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Abstract

The present study validated the factorial structure found by Sharkey and Hamilton (2011), and extended their research by testing the scale’s convergent validity by examining the relationships between the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others and self and a number of personality constructs. One hundred thirty nine University of Hawaii at Manoa students enrolled in Speech Communication classes answered online questionnaires that contained the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others and self, Machiavellian, communication apprehension, social desirability, and gelotophobia scales. The results suggest that increases in communication apprehension were correlated with reports of lower proclivity to intentionally embarrass others and oneself as well as lower proclivity to intentionally use mild face threatening tactics to embarrass others and mild and severe face-threatening acts to embarrass oneself. Results also suggest that individuals high on social desirability will be less likely to intentionally embarrass themselves and to intentionally use severe face-threatening acts to embarrass themselves. The findings in this paper have implications in regards to understanding the types of people who are willing to disrupt the working consensus through the use of intentional embarrassment despite the possibility of negative social sanctioning from other interactants.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Generally, communication aids in making sense of the world, sharing this sense of the world through our own expression, and creating meaning with others (Beebe, Beebe, & Ivy, 2010). Because this process of communication is inescapable (Beebe et al., 2010), we focus on interactions deemed important to avoid information overload (Eppler & Mengis, 2004). Most of the time, our interactions can be mindless/habitual. Mindless/habitual communication refers to our use of an automatic, routine script in handling daily interactions (Burgoon, Berger, & Waldron, 2002; King & Sawyer, 1998), like saying “How are you?” while passing someone in the hallway, not expecting a genuine reply from him/her. On the other hand, other interactions may be mindful/strategic requiring an awareness of what we are doing and how we are communicating with others (Burgoon, et al., 2002; Kellermann, 1992; King & Sawyer, 1998).

At times, people mindfully deceive others (Buller & Burgoon, 1994; Burgoon, Blair, & Strom, 2008; Burgoon & Twitchell, 2003; Zhou), persuade others (Gass & Seiter, 2011; Horcajo, Petty, & Brinol, 2010; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) attempt to induce jealousy in others (Bevan, 2004; DeSteno, Valdesolo, & Bartlett, 2006), or try to create guilt in others (Mehrabian, 2009; Simon, Stenstrom, & Read, 2010; Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007). More recently, research has focused on the mindful, conscious, and intentional use of behaviors to cause embarrassment in oneself or others (Bradford & Petronio, 1998; Gross & Stone, 1964; Sharkey, 1992; Sharkey, Kim, & Diggs, 2001; Sharkey, Park, & Kim, 2004) – intentional embarrassment, “a decision to behave with the knowledge that such behavior will cause embarrassment in another person or oneself” (Sharkey & Hamilton, 2011, p. 7, italics in original). To address the issue of intentional embarrassment as a disposition, Sharkey and Hamilton (2009) have devised two scales that measure individuals’ proclivity to intentionally embarrass others and themselves.
Proclivity to Intentionally Embarrass Others and Self Scales

Given that we are thrust into social situations on a daily basis, it is important that we understand how interactions take place. An understanding of the mechanics behind interactions is important because it lays the groundwork for effective and appropriate communication. What research on intentional embarrassment lacks is an in depth understanding of the types of people who tend to use such a norm-violating behavior. Embarrassment, as defined by Sharkey (1997), “is a short-lived emotional/psychological response of social chagrin…or uneasiness that occurs as a result of a discrepancy between one’s idealized role-identity and one’s presented role-identity and the uncertainty that follows and incident” (p. 58). Despite this aversive state that embarrassment creates, people still do participate in the creation of such scenarios. By uncovering the different traits that make up a person’s role as the intentional embarrassor, researchers will be better able to understand the types of people who are willing to violate the interactional rules to possibly achieve alternative goals. With this understanding, researchers can examine why certain people are willing to jeopardize their own as well as other individuals’ face.

To comprehend the intentional embarrassor, Sharkey and Hamilton (2009) established the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others and self scales. Both scales have been reported to demonstrate convergent and discriminant validity (Sharkey & Hamilton, 2011). Sharkey and Hamilton’s (2011) study also revealed that people who intentionally embarrass others tend to be males, verbally aggressive, and low on social anxiety. Also, people who intentionally use severe face-threatening acts to embarrass others tend to be males, verbally aggressive, and low on social anxiety. Further, individuals who intentionally use mild face-threatening acts to embarrass others tend to be high on private self-consciousness.

The same study also found that people who intentionally embarrass themselves tend to be verbally aggressive, high on private self-consciousness, and low on social anxiety. Further
findings revealed that people who intentionally use severe face-threatening acts to embarrass themselves tend to be male, verbally aggressive, and low on social anxiety. Also, individuals who intentionally use mild face-threatening acts to embarrass themselves exhibit high private self-consciousness and low social anxiety.

Given the findings mentioned above, this present study will test and extend Sharkey and Hamilton’s (2009) proclivity to intentionally embarrass scales by confirming their reliability and factorial structure while extending our understanding of intentional embarrassment by testing the two scales’ construct validity.

To understand more fully the contexts in which intentional embarrassment takes place, Goffman’s (1967, 1982) work on the interaction order is used, which includes descriptions of social identity and facework. Following this foundation, an overview of embarrassment and the plan making process as well as its effects on relationships will be provided. Last, intentional embarrassment of other and self and their hypothesized relations to various constructs will be argued.

**Interaction Order**

When people interact, a certain order is observed to facilitate a smooth communication transaction. This phenomenon is known as the interaction order. Although Goffman (1967, 1982) did not specifically define the interaction order, his observations have culminated into an expression of how it works. The interaction order can be seen as an intersection of how people present and manage their face, accept and protect others’ face, and come to a “working consensus” – a temporary agreement about interactional rules and social identity claims within a social engagement (Goffman, 1967).
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To begin, Goffman (1982) established the overall context for face-to-face interactions. Goffman (1982) observed that in face-to-face assemblies, interactants move from “the merely situated to the situational” (p. 3). The situated refers to the context in which interactions take place while the situational refers to the actual interaction that occurs (Goffman, 1982). An example of the situated versus the situational is an educational context in which a student and his/her advisor meet to discuss the furtherance of the student’s academic career. The educational context is “the situated” while the discussion that takes place between the student and the advisor is “the situational.” Thus, the situational is subsumed within a context.

The situated encounter in which an interaction takes place is governed by time, space, and interactants’ attention and cognitive states (Goffman, 1982). First, an interaction can take place in real and non-real time. Real-time pertains to interactions that transpire instantaneously due to immediate feedback between interactants. These interactions can occur over video chat (e.g. Skype), telephones, and face-to-face encounters. Non-real time pertains to interactions that transpire over an elapsed period of time where feedback is delayed between interactants. These interactions can occur via email, texting, letters, and in some instances, instant messaging. Second, space pertains to the medium through which the interaction takes place. For example, face-to-face interactions occur in close proximity between interactants, where face-to-face is the medium in itself whereas email exchanges can occur despite interactants being in separate proximities from one another. Third, Goffman (1982) stated that interactants’ attention and cognitive states are factors that influence their “engrossment and involvement” (p. 3) during interactions. Participants acknowledge that they are partaking in a give-and-take process and are aware of this acknowledgement. This state of awareness is known as a “joint focus of attention”
Social identity. Gross and Stone (1964) suggested that social “identity is the substantive dimension of the self” (p. 3). In essence, one’s self-identity is predicated upon the positive social value s/he assumes for him/herself (Swensen, 1973) through interactions with others. This concept is also known as face. One’s face is further validated when the image a person wants to portray to the public is accepted and supported by others (Swensen, 1973). Within an interaction, interactants carry with them assumptions of their own self-identity as well as assumptions about the other conversational partners’ self-identity. As interaction continues, identities may be altered to adhere to the interactants’ expectations.

Once individuals accept their role in an interaction, they trust that other interactants will work together to maintain each other’s established identity (Goffman, 1967). If the interactants accept a person’s role portrayal, face is maintained within the interaction. When individuals act “out of character,” their role portrayal is deemed incongruous by the interactants, which leads to a loss of face. An individual’s personal poise, that is, the control one has over both one’s self and the situation, is jeopardized during such violations (Gross & Stone, 1964). The inability to remain poised could result in anger, frustration, and/or embarrassment for the individual. Bystanders may also lose face due to their association with those who are experiencing embarrassment. Still, other interactants could be embarrassed for the individual’s face loss and experience empathic embarrassment (Miller, 1987). Thus, interactants, other than the embarrassed person, may also be affected when someone acts or is forced “out of character.” By remaining poised, individuals demonstrate the ability to control themselves and remain in character despite the violation (Gross & Stone, 1964). When a person is unable to control
him/herself, the embarrassed person and others usually will employ tactics to repair the damage done to interactional partners’ face. This process of face restoration is used to renegotiate the interaction order between interactants and come to a renewed working consensus.

**Face and facework.** Due to the dynamic and fluid nature of the interaction order, interactants constantly engage in the maintenance and repair of their own as well as others’ face. Face, as previously mentioned, “results from a negotiated set of actions that build, maintain, or threaten our desired identities” (Domenici & Littlejohn, 2006, p. 14). Threats to and violations of face occur when a person’s desired identity is challenged (Cupach & Metts, 1994). Brown and Levinson (1987) identified two types of universal face needs: positive face and negative face. Positive face pertains to our need to be liked and valued by the important people in our lives. Negative face refers to our need to be free from restriction and imposition. According to Cupach and Metts (1994), people struggle with both types of face needs because oftentimes, satisfying one type of face need threatens the other. For example, when person A visits person B and spends time talking and self-disclosing, the visit serves to maintain person B’s positive face because it shows that person A values the connection person A has with person B; however, this act could also constrain person B’s negative face if, for instance, person B has to miss his/her favorite show to attend to person A’s presence.

To maintain a balance of politeness and consideration, people engage in facework to protect the face of others as well as their own during social encounters. Facework is enacted when actions are taken by a person to behave consistently with his/her face throughout an interaction (Goffman, 1967). Other participants are expected also to have knowledge of facework and its uses to assist in the fluidity of an interaction order. Goffman (1967) termed this knowledge “tact.” As mentioned above, interactants trust one another to support each other’s
identity and help maintain each other’s poise. Individuals trust that those involved in the interaction accept their self-identity claims and will support the claims as long as these claims are congruous with their role portrayal. Sharkey (1992) further indicated that interactants expect that each person involved will work together in this process of face protection and maintenance. When all aspects of the interaction order are in place, a smooth communication transaction is said to begin.

