this research supports the idea of social desirability as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation.

       Social Desirability and Psychopathology. Social desirability has also been linked to lower levels of psychopathology. Higher scores on the Marlowe-Crowne Scale were associated with a lower lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorders (Lane, Merikangas, Schwartz, Huang, & Prusoff, 1990). The authors suggested that instead of causing individuals to underreport psychiatric disorders, social desirability actually functioned as a defensive mechanism against experiencing psychiatric disorders, and that the Marlowe-Crowne Scale detected a trait that defended against psychiatric disorders (Lane, Merikangas, Schwartz, Huang, & Prusoff, 1990). Comprehensive clinical assessments were conducted for probands with depression and without clinical diagnoses to look at diagnostic assessments of participants and their first-degree relatives

and spouses (40% of the participants' relatives and spouses participated) (Lane, Merikangas, Schwartz, Huang, & Prusoff, 1990). The mean of Marlowe-Crowne Scale scores was 18.26 (33 is the highest score possible, Crowne and Marlowe, 1960) for those with depression and 21.51 for those without disorders (Lane, Merikangas, Schwartz, Huang, & Prusoff, 1990). Marlowe-Crowne Scale scores ended up being collectively higher for the participants without disorders, even when their significant others' scores were taken into account (Lane, Merikangas, Schwartz, Huang, & Prusoff, 1990). This work also provides a compelling argument for social desirability as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation, as social desirability has widely been considered as a construct that could differ based on cultural values (Edwards, 1953; Ellis, 1946; Fisher & Katz, 2000). The similarity in scores on ratings of disorders for both participants and their significant others supports the notion that social desirability may be a construct that is shared across families and communities.

  Social Desirability as a Cultural Construct. As social desirability can be shared across individuals and significant others in their lives, it may represent shared cultural values and perspectives. As social desirability may have a cultural component, it is particularly salient to investigate in a school environment, as schools can have their own cultural environments that contribute to stress as well. One-third of public-school teachers rate teaching as a very or extremely stressful position (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk & Gloria, 2011). High levels of stress can often lead to burnout, depression, and decreased overall well-being. Burnout is typically identified as, "a prolonged exposure to emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job, often accompanied by insufficient recovery, resulting in previously committed teachers disengaging from their work (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk & Gloria, 2011, p. 420). Enhancing individual well-being is a vital step to take in preventing burnout in teachers. Burnout is viewed as a

psychological syndrome and has been shown to mediate the relationship between stress and depression (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk & Gloria, 2011). Depression in teachers has been pinpointed as a primary cause of teacher attrition (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk & Gloria, 2011). Social desirability has exhibited a relationship with both depression and individual well-being. While the nature of the relationship still needs to be uncluttered with personality variables, several studies have found that there is still some facet of social desirability that correlates positively with individual well-being. Understanding the relationship between well-being and social desirability can help researchers further investigate factors that contribute to burnout, and how to counteract them because higher levels of social desirability have been found to correlate with lower levels of depression, a primary cause of teacher attrition (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk & Gloria, 2011).

Complex Correlates of Social desirability with Professional Domains

Higher levels of social desirability may reflect an individual's personal and professional ideals in life such as honesty, social order, and self-respect (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 1995). Social desirability has displayed a pattern of complex correlates across several professional and academic domains. Social desirability has been found to correlate with constructs such as self-efficacy, self-expectations in academic performance, and self-reports of organizational commitment and personal discipline in employment. One theory for these patterns of complex correlates of social desirability is goal orientation, and the selfish goal model. "Inconsistencies in judgment and behavior can be meaningfully understood as the output of multiple, and in some cases competing, goal influences. People express many of these influences one at a time, thereby generating behaviors that appear inconsistent across time (Huang & Bargh, 2014, p.121). In the context of social desirability, this would imply that the influence of social desirability depends

on social context and individual goals for those contexts. These goal influences alter individual perceptions and change individual actions in different situations. Operating under this perspective, one could hypothesize that social desirability may change depending on the individual's goals in a certain social situation. As social situations change individual goals change with them, and those goals are subject to social desirability. Self-expectations and self-presentation are both important aspects of both academic life and achievement, and professional success, and the perception of both is also subject to social desirability.

Social desirability and Self-Efficacy. The relationship between social desirability and self-efficacy has been previously investigated in a sample of university students. Using a Marlowe-Crowne short-form, a positive relationship was found between self-reported independence and self-reported self-efficacy in the prediction of adjustment to university life, independent of social desirability (Silverthorn & Gekoski, 1995). When social desirability was controlled for, this relationship was not expunged (Silverthorn & Gekoski, 1995). The short-form of Marlowe-Crowne that was used for this study was related to independence and self-efficacy measures, so it was difficult to parse out social desirability's exact role in independence and self-efficacy in adjustment to university life, and independence's role in overall well-being in a university context. More research into social desirability's role independent of other variables would be beneficial to further clarify its relationship to independence and self-efficacy. The authors did not find any gender differences in social desirability, self-efficacy, or adjustment to university (Silverthorn & Gekoski, 1995). Social desirability in general has also not been shown to relate to any significant gender differences (Loo & Loewen, 2004; Paulhus, 1984; Silverthorn & Gekoski, 1995).

The aforementioned positive-negative asymmetry hypothesis has also been shown to impact exam expectations in university students. According to a study of a group of students with low-trait anxiety and high social desirability levels called repressors, these individuals showed an unrealistic optimism about exam-related events but were accurate in their predictions of their own exam performance, which contrasted with high-trait anxiety participants who predicted that their exam performances would be drastically worse than they were (Eysenck & Derakshan, 1997). While the high-trait anxiety and low-social desirability participants and the repressors participants matched each other in their low expectations of controllable events, there did appear to be differences in the ways that different levels of anxiety appeared to alter the impact of social desirability on predicted exam performance (Eysenck & Derakshan, 1997). There were no differences in positive expectations between the two groups, implying that social desirability, as measured in this study, only impacted negative expectations (Eysenck & Derakshan, 1997).

Social Desirability and Work Performance. Ones and Visweraran reviewed social desirability and work performance and found that social desirability did not predict overall job performance, technical proficiency or personal discipline but it did predict self-reports of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as well as supervisor ratings of training success (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1998). Performance, proficiency and discipline, can be separated from social contexts and social performance in many professions, however self-reports of job satisfaction and commitment, and supervisor ratings do represent social dimensions. The authors did not explain this discrepancy, but it seems plausible that individuals' socially desirable behavior is stronger while in the process of gaining employment, as shown through training and self-reports, and weaker once those individuals are employed, as demonstrated in job

performance. The process of gaining employment would be a prime area for social desirability as represented through an adaptive motivation to social evaluation to increase, as individuals would likely put more effort into impressing future employers and coworkers, than once they had the job.

The aforementioned research illuminates the role that social desirability can play in both academic and employment contexts. Both contexts are important to consider, particularly with a sample of student-teachers since they are straddling the line between student and professional throughout their internship period. This role conflict allows for burnout to occur across multiple contexts, both academically and professionally. An important aspect of burnout is depersonalization, which can be used a coping mechanism to allow a teacher to continue teaching while functioning at a low level (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk & Gloria, 2011). Teachers experiencing depersonalization tend to feel cynical, less positive towards others, and are more easily irritated (Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk & Gloria, 2011). This breakdown in interpersonal relationships, which can occur with colleagues, supervisors, and students, could be mediated by social desirability. Higher levels of social desirability and its consequential need for approval could be a protective factor against depersonalization and could be an important dimension to promote efficacy in teacher training. As previously mentioned, depersonalization can cause a breakdown of interpersonal relationships, reducing organizational support in the school system. As the student teachers in our sample had dual roles, this reduced organizational support could occur not only in their internship, but within their university classes and community as well. If social desirability represents an adaptive motivation to social evaluation, it could protect against the depersonalization aspect of burnout by motivating student teachers to maintain levels of organizational support across both their internship and their university.

22

The Current Study

Based on the preceding review, several definitions of social desirability have been proposed and utilized in previous research. This study sought to compare and contrast three conceptualizations of social desirability: the Marlowe-Crowne definition of a one-factor need for approval, and Paulhus' two-factor definition of impression management and self-deception to a new proposed definition of social desirability as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation. The Marlowe-Crowne definition and Paulhus definitions represent one approach to social desirability: that individuals want to be evaluated favorably by others, and this leads to a biasing effect in self-reports. The new proposed definition would represent a different approach to social desirability and argue that social desirability is not necessarily a distortion because it is capturing a real facet of interpersonal competence. To distinguish between these two approaches, it was imperative to investigate patterns of relationships between social desirability and positive versus negative constructs, and self and other-report constructs. If social desirability was truly a bias, then there should have been a clear pattern of strong positive correlations with positive constructs and negative correlations with negative constructs. If social desirability was adaptive, then there should have been moderate inverse relationships with negative constructs, and moderate positive relationships with some, but not all positive constructs. It was expected that if social desirability was adaptive, we would still see some of the same relationships as if it were a bias, for instance an inverse relationship with perceived stress reactivity and a positive relationship with coping. It was also expected that while there would be an inverse relationship with negative affect, there would be no relationship with positive affect, as positive affect, while potentially socially desirable, has been demonstrated to not be adaptive in teachers (Khalilzadeh & Khodi, 2018; Ripski, LoCasale-Crouch, & Decker, 2011).

Few studies have investigated the relationship between social desirability and external indicators of professional performance such as supervisor ratings of performance. External indicators were important to consider because if social desirability was a bias, then we expected a greater discrepancy between self and other-reports of teaching effectiveness. If social desirability was adaptive, then we expected less of a discrepancy, if this adaptiveness helped student-teachers perform better in public contexts. However, it was important to consider that there are often discrepancies across informants (De Los Reyes, Thomas, Goodman, & Kundey, 2013). Hence, we also investigated social desirability as a predictor in a model with self-ratings and supervisor ratings, as a discrepancy between the two reports would reflect an actual divergence between the student-teacher's everyday experience and the supervisors' couple of observations as opposed to a bias between the two.

