

Validation of the slovene version of The Self-Consciousness Scale

Andreja Avsec and Boštjan Bajec*
University of Ljubljana, Department of Psychology, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Abstract: The objective of this study was to examine the validity and reliability of the Slovene version of the Self-Consciousness Scale SCS (Fenigstein, Carver, & Buss, 1975). Although the questionnaire was translated and published in *Psihodiagnostika osebnosti* (Lamovec, 1994), its psychometric characteristics have not been examined so far. Results on a sample of 361 students (189 men and 172 women) showed that the Slovene version of the questionnaire had factor validity and reliability comparable to those found in the English version. In general, the results supported three-factor solution proposed by the authors. However, some of the items in the subscales did not load as expected and alternative translations for two of the items are proposed.

Key Words: Self-Consciousness, test construction

Validacija slovenske verzije Vprašalnika samozavedanja

Andreja Avsec in Boštjan Bajec
Univerza v Ljubljani, Oddelek za psihologijo, Ljubljana

Povzetek: Namen raziskave je bil preveriti veljavnost in zanesljivost slovenskega prevoda Vprašalnika samozavedanja SCS (Self-Consciousness Scale; Fenigstein, Carver in Buss, 1975). Kljub temu, da je bil vprašalnik preveden in objavljen v knjigi *Psihodiagnostika osebnosti* (Lamovec, 1994), njegove merske karakteristike še niso bile preverjene. Rezultati na vzorcu 361 dijakov in študentov (189 moških in 172 žensk) kažejo podobno konstruktno veljavnost in zanesljivost, kot je značilna za originalno, angleško obliko. Na splošno rezultati komponentne analize podpirajo delitev postavk v tri lestvice (zasebno samozavedanje, javno samozavedanje in socialna anksioznost), nekaj postavk pa se ni grupiralo glede na predvidevanja, zato menimo, da je vsaj pri dveh izmed njih vzrok v neprimernem prevodu.

Ključne besede: samozavedanje, sestava testov

CC= 2223

* Naslov / Address: doc. dr. Andreja Avsec, Univerza v Ljubljani, Oddelek za psihologijo, Aškerčeva 2, 1000 Ljubljana, tel.: +386 1 241 11 74, fax.: +386 1 42 59 301, e-mail: andreja.avsec@psiha.net

The experimental research of self-consciousness in social psychology started with Duval and Wicklund's theory of objective self-awareness (1972), with the main idea that in one single moment, the individual can direct his attention either toward self or toward environment. In this article, interindividual differences in frequency of directing our attention toward self are of central interest. Some individuals constantly think about their selves, analyze their behaviour, feelings, ideas... On the other hand there are individuals with such lack of self-awareness that they are not aware of their motives and how they are perceived by others. From the cognitive perspective we could say that people differ in their complexity of self-schemata (Carver & Scheier, 1992). Some individuals possess different aspects of themselves that are not connected to each other. For every role they play in their lives, for every goal, for every activity in which they participate, a separate self-schema in their self-concept exists. Those individuals have high self-complexity. In others, different aspects of selves are less separated. Higher self-complexity is related to time we spend focusing our attention to ourselves. Results indicate that people, who report frequent thinking about themselves, possess more complex self-schemata than those who think about themselves less frequently (Carver & Scheier, 1992).

A person can at a particular time focus attention to private or public self-aspects. Private self-awareness is considered a psychical state of awareness of those aspects of one's self that can only be perceived by him and are hidden for the others. Such aspects are subjective feelings and thoughts, goals, intentions, motives, values etc. On the other hand, public self-awareness is psychical state in which an individual is attentive to those aspects of his self that can also be perceived by others, such as his appearance, talking, expressions of emotions. When we think about how other people perceive us, when we observe our reflection in a great mirror in a store, when we train a conclusion of a phone call before we even called, we focus our attention to public aspects of ourselves.