**Preventive facework.** To maintain this interaction order, interactants engage in either preventive or corrective facework. In everyday interactions, persons engage in much preventive facework. Because of the disruption to the working consensus and the discomfort that follows, people generally try to avoid face threats, which inevitably result in embarrassment for someone (Edelmann, 1987; Miller, 1996). This need to avoid embarrassing circumstances, in turn, keeps people from violating the interaction order. The use of preventive facework allows for the avoidance or minimization of face-threatening acts (Cupach & Metts, 1994). At times, people avoid certain topics in conversation, go out of their way while walking to be careful of their footing, to practice a musical piece or speech to circumvent mistakes or misstatements, and so on, all to avoid possible embarrassments. At other times, people know that they are about to violate the working consensus and so use disclaimer statements to “minimize the negative attributions that might be ascribed to their motives or character because they are about to violate expectations for appropriate behavior” (Cupach & Metts, p. 7). Hewitt and Stokes (1975) identified five types of disclaimers, namely hedging, credentialing, sin license, cognitive disclaimer, and appeal for suspended judgment. Hedging allows for separation of self from the message so that if listeners reject the message, they need not reject the sender (e.g., “If I’m not mistaken…”). Credentialing establishes one’s special qualifications for saying what one says.
(e.g., “I’m the boss here. You don’t get to question my authority”). Sin license asks listeners for permission to deviate in some way from normally accepted conversation (e.g., “It’s my birthday, I get to say whatever I want”). Cognitive disclaimers involve explaining oneself as being in possession of one’s mental faculties despite appearing otherwise (e.g., “This might be absurd, but…”). Appeal for suspended judgment asks listeners to hear one out before making a judgment (e.g., “Before you yell at me, please hear me out…”). In short, disclaimer statements allow individuals to justify their face violation behaviors and prepare others for a face violation when behaving in a manner that could possibly jeopardize their self-presentation. However, on occasions when face loss does occur, corrective facework is employed to remedy the damage inflicted upon one’s face (Cupach & Metts, 1994, Goffman, 1967).

**Corrective facework.** According to Cupach and Metts (1994), corrective facework is the process of restoring lost face and realigning the disrupted conversational episode to its homeostatic state. Other conversational interactants as well as onlookers may also engage in corrective facework to renegotiate the working consensus (Cupach & Metts, 1994; Sharkey & Stafford, 1990). Some corrective facework behaviors include the use of avoidance (e.g., glossing over the situation by acting unperturbed, run away), humor (e.g., making a joke at the individual’s own expense), apologies (e.g., admit blame and seek atonement for his/her actions, nonverbal displays of discomfort), accounts (e.g., excuses, justifications), and physical remediation (e.g., cleaning up a spill) (Cupach & Metts, 1994; Sharkey & Stafford, 1990).

By assisting in the corrective facework process, other interactants who have agreed on this working consensus work together to uphold their end of the negotiated interaction rules (Goffman, 1967). This is where renegotiation of the working consensus takes place (Sharkey, 1992). For instance, if person A slips on a wet floor in front of friends causing him/her to lose
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poise, person B may quickly pull him/her up into a standing position and joke about how “anyone could have missed the ‘caution’ sign.” In this situation, person B empathizes with person A’s predicament and attempts to reestablish a working consensus by diverting attention away from person A. These violations to the interaction order can occur either unintentionally or intentionally (Goffman, 1967). Either way, embarrassment is usually felt. Unintentional and intentional embarrassment can transpire in a variety of situations.

**Unintentional embarrassment.** Unintentional embarrassment occurs when people unconsciously disrupt the working consensus and by accidentally participating in or creating a violation of their own or someone else’s presented identity (Cupach & Metts, 1994; Gross & Stone, 1964); for example, one accidentally spills a drink on someone else. This unintentional face threat may cause embarrassment for both the victim and the person who was clumsy for spilling the drink and threatening the victim’s face in front of others. At other times, a person may unintentionally embarrass him/herself. For example, one mispronounces his/her significant other’s name. Through this error, the person unintentionally violates his/her assumed identity and becomes embarrassed. In fact, onlookers may feel empathic embarrassment when observing those individuals’ face loss. Upon the violation of someone’s face, corrective facework may be used by any and all involved (Sharkey & Stafford, 1990) to reestablish the working consensus. Some of the corrective facework employed by targets include: (a) physical remediation (e.g., fix the problem), (b) apologize, (c) account (i.e., provide an excuse), (d) describe the action, (e) use humor, (f) escape the encounter, (g) display of objective symptoms (e.g., laughing, blushing), or (h) attempt to conceal their embarrassment (Cupach & Metts, 1994; Sharkey & Stafford, 1990). At other times, people will deliberately violate the self-identity of others or themselves.
**Intentional embarrassment.** Despite embarrassment being an aversive state, research has also shown that people willingly participate in the disruption of the working consensus and strategically and intentionally create embarrassing predicaments for others (Gross & Stone, 1964; Petronio & Snider, 1990; Petronio et al., 1992; Sharkey 1990, 1991, 1993; Sharkey et al., 2001; Sharkey & Stafford, 1990) as well as themselves (Sharkey et al., 2004), for example, to intentionally embarrass a friend “just for laughs” or publicly reprimand a subordinate. At other times, a person may intentionally embarrass himself/herself by asking for forgiveness after making a mistake or acting silly in a public setting.

To more clearly understand the use of intentional embarrassment, attention will be turned to the Planned Strategic Embarrassment Model (PSEM), which was developed by Petronio and Snider (1990; see also Bradford & Petronio, 1998) and utilized Berger’s (1995) plan-based approach to strategic communication.

**Planned Strategic Embarrassment Model (PSEM)**

The PSEM has three stages: 1) attention to one’s goals, 2) the planning stage, and 3) the outcome of the one’s plan. At the first stage, embarrassors generally focus on a minimum of three goals: meta-goals, first-order goals, and second-order goals. Meta-goals are the most basic objectives of every plan. Berger (1995) highlighted that there were, at a minimum, two meta-goals: 1) efficiency, which refers to the creation of plans that can be executed with the least amount of time and effort and 2) appropriateness, which refers to the acceptability of a plan by social others. Efficiency and appropriateness may conflict with one another (Petronio & Snider, 1990) in certain instances. For example, person A sees person B walking ahead of him/her and wants to say ‘hi’ but does not want to speed up to catch person B. Person A then yells out person
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B’s name, causing others to stare at person B. As a result, person B is embarrassed by person A’s action of yelling out person B’s name in public. In this situation, person A sacrificed appropriateness for efficiency. Embarrassors may also emphasize both meta-goals (Braithwaite, 1995; Petronio & Snider, 1992; Sharkey, 1995). For example, putting together a slideshow of a sibling’s most embarrassing moments as well as highest achievements as part of a roast for his/her graduation. To create an extensive collage of images, one efficiently seeks help from other family members, friends, colleagues, and so on. Despite the embarrassment that could occur, revealing the slideshow during the sibling’s graduation party is deemed appropriate, as one had gained tacit social approval from other participants who would be present at the event.

First-order goals, like meta-goals, are consciously pursued by individuals; they are explicit and more immediate; for example, pulling a chair out from under a friend so that s/he falls just to create embarrassment for her/him. In other cases, however, embarrassment might not be an embarrassor’s first-order goal (Bradford & Petronio, 1998; Petronio & Snider, 1992). Second-order goals provide the means for achieving the first-order goal of embarrassment, and they are usually implicit (Bradford & Petronio, 1998), though they could be just as immediate and explicit as the first-order goal (Sharkey, 1997). For instance, people may disclose their infidelities in a previous relationship, which they know will embarrass themselves, so that their present partner does not discover this fact from someone else. In this case, the disclosers use intentional self-embarrassment to strengthen their relationship with their loved ones. Self-disclosures were used to fulfill disclosers’ goal of solidarity. These three main goals (i.e., metagoals, first- and second-order goals) of the PSEM make up the model’s first stage.

The second stage of PSEM includes the planning process that could occur either prior to the action or “on-line” during the interaction (Berger, 1995). This flexibility in planning occurs
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because one’s plan to embarrass the other person could be modified or abandoned depending on the situation and the interaction that ensues. Berger (1995) further posited that for a plan to be successful, embarrassors should have sufficient information about the target and context. Bradford and Petronio (1998) highlighted six different factors that influence the planning process: (a) target information, the intimacy level between embarrassor and the target (i.e., the more we know about another person, the easier it is to execute the plan); (b) plan timing, where and when the embarrassment takes place, and the amount of time spent constructing the plans; (c) prior experience, the amount of times the embarrassor has successfully embarrassed others (i.e., the more varied the repertoire of embarrassment plans, the more likely the embarrassor will succeed in carrying out the plan); (d) context, cultural and social expectations, which due to their implicit nature, may be important to take into consideration; (e) the nature of relationships, a person’s relationship knowledge base of information (i.e., it is much easier to embarrass a friend than a stranger); and (f) skill, embarrassor’s flexibility in enacting the plan so that s/he does not become the target of embarrassment instead.

Having executed the plan, as with unintentional embarrassment, face saving strategies are employed by the target and, at times the embarrassor and onlookers, to reduce the target’s embarrassment (Cupach & Metts, 1994) and reestablish a working consensus. At other times, observers of the embarrassed person will prolong and encourage the target’s face loss (Sharkey, 1997); for example, an individual may present a sexy gag gift to another friend at her bachelorette party with others watching, which causes embarrassment for her. The friends extend the bride-to-be’s predicament by asking her to pass the gift around for others to remark on and laugh at. As a result of the prolonged embarrassment, it takes the bride-to-be a longer time to recover from her loss of composure. At some point, the interactants will work together to
redefine the identities of all involved and to construct a new working consensus. Having laid out the process of intentional embarrassment, the next two sections will look specifically into the differences between intentional embarrassment of others and self, respectively. To better understand intentional embarrassment of others and self, the goals, tactics/strategies, and outcomes pertinent to both types of embarrassment episodes (i.e., others and self) will be discussed.