In a meta-analysis of over 700 studies that used social desirability measures, Ones and Viswesvaran found that social desirability was related to job satisfaction and supervisor ratings of training success, but not overall post-training job performance (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1998). These results suggest that social desirability represents a need for approval from others, but only to a certain extent. In a more evaluative part of the job process, such as training, it appears that social desirability has some ability to predict supervisor ratings of training success however, once that process is over, that relationship with performance is no longer demonstrated. It is possible, then, that social desirability becomes particularly salient in contexts where an individual is likely to be evaluated by others. This result fits in well with the Marlowe-Crowne definition of an overall need for approval and Paulhus' impression management factor. Both of those definitions revolve around the external validation component of social desirability; people with higher levels of social desirability crave approval from others and manage the impressions

that they give out to gain this approval. This result also fits well with the proposed redefinition of an adaptive motivation to social evaluation. An adaptive motivation to social evaluation would activate an individual's aspiration to be perceived positively in a social context, which could influence their behaviors while under evaluation in job training. As an adaptation, we would expect that socially desirable responding would be flexible; an individual would want to be perceived positively in a social context of evaluation, but this aspiration would not continue into day-to-day performance. As a bias, we would expect that socially desirable responding would remain more constant and continue beyond the evaluation portion of job training and impact post-training job performance as well.

The results of the Ones and Viswesvaran review also become particularly salient in the context of student-teaching. Student-teaching is an incredibly evaluative process. Student-teachers are frequently observed, and their performances are rated by supervisors, colleagues, and potentially even their students. An adaptive motivation to social evaluation may be especially adaptive for student-teachers, because being more attuned to the evaluation of others could prompt prosocial behaviors that would be adaptive to their teaching performance in this very public context. The definition of an overall need for approval implies a continuous dependence on external approval, where an individual perceives approval as necessary to their interpersonal functioning, while impression management involves an individual consciously altering their self-reports (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Paulhus, 1984). A teacher high in either of these dimensions would be consciously deceiving others, as a result of being sensitive to social influence and overly impressionable (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Paulhus, 1984). An adaptive motivation to social evaluation would eliminate the negative connotations of both the Marlowe-Crowne and Paulhus definitions, and identify a teacher who was high in this motivation as

25

socially flexible and positively internally motivated to perform well socially, assuming they have the skills for doing so. An adaptive motivation to social evaluation would thus imply that the correlations between social desirability measures and self-reports are not biased, but instead that they accurately reflect the social situation at the time of reporting.

Some studies have divided the definition of an overall need for approval into multiple components and considered social desirability to be a form of impression management (a form of other-deception) or self-deception. Some conceptions of impression management, in particular, would see social desirability as a purposeful deception of others in public social situations (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 1995). From this perspective, impression management actually relates more to lying and falsification than self-deception, because it represents a deliberate altering of responses in order to deceive another person to gain their approval (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 1995; Paulhus, 1984). It is also important to note that this idea of deliberate falsification may not have real-world implications. In a review of the literature on personality and integrity testing for personnel selection, Ones & Viswesvaran found that in a comparison of scale score distributions under faking instructions and honest response conditions, individuals did fake their responses in an experimental environment, but this faking may not extend to the real world, as faking studies have not been conducted in non-experimental settings (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1998). Therefore, impression management as a construct may not be as relevant to real-world contexts as other research has implied. This result may also bring into question the idea of social desirability as a bias, if its impact is only shown under specific instructions designed to elicit faking. If social desirability does not have real-world implications, then self or other-deception may not be the most accurate conceptualization of the construct.

Other conceptions of impression management would see social desirability as a form of interpersonal self-control, particularly in public social contexts (Uziel, 2010; Uziel, 2010b). The discrepancies between definitions of impression management leaves room for alternative interpretations. Several studies have considered the relationship between social desirability and positive and negative affect. Those studies have suggested that social desirability is a need for approval that can be coupled with personality traits to enhance well-being by lowering negative affect (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011; Thomsen, Jorgensen, Mehlsen, & Zachariae, 2004). The relationship between negative affect and social desirability in particular may shed light on this discrepancy. The inverse relationship between social desirability and negative affect may reflect that social desirability is not necessarily self-deception or other-deception in the form of self-enhancement, but more of a motivational component of interpersonal functioning that can help to lower negative affect. In contrast, the inverse relationship between social desirability and negative affect could also reflect bias; individuals higher on social desirability may be less likely to report negative affect. However, the lack of a relationship between positive affect and social desirability still leaves room for the elucidation of social desirability as a construct.

As noted earlier, a review of 35 studies investigating the use of social desirability scales in clinical contexts found that in the four studies that accounted for personality variables, personality traits inhibited the effect of social desirability on well-being (Perinelli & Gremigni, 2016). This result implies that social desirability and personality traits overlap in some sense, and that social desirability does not offer anything to individual well-being independent of other personality variables. This perspective is supported by other results in the literature surrounding interpersonal well-being and social desirability. Conceptualizing of social desirability as

impression management, Uziel found that impression management was correlated with agreeableness but not extraversion and hypothesized that impression management functioned similarly to an additional personality trait that boosted interpersonal conduct (Uziel, 2010b). Uziel's conclusions support the idea of impression management as separate from other personality traits, and as a factor that, independent of other constructs, could relate to interpersonal social skills.

Uziel's results also relate to the research on positive affect. In studies of affect, positive affect has shown a non-significant relationship with social desirability (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011). Positive affect has also been said to correspond with extraversion, which has also been shown to not be related to social desirability (Uziel, 2010b; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). While extraversion may seem to be socially desirable, particularly in professions that emphasize public interaction and performance, such as teaching, according to several studies, it may not motivate students to perform well academically (Khalilzadeh & Khodi, 2018) or contribute to high-quality instruction (Ripski, LoCasale-Crouch, & Decker, 2011). Therefore, extraversion, and subsequently positive affect, aren't necessarily needed for positive teaching performance evaluations. The idea of a sensitivity to social approval as at least motivational supports the notion that social desirability can be adaptive and related to the potential mitigation of negative mental health outcomes such as depression, without being related to positive affect. Uziel's result also brings the previous social desirability definitions into question. Both the Marlowe-Crowne and the Paulhus definitions have negative connotations and assume that an individual high in social desirability is engaging in self or other-deception. Purposeful deception, and dependence on other-approval would, presumably, not be consistent with individual well-being or professional efficacy. However, despite its lack of a relationship

with positive affect, an adaptive motivation to social evaluation would better represent social desirability, as an adaptive construct that can help abate some of the negative mental health outcomes associated with burnout and social isolation.

Several of the aforementioned definitions used in the literature have conceived of social desirability positively, as something that can mitigate depression, or negatively, as a deliberate falsification to generate a positive impression (Lane, Merikangas, Schwartz, Huang, & Prusoff, 1990; Lindeman & Verkasalo, 1995). In their conception of social desirability as an overall need for approval, Marlowe and Crowne still stated that behaviorally a need for approval would present itself as a "dependence on the approval of others" that "should make it difficult to assert one's independence" and that a need for approval "had to entail vulnerability in self-esteem and the use of repressive defenses" (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964, p.18). These definitions have skewed negatively in their conception of social desirability. This side implies that those with higher levels of social desirability would have lower independence and self-efficacy. However, as mentioned earlier, the pattern of positive-negative correlations that social desirability has been associated with does not offer a clear view of social desirability as only a bias (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011; Kozma & Stones, 1987; Herman, Hickmon-Rosa, & Reinke, 2018). For there to be a biasing effect on self-reports for individuals high in social desirability, there should be a consistent pattern of positive relationships with desirable constructs and inverse relationships with negative constructs. For individuals low in social desirability, this consistent pattern of positive versus inverse relationships should not occur.

In the current study I tested the idea of social desirability as a positive influence on adjustment to teaching by using multiple sources of information from self and other-reports to elucidate which definition of social desirability is the best fit for the sample used in this study.

The current study examined self-reports of perceived stress reactivity, positive and negative affect, teaching self-efficacy, and coping from student teachers in their first full-time teaching experience in relation to social desirability scores as measured through a validated short-form of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale. The study also examined self-reports of efficacy over two time points, perceived stress reactivity, affect, and social desirability in relation to supervisor ratings of the student-teachers' effectiveness, and investigated any potential discrepancies between these reports. Multi-informant data was critical to include, to determine if social desirability is indeed a nuisance to validity.

The purpose of this set of research questions was to ascertain the impact of external correlates of social desirability on a myriad of self-reports, and clarify the phenomenon of social desirability in the context of this study. Based on prior research, it was expected that social desirability would be inversely correlated with measures of negative affect and perceived stress reactivity and will not be correlated at all with measures of positive affect. This pattern would be consistent with the redefinition of social desirability, because an adaptive motivation to social evaluation reflects social effectiveness, which would promote individual well-being, and lower negative emotionality. Negative affect, not positive affect is related to stress and (poor) coping skills, making it more relevant for the purposes of this study (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). It was also expected that social desirability would correlate more highly to spring semester ratings of self-efficacy than fall semester ratings of self-efficacy. Over time, as student-teachers learned more about the social environment of their school, it was expected that the adaptiveness of their motivation to perform well in the social environment of their school would increase and they would more correctly appraise their own performance and therefore their self-rating would correlate more highly with supervisor ratings of effectiveness.

Through the results of this study, it was expected that the redefinition of social desirability as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation would be a better fit for the sample of student- teachers than any of the prior definitions previously mentioned in this review. This was particularly relevant in the discrepancy or lack thereof between spring self-efficacy ratings and supervisor ratings of effectiveness, which was investigated by including social desirability as a predictor in a model with teaching-efficacy as the other predictor, and supervisor ratings as the outcome. It was expected that social desirability would not add variance to the model above and beyond the variance added by teaching-efficacy. This sample of student teachers was an ideal sample to explore this definition with, due to the demands placed on them in both an academic and professional context, and the conflicts between their roles as both a university student and a full-time teacher.