For observation of intra-individual differences in dispositional tendencies of focusing attention to one's self, Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975) constructed The Self-consciousness Scale (SCS). Despite critiques about its factor validity, SCS is practically the only questionnaire used by researchers to measure self-consciousness. In clinical assessment some others appear (for example Ruminative Responses Scale RRS, Nolen-Hoeksema & Morrow, 1991; Treynor, Gonzales & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2003), but they are more specific and are not used as an alternative to SCS. Creation of items of SCS was based on characteristics that should be, according to theory, typical for individuals with high level of self-consciousness: preoccupation with past, present, or future behaviour, recognition of one's own positive and negative traits, sensitivity for inner feelings, introspective behaviour, tendency to visualise oneself, awareness of appearance and self-presentation style, worry about evaluation by others. On the basis of these characteristics 38 items were formed. With factor analysis three factors were extracted and the number of items was reduced to 23. The questionnaire measures three constructs on three subscales: Private Self-

Consciousness (PrSC), Public Self-Consciousness (PuSC) and Social Anxiety (SA) that represents worrying about behaviour in social situations. The SCS was translated to Slovene by Tanja Lamovec (1994) for the research purposes.

Different studies dealt with validity of the questionnaire and majority of them confirmed three-factor structure, proposed by authors (Bernstein, Teng, & Garbin, 1986; Britt, 1992; Scheier & Carver, 1985). Original three-factor structure was also found in translations to other languages, such as Spanish (Banos, Belloch, & Perpina, 1990), Italian (Comunian, 1994), German (Heinemann, 1979), Swedish (Nystedt & Smari, 1989), Chinese (Shek, 1994) and Estonian (Realo & Allik, 1998). However results of studies are not consistent – some of them found also two-, four- or even five-factor solutions (Anderson, Bohon, & Berrigan, 1996; Bumkrant & Page, 1984; Chang, 1998; Mittal & Balasubramanian, 1987; Piliavin & Charng, 1988; Ruganci, 1995).

Many studies dealt with relations between PrSC and processing of information about oneself. People who often focus attention toward themselves possess more self-knowledge (Carver & Scheier, 1992) and they have more detailed and stable self-schemata (Nasby, 1985, 1989a, 1989b) which are easily recalled (Mueller, 1982; Turner, 1978b). That enables more effective processing of information, so we can expect that that these people describe themselves more consistently and reliably. Results show that people with higher level of self-awareness really exhibit greater consistency between their self-descriptions and actual behaviour (Carver, 1975; Scheier, Buss, & Buss, 1978; Smith & Schaffer, 1986; Turner, 1978a), description of others (Franzoi, 1983; Gibbons et al., 1985) and objective standards (Gibbons et al., 1985). In another study (Scheier et al., 1978) results on self-descriptive questionnaire of aggression was compared with aggressive behaviour in experimental situation. Results confirmed high correlation between self-description and actual behaviour in individuals with high PrSC ($r = .66$) compared to individuals with low self-consciousness – their self-descriptions were not correlated with actual behaviour ($r = .09$). Researchers also confirmed higher internal consistency of self-evaluation for individuals with higher self-consciousness (Siegrist, 1996). Siegrist claims that at least two different explanations of such results are possible. The first is consistent with the finding that people with higher self-consciousness have better self-knowledge. The second one is that people differ in motivation: persons with higher self-consciousness could have more interest in filling in the questionnaires.

Attending to one's self is also connected with more effective self-regulation. Carver, Scheier and co-workers (for review see Carver and Scheier, 1982, 1990) conducted several studies that confirmed higher consistency between someone's behaviour with standards of behaviour that is important to him. That brings higher possibility for achieving one's goals. People with higher levels of self-consciousness are less suggestible since they are connected to feelings about their inner state (Gibbons, Carver, Scheier, & Hormuth, 1979; Scheier, Carver, & Gibbons, 1979). Mullen and Suls (1982) also discovered that higher level of self-consciousness of inner states

enables individual to cope with stress more effectively and therefore he is less exposed to illness. PrSC is also related to openness to experience (McCrae, 1993; Realo & Allik, 1998; Trapnell & Campbell, 1999; Zuckerman, Kuhlman, Joireman, Teta, & Kraft, 1993).