**Intentional Embarrassment of Others**

Embarrassment of others occurs when individuals violate the working consensus by threatening the self-identity of another (Sharkey, 1992). The trust that was formed according to relational rules/norms is broken, requiring at times, that remediation takes place to restore the target’s face (Cupach & Metts, 1994) and at times, the perpetrator’s face. At times, this trust can be broken when people intentionally embarrass their conversational partners.

**Goals.** People intentionally embarrass others for a variety of reasons (Braithwaite, 1995; Gross & Stone, 1964; Petronio, Olson, & Dollar, 1988; Sharkey, 1995, 1997, 2000): (a) to socialize individuals into a group, (b) to negatively sanction an individual’s behaviors, (c) to establish and/or maintain power, (d) to discredit another, (e) to show solidarity, and (f) to achieve self-satisfaction; for example, new pledges participate in Hell Week as part of their initiation into a fraternity. As part of this initiation ceremony, new pledges are hazed through a variety of embarrassing acts such as water drinking challenges, whereby the winner is the last to throw up. Embarrassment is used here to socialize new members into the fraternity. Another example of intentional embarrassment of others is when a parent or teacher tells a child to apologize in front
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of all of his/her classmates for stealing from another peer. Embarrassment is used here to negatively sanction the child’s stealing behavior.

Of these goals, the most widely reported goal of embarrassors was to show solidarity (Sharkey, 1991, 1992) followed by negatively sanctioning another’s behavior. These recollections could be attributed to embarrassors’ tendency to report positive aims for egotistical reasons (Sharkey, 1997). Such biased reports can be attributed to social desirability, whereby people want to be positively viewed by others and feel good about their actions. Due to this need to gain social approval, people tend to report more positive goals (i.e., to show solidarity) over negative goals (i.e. to maintain power). However, despite these self-reports of positively valenced goals, targets may construe embarrassors’ use of intentional embarrassment in a different light. Other researchers have looked at the goals of embarrassors from targets’ perspectives (Petronio et al., 1988; Sharkey et al., 2001; Sharkey, Kulp, Carpenter, Lee, & Rodillas, 1996) and although targets reported intentional embarrassment by their partners as a way to control the relationship, a way to impress others at one’s partner’s expense, an intentional norm violation, and a way to retaliate, the predominant goal reported by targets also was solidarity. In the end, Sharkey et al., (2001) reported that both embarrassors and targets predominantly reported solidarity and power as embarrassors’ attempted goals for creating face-violating predicaments.

Tactics/strategies. Next, embarrassors tend to employ certain tactics/strategies to enact the embarrassment plan. The tactics/strategies used by embarrassors include: (a) recognition/praise, (b) criticism/correction, (c) teasing, (d) cause to look unpoised/awkward, (e) violation of privacy, and (f) association with someone who is enacting untoward behavior that causes negative generalizations by others about the target’s self-presentation (Sharkey, 1992;
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Sharkey & Stafford, 1990; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990). For instance, the violation of someone’s privacy could occur when person A jokes that person B got arrested for drinking under the influence, despite being sworn to secrecy by person B. Person A intentionally embarrassed person B by violating person B’s privacy. In another case, intentional embarrassment could transpire through recognition/praise when a child sends a singing anniversary card to his/her parents’ workplace as a gesture of appreciation. This overt recognition from their child could cause embarrassment for the parents, despite the child’s sincerity. Sharkey (1992) found that the most commonly reported embarrassment tactic used by embarrassors was a violation of privacy. However, adult children tended to use recognition/praise with their parents, while in the workplace, superiors tended to use criticism or teasing with subordinates (Sharkey, 1993; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990). The tactics/strategies employed by embarrassors can also change according to the determined goals. Sharkey (1992) found that teasing along with recognition/praise and violations of privacy were tactics used to fulfill the goal of solidarity. As argued, embarrassors tend to employ a variety of tactics/strategies to achieve their goals. Once people have achieved their goal of violating another’s face, corrective facework is used to repair the working consensus and allow interactions to resume.

**Corrective facework.** Targets and embarrassors differ in their perspectives on the corrective facework strategies employed to remedy face loss. The inconclusiveness of findings on target’s responses (Sharkey, 1990, 1991, 1992) led Sharkey (1997) to suggest that “the context plays an important part in target responses” (p. 78). Braithwaite (1995) reported that male targets reacted with either humor or avoidance during “coed” baby/wedding showers. For instance, other interactants might joke that the father-to-be is incompetent in taking care of his unborn child, as he is still a child himself. Being at a baby shower, one is in a happy mood, thus,
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resulting in less animosity from targets despite the embarrassing predicament of having one’s competence insulted. On the other hand, being in a job promotion meeting, one is determined to sell his/her idea to the board of directors. Criticism of one’s competence from a fellow colleague vying for the same spot will probably result in more animosity from the target compared to the baby shower situation. According to embarrassors, targets responded with objective symptoms (e.g. blushing) and hostility more than any other response (Sharkey, 1997). Other scholars have found that targets tend to respond with hostility when one person is perceived to be responsible for another’s embarrassment. Criticism, on the other hand, was reported by embarrassors to result in concealment or accounts (Sharkey, 1991, 1992). Sharkey (1997) found that embarrassors viewed targets’ negative responses as protective measures to prevent similar encounters from happening in the future. Aside from recognizing targets’ responses, embarrassors also realized that they, as well as observers, could be embarrassed by the predicament that they (i.e., the embarrassors) create (Sharkey, 1997). Should such a scenario occur, embarrassors engage in facework to restore their own face as well as observers’ face. After the embarrassment attempt, the question remains as to how successful the embarrassor was in enacting the plan.

Plan success. Targets and embarrassors also hold different perspectives in assessing the success of an intentional embarrassment plan. Sharkey (1993) found that embarrassors claimed success in achieving their goals more so than targets claimed. This could be attributed to the notion that people want to see themselves as succeeding rather than failing. Thus, incidents of successful plans become more prominent and readily available in their memory bank. Perhaps the most interesting finding with regards to plan success lies in Sharkey, et al.’s (1996) study. Friends were found able, with great accuracy, to predict the intent or non-intent of embarrassors
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from both embarrassors’ and target’s perspectives. This accuracy in predicting intent could be attributed to the nature of friendships that is governed by behavioral rules idiosyncratic to the particular relationship. The more understanding individuals have of each other, the more predictable they become to one another. Sharkey (1992) discovered that embarrassors reported failing to achieve their goals more often when embarrassors teased a target. This failure due to the use of teasing is possible especially when targets do not comprehend the tease as embarrassing. Targets’ lack of comprehension can be attributed to the implicit nature of teasing, whereby persons from different cultural backgrounds, life experiences, and so on will have different perspectives on the particular tease. A lack of comprehension could also lead targets to misunderstand embarrassors’ goals (Pawluk, 1989). For instance, targets may perceive embarrassors’ actions as a personal attack despite embarrassors’ goal of creating solidarity.

**Proclivity to Intentionally Embarrass Others Scale**

As laid out above, research so far has uncovered the goals, tactics/strategies, and responses to intentional embarrassment but how prevalent is this communicative act used? In his research on the goals, tactics, and consequences of intentional embarrassment, Sharkey (1991) specifically asked participants how often they had intentionally embarrassed others in the last six months. Out of 1,116 participants who provided a situation in which they claimed to have intentionally embarrassed a target, 53.2% said that they had intentionally embarrassed someone 1 to 5 times in the last six months, 10.3% said that they had intentionally embarrassed someone 6 to 10 times, 2.8% said 11 to 15 times, 2.5% said 16 to 20 times, and 6.7% indicated that they had embarrassed others more than 20 times during the last six months.

Given that people vary quite a bit in their reports of how frequently they use face-violating acts, Sharkey and Hamilton (2009) created a scale to measure people’s proclivity to
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intentionally embarrass others (PIE-other). The development of the proclivity to intentionally embarrass scale will aid researchers in understanding why certain people are more prone towards embarrassing others, the characteristics of such people, and the social consequences of employing such behaviors.

**Intentional Embarrassment of Self**

Intentional embarrassment of others, as mentioned above, has been a well-researched area. However, studies on intentional embarrassment of oneself are scarce. This section will examine intentional embarrassment of self, goals for self-embarrassment, as well as the tactics and strategies employed to self-embarrass. Intentional embarrassment of self occurs when individuals violate the working consensus by threatening their own self-identity (Sharkey et al., 2004). By threatening their own self-identity, individuals jeopardize their self-presentation that other interactants have come to accept. Although research thus far has focused primarily on intentional embarrassment of others, several scholars have noted the use of intentional self-embarrassment during interactions (Goffman, 1967; Miller, 1996; Sharkey, 1991), while others have focused on one type of intentional self-embarrassment, self-disparaging humor (Chang & Gruner, 1981; Hackman, 1988; Smith & Powell, 1988; Stocking & Zillmann, 1976).

Sharkey et al. (2004) were the first to investigate the phenomenon of intentional embarrassment of self specifically. They found that respondents did not have any trouble reporting that they embarrassed themselves to achieve a number of goals. For instance, out of 472 participants in Sharkey et al.’s (2004) study, 39.6% reported intentionally embarrassing themselves for solidarity purposes, 15.9% reported face management purposes, 15.7% reported attention purposes, and 13.0% reported self-gratification/satisfaction purposes. Interestingly
Proclivity to Intentionally Embarrass Others and Self Scales

enough, both self and other embarrassors report solidarity/socialization as the main goal for intentional embarrassment. This can be attributed to the notion that humans are social beings who strive for acceptance and belonging. Thus, it is important for one to maintain relational bonds, and apparently, this sense of togetherness is believed by some to be fostered through embarrassment. As with intentional embarrassment of others, self-embarrassors also use certain tactics to achieve their goals.