Additionally, in the development of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and the BIDR, patterns of correlations with other self-report constructs were not investigated in the validation of either measure (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Paulhus, 1984). In the development of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale, items were rated as desirable or undesirable by a team of ten faculty members and graduate students (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). For this reason, the evidence that social desirability is a bias is difficult to tease apart, as the questions are dependent on cultural context. To further tease apart the potential definitions of social desirability, I compared the initial item endorsement from the Reynolds short-form (from 1984) to our sample's percent endorsement, and examined the internal consistency of the scale for this sample. These analyses were particularly important to investigate, as the measures we used to demonstrate social desirability may not fully capture the nature of social desirability in the sample.

This study used exploratory analyses to investigate three definitions of social desirability in a sample of student-teachers. The literature reviewed above provided some evidence that social desirability is potentially a more positive construct than has been previously considered. However, the connection with perspectives other than self-report is scarce in the previous literature. Through this study, the aim was to begin to clarify the construct of social desirability and investigate how it could impact student-teachers and their functioning.

Hypotheses

1. For social desirability to constitute a bias, we expected consistent significant inverse relationships between social desirability and negative constructs such as negative affect and perceived stress reactivity, and significant positive relationships between social desirability and positive constructs such as coping and positive affect. For social desirability to constitute an adaptive motivation, we expected significant inverse relationships between social desirability and the previously mentioned negative constructs, and significant positive relationships between social desirability and positive constructs related to well-being such as coping, but not between other desirable positive constructs like positive affect.

2. If social desirability biases self-reports we expected that there would be a significant r-squared difference when social desirability was included as a predictor in a model that already included self-rated teaching efficacy and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness. If social desirability was adaptive, we expected that there would not be a significant r-squared difference when social desirability was included as a predictor in a model that already included self-rated teaching efficacy and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness

Table 2

Rationale for the Redefinition of Social desirability

Hypotheses	Variables	Measures	Rationale for an adaptive motivation to social evaluation
Social desirability would have an inverse relationship with negative affect, and perceived stress reactivity, a positive relationship with coping, and no relationship with positive affect a group of student teachers	Social desirability Negative Affect Positive Affect Perceived Stress Reactivity Coping	Marlowe-Crowne Short-Form PANAS PSRS Coping Competence Questionnaire	Higher levels negative affect and perceived stress reactivity hinder functioning which would subsequently hinder teaching efficacy. Higher levels of coping competence would promote functioning. Positive affect is not related to teaching efficacy
There would not be a significant r-squared change in a model including self-efficacy and social desirability as a predictor of supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness when social desirability was removed from the model	Self-Ratings of Efficacy Supervisor Ratings of Effectiveness	Self-Efficacy Ratings Supervisor Rating of Teacher Effectiveness	If social desirability was a bias, then including it in a model with self-rated teaching efficacy and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness would create a larger r-squared change than if social desirability was an adaptive motivation

33

Chapter 3: Methods

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the definition of social desirability as it relates to perceived stress reactivity, positive and negative affect, and ratings of self-efficacy in a group of student-teachers. The current study explored social desirability as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation, including how this sensitivity could be a protective or an inhibitory factor in teaching efficacy. Correlational analyses and regression analyses were used to examine how self-reports of several constructs related to social desirability, such as affect, stress reactivity, and coping relate to the three potential definitions of social desirability. The study was part of a larger project between the Temperament and Narratives Lab and the Teacher Training Undergraduate Program at the University of Maryland, designed to understand and improve the factors that contribute to student well-being and effectiveness as they transitioned into their teaching careers.

Design

The study used archival data already collected by a team of graduate students from student-teachers throughout their senior year practicum teaching experience (September to May of 2015-2019) from the University of Maryland-College Park teaching preparation program. The data were collected in-person over three time points: early October, mid-November and mid to late April. Student-teachers completed questionnaires on social desirability, affect, perceived stress reactivity, coping competence and personal need for structure at the first meeting via the survey platform Qualtrics. Student-teachers completed the self-efficacy measures at the second and third meetings via Qualtrics as well. The students' supervisors completed ratings of teacher effectiveness after data was collected from the students in the spring semester.

The study also characterized a new definition of social desirability that fit more robustly with the themes identified from the analyses of this research. This study was part of a greater research investigation conducted under the supervision of Dr. Hedwig Teglasi by graduate student researchers in the Temperament and Narratives Lab at the University of Maryland-College Park. The current study used a subset of data from a larger project investigating the efficacy of the University of Maryland teacher preparation program. The larger study had collected survey data, student-teacher stories, and interviews to provide ongoing feedback to the coordinators of the preparation program to improve future student-teacher outcomes.

Participants

The sample consisted of 61 undergraduate seniors in the University of Maryland-College Park's Education major who were completing their teaching internship year, 58 women (95%) and 3 men (5%). However, the three male participants dropped out of the study after the first meeting. The participants ranged in age from 19 to 23 years old and were mostly (about 65%) white. As the study continues, we hope to recruit more participants from the University of Maryland-College Park Education program, and potentially expand to similar programs at other institutions.

Procedures

Research buddy procedures

Each participant was given an ID number and a research buddy. The research buddy was the main point of contact for the participant during this study. The research buddy was a doctoral-level graduate student in the School Psychology Program at the University of Maryland-College Park and member of the Temperament and Narratives Lab. The research buddy had access to their designated participants' ID numbers but not any of their questionnaire responses

or journal entries. The purpose of the research buddy was to build rapport with the participant over the course of the two school semesters of the study. The research buddy and the participant scheduled a mutually convenient time to meet in one of the lab spaces three times over the course of the two semesters of the study, twice in the first semester and once in the second semester. The research buddy also sent three surveys about the participant's recent teaching experiences via Qualtrics links to the participant over the course of the second semester before the in-person meeting. The survey responses were stored on Qualtrics and the Qualtrics is monitored by a separate data manager who purposefully does not have any participants to maintain confidentiality. The participants filled out the Qualtrics for first semester on the computer in the room with their buddy, but the buddy was unable see the survey responses. Afterwards the data was stored via Qualtrics with the ID number.

Initial meeting procedures

During the first meeting, participants completed the 13-item Reynolds Short form of the Marlowe-Crowne scale, the PANAS, the first-semester rating of self-efficacy, and the Perceived Stress Reactivity Scale as part of a battery of questionnaires administered via Qualtrics. Participants were compensated $12 an hour, and the content of this meeting typically took about two hours. The research buddy provided a computer to participants to fill out all of these forms via a Qualtrics link. The research buddy was unable to view any of the participant's responses to the questionnaires, and only the data manager had access to the Qualtrics responses for confidentiality.

End of the Semester

At the end of the second semester we asked the supervisors of each participant to rate the participant's effectiveness as a teacher in a variety of domains such as classroom management,

content delivery, lesson planning, learning objectives, and overall organization on a 7-point Likert scale. The supervisors had been supervising the participants for the full school year and would have conducted at least four observations of the participant. These supervisor ratings would provide an additional source of insight into the potential impact of social desirability, positive and negative affect, and perceived stress reactivity in the sample of student-teachers. Research buddies also conducted an interview with the participant to gauge their view of their performance as a teacher using the same Likert scale as provided to the supervisors.

Measures

Social desirability. To test levels of social desirability I utilized the 13-item Reynolds short-form of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale of Social Desirability. The Marlowe-Crowne Scale of Social Desirability was originally developed in contrast to the Edwards Scale of Social Desirability to test a single factor, the need for approval, without the comorbid clinical implications of the Edwards Scale, which was developed from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The correlation between the Marlowe-Crowne and the Edwards scale was .35, which was significant at $p < .01$, and the Marlowe-Crowne Scale had a fairly high internal consistency of .88 using the Kuder-Richardson formula to test measures with dichotomous choices (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The original scale consisted of 47 items and participants rated socially desirable or undesirable statements as either True or False as related to them individually.

Reynolds developed a 13-item version of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale in 1982 using the responses from 608 undergraduate students on the full Marlowe-Crowne Scale and three short forms- an 11-item, a 12-item, and a 13-item scale (Reynolds, 1982). The 13-item scale was the strongest psychometrically of the short-forms in the study, $r = .93$ with the full Marlowe-Crowne

Scale (Reynolds, 1982). The 13-item scale was also more feasible in the context of this study, as it was included in a battery of questionnaires disseminated through the survey response website Qualtrics to answer during an in-person initial meeting. Internal consistency for this sample was reported.

      Perceived stress reactivity. To test levels of perceived stress reactivity in this sample I utilized the Perceived Stress Reactivity Scale (PSRS). I was looking to test perceived stress reactivity as I hypothesized higher levels of stress reactivity would be related to lower levels of social desirability. The Perceived Stress Reactivity Scale, the first of its kind, is a 23-item questionnaire with five factors designed to test perceived stress reactivity, which is a disposition underlying individual differences in stress responses, and is relatively stable across situations and response systems (Schlotz, Yim, Zoccola, Jansen, & Schulz, 2011). The five factors are prolonged reactivity, reactivity to failure, reactivity to social conflicts, reactivity to work overload, and reactivity to social evaluation (Schlotz, Yim, Zoccola, Jansen, & Schulz, 2011). Perceived Stress Reactivity is important to investigate, particularly with a student-teacher sample, as stress reactivity has been associated with negative physical and psychological health outcomes, which could lead to teacher attrition and burnout. Work overload, social conflicts, and social evaluation, three components of perceived stress reactivity, are also hallmarks of student-teaching (Schlotz, Yim, Zoccola, Jansen, & Schulz, 2011). The Perceived Stress Reactivity Scale was investigated and the factor structure found to be similar across 2,040 participants across the United States, The United Kingdom and Germany (Schlotz et. al, 2011). In the US sample, the participants were 336 undergraduate students (64% women, mean age: 20.6 years) who were randomly assigned to either a paper and pencil or a computerized version of the PSRS. The researchers conducted an exploratory factor analysis and the five factors all showed

adequate loadings with the items they were supposed to load onto, however there were two items with inconsistent loadings that were removed; the scale had an overall internal consistency of .80 (Schlotz et. al, 2011). PSRS scores showed a slight negative association with social desirability for the U.S. and U.K. students (-.27< r < -.10 for the UK students, -.29 < r < -.12 for the U.S. students) which is significant at $p < .05$ (Schlotz et. al, 2011). Perceived Stress Reactivity was important to analyze in the proposed sample because it could have had implications for teaching efficacy and early teacher retention. The properties of the PSRS were described in this sample.