According to the theory individuals with high self-consciousness should be more satisfied with their life and should be more psychologically healthy: self-knowledge should lead to better psychical adaptation. If one knows himself better, he also knows what he wants to become and achieve, so he strives to improve himself and to achieve desired goals. But studies report that attending to one's self can bring negative cognitive and affective consequences. Specifically, anxiety, especially social anxiety is related to higher PuSC and depression is related to higher PrSC (Gibbons, 1990; Ingram, 1990; Mor & Winquist, 2002; Reeves, Watson, Ramsey, & Morris, 1995). Based on these results, it is not surprising that PrSC correlates with neuroticism (McCrae, 1993; Trapnell & Campbell, 1999) although Scandell (1998) reports that when controlling for PuSC the correlation is not significant any longer. PrSC is also related to lower self-esteem (Turner, Scheier, Carver, & Ickes, 1978; Watson, Hickman, Morris, Stutz, & Whiting, 1994).

Studies in clinical setting most often focused on damaging consequences of focusing attention to specific negative emotional states. Such an example can be an individual that thinks about his tiredness and lack of motivation, worries about effects of those symptoms on his work, and passively ruminates on everything wrong in his life that could be the cause of his temporary state. Individuals like this are worried about causes and effects of their depression but they do not act to change this situation. Majority of their time is spent on rumination about their bad feelings (Lyubomirsky, Caldwell, & Nolen-Hoeksema, 1998; Nolen-Hoeksema, 1991). A lot of empirical studies show that individuals who ruminate when feeling depressed, experience longer and more difficult periods of depressive states comparing to those that do not think about their negative emotions exaggeratedly (Lyubomirsky & Nolen-Hoeksema, 1993, 1995; Nolen-Hoeksema, Morrow, & Fredrickson, 1993; Nolen-Hoeksema, Parker, & Larson, 1994; Wood, Saltzberg, Neale, Stone, & Rachmiel, 1990).

Dividing self-consciousness into constructive and destructive aspects could resolve this contrast between the theory and empirical results, so-called self-absorption paradox. Quite some studies report about the four factors of the questionnaire SCS (for examples see Nystedt & Ljungberg, 2002; Trapnell & Campbell, 1999) and some analyses of discriminative validity confirmed it was plausible to divide PrSC scale into two components; the first one being self-reflectiveness (also called chronic self-analysis) and the second internal state awareness. Studies indicate that they are differently correlated with mild levels of psychopathology (Anderson et al., 1996), self-esteem (Watson et al., 1994; Conway & Giannopoulos, 1993), loneliness and self-efficacy (Watson, Milliron, & Morris, 1995), as well as with feelings of shame and guilt (Joireman, 2004), empathy (Joireman, Parrott, & Hammersla, 2002), and social anxiety (Watson, Morris, Ramsey, Hickman, & Waddell, 1996). In majority of

cases self-reflectiveness scale is related to negative outcomes while internal state awareness is related to positive ones.

Focusing attention toward public self-aspects is related to somewhat different psychological constructs than focusing attention toward private self-aspects. Individuals with highly expressed PuSC are very concerned about how they are seen by others and they exhibit higher conformity and give more wrong answers in perceptual tasks when under group pressure (Froming & Carver, 1981). They are more sensitive to rejection by others (Fenigstein, 1979) and are more concerned about their appearance (Miller & Cox, 1982). They change their behaviour to comply with partner's expectations more often and are more afraid of being evaluated negatively by their peers (Doherty & Schlenker, 1991). We could say that individuals with high PuSC use different self-presentational tactics to maximize social approval and minimize negative evaluation by others. However PuSC is not a synonym for social desirability. Turner et al. (1978) report statistically insignificant correlations between PuSC and Crowe-Marlow scale of social desirability in two different samples ($r = .06$ and $r = .01$). Froming and Carver (1981) also found non-significant correlations between those scales. Among five factors of personality PuSC correlates with extraversion and neuroticism (Trapnell & Campbell, 1999). Zuckerman et al. (1993) report also about significant correlations between PuSC and conscientiousness, and Scandell (1998) found correlation between PuSC and neuroticism.