Sharkey et al. (2004) asked respondents to explain a time when they intentionally/deliberately embarrassed themselves (also see Miller, 1996). To answer this question, respondents by necessity reported what they did to themselves (i.e., what tactic they used). What Sharkey et al. found was that self-embarrassors used a number of tactics: (a) normative public deficiencies (feigning the loss of control, faking physical pratfalls, and inept performances), for example, pretending that one was drunk and unable to walk a straight line to elicit laughs from friends within the group, which could, in turn, lead to an inside joke that strengthens group ties; (b) bystander behavior (“team transgressions” in which people placed themselves in situations where they would be “guilty by association”), for instance, singing in unison with a friend while walking through a crowded mall. Despite receiving stares and smirks from other people, one chooses to embarrass oneself so that the friend is not left singing alone. Bystander behavior, thus, is employed when individuals place themselves in a situation where another is acting out of the norm despite the negative association that may arise for the “bystander;” and (c) self-criticism (calling attention to one’s flaws and mishaps), for example, using self-disparaging humor to increase group solidarity despite the possibility of face loss for the individual. People who engage in such behaviors are aware that their actions can cause
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themselves embarrassment but do so anyway to fulfill a variety of primary goals (mentioned above).

**Proclivity to Embarrass Self Scale**

Much research still needs to be conducted in the area of self-embarrassment to increase understanding of this phenomenon and its effects on the interaction order. Sharkey et al.’s (2004) study on self-embarrassment adds to the growing body of literature that embarrassment can be a strategically planned emotion. The present study is interested in validating the factorial structure found by Sharkey and Hamilton (2011) and to extend their research by testing the scale’s convergent validity by examining the relationships between the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others (PIE-other, the proclivity to intentionally embarrass oneself (PIE-self), and a number of personality constructs: (a) Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970), (b) communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1993), (c) social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), and (d) gelotophobia (Ruch & Proyer, 2008b).

**Machiavellian IV.** Machiavellianism refers to the degree to which a person feels other people can be manipulated or deceived for personal gain (Christie & Geis, 1970). This concern for oneself over others can be attributed to high Machiavellians’ “cool detachment” and low emotional involvement with other people (Christie & Geis, 1970; Durand & Nord, 1976). Owing to this lack of emotional involvement with others (Ang & Williams, 2004), high Machiavellians engage less in face saving strategies during embarrassing encounters (Christie & Geis, 1970; Rawwas, Vittell, & Al-Khatib, 1994). High Machiavellians’ association with selfishness and competitiveness at the expense of others (Ang & Williams, 2004; Liu, 2008) could explain this lack of participation in targets’ face saving process. Additionally, high Machiavellians were
found to be manipulative, exploitive, and less likely to evaluate ethically questionable situations as inappropriate (Ang & Leong, 2000; Rawwas et al., 1994; Robbins, 2005; Steenhout & Kenhove, 2006).

Having an emotional detachment from others suggests that high Machiavellians are less able to empathize with others. In support of this relationship between emotional detachment and empathy, Miller (1987) found that empathic embarrassment was “minimized by detached, dispassionate objectivity and enhanced by compassionate empathy” (p. 1068). Being less empathic, one will be more willing to engage in acts that violate another’s face during an encounter. As explained above, high Machiavellians may not deem the violation of another’s self-identity/face as inappropriate. Due to a low regard for others’ face, high Machiavellians are more inclined than low Machiavellians to use verbal aggressiveness during conflict situations (Ang & Williams, 2004; Christie & Geis, 1970). Additionally, Sharkey and Hamilton (2011) reported a strong positive association between verbal aggressiveness and intentional embarrassment of others, suggesting that:

H1a: Machiavellianism will be positively correlated with one's proclivity to intentionally embarrass others.

Because high Machiavellians are mainly concerned about maximizing their end goals (Ang & Williams, 2004), it is likely that they will not deem the use of intentional self-embarrassment as inappropriate as long as their end goal is achieved. High Machiavellians will be willing to disrupt the working consensus by stepping out of their presented self-identity as long as this violation can be justified through a successful plan outcome. Sharkey and Hamilton
(2011) also reported a strong positive association between verbal aggressiveness and intentional embarrassment of self, implying that:

H1b: Machiavellianism will be positively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass self.

**Communication Apprehension.** McCroskey (1977) defined communication apprehension as an “individual level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (p. 78). Due to an avoidance of interactions with others, individuals high in communication apprehension tended to exhibit low communication competence (Richmond & McCroskey, 1989). This lack of competence can be attributed to fewer opportunities to practice communication skills. Richmond and McCroskey (1989) also found that having less practice in communication contributed to high speaker anxiety, introversion, and a lack of composure when interacting with others. Additionally, people high in communication apprehension tended to talk and disclose less to others (Long, Fortney, & Johnson, 2000; McCroskey, 1984; McCroskey & Richmond, 1995).

Given this fear of interacting with others, individuals high in communication apprehension tend to shy away from situations where they could potentially be at the center of attention (Withers & Vernon, 2006). Placing others in an embarrassing situation or using oneself as the butt of jokes will indeed force one into the spotlight. Individuals high in communication apprehension will be less likely to commit such acts of intentional embarrassment simply due to their reticence in communicating with others (Richmond & McCroskey, 1992). As mentioned by McCroskey (1977), individuals high on communication apprehension tended to experience a heightened sense of social anxiety when interacting with other people. This anxiety, in turn,
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Further heightens their reticence to engage in social situations. Sharkey and Hamilton (2011) uncovered a strong positive association between social anxiety and intentional other- and self-embarrassment. Communication apprehension, then, serves as a deterrent to the use of self- and other-embarrassment. Thus,

H2a: Communication apprehension will be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass others.

H2b: Communication apprehension will be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass self.

**Social desirability.** Social desirability is defined as the need to be viewed favorably by others (Adams et al., 2005; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Mioto & Preti, 2008). By maintaining the working consensus, one is able to function according to the agreed upon norms. This recognition of shared norms allows for the smooth running of every day interactions and the acceptance of a person’s publicly presented self (Goffman, 1967). To gain acceptance within an interaction, individuals also need to be sensitive towards other interactants’ feelings. The more empathic individuals are, the more able they will be at recognizing cues that indicate violation of the working consensus (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960, Goffman, 1967).

Through the use of intentional embarrassment, an individual violates the expectations of other interactants to uphold both the individual and interactant’s face (Goffman, 1967). The working consensus is disrupted when norm violations occur, which result in discord among interactants. This discord is usually unwelcomed by interactants as it upsets the interaction order. Studies on impression management have found that the more individuals need to maintain a positive social image, the more they practice self-control and perform behaviors that are
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approved by other interactants (Barrick & Mount, 1996; Booth-Kewley, Larson, & Miyoshi, 2007; Paulhus, 1989; Uziel, 2010). This need to maintain positive impressions indicates that persons high on social desirability will be less likely to perform acts that may jeopardize their acceptance within an interaction. As such, individuals who thrive on social acceptance will avoid acts that could elicit negative responses from other interactants (i.e., target hostility from being placed in an embarrassing situation).

Despite this possibility of target hostility (Petronio et al., 1988; Sharkey, 1997; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990), those low on social desirability will probably not be deterred by the perceived disapproval of others for violating the working consensus because achieving their primary goals are more important. It seems that regardless of the negative impression one may elicit from others, those who participate in intentional embarrassment do so anyway. In short,

H3a: Social desirability will be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass others.

Sharkey and Hamilton (2011) found a strong positive association between private self-consciousness and the tendency to intentionally embarrass oneself. According to Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975), private self-consciousness is a tendency to introspect and examine one’s inner self and feelings. Considering this tendency to ruminate about oneself, individuals high on private self-consciousness are governed by their own personal standards and beliefs rather than public benchmarks (Ashford & Northcraft, 1992). Due to this ability to behave according to one’s own standards and not of others, a person high in private self-consciousness will be less likely to aspire towards socially desirable behavior if s/he is not comfortable doing so. In short, if an individual high on private self-consciousness believes that intentional self-
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Embarrassment can be used to achieve a particular private goal, s/he will be driven to do so despite the possibility of negative social sanctioning. Conversely, individuals high on social desirability will be more likely to make their decisions based on social ideals rather than their own personal standards. Thus,

H3b: Social desirability will be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass self.

Gelotophobia. Titze (1995, 1996, 1997) defined gelotophobia as the pathological fear of appearing to social partners as a ridiculous object. Due to this dread of being scrutinized by others, gelotophobes tend to avoid exposure to people. From this scrutiny, gelotophobes fear most the outcome of being laughed at by others (Titze, 1996). Also, as a result of this fear, gelotophobes tend to experience social withdrawal and paranoia toward other people’s attention (Titze, 1996). Participating in an embarrassing situation normally elicits feelings of remorse and mortification (Edelmann, 1987), which could be more intensely experienced by gelotophobes. A reason for these feelings of remorse is the possibility of being laughed at and/or negatively sanctioned for committing a socially inept act. Despite this possible response by others, people still do engage in intentional self-embarrassment. People who intentionally embarrass themselves are willing to put themselves in situations where they can be ridiculed for their actions, which is what gelotophobes try to avoid. Therefore:

H4: Gelotophobia will be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass self.

However, research on gelotophobia has only centered on this psychological condition’s effect on the individual (Titze, 1995, 1996, 1997). Hence, gelotophobes’ willingness to create
intentional other-embarrassment remains unclear. This paper seeks to explore the extent of the relationship between gelotophobia and the tendency to intentionally embarrass others. Thus, the question is posed:

RQ1: What is the relationship between gelotophobia and one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass other?
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CHAPTER 2. METHODS

Procedure

One hundred and thirty-nine students enrolled in Speech Communication classes at the University of Hawai`i at Manoa participated in the study (90 females, 48 males, 1 did not report any demographic data, \( M_{\text{age}} = 20.71 \) years, age range: 18-37 years, six participants did not complete the questionnaire and were removed from further analysis). Self-reported ethnic/cultural backgrounds of the participants included Asian (64, 46%), Black (6, 4.3%), Caucasian (20, 14.4%), Hispanic (2, 1.4%), Pacific Islander (7, 5%), Mixed (35, 25.2%), and Other (4, 2.9%). The college levels of participants were Seniors (36, 25.9%), Juniors (34, 24.5%), Sophomores (48, 34.5%), and Freshmen (20, 14.4%).

Instructors/professors in the Speech Department were notified about the research, and in turn, publicized the project for student participation; instructors/professors provided either extra credit or class participation points after students completed the study.

Before the survey was taken, participants were required to complete a consent form online. In this consent form, participants were introduced to the research study, and it was clearly stated here that the study was entirely voluntary and anonymous. Each participant was given a copy of the consent form for his/her records. The survey was accessed through SONA, a research participation site used by the Department of Speech at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. The survey took approximately 30 to 40 minutes to complete.