      Positive and negative affect. To test levels of positive and negative affect in this sample I utilized a 10-item short form Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), administered via a Qualtrics survey. I was looking to test positive and negative affect as I hypothesized that negative affect would be inversely correlated with social desirability and positive affect would not be correlated with social desirability. While prior measures of positive and negative affect did exist, they had low reliability or poor validity, so the PANAS was created to fill this void (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). Positive and negative affect were particularly important to investigate with a sample of student-teachers because they are two of the main factors identified for self-reported mood and well-being, and higher levels of one versus the other could contribute to teacher stress and burnout. When developing PANAS, the investigators randomly interspersed the 20 PANAS terms in a 60-item mood questionnaire where subjects rated the extent to which they had faced these moods in a delineated time period on a five-point scale (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). The 20 PANAS terms have since been investigated alone, and the same results were found (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliabilities ranged between .86 and .90 for Positive Affect and from .84 to .87 for negative affect, and there were no differences in reliability based on the time instructions used (Watson,

Clark & Tellegen, 1988). The correlation between negative affect and positive affect ranged from -.12 to -.23, and the scales shared between one percent and five percent of their variance (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988).

This study utilized a 10-item PANAS short-form by Kercher, which was validated on 804 elderly participants, and found a correlation between -0.02 to .05 between positive and negative affect (Kercher, 1992). The alphas obtained for this sample were .75 for positive affect and .81 for negative affect (Kercher, 1992). Similar data was reported for the current sample as well.

Self-ratings of efficacy. The student-teachers' self-ratings of efficacy were 12 questions completed on a seven-point Likert Scale. The scale featured questions about the student-teachers' degree of confidence in their ability to engage and teach their students and fulfill their roles as a teacher, as well as a teaching responsibility scale. Teacher self-efficacy has been shown to be negatively associated with teacher stress and teacher burnout (Herman, Hickmon-Rosa, & Reinke, 2018). Teacher self-efficacy has been connected to student academic achievement and yearly gains, however it is a skill that can be changeable through cognitive restructuring and mastery (Herman, Hickmon-Rosa, & Reinke, 2018). The student-teachers completed this measure in their Fall Semester and Spring Semester of their placement. For the purposes of this research, the teaching efficacy scale was separated from the teacher responsibility scale. In preliminary analyses, teaching responsibility was not significantly correlated with supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness ($r = .111$, $p = .393$), and teaching efficacy was significantly correlated with supervisor ratings ($r = .320$, $p = .012$). Sample data from these self-ratings will be reported.

Coping Competence Questionnaire. To test levels of coping competence in our sample I utilized the 12-item Coping Competence Questionnaire, administered via a Qualtrics survey.

Coping competence was important to test with this sample, as I hypothesized that coping competence would be positively related to social desirability. The Coping Competence Questionnaire was designed to investigate resistance against depression (Schroder & Ollis, 2012). Coping competence is particularly important to investigate with a sample of student-teachers, as it could protect against potential future depression and burnout. When developing the CCQ, the investigators tested five sub-samples of participants with a series of variables (i.e. Big 5 Personality Factors, depression, and coping styles) to assess the construct validity of the CCQ (Schroder & Ollis, 2012). Coefficient alphas ranged between .90 and .94, and in one of the five samples testing, test-retest reliability was .84 after one month (Schroder & Ollis, 2012). As the items were developed to investigate depression, some of the wording of the scale was modified to be more appropriate for the non-clinical sample of this study..

Personal Need for Structure Scale. To test levels of personal need for structure in our sample I utilized the 12-item Personal Need for Structure Scale, administered via a Qualtrics survey. I was looking to test personal need for structure as I hypothesized that a need for structure would be unrelated to social desirability, consistent with previous literature reviewed (Neuberg & Newsom, 1993). The Personal Need for Structure Scale was designed to investigate individual differences in the need for structure, and how that need manifested in the organization of social and nonsocial information and stereotypes (Neuberg & Newsom, 1993). Personal need for structure was particularly important to investigate with a sample of student-teachers, as a higher need for structure could result in less flexibility to the varied social situations that arise in teaching. When developing the scale, four independent groups of Arizona State University students were given a battery of scales including the Personal Need for Structure Scale and the Marlowe-Crowne Scale, and several scales of rigidity and uncertainty (Neuberg & Newsom,

1993). The internal consistency for their sample was .77, and the Personal Need for Structure Scale was not related to the Marlowe-Crowne Scale (Neuberg & Newsom, 1993).

Supervisor ratings of teacher effectiveness. The student teachers' professors (called PDS coordinators and Campus Supervisors) and their Field Supervisors rated the student-teachers' effectiveness as teachers. The one-item prompt given is: *How would you judge the student's effectiveness as a teacher on the ten-point Likert scale below* and the scale represents the "degrees of concern" that the supervisor had about the student-teacher. The supervisor ratings of efficacy functioned as an outcome measure for the program. Rater agreement between the two supervisors was reported, previous research has indicated that there is substantial agreement across both of the supervisor raters.

Data-Analytic Plan

Analyses for Hypothesis 1. The hypothesis that higher ratings of social desirability would correlate with lower ratings of negative affect and lower ratings of perceived stress reactivity was tested with bivariate correlational analyses between the Reynolds short-form of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and the Kercher short-form of PANAS and between the Reynolds short-form of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and the PSRS. The hypothesis that social desirability would be positively related to higher levels of self-rated coping competence and unrelated to personal need for structure was tested with correlational analyses between the Reynolds short-form of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and the Coping Competence Questionnaire and correlational analyses between the Reynolds short-form of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and the Personal Need for Structure Scale.

Analyses for Hypothesis 2. The hypothesis that there would not be a significant discrepancy between ratings of self-efficacy, particularly in the spring semester and supervisor ratings of

effectiveness when social desirability was included in the regression model was tested by

running a hierarchical regression model with self-efficacy as the sole predictor of supervisor

ratings in one model, and self-efficacy and social desirability as predictors in the second model.

A larger r-squared change would have indicated that social desirability exerted a biasing effect

on our sample.

    Analysis of the Social Desirability Measure. To investigate the strength of social

desirability measurement in our sample, I investigated the internal consistency of the Reynolds

Short-Form of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale with our sample. I compared this internal consistency

result to the published norms in more recent social desirability studies. A low internal

consistency would have indicated that perhaps this measure was not a strong fit for this sample

of student-teachers.

Table 3

Marlowe-Crowne Short-Form Questions and Factors

Marlowe-Crowne Short-Form Item	Included in BIDR?	Impression Management or Self-Deception
1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged	No	
2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way	No	
3. On a few occasions I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability	No	
4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority, even though I knew they were right	No	
5. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a great listener	No	

6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone	Yes	Impression Management
7. I am always willing to admit when I made a mistake	No	
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget	Yes	Impression Management
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable	Yes	Impression Management
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own	No	
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others	No	
12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me	Yes	Impression Management
13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings	No	

Chapter 4: Results

Properties of the Measure

     This study closely scrutinized the properties of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale of Social Desirability. Cronbach's alpha was computed to determine the internal consistency of the Reynolds short-form of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale used in this study. Cronbach's alpha was computed for the thirteen dichotomous items (α=.616). In the original Marlowe-Crowne study, an alpha of .88 was found using the Kuder-Richardson 20 formula for a sample of 39 undergraduate students for 33 dichotomous items (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), however more recent studies reporting the Cronbach's alpha have found lower internal consistencies than the original study (see review, Beretvas, Meyers, & Leite, 2002). Using a sample of 182 alphas, aggregated from 93 social desirability studies, Beretvas et. al used mixed-methods methodology, because of the heterogeneity in sample sizes ranging from $n = 1$ to $n =707$, violating the assumption of homoscedasticity, and the nestedness of the samples used in the study, to predict the average internal consistency scores of male and female adults and adolescents on the full-length Marlowe-Crowne scale, and found that for adult women the reliability was predicted to be .797, and for female adolescents the reliability was predicted to be .661 (see review, Beretvas et al., 2002). The authors concluded that the Marlowe-Crowne Scale needed to be investigated more robustly, as some of the items may no longer be culturally relevant, for example, the item "I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car" would not be relevant to individuals without a car or without a driver's license (see review, Beretvas et. al., 2002). Similarly, when Reynolds developed the short-form scale used for this study, he found an internal consistency of .76 using the Kuder-Richardson formula with a sample of around six hundred undergraduates (Reynolds, 1980). The alpha found in this study was lower than in

previous work, and some hypotheses for why this occurred will be explained in the Discussion section.

To further examine the properties of the social desirability measure used, the percent endorsement of the items was investigated and compared to the original short-form validation. As seen in Table 4, in this study the most-endorsed items (two-third of respondents endorsed) were numbers 5 (No matter who I'm talking to I'm always a good listener), 7 (I am always willing to admit when I made a mistake), 9 (I am always courteous even to people who are disagreeable), and 11 (there have been times when I was jealous of the good fortune of others). Items 5, 7, and 9 were also the most-frequently endorsed items in the Reynolds study, though they were endorsed slightly less frequently than in this study (#5 was endorsed 75.4% in this study vs. 59% in the Reynolds study, #7 was endorsed 69.6% in this study vs. 61% in the Reynolds study, and #9 was endorsed 78.3% in this study vs. 55% in the Reynolds study) (Reynolds, 1982). Item 11 was the most highly endorsed item in this study, and the least-endorsed item in the Reynolds study (81.2% vs. 30%) (Reynolds, 1982).