The aim of this study was to verify metric characteristics of Slovene version of the SCS that had been translated for research purposes by Slovenian researcher Tanja Lamovec in 1994. Using component analysis we wanted to verify whether our data confirm the original three-factor structure or the personal self-consciousness should be divided to two separate scales as some of the studies report. We were also interested in construct validity. In accordance with previous studies we expected correlations between all of the SCS scales with neuroticism and PrSC with openness. The major impact on the latter should have items that measure cognitive motivation of an individual. Despite theory that assumes positive correlation between the SCS scales and measures of psychological well-being, we expected negative correlation with self-esteem and satisfaction with life, since previous studies do not support theoretical assumptions.

Method

Participants

361 participants (189 male and 172 female) participated in the study. Most of them (259) were pupils (141 male and 118 female) of the fourth high-school grade (gymnasium, electrical and mechanical engineering, economic and administrative school) and 102 of them were students (48 male and 54 female) of the first year at

Faculty of Sport and Faculty of Arts (pedagogic and andragogic studies). They were between 18 and 22 years of age ($M = 19.2$, $SD = 0.7$).

Instruments

Self-Consciousness Scale (Fenigstein et al., 1975) consists of 23 items, 10 of them referring to PrSC scale, 7 to PuSC scale and 6 to SA scale. In every item respondents must choose degree of agreement with an item, using 5-point scale (where 0 means *strongly disagree* and 4 means *strongly agree* – we decided not to change the scale used in the English version of the SCS). Three items are scored reversely. Reliability of scales in the course of time was observed (Fenigstein et al., 1975) with a two-week interval between measurements. Test-retest correlations were .84 for PuSC scale, .79 for PrSC scale and .73 for SA scale. Coefficients of internal consistency ranged between .63 and .75 for PrSC scale, between .76 and .84 for public self-consciousness scale, and between .68 and .79 for SA scale (Anderson et al., 1996; Bernstein et al., 1986; Britt, 1992; Scheier & Carver, 1985).

Big Five Observer-S (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, Bucik, & Boben, 1997) is a scale for measurement of big five factors of personality. It comprises 40 bipolar adjectives, 8 for each of the dimensions: Energy, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability and Openness. Each pair of adjectives is evaluated on a 7-point scale, 1 meaning one extremity of the adjective and 7 the other one. Authors (Caprara et al., 1997) reported coefficients of internal consistency between .67 and .85 and appropriate factor structure of the questionnaire. In our sample, α coefficients ranged between .63 and .83.

Self-Concept Clarity Scale (SCC; Campbell, Trapnell, Heine, Katz, Lavalley, & Lehman, 1996) was made to measure the structural aspect of self-concept – degree of clarity, internal consistency, and stability of beliefs about one's self. It consists of 12 items. Participants respond on a 5-point scale to indicate their agreement with items (1 meaning *I completely disagree* and 5 *I completely agree*). Campbell et al. (1996) reported internal consistency coefficient $\alpha = .86$, while test-retest coefficients ranged between .70 and .79. Factor analysis showed one factor.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1989) was constructed to measure positiveness of a global evaluation of oneself. Scale consists of 10 items, 5 of them are scored reversely. Participants evaluate their agreement with each of the items on a 5-point scale (1 meaning *I completely disagree* and 5 *I completely agree*). Test-retest correlations ranged from .82 to .88 and Cronbach's alpha obtained on different samples ranged from .77 to .88 (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1993). Factor analyses confirmed one- as well as two-factor structure (self-confidence and self-deprecation). Internal consistency (α) in our sample was .88.