Measures

Six scales were used to assess participants’ traits and dispositions. Overall scale means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliabilities are found in Table 1.
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**Proclivity to intentionally embarrass others (PIE-other).** People’s tendency to deliberately embarrass others was measured using Sharkey and Hamilton’s (2009, 2011) PIE-other scale. The PIE-other scale was developed based on real-life scenarios reported by participants. This scale was shown to possess high content (Sharkey & Hamilton, 2009) and construct (Sharkey & Hamilton, 2011) validities as well as reliabilities between $\alpha = .94$ and .96, respectively. For this study, the scale reliability for PIE-other was $\alpha = .95$ ($M = 3.36, SD = .94$). Fifty items were rated on a 7-point Likert type scale ($1 = Extremely Unlikely and 7 = Extremely Likely$) (see Appendix B for the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others’ scale).

**Proclivity to intentionally embarrass self (PIE-self).** People’s tendency to deliberately embarrass themselves was measured using Sharkey and Hamilton’s (2011) PIE-self scale. The PIE-self scale was developed based on real-life scenarios reported by participants. This scale was shown to possess high content (Sharkey & Hamilton, 2009) and construct (Sharkey & Hamilton, 2011) validities as well as reliabilities of $\alpha = .95$ and .96, respectively. Fifty items were rated on a 7-point Likert type scale ($1 = Extremely Unlikely and 7 = Extremely Likely$). For this study, the scale reliability for PIE-self was $\alpha = .96$ ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.07$). (see Appendix E for the proclivity to intentionally embarrass self scale).

**Machiavellianism.** Machiavellianism was measured using Christie and Geis’s (1970) Mach IV Scale. The Mach IV scale was developed to evaluate a person's tendency to deceive and manipulate other people for personal gain. Twenty items were rated on a 7-point Likert type scale ($1 = Disagree Strongly and 7 = Agree Strongly$). Some items included in this scale are “Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so,” “It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance,”
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“When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight,” (reverse recoded) “It is possible to be good in all respects,” (reverse recoded), and so on. A number of studies have found the scale to hold convergent and discriminant validities (see Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991) with reliabilities between \( \alpha = .67 \) and .75 (Christie & Geis, 1970; Liu, 2008; Steenhaut & Kenhove, 2006). Using PASW Statistics v18.0 (2010), a reliability analysis was conducted to check scale reliability. The analysis revealed that nine items needed to be dropped from the Mach IV scale to increase reliability. The reliability of the Mach IV scale after the items were dropped was \( \alpha = .69 \) \((M = 4.61, SD = .88)\) (see Appendix C for scale items).

Communication Apprehension. Communication apprehension was measured using McCroskey’s (1993) personal report of communication apprehension (PRCA-24) scale. The PRCA-24 scale was created to measure individuals’ fear of communicating with others. This scale measures both state and trait communication apprehension. However, this paper only utilized the trait communication apprehension aspect of the scale. Twenty-four items were rated on a 5-point Likert type scale \((1 = \text{Strongly Agree and } 5 = \text{Strongly Disagree})\). Some items included in the scale are, “Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions,” “I am afraid to express myself at meetings,” “Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations,” “My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech,” and so on. Researchers have found that the scale exhibits construct and criterion-related validities (see Rubin, Palmgreen, & Sypher, 1994) with reliabilities between \( \alpha = .93 \) and .96 (Long, Fortney, & Johnson, 2000; McCroskey & Richmond, 1995). For this study, the scale reliability for communication apprehension was \( \alpha = .95 \) \((M = 3.17, SD = .78)\) (see Appendix D for scale items).
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**Social Desirability.** Social desirability was evaluated using Crowne and Marlowe’s (1960) social desirability scale. The social desirability scale was created to assess a person’s need to be viewed favorably by others. Participants rated thirty-three items either true or false. Items included in the scale are “On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability,” “There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right,” “I don’t find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people,” “I have never felt that I was punished without cause,” and so on. Several researchers have found the scale to hold convergent and discriminant validities (see Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991) with reliabilities between $\alpha = .75$ and $\.88$ (Loo & Loewen, 2004; Miotti & Pretti, 2008). Using PASW Statistics v18.0 (2010), a reliability analysis was conducted to check scale reliability. The analysis revealed that thirteen items needed to be dropped from the social desirability scale to increase reliability. The reliability of the social desirability scale after the items were dropped was $\alpha = .73$ ($M = .54, SD = .19$) (see Appendix F for scale items).

**Gelotophobia.** Gelotophobia was measured using Ruch and Proyer’s (2008b) Gelotophobia (GELOPH) scale. The GELOPH scale was constructed to assess a person’s fear of being laughed at. Fifteen items are rated on a 4-point scale ($1 = \text{Strongly Disagree}$ and $4 = \text{Strongly Agree}$). Items that were included in this scale include “I avoid showing myself in public because I fear that people could become aware of my insecurity and could make fun of me,” “I control myself strongly in order not to attract negative attention so I do not make a ridiculous impression,” “If someone has teased me in the past I cannot deal freely with him forever,” “Especially when I feel relatively unconcerned, the risk is high for me to attract negative attention and appear peculiar to others,” and so on. Several studies have found the scale to hold
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convergent and discriminant validities (Ruch, 2009; Ruch & Proyer, 2008) with reliabilities between $\alpha = .82$ and .89 (Platt, 2008; Platt & Ruch, 2009; Ruch & Proyer, 2009). For this study, the scale reliability for gelotophobia was $\alpha = .89$ ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .78$) (see Appendix G for the gelotophobia scale).
CHAPTER 3. RESULTS

A one-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test the relationship between all six variables. To answer the research question, a two-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation was used to analyze the relationship between gelotophobia and the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others (refer to Table 1 for the six variables’ standard deviations, means, correlations, and reliabilities).

Hypothesis 1(a) predicted that Machiavellianism would be positively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass others. The correlation between Machiavellianism and one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass others was not significant, \( r(136) = .01, p > .05 \). No relationship was found between respondents’ belief that people can be manipulated for personal gain and their proclivity to intentionally embarrass others.

Hypothesis 1(b) proposed that Machiavellianism would be positively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass oneself. The correlation between Machiavellianism and one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass oneself was not significant \( r(136) = -.03, p > .05 \). No relationship was found between respondents’ belief that people can be manipulated for personal gain and their proclivity to intentionally embarrass self.

Hypothesis 2(a) predicted that communication apprehension would be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass others. A significant negative correlation between communication apprehension and one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass others was found, \( r(136) = -.15, p < .05 \). Increases in the fear of communicating with others were correlated with reports of lower proclivity to intentionally embarrass others.
Hypothesis 2(b) expected that communication apprehension would be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass oneself. A significant negative correlation between communication apprehension and one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass oneself was found, $r(136) = -0.22$, $p < .01$. As respondents’ fear of communicating with others increased, their proclivity to embarrass themselves decreased.

Hypothesis 3(a) proposed that social desirability would be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass others. The hypothesis was not supported, $r(136) = -0.08$, $p > .05$. No relationship was found between respondents’ need to be accepted by others and their proclivity to intentionally embarrass others.

Hypothesis 3(b) expected that social desirability would be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass oneself. The correlation between social desirability and one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass oneself was significant, $r(136) = -0.15$, $p < .05$. As respondents’ need to be accepted by others increased, their proclivity to intentionally embarrass themselves decreased.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that gelotophobia would be negatively correlated with one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass oneself. The hypothesis was not supported, $r(136) = -0.04$, $p > .05$. No association was found between respondents’ fear of being laughed at and their proclivity to intentionally embarrass themselves.

The sole research question explored the extent to which there was a relationship between gelotophobia and one’s proclivity to intentionally embarrass others. The results revealed a non-significant correlation between gelotophobia and one’s proclivity to embarrass others $r(136) =$
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-.02, \( p > .05 \). No relationship was found between respondents’ fear of being laughed at and their proclivity to intentionally embarrass others.

**Post-hoc analysis.** Because no association was found between the gelotophobia and Machiavellian scales and the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others and self scales, a decision was made to: (a) confirm the factorial structure of the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others and self scales and (b) see if the second order factors (severe and mild) found in Sharkey and Hamilton’s (2011) research would differentiate between the various constructs discussed in this present study (i.e., Machiavellianism, communication apprehension, social desirability, & gelotophobia).

Confirmatory factor analyses (correlations between the scales’ first order facets and the scales’ second order factors) were conducted on the PIE-other and PIE-self scales. Results revealed that both scales contained two second-order factors each. These factors differed in terms of harshness of threat to face – mild and severe. These results mirrored Sharkey and Hamilton’s (2011) findings, confirming the factorial structure of the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others and self scales.

Using the four second-order factors (mild face threat PIE-other, severe face threat PIE-other, mild face threat PIE-self, & severe face threat PIE-self), a series of one-tailed Pearson product-moment correlations were used to determine the relationship between the factors and the four independent variables (see Table 1 for correlations between the variables). First, a significant negative correlation was found between communication apprehension and mild face threats for PIE-other, \( r(136) = -.17, p < .05 \); the more apprehensive respondents were in communicating, the less likely it would be for them to intentionally perform mild face-
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threatening acts that cause embarrassment for another person. No association was found between communication apprehension and the use of severe face threats to intentionally embarrass another, \( r(136) = -0.12, p > 0.05 \).

Second, a significant negative correlation was also found between communication apprehension and mild face threats, \( r(136) = -0.20, p < 0.01 \) and severe face threats for PIE-self, \( r(136) = -0.15, p < 0.01 \). Increases in communication apprehension led to reports of lower tendencies to intentionally embarrass self using both severe and mild face threats. (see appendixes B and E for items categorized under severe or mild face threats for the PIE-other and PIE-self scales, respectively).

Third, a significant negative correlation was also found between social desirability and severe face threat for PIE-self, \( r(136) = -0.17, p < 0.05 \), but no association was found between social desirability and mild self face threats, \( r(136) = -0.11, p > 0.05 \). The more respondents sought to be socially desirable, the less likely they were to intentionally perform severe face-threatening acts that caused themselves embarrassment.