Table 4

Percent Endorsement of Marlowe-Crowne Items

Marlowe-Crowne Short-Form Item	Percent Endorsement	Direction	MC Item Endorsements (Reynolds, 1982)
1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged	58.0%	Not Desirable	36.0%
2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way	58.0%	Not Desirable	30.0%

3. On a few occasions I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability	66.7%	Not Desirable	44.0%
4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority, even though I knew they were right	37.7%	Not Desirable	42.0%
5. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a great listener	75.4%	Desirable	59.0%
6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone	53.6%	Not Desirable	34.0%
7. I am always willing to admit when I made a mistake	69.6%	Desirable	61.0%
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget	42.0%	Not Desirable	47.0%
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable	78.3%	Desirable	55.0%
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own	29.0%	Desirable	41.0%
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others	81.2%	Not Desirable	30.0%
12. I am sometimes irritated by people	53.5%	Not Desirable	50.0%

who ask favors of me			
13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings	29.0%	Desirable	38.0%
	n=61		*n=608*

In this study, items 10 (I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own) and 13 (I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings) were both endorsed by fewer than a third of the sample (both endorsed 29% of the time). In the Reynolds study the two least-frequently endorsed items were items 2 (I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way) and 11 (there have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others), which were both endorsed 30% of the time (Reynolds, 1982). Number 11 was the most frequently endorsed in this study, and number 2 was endorsed 58% of the time, both significantly (greater than 25%) different than the original Reynolds study. Overall, there was overlap between the most-frequently endorsed items in this study and the Reynolds study, however this study had a greater magnitude of endorsement in the most-frequently endorsed items and there were some meaningful (greater than or equal to 25%) differences in the least-frequently endorsed items.

Descriptive Statistics

Shown in Table 5 are the means and standard deviations of the variables used in this study. The social desirability scale had a mean of 6.30 and a standard deviation of 2.56, while the original Reynolds short form had a mean of 5.67 and a standard deviation of 3.20 (Reynolds, 1982). The coping competence questionnaire yielded a mean of 43.52 and a standard deviation of 3.95, while the original study yielded a mean of 49.78 and a standard deviation of 11.63

(Schroder & Ollis, 2013). A ten-item short-form of PANAS was used for this study, so to compare the means and standard deviations to the original PANAS study, the means and standard deviations from the original validation were divided by the number of items. The mean score for positive affect in this study was 15.11 and the standard deviation was 3.92. In the full-item PANAS validation, the mean score was 29.7 (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The mean positive affect item score for this study was 3.02, and for the full-item PANAS it was 2.97. The mean score for negative affect in this study was 13.00 and the standard deviation was 4.65. In the original study the mean was 14.8, and the standard deviation was 5.4 (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The mean negative affect item score for this study was 2.6, and the mean negative affect item score in the original study was 1.48. For the Personal Need for Structure scale, there were three missing datapoints. Item 7 was missing for one participant, item 8 for another participant, and item 9 for a third participant. To address this missing data, I calculated the mean of the participant's previous responses to the other questions on the scale, and filled in that mean for the missing datapoint.. Overall the means and standard deviations did not differ significantly from the original norms.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations

Construct	Minimum-Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Standard Error
Social Desirability	0-12.00	6.30	2.56	-.571	.289

Perceived Stress Reactivity	17.00-31.00	23.0	2.78	.279	.291
Coping Competence	34.00-54.00	43.52	3.95	.224	.295
Teacher Efficacy	48.00-84.00	65.19	7.55	-.005	.304
Positive Affect	7.00-24.00	15.11	3.92	.129	.302
Negative Affect	5.00-25.00	13.00	4.65	.567	.304
Personal Need for Structure	36.00-59.00	46.47	4.47	.031	.291

Hypothesis Testing

This study aimed to investigate the merit of redefining social desirability as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation in contrast to the more bias-oriented definitions (Marlowe-Crowne's overall need for approval and Paulhus' impression management or self-deception). The first hypothesis concerned the relationship of social desirability with several variables aligned with positive and negative self-rated attributes. To constitute a bias, that pattern of correlations was expected to be consistent with positive correlations between social desirability and positive self-rated attributes, such as positive affect and coping competence, and consistent negative correlations between social desirability and negative self-rated attributes such as negative affect and perceived stress reactivity. For social desirability to constitute a bias, it was expected that social desirability would impact all negative self-reports equally and that there would be a consistent pattern of inverse correlations between social desirability and negative self-reports like perceived stress reactivity and negative affect. To constitute the adaptive perspective, it was hypothesized that social desirability would have an inverse relationship with negative affect, and perceived stress reactivity, a positive relationship with coping, and no relationship with positive affect in a group of student teachers, using Pearson Correlations in the statistical software SPSS. As seen in Table 6, social desirability did not show a significant inverse relationship with negative affect (r= -

.022, *p*=.865), contrary to both the bias and adaptive perspectives. Consistent with both the bias and adaptive perspectives, social desirability did show a significant inverse relationship with perceived stress reactivity (*r*= -.452, *p* <.001) and a positive significant relationship with coping (*r*=.298, *p*=.013). Consistent with the adaptive perspective, social desirability did not show a significant relationship with positive affect *r*=.080, *p*=.525).

Table 6

Positive vs. Negative Self-Report Correlations with SD (all two-tailed)

Positive Constructs	Negative Constructs
Positive Affect (*r*=.080, *p*=.525)	Negative Affect (*r*= -.022, *p*=.865)
Coping Competence: (*r*=.298, *p*=.013)	Perceived Stress Reactivity (PSRS) Total: (*r*= -.452, *p* <.001)
	Prolonged Reactivity: (*r*= -.087, *p*=.475)
	Work Overload: (*r*= -.412, *p* <.001)[a]
	Social Conflict: (*r*= -.474, *p* <.001)[a]
	Failure: (*r*= -.239, *p*= .048)[b]
	Social Evaluation: (*r*= -.249, *p*=.039)[b]
Teaching Efficacy: Spring (*r*=.192, *p*=.136) Teaching Responsibility: Spring: (*r*=.120, *p*=.120)	Personal Need for Structure: (*r*= -.136, *p*=.269)
Total Teaching Efficacy and Responsibility: Fall (*r*=.150, *p*=.230) Spring (*r*=.192, *p*=.136)	

Supervisor Mean Ratings of Teaching

Effectiveness: (r=-.053, p=.666)

a: significant at the .01 level

b: mean difference from a significant at the .05 level

Within Hypothesis 1, there were patterns of correlations among the PSRS subscales specifically, that gave further support for the adaptive perspective of social desirability examined for redefinition in this study. The bias perspective does not specifically target specific dimensions of self-rated scales the way the adaptive motivation redefinition does. Within the PSRS, there were differences in the magnitudes of correlations of subscales related to aspects of teaching that showed significant post-hoc differences. There are five PSRS subtests: prolonged reactivity, social evaluation, social conflict, reactivity to failure and work overload. Four of these five subtest were significantly inversely correlated with social desirability in this study: work overload, reactivity to failure, social conflict and social evaluation. Each subtest measured a different dimension of situational stress. There were no a priori hypotheses, but it was expected post-hoc that the strength of associations with social desirability would differ across domains that would be more or less salient to teaching. To examine the magnitude of differences between these subtests, Fisher's Exact tests with a Monte Carlo simulation were conducted, as seen in Table 7.

Table 7

Fisher's Exact Tests

Constructs	t-value with Pearson's r	Significance
Work Overload vs. Failure	t = 4.297	$p < .001$

Social Conflict vs. Social Evaluation	$t = 2.091$	$p = .040$
Social Conflict vs. Failure	$t = 2.592$	$p = .012$

When the Monte Carlo simulation performed a thousand iterations, all three of the Fisher's Exact tests were still in the range of confidence based on the data. The Fisher's Exact tests demonstrated significant differences between the correlations of social desirability and the subtests of the PSRS. Different patterns of correlations and different magnitudes of difference were found depending on the PSRS subconstruct. As previously stated, if social desirability were a bias, it was expected that there would be a more consistent pattern of inverse correlations with negative self-ratings like perceived stress. To constitute an adaptive motivation it was expected that there would be inverse correlations with some, but not all, negative self-ratings. The inconsistency of inverse correlations with negative self-ratings contradicts the bias perspective. Social relationships, social conflict and feeling overworked are key factors in teacher burnout (Steinhardt, Smith-Jaggars, Faulk, & Gloria, 2011). Therefore, it would make sense that for social desirability to be adaptive there would be stronger inverse correlations with dimensions like work overload and social conflict in teachers, which were reflected in the results of this study. A validity assessment study of the PSRS with a general population of undergraduate students in the United States and United Kingdom found smaller (-0.27 < r < -0.10 in the UK, -0.29 < r < -0.12 in the U.S.) inverse correlations between social desirability (significant at the p < .05 level) and the work overload, social conflict and social evaluation subscales, and insignificant correlations between social desirability and the reactivity to failure and prolonged reactivity subscales (Schlotz et. al, 2011). Student-teachers are more frequently put into

professional situations where their work and social acumen are evaluated and subject to judgment by other professionals and students in their schools. The significantly greater magnitude of correlations with the social conflict and work overload subscales compared to the other PSRS subscales, as seen in Table 7, demonstrates that overall, student teachers in this study were less reactive to stressors commonly associated with teaching.