State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI X-2; Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970) measures anxiety as personality trait that is a general proneness of individual to perceive different situations as threatening and to respond to them with different level

of anxiety. The scale consists of 20 items. Participants use a 4-point scale (almost never, sometimes, often, and almost always) to indicate frequency of feelings described by each item. Seven of the items are scored reversely. Lamovec (1988) reported correlation .87 with Manifest anxiety scale (MAS), which is an indication of STAI X-2 validity. Internal consistency α in our sample equaled .88, however we must be careful when interpreting it, since scales used are at the ordinal level of measurement.

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) measures general satisfaction with life, cognitive aspect of satisfaction with life. Result obtained can be interpreted as individual's global evaluation of his quality of life, based on his personal criteria. The Scale consists of five items requiring response on a 7-point scale between 1 (entirely untrue) and 7 (entirely true). Pavot and Diener (1993) reported high coefficients of internal consistency (as ranging between .79 and .89) and stability in time (test-retest correlations ranging between .50 and .84). In our sample α equaled .83.

Procedure

Results were obtained in two separate studies. In the first one data in a sample of fourth high-school grade pupils were gathered. They also filled in other questionnaires. Because we conducted the study in two sessions which were two months apart, some of the pupils did not respond to all of the questionnaires (N ranged between 253 and 259). In the second study first-year students participated. Some other questionnaires were used in this study as well, and since it was also conducted in two different sessions some of the students did not respond to all of the questionnaires (only 68 of them filled in BFO).

Results

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and α coefficients of internal consistency for different scales of SCS which ranged between .76 and .79. The results are comparable to those, found in other studies (e.g. Nystedt & Smari, 1989;

Table 1. *Averages and standard deviations for Slovene sample of 361 students and pupils on SCS.*

Scale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis	α
PrSC	22.36	6.38	0.13	-0.28	.76
PuSC	16.48	5.24	-0.27	-0.17	.77
SA	11.48	5.21	0.16	-0.55	.79

Note. PrSC = Private Self-Consciousness; PuSC = Public Self-Consciousness; SA = Social Anxiety.

Table 2. Gender differences in Self-Consciousness Scale.

	Men			Women			Total		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
High school									
PrSC	19.77	6.02	136	23.07	6.73	118	21.30	6.56	254
PuSC	14.50	5.53	136	18.22	5.10	118	16.23	5.64	254
SA	10.34	4.67	136	12.53	5.74	118	11.36	5.30	254
Undergraduate									
PrSC	23.81	5.19	53	25.93	4.99	54	24.88	5.17	107
PuSC	15.94	3.76	53	18.22	4.11	54	17.09	4.09	107
SA	11.06	4.47	53	12.46	5.46	54	11.77	5.02	107
Total									
PrSC	20.90	6.06	189	23.97	6.36	172	22.36	6.38	361
PuSC	14.90	5.13	189	18.22	4.80	172	16.48	5.24	361
SA	10.54	4.62	189	12.51	5.64	172	11.48	5.21	361

Note. PrSC = Private Self-Consciousness; PuSC = Public Self-Consciousness; SA = Social Anxiety.

Reallo & Allik, 1998; but see Chan, 1996). Two-way MANOVAs indicated important gender differences in all SCS scales, PrSC: $F(1, 357) = 15.22$; $p = .00$; $\eta^2 = .041$; PuSC: $F(1, 357) = 27.43$; $p = .00$; $\eta^2 = .071$; SA: $F(1, 357) = 9.24$; $p = .00$; $\eta^2 = .025$. Female participants had higher scores than male participants (Table 2). Important differences emerged also in PrSC between high school and undergraduate students, $F(1, 357) = 24.74$; $p = .00$; $\eta^2 = .065$, with the latter having higher scores.

The correlation between the PrSC and SA scales was .20, the correlation between PuSC and SA was .38, and the one between PuSC and PrSC was .68.