Last, no associations were discovered between mild and severe face threats of other and self and Machavelianism and gelotophobia (see Table 1).
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CHAPTER 4. DISCUSSION

This study sought to test and extend Sharkey and Hamilton’s (2009) proclivity to intentionally embarrass scales by confirming their reliability and factorial structure while extending our understanding of intentional embarrassment by testing the two scales’ construct validity. Four scales (i.e., Machiavellian IV, communication apprehension, social desirability, & gelotophobia) were used to test the validity of the PIE-other and PIE-self scales.

The tests revealed that convergent validity was evident between the communication apprehension scale and the proclivity to intentionally embarrass others as well as the proclivity to intentionally embarrass self-scales. Convergent validity was also found between the social desirability scale and the proclivity to intentionally embarrass self-scale. To further support this finding, Sharkey and Hamilton (2011) reported that both the PIE-other and PIE-self scales did demonstrate convergent validities.

Further, the results of this study showed that Machiavellianism was not associated with the tendency to intentionally embarrass others and self. Machiavellianism was also not associated with the use of severe and mild face-threatening acts to intentionally embarrass others and self. This lack of relationship between the constructs could be attributed to low scale validity. Nine out of twenty scale items were dropped to increase scale reliability from $\alpha = .48$ to $\alpha = .69$. Having a significant number of items removed could have caused the scale to no longer measure what it was made to measure, which in turn could have influenced the results between Machiavellianism and the PIE-other and PIE-self scales.

Further, Machiavellians have a utilitarian approach to understanding human relationships. High Machiavellians employ a “me against the world” attitude and believe that people are to be
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manipulated for their (high Machiavellians) own gain (Christie & Geis, 1970). Being in a college setting, students are taught to be more considerate and compassionate towards others (Neely, Schallert, Mohammed, Roberts, & Chen, 2009). This form of learning tends to foster empathy - a disposition Machiavellians seem to lack (Durand & Nord, 1976). Because students learn to empathize with the plight of others (Courtwright, Mackey, & Packard, 2005), participants high in Machiavellianism were not prominent in the dataset. In fact, participants’ answers were centered on neutrality (see Table 1 for mean and standard deviation). Also, students might be less likely to use intentional embarrassment as a tool for malice and more likely to use intentional embarrassment to increase solidarity.

As discussed in previous literature, people tended to use intentional embarrassment as a tool to increase solidarity (Sharkey, 1991, 1992). Given that high Machiavellians are more likely to exploit others for personal gain (Ang & Williams, 2004), they would be less concerned with building group solidarity. Thus, the lack of association between Machiavellianism and intentional embarrassment could be explained by the notion that high Machiavellians would opt for means other than intentional embarrassment to achieve their primary goals.

Finally, the non-significant correlation between Machiavellianism and intentional embarrassment could also be attributed to the individualistic nature of the Machiavellian IV scale. In fact, the theory of Machiavellianism emphasizes personal gain, selfishness, and competitiveness at the expense of others (Ang & Williams, 2004, Liu, 2008). Given the strong Asian influence in Hawaii, people high in collectivism would probably not attest to these tendencies, which could then lead to low scores on the Machiavellian IV scale (Markus & Kitayama, 1994). In fact, people from collectivistic cultures tend to emphasize strong interdependence and sensitivity toward others (Kim, 2002, Markus & Kitayama, 1994), which
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are contrary to the characteristics of individuals high on Machiavellianism. This lack of concern for togetherness and the neutrality of participants’ answers could explain why Machiavellianism had no effect on a person’s tendency to intentionally embarrass others and self.

Despite the non-significant findings between the Machiavellian scale and the PIE-self and PIE-other scales, communication apprehension was found to be associated with the PIE-other scale. Although this correlation was significant, it is important to note that the effect size was small. Further post hoc analysis also indicated a significant negative correlation between communication apprehension and the use of mild face-threatening acts to intentionally embarrass others. Again, it is important to note that despite the significant correlation, the effect size was still relatively small. Mild face-threatening acts tend to be more private (e.g., discretely pointing out to a co-worker that s/he has food stuck in between his/her teeth, discretely telling a friend that s/he is wearing too much perfume/cologne, etc.) and if they are public, they tend to hold more positive valence compared to severe face-threatening acts (e.g., complimenting a friend on how good s/he looks, passionately hugging a significant other in public, etc.). Despite the positive nature of mild face-threatening acts, it seems that individuals high on communication apprehension are less likely to perform them. This aversion could be attributed to the notion that individuals high on communication apprehension avoid performing acts that could violate social expectations (Richmond & McCroskey, 1989). By pointing out to a co-worker his/her flaws in an argument, the individual could receive a negative response from the co-worker for further provoking the situation.

Other findings revealed a significant negative correlation between communication apprehension and PIE-self. Although this correlation was significant, it is important to note that the effect size was still relatively small. People who intentionally embarrass themselves do so at
Proclivity to Intentionally Embarrass Others and Self Scales

the expense of their presented self-identity. For example, by revealing information that is unflattering about oneself, one jeopardizes the agreed upon image s/he has created within the working consensus. This disruption to the working consensus could lead to negative responses from other interactants. Because people high in communication apprehension try to avoid negative evaluations and being the center of attention (Withers & Vernon, 2006), it would be unlikely that they would employ intentional self-embarrassment.

Further post hoc analysis indicated a significant negative correlation between communication apprehension and the use of severe and mild face-threatening acts to intentionally embarrass oneself. Again, it is important to note that despite the significant correlation, the effect size was still relatively small. Severe face-threatening acts tend to be more public in nature, such as acting in an incompetent manner or complimenting oneself in the presence of other people. Mild face-threatening acts (e.g., telling a funny story about oneself, admitting a mistake to someone else), on the other hand, tend to be used to manage one’s impressions through self-disclosing, confessing, or explaining some past embarrassing event, a personal characteristic, or making fun of one’s shortcomings. Given that mild face-threatening acts can work for or against the individual, it is understandable as to why individuals low on communication apprehension might still choose to not engage in these acts of intentional self-embarrassment. Therefore, individuals high on communication apprehension who shy away from situations where they could be at the center of attention (Withers & Vernon, 2006) would be less likely to perform any intentional embarrassment acts that could threaten their face, regardless of the severity of the acts. For instance, by cutting wind in front of another person (severe face threat) or pointing out a personal flaw to a friend (mild face threat) individuals are still placing themselves at the forefront for attention - a situation individuals high on communication
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apprehension strive to avoid. Additionally, due to their introversion and lack of composure when interacting with others (Richmond & McCroskey, 1989), people high in communication apprehension would be less likely to create an embarrassing encounter for themselves due to their lack of ability to effectively recover from the loss of face.

Next, results indicated no association between social desirability and PIE-other. This result could be attributed to participants’ feelings about intentional embarrassment. Participants could have both positive and negative feelings about intentional embarrassment. Some might have felt that by creating intentional embarrassment, they would receive positive evaluations (e.g., build group solidarity) while others could have been more apprehensive about creating intentional embarrassment due to the fear of negative evaluations (e.g., hostility from target). Because intentional embarrassment is such a contextual communicative event, it would be difficult for individuals high in social desirability to respond similarly throughout all scenarios (e.g., revealing one’s personal flaws to a friend may elicit negative evaluations from the friend, but it could also strengthen the friendship due to the disclosure). In support of this argument, Doss and Hubbard (2009) studied the relationship between public self-consciousness and the tattoo visibility. They found that those who looked to others for social acceptance but still wished to be tattooed tended to reveal their tattoo if positive evaluations were expected and hid the tattoos when negative responses were anticipated. This finding further strengthens the argument that embarrassors will either view the context as hostile or friendly to the intentional embarrassment, leading them to use such behaviors only in contexts in which they believe others will react in a positive fashion and avoid situations in which they believe targets will react negatively.
However, the results revealed a significant negative association between social desirability and the proclivity to intentionally embarrass oneself. Although the finding was significant, the effect size was negligible. This relationship could be attributed to the notion that individuals high on social desirability will exhibit low private self-consciousness (Marquis & Filiatrault, 2002), thus, causing them to evaluate their own actions based on societal standards. Individuals who desire social approval will be driven to maintain the working consensus. When individuals intentionally embarrass themselves, they are stepping out of their presented self-identity and disrupting the working consensus, which, in many cases, could lead to negative responses from other interactants. Due to the risk of receiving negative appraisals, individuals high on social desirability would be less likely to intentionally embarrass themselves.

Further analysis revealed that although the effect size was small, social desirability was negatively correlated with the use of severe face-threatening acts to intentionally embarrass oneself but not with mild self-face threats. These severe acts tend to place the person in highly embarrassing situations (e.g., mooning others, arguing with a significant other in the presence of others, deliberately tripping oneself, acting in a goofy way) in which the person’s presented self-identity, in most cases, would be questioned. It would be less likely for a person high in social desirability to intentionally create such situations for himself/herself due to their need to be accepted by others (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The same analysis suggested no relationship between respondents’ level of social desirability and their use of mild face-threatening acts to intentionally embarrass themselves. This lack of a relationship could be attributed to the fact that mild face-threatening acts consist of a decision to engage in impression management; the mild face threats are characterized by self-disclosing, confessing, or explaining some past embarrassing event, a personal characteristic, or making fun of one’s shortcomings; in essence,
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the information could work for or against the person. By using these mild embarrassing tactics (e.g., correcting a new acquaintance’s mispronunciation of one’s name, praising a significant other in front of others, and so on), individuals violate their presented self-identity, which, depending on the context, could lead to a myriad of responses from other interactants. Given the subjectivity of the use of intentional embarrassment, it would be difficult for people to respond in a consistent manner throughout all scenarios. Thus, a lack of association between social desirability and intentional mild self embarrassment tactics could imply that people have mixed attitudes toward intentional embarrassment and are careful in utilizing it due to the difficulty in discerning the valence of other interactants’ responses prior to the act.

Last, gelotophobia was not at all associated with respondents’ tendency to intentional embarrass others and themselves, regardless of the severity of the face threats. Being a psychological condition (Titze, 1995, 1996), gelotophobia could be a mental state that not too many people are diagnosed with. Given their extreme fear of being laughed at, gelotophobes tend to avoid exposure to people (Titze, 1996). In fact, participants’ responses were centered on “moderately disagree” with little variance, suggesting a lack of low and high gelotophobes. Consequently, if this study had located individuals with gelotophobic tendencies, associations may have been found (see Table 1 for mean and standard deviation).