This study also examined the potential role of social desirability as a source of bias or as indicative of positive self-evaluation in ratings of teaching self-efficacy. It was expected that there would be a positive correlation between self-efficacy ratings and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness. Under the bias perspective it was expected that the positive relationship between self-efficacy ratings and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness would be greater in magnitude with social desirability included in a regression model, with social desirability and self-efficacy as independent variables and supervisor ratings as the dependent variable, because social desirability as a bias would inflate self-efficacy ratings. The second hypothesis argued that the biasing role would not be supported if there was not a change in the relationship between spring semester ratings of self-efficacy and supervisor ratings of effectiveness when social desirability was removed from the model. Under the adaptive perspective the relationship between self-efficacy ratings and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness would not be impacted by social desirability, because self or other deception about one's efficacy as a teacher would not be adaptive for student-teachers. Social desirability did not explain additional variance beyond self-rating efficacy in a regression model with self-efficacy and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness, arguing against the bias perspective, as seen in Table 8.

To investigate the relation between spring rating self-efficacy and the external supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness with and without the contribution of social desirability a

hierchical multiple regression model was used with supervisor ratings as the dependent variable and teaching self-efficacy and social desirability entered at steps 1 and 2, respectively. At step one, a model with teaching-self-efficacy as the independent variable and supervisor ratings as the dependent variable was run. At step 2, social desirability was added as an independent variable to the model.   The r-square for Model 1 was .102, and the r-square for Model 2 was .125, making the r-square change .023, a nonsignificant change. Spring self-efficacy ratings on their own were a significant predictor of supervisor ratings, but when social desirability was added in, the model was no longer significant. Social desirability did not make a significant contribution to the variance on supervisor-rated teaching effectiveness

Table 8

R-Squared Change

Model		t	β	p	r-squared	r-squared change
1		2.590	.758	.012	.102*	.102
2	Self-Efficacy	2.791	.829	.007	.125*	.023
	Social Desirability	-1.241	-.107	.219		

*significant r-squared

Chapter 5: Discussion

The central debate in social desirability research is whether or not social desirability represents a need for approval (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) or a two-factor construct of self-deception and impression management (Paulhus, 1984). What both of these definitions have in common is the idea of bias that decreases the accuracy of self-reports. Both definitions have negative implications; social desirability as a bias means that an individual is either consciously deceiving others for approval or subconsciously deceiving themselves to maintain their own emotional well-being (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Paulhus, 1984). Social desirability as a bias would not be conducive for adaptive functioning and well-being because an individual would either be expending energy to maintain a public persona, or deluded in their self-perception, both of which could eventually be called into question when discovered by others. For those conducting assessments and trying to ascertain the validity of test results, social desirability as a bias would not offer additional information on the subject of the assessment and their motivations for creating a biased perspective. The bias perspective of social desirability does not look beyond the biasing impact to critically examine the purpose behind individual's responses on self-report measures. The first conceptualization of social desirability stated that "questionnaires are administered under all sorts of conditions, and the motivations of their respondents may vary in consequence" (Ellis, 1946, p. 386). The use of social desirability as a source of information as opposed to as a bias, could allow further understanding of an informant's mindset when completing self-reports.

The variables used in this study included more general personality variables like self-reported affect, and also situational variables with various degrees of relevance to adaptive functioning as a teacher such as perceived stress reactivity, coping, teaching self-efficacy, and

supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness. Rating one's positive or negative affect has little to do with specific situations, and is more generally related to overall mood. The PANAS gives one word feeling-words and asks about the magnitude of emotions like "inspired, afraid, alert, upset, and enthusiastic" in the moment (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The PSRS asks about specific situations and the individual's past reactions to them such as "When I have conflicts with others that may not be resolved…" with the option to respond either: "I generally shrug it off", "It usually affects me a little" and "It usually affects me a lot." The PSRS gives much more context, as a performance-related construct than the PANAS does as a personality construct. The intent of using these measures was to examine the patterns of constructs related to social desirability that could have implications for eventual teaching evaluations from supervisors and students.

Patterns of correlations between social desirability and self-reported constructs in this study add weight to the view that social desirability constitutes an adaptive motivation as opposed to a bias. The results revealed a distinct array of correlations that were relevant to participants' functioning as teachers, such as coping and stress reactivity, as opposed to more general mood-related constructs like affect. If social desirability does have a biasing effect, in this study that effect was not generalized to all the areas of self-report investigated. This variation may mean that the construct of social desirability is not as clear-cut as has previously been conceived. Under the bias perspective, it would be expected that social desirability would bias all self-reports, whereas under the adaptive perspective, social desirability would influence self-reports that an individual perceived as important. When thinking of what social desirability represents, and how it impacts self-reports, a redefinition seems to be in order when looking at

the results of this study. The particular patterns revealed in this study need to be understood in the context of what social desirability might mean to student-teachers in this study.

Consistent with Hypothesis 1 and the previous literature reviewed, the correlation between social desirability and positive affect was not significant (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011). However, if social desirability were a bias, I would expect that social desirability would inflate self-ratings of positive affect, as positive affect could be considered socially desirable. Positive affect, while perhaps socially desirable, has not been shown to be adaptive in teachers (Khalilzadeh & Khodi, 2018; Ripski, LoCasale-Crouch, & Decker, 2011), and has not been shown to relate to social desirability across other studies (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011; Uziel, 2013). High positive affect signifies the degree to which an individual feels as though they have high energy and the ability to maximumly concentrate, in addition to feeling engaged and happy (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). As many studies of social desirability have been conducted with college students in particular, including the validation studies for the various social desirability scales, the ability to concentrate and have high energy would be particularly relevant to the samples that social desirability was validated on (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Paulhus, 1984, Silverthorn & Gekoski, 1995). A key aspect of social desirability as a bias is that individuals are motivated to present a positive view of themselves to others, no matter the circumstances. In redefining social desirability, this study aimed to emphasize that individuals may only be motivated to present a favorable view in areas that matter most to their functioning in specific situations, for example, teaching. However, the results are also consistent with previous literature indicating that positive affect is not related to social desirability in student populations in general, bringing into question the bias perspective of social desirability when related to affect. Contrasting with positive affect, coping competence,

both in the literature and in this study has been shown to have a positive relationship with social desirability.

Consistent with the adaptive perspective, but in contrast to the previous literature and Hypothesis 1, negative affect was not related to social desirability. Prior literature has shown an inverse relationship between negative affect and social desirability (Brajša-Žganec, Ivanović, & Lipovčan, 2011). If social desirability were to constitute a bias, an inverse correlation with negative affect would be expected, similar to the .30-.40 correlations found with the PSRS. Affect in general may be less relevant from an adaptive perspective than other characteristics like stress reactivity and coping competence, that could reflect more positively or negatively on oneself in a teaching context. In this study, the valence of affect was not relevant, as neither positive nor negative affect was correlated with social desirability. Social desirability is very possibly a context-based phenomenon as societal expectations and stigmas change over time. Teachers, for example, may feel a greater motivation to endorse traits that make others perceive them more favorably. However, in a profession as prone to consistent evaluation as teaching, particularly as a student-teacher, presenting oneself more positively than the reality could have negative ramifications if the reality is disparate from the presentation. It is possible that there would be less hesitancy, particularly recently, to acknowledge negative affect. It is possible that affect, which is more personality-related, is less relevant to teaching and their own self-evaluation in a teaching context than variables that are more evocative of a specific context like perceived stress reactivity and coping.

From the adaptive perspective, relationships between self-rated attributes and social desirability are distinct and rooted in context. For the purposes of this study, the context that these self-ratings are rooted in is the adaptive requirements of teaching. Consistent with

Hypothesis 1, and the adaptive perspective, both coping competence and perceived stress reactivity were correlated with social desirability in this study. Coping competence was significantly positively correlated with social desirability. This relation was expected, as stronger coping skills would be particularly adaptive for student-teachers, as they are consistently evaluated and subject to the stress of being both a student and a teacher. Perceived stress reactivity, overall, consistent with Hypothesis 1, was significantly negatively correlated with social desirability. This result was expected because higher levels of stress reactivity would not be adaptive for student-teachers. All of the subscales of the PSRS yielded significant correlations with social desirability except the Prolonged Reactivity subscale ($r= -.087$, $p=.475$). Schlotz et. al conceptualized perceived stress reactivity as the intensity of an individual's typical reaction to stressful situations, and the prolonged reactivity subscale specifically as trouble winding down after a stressful experience (Schlotz, et. al, 2011). Low negative affect reflects calmness, and prolonged reactivity reflects an inability to calm down (Schlotz et. al; Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). This is consistent with the results on affect because low prolonged reactivity and low negative affect both reflect the ability to be calm. Since negative affect was not found to be significantly correlated to social desirability in this study, and there seems to be overlap between negative affect and prolonged reactivity, the lack of a relationship between prolonged reactivity and social desirability is consistent with the findings on affect. This result fits in with the redefinition of social desirability because while presenting as calm may be socially desirable, it is not related to coping competence (Schroder & Ollis, 2012). Therefore, according to the results of this study, overall calmness is not significantly related to social desirability. This links to social desirability having a motivational function, as calmness, while

perhaps socially desirable, is not necessarily an adaptive way to cope with stress in a professional environment like teaching.

The two highest correlations between subscales of the PSRS and social desirability were the social conflict subscale ($r= -.474$, $p <.001$) and the work overload subscale ($r= -.412$, $p <.001$). Social conflict was conceptualized of as "feeling affected, annoyed, upset in response to social conflict, criticism, rejection" (Schlotz et. al., 2011, p. 81). As mentioned previously, student-teachers are evaluated frequently, so being reactive to criticism and conflict wouldn't be conducive to their teaching ability. Several key aspects of teacher burnout and "prolonged exposure to emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job, often accompanied by insufficient recovery" and "feeling cynical, irritable and negative towards others" (Steinhardt, Smith-Jaggars, Faulk, & Gloria, 2011, p. 420). Both of these aspects of burnout fit in well with the definition of social conflict, and are reflected in the relationship between social desirability and work overload as well. Work overload was conceptualized as "feeling nervous, agitated, irritated in response to high workload" (Schlotz et. al, 2011, p. 81). Two of the most prominent stressors for teachers, that fit in well with the work overload subscale of the PSRS, are role overload and high-stakes testing (Steinhardt et. al, 2011). A high workload is to be expected of a teacher, in general, especially student-teachers who are also in school full-time as well. Being reactive to a high workload impacts social relationships, and contributes to social conflict and the lack of emotional recovery present in teacher burnout (Steinhardt et. al, 2013).