The factor structure of the questionnaire was verified with the principal component analysis (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin = .867; Bartlett's test of sphericity: $\chi^2(253) = 2685$, $p = .000$, correlations between items ranged from $-.15$ to $.63$, with average correlation being $.20$). Five components with eigenvalues above 1 that explained 54% of variance were found: 5.93 (25.8%), 2.73 (11.9%), 1.56 (6.8%), 1.23 (5.3%) and 1.02 (4.4%). Based on Cattell's scree test we extracted only three components, because the proportion of variance explained by each of the following components decreased substantially and had no practical value (extraction of four components did not show division of PrSC scale, as only items 22 and 23 were loaded on the fourth component). Because of high correlations between the components ($r = .51$ between the first and the third, and $r = .36$ between the second and the third component) oblique promax rotation was performed.

Component loadings after promax rotation can be found in Table 3. First component was clearly loaded by 8 of 10 PrSC items and also by the item 2 from PuSC scale. The item 17 was approximately equally loaded on the first and the third component. All six items composing SA had highest loadings on the second component. Two of them also had high loadings on the third component. The third component

Table 3. *Structure matrix of component loadings after promax rotation.*

Item No.	Scale	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3
2	PuSC	.710	.143	.345
15	PrSC	.698	.263	.346
1	PrSC	.672	.205	.267
7	PrSC	.668	.320	.527
17	PuSC	.636	.263	.553
20	PrSC	.627	.174	.385
3	PrSC	.619	.080	.241
18	PrSC	.583	.237	.331
13	PrSC	.498	-.031	.469
9	PrSC	.496	.084	.044
10	SA	.175	.757	.247
4	SA	.228	.738	.187
16	SA	.158	.685	.301
23	SA	.212	.636	.118
8	SA	.120	.595	.268
12	SA	.045	.594	-.012
11	PuSC	.353	.359	.802
6	PuSC	.354	.579	.689
14	PuSC	.475	.534	.669
5	PrSC	.385	.160	.626
21	PuSC	.118	-.048	.541
19	PuSC	.369	.498	.508
22	PrSC	.057	-.231	.238

Note. PrSC = Private Self-Consciousness; PuSC = Public Self-Consciousness; SA = Social Anxiety.

represented PuSC. It had the highest loadings on five items that compose the PuSC scale and two of the items that measure PrSC. The item 22 had very low loadings on all three components and we can assume that it does not measure any of the three components. The problematic items were thus 2, 17, 5 and 22. First three of them loaded on different components than other items of belonging scales.

Construct validity of the SCS was verified by observing correlations between the SCS scales and various personality measures. Results are presented in Table 4. All three scales of the SCS were negatively related to Self-Esteem and positively to Anxiety. Satisfaction with Life, a measure of subjective well-being, was related only to SA. The SA scale exhibited also the highest correlations with the Big Five factors. It was highly related to Energy and Emotional Stability. PrSC and PuSC scales were both negatively related only to Emotional Stability and in low degree also to Energy.

Table 4. Correlations between SCS scales and other measures.

	Scale	N	PrSC	PuSC	SA
BFO	Energy	317	-.12 *	-.22 **	-.68 **
BFO	Agreeableness	317	.01	-.07	-.12 *
BFO	Conscientiousness	317	.01	-.04	-.24 **
BFO	Emotional Stability	317	-.34 **	-.43 **	-.50 **
BFO	Openness	317	-.02	-.12 *	-.32 **
SCC	Self-Concept Clarity	253	-.36 **	-.39 **	-.36 **
RSE	Self-Esteem	253	-.31 **	-.35 **	-.45 **
STAI	Anxiety	248	.42 **	.48 **	.54 **
SWLS	Satisfaction with Life	107	-.05	-.12	-.38 **

Note. PrSC = Private Self-Consciousness; PuSC = Public Self-Consciousness; SA = Social Anxiety.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Discussion

We examined the psychometric characteristics of the Slovene version of the SCS. The results indicate that the Slovene version of the questionnaire has psychometric characteristics comparable to those found in the original version.