Implications/Future studies

Given that only the communication apprehension and social desirability scales demonstrated some association with the PIE-other and PIE-self scales, it is important to note that prior construct validity was established for both the PIE-other and PIE-self scales (Sharkey & Hamilton, 2011). As such, the PIE-other and PIE-self scales did not fail the validity tests but
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rather were examined using scales of questionable validity (i.e., Social Desirability & Machiavellian scales). Additional research still needs to be conducted on both the PIE-other and PIE-self scales to test their validity. Future studies should utilize scales that are more current and thoroughly assessed to reduce the effects of possible low scale validity on the results.

Another possibility for the lack of association between the Machiavellian and gelotophobia scales with the PIE-other and PIE-self scales could be evidence of discriminant validity. It could be possible that Machiavellianism and gelotophobia are not at all pertinent traits in deciding whether or not people will intentionally embarrass themselves or others. Thus, the lack of findings between these scales and the PIE-other and PIE-self scales should not be disregarded but rather included in future research to partial out discriminant validity for the PIE-other and PIE-self scales.

Given that communication apprehension demonstrated the strongest link to the tendency to embarrass self and other (although not mild self embarrassments), it is reasonable to argue that some level of social confidence is required of embarrassors when carrying themselves within an interaction. As found by Sharkey and Hamilton (2011), people high in social anxiety are less likely to intentionally embarrass others and themselves. This finding coupled with the findings for communication apprehension suggest that to carry out an intentional embarrassment plan, embarrassors have to be communicatively competent and adept in maneuvering themselves through the norm-violating scenario. Due to the possibility of drawing attention toward the embarrassor and the possible negative social consequences that may follow, one also needs to be attentive to others’ responses and react swiftly to repair the working consensus. People who are apprehensive about communicating lack composure when interacting with others (Richmond & McCroskey, 1989), which could impair their ability to renegotiate the working consensus. Being
unable to restore this equilibrium in the working consensus, individuals could be alienated from the group. Considering that social confidence seems to be a key factor influencing the use of intentional embarrassment, future studies should uncover more traits of individuals who practice intentional embarrassment so that further assessments of these individuals can be made.

Also, culture should be taken into consideration when constructing future studies on intentional embarrassment. In assessing the results for this study, participants were found to have predominantly Asian backgrounds. Singelis, Bond, Sharkey, and Lai (1999) reported that Asians in Hawaii tended to display similar interdependent characteristics as Asians from Hong Kong. The same study also revealed cultural differences between Asians in Hawaii and United States’ mainland; Asians in Hawaii tended to value interdependence and collectivism more than the United States’ mainland who valued independence and individualism. The findings of this study could have been influenced by the respondents’ collectivistic and interdependent nature; therefore, it is important that future researchers include multiple purer cultures in their studies to increase the variability of face/identity concerns.

Limitations

The present study is limited in several respects. First, this study was limited only to college students from one university. This created a sampling bias that might have hindered generalizability of these findings. Future studies should include non-college student populations, such as working adults, high school students, professionals, and so on. Second, the sample was heavily biased towards Asians, who have been found to be more collectivistic and interdependent than, for example, mainland Americans (Singelis et. al., 1999). This posed another generalizability issue. To overcome this selection bias, future studies should include data from...
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the mainland population and other geographic areas that may provide more diversity of culture. Third, participant recruitment was limited to students in communication classes.

Fourth, a number of items from the Machiavellian IV and social desirability scales were thrown out to increase scale reliability. Granted that both scales were unidimensional, dropping the items pose a question for scale validity. Future research should utilize more reliable and current scales. Finally, there was a lack of variance among participants’ responses. This indicated that participants’ responses had limited range and were centered on the mean. Future studies should correct for these limitations to increase variability of the sample.

**Conclusion**

This study examined the validity of the PIE-other and PIE-self scales by correlating them with Machiavellian IV, communication apprehension, social desirability, and gelotophobia scales. Although most of the associations predicted did not pan out, it is still evident that people do practice intentional embarrassment. Despite coming to a working consensus in an interaction, people still, on occasion, violate this agreement by threatening another’s face or stepping out of their presented self-identity. When such disruptions occur, interactants will need to renegotiate their self-identities within the group through the use of facework and reestablish the working consensus (Goffman, 1967).

This study has confirmed the factorial structure of the PIE-scales, replicated the reliability of the scales, and extended the construct validity of the scales. Additionally, this project has added to our understanding of people who use intentional embarrassment. Through this study, we now know that people low on communication apprehension are more likely to intentionally embarrass others and use mild face-threatening acts to do so. Individuals low on
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communication apprehension are also more likely to intentionally embarrass themselves and are willing to use both severe and mild face-threatening acts to achieve their goals. Finally, people low on social desirability are more likely to intentionally embarrass themselves but are less likely to use severe face-threatening acts to do so.

In conclusion, this study paints a clearer profile of an intentional embarrassor and should serve as a stepping-stone towards further understanding of the dispositions of individuals who practice intentional embarrassment and the role of intentional embarrassment within the working consensus.
Table 1

Correlations of PIE-other and PIE-self scales with Social Desirability, Gelotophobia, Machiavellian, and Communication Apprehension scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PIE-self</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PIE-oth</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sev self</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mil self</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sev oth</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.96**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mil oth</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Soc des/</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gelot</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mach</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Com A</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, two-tailed

Notes.  Sev self = Severe self, Mil self = Mild self, Sev oth = Severe other, Mil oth = Mild other, Soc dec = Social desirability, Gelot = Gelotophobia, Mach = Machiavellian, Com A = Communication apprehension

Two-tailed correlations are reported for the associations between Gelotophobia and PIE-other, Severe other, & Mild other.

/ = Dichotomous variable

Reliabilities are along the diagonal
APPENDIX A

Agreement to participate in Proclivity to Intentionally Embarrass Study

Your participation is being requested for an online research study regarding “Scale development for the proclivity to intentionally embarrass (PIE) instrument,” which is being conducted to fulfill thesis requirements for a Master’s degree at the University of Hawai`i at Manoa. We are developing a self-report scale that will be used to measure a person’s tendency to knowingly embarrass others or her/himself. We believe that there is little or no risk to you by participating in this research project. Simply, you are being asked to answer each of the questions provided to the best of your ability; however, if you feel a question is too personal/sensitive, you may skip it and move on to the next question. When you reach the end of the survey, simply click “submit questionnaire” and a page thanking you for your participation will appear. Filling out the questionnaire should take you 20-30 minutes to complete.

Your responses to the questionnaire items will remain anonymous. At no time will your answers be associated with your name, and the data will only be summarized into broad categories. Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law. Agencies with such oversight, such as the UH Committee on Human Studies, have the authority to review research data.

If you are interested in the results of this project, please contact the principal researcher (listed above) for information about the status of the project.

You will receive research credit or extra-credit in your class in exchange for your participation if your instructor has previously agreed to provide research or extra-credit. If you would receive research or extra-credit in exchange for your participation, you can get an equivalent amount of credit by doing an alternative research project should you choose not to participate in this study, or if you withdraw before completion of the online questionnaire. To receive this credit should you decide to withdraw, simply print a second copy of this form, write your name on it, and provide this copy to your instructor.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Michelle Koo by phone at (808)956-3319 or via email at mkoo@hawaii.edu. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a study participant, please contact the UH Committee on Human Studies at (808)956-5007, or uhirb@hawaii.edu.

I have read and understand the above information, certify that I am at least 18 years old, and agree to participate in this study.

Click Yes or No
APPENDIX B

Proclivity to Intentionally Embarrass Other Scale

Directions: During our lives, we have all been embarrassed at one time or another. Many of these embarrassing moments were created because of unintentional actions; for example, you may slip and fall, call someone by the wrong name, accidentally walk in on someone using a bathroom, forget someone’s birthday, or someone may walk in on you while you are singing in front of a mirror, and so on. At other times, however, people say or do things that they know will cause someone embarrassment. Below are a number of behaviors that people have reported using even though they knew the behaviors would embarrass another person (a co-worker, a friend, a stranger, a significant other, a superior, a subordinate, a family member, and so on).

Knowing that your behavior would embarrass another person, please indicate how likely it would be that you would act in the ways listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my family member, I would sing happy birthday to her/him while in a crowded restaurant.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass a friend, I would pull a chair out from under this person while she/he was trying to sit on it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would laugh at a piece of artwork she/he created.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my parent, I would throw her/him a surprise party.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would comment on how her/his clothes did not match well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would pull her/him aside and tell my friend that the zipper on her/his jeans was down.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my sibling, I would retell an embarrassing story about her/him to a group of her/his friends.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my significant other, I would tease her/him in front of family members about how she/he blushes a lot.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my significant other, with her/him present, I would show a mutual friend a naked baby picture of my significant other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass her/him, I would walk-in</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(s) on a friend of the opposite sex who was using the toilet.

11. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would compliment him/her on how good he/she looked. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. Knowing that doing so would embarrass a co-worker, if we were having a conflict, I would point out her/his faulty argument. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. Knowing that doing so would embarrass him/her, if a new acquaintance forgot my name, I would point it out to him/her. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Knowing that doing so would embarrass my younger sibling, at home, I would give her/him a wedgy (pulling up on her/his underpants so that they would ride up her/his butt crack). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Knowing that doing so would embarrass a new acquaintance, I would correct his/her mispronunciation of my name. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my significant other, I would praise her/him in front of others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my significant other, I would passionately hug him/her in public. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, if my friend forgot her/his house keys, I would tease her/him about it. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my parent, I would make fun of the fact that she/he put a t-shirt on backwards. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Knowing that doing so would embarrass those people present, I would tell an explicit sex joke in front of a group of males and females. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, while in her/his presence, I would tell a secret about her/him to another friend. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my significant other, I would send a “strip-o-gram” (i.e., a company sends a stripper) to her/his birthday party. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, while with a group of friends, I would tell my friend that he/she had bad breath. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Knowing that doing so would embarrass my sibling, I would try to make him/her laugh so hard that his/her drink would be expelled though his/her nose. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. Knowing that doing so would embarrass an acquaintance, I would reveal a piece of embarrassing information I know about him/her. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Knowing that doing so would embarrass a co-worker, I would discreetly point out that he/she had a piece of food stuck between his/her teeth. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, after finding out that she/he told a lie about me, I would accuse her/him of lying.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my family members, I would act goofy while in public with them.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, while with a group of friends, I would announce that she/he just cut wind (farted).  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. Knowing that doing so would embarrass an acquaintance, I would discreetly point out that he/she had a stain on his/her shirt/blouse.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my significant other, I would dance in a funny way around others.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would send a singing telegram to her/him while she/he was at work.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would wear an article of clothing that she/he did not like.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34. Knowing that doing so would embarrass the person I’m having a conflict with, I would point out that his/her facts were wrong.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. Knowing that doing so would embarrass a friend, in the presence of others, I would announce that my friend’s undergarment (i.e., underwear) was showing.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would de-pant him/her (pull down his/her pants or swimming suit) in front of a couple of other friends.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my significant other, I would passionately kiss her/him in public.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would jump out from behind a door to scare her/him.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
39. Knowing that doing so would embarrass the guest of honor, I would give her/him a sexy gag gift.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
40. Knowing that doing so would embarrass an acquaintance, while with a group of friends, I would announce that toilet paper was hanging from his/her pants.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
41. Knowing that doing so would embarrass her, I would throw cold water on a female friend who was wearing a white t-shirt and no bra.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
42. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, with my friend present, I would reveal to person “B” that my friend had a crush on her/him.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
43. Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would joke  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my co-worker, if she/he were to act like a “know-it-all”, I would ask this person a question that she/he would not know the answer to.</td>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, while at a party, I would ask her/him to stand and perform (i.e., sing, dance, tell a joke or story, etc.)</td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, if I thought she/he was wearing too much perfume/cologne, I would tell her/him discretely.</td>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend “A”, with “A” present, I would tell another friend about one of “A”的 bad personal habits (e.g., picking of nose, biting of nails, etc.).</td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, while with one or more other people, I would sing loudly.</td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my friend, I would point out that her/his pants’ crotch was ripped.</td>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so would embarrass my family member, I would trip him/her as he/she walked by me.</td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (s) = severe, (m) = mild
APPENDIX C

Machiavellian IV Scale

Directions: Listed below are a number of statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with such matters of opinion.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meaning are indicated below.

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then circle the appropriate number in front of the statement. Give your opinion on every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, use the one which is closest to the way you feel.

7 = Agree Strongly, 6 = Agree Somewhat, 5 = Agree Slightly,
3 = Disagree Slightly, 2 = Disagree Somewhat, 1 = Disagree Strongly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.*</td>
<td>Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.*</td>
<td>The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (r)</td>
<td>One should take action only when sure it is morally right.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (r)</td>
<td>Most people are basically good and kind.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.*</td>
<td>It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (r)</td>
<td>Honesty is the best policy in all cases.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (r)</td>
<td>There is no excuse for lying to someone else.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.*</td>
<td>Generally speaking, men won’t work hard unless they’re forced to do so.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (r)</td>
<td>All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (r)</td>
<td>When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. (r)</td>
<td>Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.*</td>
<td>Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.*</td>
<td>The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that the criminals are stupid enough to get caught.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. (r)</td>
<td>Most men are brave.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>It is wise to follow important people.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.(r)</td>
<td>It is possible to be good in all respects.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.(r)</td>
<td>Barnum was wrong when he said that there’s a sucker born every minute.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.*</td>
<td>It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.*</td>
<td>People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.*</td>
<td>Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (r) = reverse scored, * = dropped items
APPENDIX D

Communication Apprehension Scale

Directions: This instrument is composed of 24 statements concerning your feelings about communication with other people. Please indicate in the space provided the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Are Undecided, (4) Disagree, (5) Strongly Disagree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Many of the statements are similar to other statements. Do not be concerned about this. Work quickly, just record your first impression.

1. I dislike participating in group discussions.
2. (r) Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions.
3. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.
4. (r) I like to get involved in group discussion.
5. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.
6. (r) I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.
7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.
8. (r) Usually I am calm and relaxed while participating in meetings.
9. (r) I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.
10. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.
11. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable.
12. (r) I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.
13. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.
14. (r) I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.
15. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.
16. (r) Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.
17. (r) While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.
18. I’m afraid to speak up in conversations.
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19. (r) I have no fear of giving a speech.
20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
21. (r) I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.
23. (r) I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
24. While giving a speech I get so nervous, I forget facts I really know.

Note. (r) = reverse scored
APPENDIX E

Proclivity to Intentionally Embarrass Self Scale

**Directions:** During our lives, we have all been embarrassed at one time or another. Many of these embarrassing moments were created because of unintentional actions; for example, you may slip and fall, call someone by the wrong name, accidentally walk in on someone using a bathroom, forget someone’s birthday, or someone may walk in on you while you are singing in front of a mirror, and so on. At other times, however, **people say or do things that they know will cause themselves embarrassment**; that is, knowing that they will embarrass themselves, they will act in certain ways. Below are a number of behaviors that people have reported using to intentionally embarrass themselves.

_Knowing that your behavior would be embarrassing to yourself, please indicate how likely it would be that you would act in the ways listed below._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would try to deliberately trip myself in front of others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would loudly argue with someone in public.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would ask a friend to forgive a mistake I made.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would act in an incompetent manner around others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would reveal embarrassing information about myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would call attention to the fact that my pant’s zipper was down.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would point out that I had forgotten something.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would dress up like a person of the opposite sex for a party.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would explain to others a mistake that I made.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, while with a number of co-workers, I would announce that I received an award.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would make fun of what I was wearing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would tell a non-flattering story about myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, while with a person who was acting silly, I would encourage her/him to continue acting silly.

14. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would compliment myself in front of others.

15. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would act silly in front of others.

16. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would criticize myself in front of friends.

17. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, while talking with a new acquaintance, I would apologize that I could not remember her/his name.

18. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would show a funny picture of myself to a friend.

19. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would call out to a friend in public.

20. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would tell my significant other about a bad decision that I made in the past.

21. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, while with a group of friends, I would pretend that I was drunk.

22. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, if someone were to walk in on me while I was naked, I would joke about it afterward.

23. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, while with people I know, I would pretend that I was an animal of some kind.

24. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would make fun of a mistake I made.

25. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would confess to an acquaintance that I forgot how to get to a location I have frequented many times.

26. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would point out one of my personal flaws to a friend.

27. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would act goofy at a party.

28. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would walk in a silly manner while walking with my significant other.

29. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would talk to a sibling about a sexual encounter I had.

30. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would trip
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(s) myself in front of friends.

31. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would tell a funny story about myself in front of friends. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would compliment myself in front of others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, while in the presence of family members, I would style my hair into funny shapes. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would make my voice sound like a cartoon character. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would admit to someone that I was not paying attention to what she/he was saying. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would insult a person in public who just insulted me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would streak (i.e., run naked in front of others). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would cut wind in front of a person I know (i.e., fart). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would admit to someone that I was wrong. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would tell someone about a situation I was in that I am not proud of. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, while others were in line, I would argue with a cashier about incorrect change. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would ask someone to lend me money. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would “moon” others (i.e., pull my pants down and show my buttocks). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would yell to a family member in a store. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would dance with a recent acquaintance who was dancing in an odd/silly fashion. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would ask someone out on a date. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

47. Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, while singing karaoke, I would try to sing a song I really didn’t know the words to. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, on a dare, I would dance in a sexually provocative manner in front of friends.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, I would make goofy/silly faces at someone.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Knowing that doing so I would embarrass myself, while with friends, I would belch loudly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: (s) = severe, (m) = mild*
**APPENDIX F**  
Social Desirability Scale

Directions: Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>encouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I have never intensely disliked anyone.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am always careful about my manner of dress.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>would probably do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too little of my ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I like to gossip at times.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>authority even though I knew they were right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I can remember “playing sick” to get out of something.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>There have been occasion when I took advantage of someone.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I always try to practice what I preach.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I don’t find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed,</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obnoxious people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>When I don’t know something I don’t at all mind admitting it.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wrongdoings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I never resent being asked to return a favor.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I have never felt that I was punished without cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. *</td>
<td>I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * = dropped items
APPENDIX G

Gelotophobia Scale

Directions: The following statements refer to your feelings, actions, and perceptions in general. Please try as much as possible to describe your habitual behavior patterns and attitudes by marking an X through one of the four alternatives. Please use the following scale:

(1) strongly disagree (2) moderately disagree (3) moderately agree (4) strongly agree

For example
I am a cheerful person.......................................................................................................................(1) (2) (3) (4)

If you strongly agree with this statement, that is, if you are in general a cheerful person, mark an X through (4). If you strongly disagree, that is, if you are habitually not cheerful at all, mark an X through (1). If you have difficulty answering a question, pick the response that most applies.

Please answer every question, do not omit any.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>When others laugh in my presence I get suspicious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I avoid showing myself in public because I fear that people could become aware of my insecurity and could make fun of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>When strangers laugh in my presence I often relate it to me personally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It is difficult for me to hold eye contact because I fear being assessed in a disparaging way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>When others make joking remarks about me I feel being paralyzed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I control myself strongly in order not to attract negative attention so I do not make a ridiculous impression.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I believe that I make involuntarily a funny impression on others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Although I frequently feel lonely, I have the tendency not to share social activities in order to protect myself from derision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>When I have made an embarrassing impression somewhere, I avoid the place thereafter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>If I did not fear making a fool of myself I would speak much more in public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>If someone has teased me in the past I cannot deal freely with him forever.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>It takes me very long to recover from having been laughed at.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>While dancing I feel uneasy because I am convinced that those watching me assess me as being ridiculous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Especially when I feel relatively unconcerned, the risk is high for me to attract negative attention and appear peculiar to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>When I have made a fool of myself in front of others I grow completely stiff and lose my ability to behave adequately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H
Demographic Questionnaire

Please provide the following demographic information:

1. What is your age? ____________

2. What is your sex? Male  Female (Please circle one)

3. Please indicate the culture/ethnicity that you most identify with. If you prefer to be identified as a combination of two or more groups please write them all down.

_____________________________________________________________________

4. To what extent do you identify with your ethnic/cultural background?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. What is your class standing (ex. sophomore, junior etc.)? ____________________________
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