There were two additional correlations between PSRS subscales and social desirability that differed in size from the two subscales with the highest correlations, the social evaluation subscale ($r= -.249$, $p=.039$) and the reactivity to failure subscale ($r= -.239$, $p=.048$). Social evaluation was conceptualized as "feeling nervous, losing self-confidence in response to social

evaluation" (Schlotz et. al, 2011, p. 81). This correlation was lower than other subscale correlations, and a Fisher's exact test between social conflict (the highest correlated subscale of the PSRS with social desirability) and social evaluation yielded a significant difference between the two ($t = 2.091$, $p = .40$). This result fits in well with the proposed redefinition of social desirability as an adaptive motivation to social evaluation. The social evaluation subscale being a lower correlation than the social conflict subscale reflects a difference in the two constructs. While social conflict centered around being reactive to criticism, social evaluation was more about nervousness and self-confidence in response to social evaluation. As student-teachers are frequently evaluated, it would make sense that they would be less prone to reactivity around conflict than to nervousness around social evaluation and judgment. Self-evaluation, a component of burnout, reflects feelings of incompetence at work (Steinhardt et. al, 2011). As student teachers are still in training, it makes sense that they would relate more to nervousness and feelings of incompetence around social evaluation as opposed to reactivity around social criticism. As social desirability may be context-dependent, it would be interesting to see if the significant difference between social conflict and social evaluation would continue as the students continued teaching. Feelings of incompetence can also be reflected in reactivity to failure. Reactivity to failure was conceptualized as, "feeling annoyed, disappointed, down in response to failure" (Schlotz et. al, 2011, p. 81). This result is also consistent with the redefinition of social desirability; failure is a learning opportunity and temporary as an intern teacher. In professional contexts where failure is prominent and prolonged, burnout becomes more likely (Steinhardt, et. al, 2011). However, failure is socially and context dependent; failure is defined by the environment. As failure is par for the course as a student-teacher, it seems as though failure is not as related to social desirability as other PSRS subscales.

From the bias perspective, social desirability would artificially inflate self-ratings of teaching self-efficacy, subsequently distorting relations with external evaluations of teaching effectiveness. Per Hypothesis 2, when social desirability was included as a predictor in a regression model with teaching efficacy as the other predictor and supervisor ratings as the outcome, social desirability did not exert a biasing effect on the relationship between self-ratings of teacher efficacy and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness. Self-efficacy is associated with actual performance, so accordingly, there was a correlation between teaching self-efficacy and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness (Khalilzadeh & Khodi, 2018; Silverthorn & Gekoski, 1995). Social desirability in this study was associated with several self-ratings, but did not add to the prediction of supervisor ratings beyond those self-ratings. As an adaptive motivation, social desirability wouldn't change the relationship between self-ratings of teaching self-efficacy and supervisor ratings of teaching effectiveness because ratings of teaching self-efficacy wouldn't be biased, they'd be the student-teacher's real perceptions of their performance. Also, as an adaptive motivation, social desirability would influence actual performance.

That social desirability did not add anything beyond self-efficacy to the regression model fits in well with several studies referenced in the previous literature review, and with the hypothesized adaptive perspective as well. Using the Marlowe-Crowne Scale, BIDR and the Lie Scale of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire, Uziel concluded that individuals high in impression management (the social desirability designation) have stronger social skills in public social contexts because of higher levels of interpersonal self-control (Uziel, 2010; Uziel, 2010b). This study similarly concludes that social desirability is not a bias but an asset, particularly in a profession where social evaluation is consistent. What literature has conceived of as bias, may

reflect a deeper sensitivity and awareness of social expectations, that could help guard against future negative outcomes like burnout. Greater sensitivity to social expectations may be extra pressure to socially perform, but it also gives greater opportunities in a socially salient domain like teaching to develop social relationships with others that would help provide social support in the stressful environment of a school (Steinhardt et. al, 2011).

The factors that influence self-report may be different in traditional social desirability research studies than in real-life application. In real life application, the responses on self-reports have consequences, such as diagnoses or professional positions. Social desirability's real-life influence on self-reports was first addressed in 1946, in the first study of social desirability and personality (Ellis, 1946). Albert Ellis stated that the motivations behind response distortions could provide valuable clinical information for practitioners and researchers (Ellis, 1946). In recent research, the motivations behind socially desirable responding have been lost in the focus on measurement bias. While the results of this study did come from a research study, we aimed to minimize the risk of bias by having a separate data manager who did not meet with participants. The conditions of this study were conducive to accurate reporting, as we repeatedly emphasized to participants that their responses would not have consequences and would not be shared with their research buddy or their teaching supervisors. We also aimed to reduce bias by not allowing the research buddies to see any of the survey results. This potentially impacted our results by minimizing faking aiming to make a good impression and emphasizing some of the real strengths of the participants that were included.

Social Desirability Measure

The low internal consistency of the social desirability measure used in this study (α=.616) may limit some of the conclusions. The finding that this study's internal consistency

was lower than those reported in the normative sample may reflect some of the socially and culturally salient components of the measure. For example, one of the statements used for the Reynolds short form was: I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own, which was endorsed 29% of the time in this study as opposed to 41% of the time in the original validation (Reynolds, 1982). Compared to the 1960s when the original Marlowe-Crowne Scale was developed, and even the 1980s when the Reynolds short form was developed, a statement like this may not be as culturally salient, since with the prominence of, for example, social media, more viewpoints are expressed in the general public. Alternatively, statements on the short form like: No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a great listener may be particularly salient for student teachers specifically (Reynolds, 1982). In this study, that particular item was endorsed 75.4% of the time compared to 59% of the time in the original validation (Reynolds, 1982). These items are meant to be dichotomous, all or nothing, but when framed in the context of teaching, an item about listening may be perceived to be true for that individual specifically in their professional life. Especially for a student teacher, an item such as this one may be something that is true 90% of the time for them in a particular context (i.e. teaching), but not always, so it is important to consider how the context of the study played into the responses on the measure.

The social desirability questions are in True/False format to catch faking, as almost no one does the desirable thing all of the time. However it is important to consider that, in the context of professional identity, individuals may be willing to endorse a statement that they feel they do most of the time even if the questionnaire is designed to elicit an all-the-time answer. The format of the scale, and its shortened nature may blur the purpose of catching response distortion due to current sociocultural factors and the nature of the sample's profession. As seen

in Table 5, the most frequently endorsed desirable items in this study were: "No matter who I'm talking to I'm always a good listener" (75.4% compared to 59% in the original Reynolds study), "I am always willing to admit when I made a mistake" (69.6% compared to 61% in the original study), and "I am always courteous even to people who are disagreeable" (78.3% compared to 55% in the original study) (Reynolds, 1982). All of those items are highly related to teaching and being in a public environment. The most frequently endorsed item was not desirable: "There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others" (81.2% compared to 30% in the original study) (Reynolds, 1982). It is important to note that, though this item is keyed undesirable, student-teachers in this study were willing to admit to feeling jealous. Within the context of student-teaching in particular, this is an interesting result. This questionnaire was administered at the beginning of the academic year. Perhaps student-teachers, nervous about their new teaching responsibilities felt jealous of the more established teachers around them who seemed to have an easier time with some of the responsibilities of teaching. Alternatively, it's possible that some student-teachers were afforded more opportunities to practice teaching at their practica sites than others and were feeling jealous of the other students in their program.

The results of this study also lend support for another reconceptualization of bias in the self-report literature: the depression-distortion hypothesis. The depression-distortion hypothesis posits that, when filling out reports, informants who are depressed exhibit a bias towards negative reporting of targets' behavior (Ritchers, 1992). This distortion has often been reported with depressed mothers (Ritchers, 1992). However, corroboration of the depression-distortion hypothesis has been contradictory in the literature. Some studies have reported no evidence of a depression-distortion bias, others have found that depressed caregivers rate their children more highly than other informants, and evidence has indicated that children of depressed caregivers

are at a higher risk for psychopathology (De Los Reyes, Goodman, Kliewer, & Reid-Quiñones, 2010; Youngstrom, Loeber, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 2000). Context is key, and context varies due to a myriad of factors. As with the depression-distortion hypothesis, social desirability's role as a bias is not completely clear in the literature, indicating that an alternative perspective is warranted.

Conclusion

Although the results of this study provide some support for the redefinition of social desirability, more work is needed to elucidate the relationship between social desirability in research and real-life settings where there are implications to social presentation. Continuing with the results of this study, future research should investigate whether similar results would be seen in full-time teachers with a range of teaching experiences. Perhaps social desirability would play a different role at different professional levels. Additionally, research should be conducted to further elucidate the construct of social desirability, and its various manifestations across self and other-report contexts. When informants feel more responsible for the report outcomes, for example, when the report is being used for an assessment of services or a diagnosis, it may influence their motivation to provide certain types of information that would be relevant.

Prior social desirability research portrayed this motivation as faking, and something to guard against in self-reports, whereas this study provides support for an alternative perspective. Socially desirable responding may provide valuable information for psychologists who administer self-reports that reflects the informant's social and emotional values. The purpose and motivation behind socially desirable responding may provide more information than the bias perspective emphasizes. Given the frequency with which we use self-reports, teasing apart what social desirability means is critical to our understanding of individual perspectives in self-

reports. This study has provided some support for a reconceptualization of social desirability as a more adaptive construct, a construct important for psychologists who utilize self-reports to consider when interpreting the results of those reports.

Limitations

The limitations of this project were that there was a smaller-than-ideal sample size with a limited amount of racial and ethnic diversity, which may have affected the detection of relationships among the variables. More robust relationships between the variables could perhaps have been found with a larger sample size. Furthermore, the sample was limited to a single teacher-preparation program and may not be generalizable to other programs or current teachers.

Another limitation is that the reliability of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale has recently been called into question with the advent of the BIDR, and the hypotheses that social desirability may be a two-factor construct. For the purposes of this study, the Marlowe-Crowne definition and measure was the most frequently used social desirability measure and it had the best reliability of the social desirability measures (see review, Beretvas, Meyers, & Leite, 2002; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

Another limitation was that the Kercher short-form of the PANAS used for this study has been called into question for including items that have an increased level of covariance, which diminished its content validity, but inflated the reliability (Thompson, 2007).

Additionally, the outcome measure, the supervisor rating of teacher effectiveness, used was a single question, non-validated measure rated on a Likert Scale, however there was substantial agreement across both of the supervisor raters. In future research it may be helpful to

find a more detailed outcome measure, particularly since this measure is the only other-rating measure featured in this project.

References

Andrews, P., & Meyer, R. G. (2003). Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale and the short

form C: Forensic norms. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 59, 483-492.

Andrejević, M., Meshi, D., van den Bos, W., & Heekeren, H. R. (2017). Individual differences in

social desirability are associated with white-matter microstructure of the external capsule.

Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience, 17(6), 1255-1264.

Bardwell, W. A. & Dimsdale, J. E. (2001). The impact of ethnicity and response bias on the self-

report of negative affect. Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research, 6, 27-38.

Beretvas, R. N., Meyers, J. L., & Leite W. L. (2002). A reliability generalization study of the

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Educational and Psychological

Measurement, 62, 570-589

Brajša-Žganec, A., Ivanović, D., & Lipovčan, L. (2011). Personality traits and social

desirability as predictors of subjective well-being. Psihologijske teme, 20 (2), 261 – 276.

Retrieved from http://hrcak.srce.hr.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/file/110090

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). The trouble with teacher turnover: How

teacher attrition affects students and schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 27*(36).

http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3699

Crandall VC, Crandall VJ, Katkovsky W. A children's social desirability questionnaire. Journal

of Consulting Psychology. 1965; 29:27–36.10.1037/h0020966 [PubMed: 14277395]

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of

psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.

Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D (1964). The approval motive: studies in evaluative dependence.

New York: Wiley, 233p.

De Los Reyes, A., Goodman, K. L., Kliewer, W., & Reid-Quinones, K. (2010). The longitudinal

consistency of mother–child reporting discrepancies of parental monitoring and their

ability to predict child delinquent behaviors two years later. *Journal of youth and*

adolescence, *39*(12), 1417-1430.

De Los Reyes, A., Thomas, S. A., Goodman, K. L., & Kundey, S. M. (2013). Principles

underlying the use of multiple informants' reports. *Annual review of clinical*

psychology, *9*, 123-149.

Ellis, A. (1946). The validity of personality questionnaires. *Psychological Bulletin, 43,* 385-440.

Edwards, A. L. (1953) The relationship between the judged desirability of a trait and the

probability that the trait will be endorsed. Journal of Applied Psychology, 37, 90-93.

Edwards A.L. (1961). Social desirability or acquiescence in the MMPI? A case study with the

SD scale. J Abnormal Soc Psychol 63, 351–359.

Eysenck MW and Derakshan N. (1997). Cognitive biases for future negative events as a function

of trait anxiety and social desirability. Personality and Individual Differences 22: 597-

605.

Fastame, M. C., Penna, M. P., & Hitchcott, P. K. (2015). Life satisfaction and social desirability

across the late life span: What relationship? Quality of Life Research: An International

Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and Rehabilitation, 24, 241-244.

doi:10.1007/s11136-014-0750-4

Fisher, R. J. and Katz, James E. (2000). Social-Desirability Bias and the Validity of Self-

reported Values. Psychology & Marketing 17(2), 105–120.

Furnham, A., & Traynar, J. (1999). Repression and effective coping styles. European Journal of Personality, 13, 465–492.

Hamama, L., Ronen, T., Schar, K., & Rosenbaum, M. (2013). Links between stress, positive and negative affect, and life satisfaction among teachers in special education schools. Journal of Happiness Studies, 14(3), 731–751. doi:10.1007/s10902-012-9352-4.

Huang, C., Liao, H. and Chang, S. 1998. Social desirability and the Clinical Self-Report Inventory: methodological reconsideration. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 54(4):517-528.

Huang, J. Y., & Bargh, J. A. (2014). The selfish goal: Autonomously operating motivational structures as the proximate cause of human judgment and behavior. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 37, 121–135. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X13000290

Herman, K. C., Hickmon-Rosa, J. E., & Reinke, W. M. (2018). Empirically derived profiles of teacher stress, burnout, self-efficacy, and coping and associated student outcomes.

Kercher, K. (1992). Assessing subjective well-being in the old-old. The PANAS as a measure of orthogonal dimensions of positive and negative affect. Research on Aging, 14, 131-168.

Khalilzadeh, S., & Khodi, A. (2018). Teachers' personality traits and students' motivation: A structural equation modeling analysis. Current Psychology, 1-16.

Kozma, A. and Stones, M.J. (1987) Social Desirability in measures of subjective well-being: Age Comparisons. Social Indicators Research 19, pp. 35-48

Lane, R. D., Merikangas, K. R., Schwartz, G. E., Huang, S. S. & Prusoff, B. A. (1990). Inverse relationship between defensiveness and lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorder. American Journal of Psychiatry, 147, 573–578.

Latkin, C.A., Edwards, C., Davey-Rothwell, M.A., Tobin, K.E., 2017. The relationship between

social desirability and self-reports of health, substance use, and social network factors among urban substance users in Baltimore, Maryland. Addict Behav 73, 133-136.

Lindeman, M., & Verkasalo, M. (1995). Personality, situation, and positive-negative asymmetry in socially desirable responding. European Journal of Personality, 9, 125- 134.

Loo, R., & Loewen, P. (2004). Confirmatory factor analysis of scores from full and short versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34, 2343-2352.

Miller, P. H., Baxter, S. D., Royer, J. A., Hitchcock, D. B., Smith, A. F., Collins, K. L., . . . Finney, C. J. (2015). Children's social desirability: Effects of test assessment mode. Personality and Individual Differences, 83, 85-90.

Neuberg, S. L., & Newsom, J. T. (1993). Personal need for structure: Individual differences in the desire for simpler structure. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *65*(1), 113.

Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1998). The effects of social desirability and faking on personality and integrity assessment for personnel selection. Human Performance, 11, 245–271.

Paulhus, D. (1984). Two-component models of social desirability responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46(3), 598–609.

Paulhus, D. (1988). Assessing self-deception and impression management in self- reports: The balanced inventory of desirable responding. Version 6. Unpublished manual: University of British Columbia.

Perinelli, E & Gremigni, P. (2016) Use of social desirability scales in clinical psychology: a systematic review. J Clin Psychol. 2016; 72:534–551. [PubMed: 26970350]

Reynolds, W.M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe–Crowne

Social Desirability Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38, 119–125.

Ripski, M. B., LoCasale-Crouch, J., & Decker, L. (2011). Pre-service teachers: Dispositional

traits, emotional states, and quality of teacher-student interactions. *Teacher Education*

Quarterly, *38*(2), 77-96.

Richters, J. E. (1992). Depressed mothers as informants about their children: a critical review of

the evidence for distortion. *Psychological bulletin*, *112*(3), 485.

Schlotz, W., Yim, I. S., Zoccola, P. M., Jansen, L., & Schulz, P. (2011). The perceived stress

reactivity scale: Measurement invariance, stability, and validity in three

countries. *Psychological assessment*, *23*(1), 80.

Schroder, K. E., & Ollis, C. L. (2013). The Coping Competence Questionnaire: A measure of

resilience to helplessness and depression. *Motivation and Emotion*, *37*(2), 286-302.

Silverthorn, N. A., & Gekoski, W. L. (1995). Social desirability effects on measures of

adjustment to university, independence from parents, and self-efficacy. Journal of

Clinical Psychology, 51, 244–251.

Smeding, A, Dompnier, B & Darnon, C (2017) Individual differences in perceived social

desirability of openness to experience: A new framework for social desirability

responding in personality research. Elsevier journal 113, 155-160.

Smith, D., Driver, S., Lafferty, M., Burrell, C., & Devonport, T. (2002). Social

desirability bias and direction modified in the Competitive State Anxiety

Inventory-2. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 95(3), 945–952.

Steinhardt, M., Smith-Jaggars, S., Faulk, K., & Gloria, C. (2011). Chronic work stress and

depressive symptoms: Assessing the mediating role of teacher burnout. *Stress and*

Health, 27(5), 420-429. doi:10.1002/smi.1394

Tan, J. A., & Hall, R. J. (2005). The effects of social desirability on applied measures of

goal orientation. Personality and Individual Differences, 38: 1891-1902.

Thompson, E. R. (2007). Development and validation of an internationally reliable short-form of

the positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS). *Journal of cross-cultural*

psychology, *38*(2), 227-242.

Thomsen, D.K., Jorgensen, M.M., Mehlsen, M.Y., & Zachariae, R. (2004). The influence of

rumination and defensiveness on negative affect in response to experimental stress.

Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 45, 253-258.

Uziel, L. (2010). Look at me, I'm happy and creative: The effect of impression management on

behavior in social presence. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36, 1591–1602.

Uziel, L. (2010b). Rethinking social desirability scales: From impression management to

interpersonally oriented self-control. Perspectives on Psychological Science,5, 243–262

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures

of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 54, 1063–1070

Youngstrom, E., Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (2000). Patterns and correlates of

agreement between parent, teacher, and male adolescent ratings of externalizing and

internalizing problems. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *68*(6), 1