The authors of the questionnaire (Fenigstein et al., 1975) reported about non-significant gender differences which they considered surprising since stereotypical representations of men and women include attitudes about higher self-consciousness of women. But many other studies report about important differences between the genders, with higher scores on one or on all three scales for women (Nystedt & Smari, 1989; Realo & Allik, 1998). Therefore, our results, indicating higher means for women on all three scales, are not surprising. Women are more concerned about their appearance and thus they are thinking more about their self-presentation, and they also show higher fear of embarrassment and think more about their inner feelings and thoughts.

Our results also revealed the important differences in PrSC between secondary-school pupils and university students. Since age difference between both samples was only one year, we can assume that the difference is a result of selection of the student sample. Although to our knowledge there is no research that would study the differences in self-consciousness of participants with different levels of education, we assume that the level of education might be the reason for the differences. McFarland and Sparks (1985) found that age and education are both linearly related to the internal consistency of personality scales. As we already reported, the PrSC is related to internal consistency, so it could be possible that education to some extent facilitates self-consciousness, provides more feedback to individual, which in turn enables him to build more coherent picture about himself.

The exploratory component analyses support the three-factor solution proposed by Fenigstein et al. (1975), although many later studies confirmed a four-factor

solution with distinction between Internal State Awareness and Self-Reflectiveness (Bumkrant & Page, 1984). Some of the items are not saturated according to theory (2, 5, 17, and 22). At least for the item 2, inappropriate translation seems to be the cause of different saturation. The more appropriate translation of item 2 ("I'm concerned about my style of doing things") might be "Skrbi me, kako izgleda moj način vedenja, delovanja." For item 22, Anderson et al. (1996) similarly reported low loadings and low communality estimates and they omitted the item from further analyses. Thus, the item 22 seems to be problematic also in the original language.

The largest problem, not specific to our sample only, represent high correlations between the scales and thus also between the components in factor analyses. They indicate the problematic discriminative validity of PrSC vs. PuSC. This problem was already reported by Chan (1996). He suggested one general factor of self-consciousness. The authors of the questionnaire (Fenigstein et al., 1975) claimed that PrSC and PuSC do not represent different extremes of the same continuum, but are different dimensions moderately correlated to each other ($r = .23$ to $.26$). Later studies reported slightly higher correlations, between $.17$ and $.61$ (Abrams, 1988). Thus the high correlations between the scales are not a problem only in the Slovene translation. Wicklund and Gollwitzer (1987), for example, even argue against the theoretical dichotomy between private and public aspect of self-consciousness.

Many studies dealt with relations between SCS and different measures of well-being. Although theoretically positive effects of knowing oneself could be anticipated, our results indicate that SCS reflects more neurotic and not epistemic aspect of motivation for self-interest. All three scales of the SCS are negatively related to self-esteem and positively to anxiety, thus confirming previous findings (Gibbons, 1990; Ingram, 1990; Turner et al., 1978; Watson et al., 1994). Satisfaction with Life, another criterion of well-being, is related negatively only to SA, whereas it does not correlate with PrSC and PuSC, which indicates that self-consciousness is not related to someone's evaluation of his life. According to the results of previous studies (Campbell et al., 1996) we expected a negative correlation between PrSC and clarity of self. Authors assumed that individuals with less clear self-concept should possess higher tendency toward ruminating self-analysis, not because of intellectual curiosity but because of obsessive self-attributive thoughts. Our results confirmed those expectations since all SCS scales correlate negatively with Self-Concept Clarity. Campbell et al. also reported a negative correlation between Self-Concept Clarity and PuSC, which indicates that individuals with less clear self-concept are more sensitive and worry more about others' perception and evaluation of their behaviour. Relation of the SCS scales with the Big Five is also of great interest. SA exhibits the correlations with all Big Five factors, the highest to Energy and Emotional Stability. Although in previous studies the most consistent relation is that of PrSC with Openness (McCrae, 1993; Trapnell & Campbell, 1999; Zuckerman et al., 1993), this is not the case in our sample. Openness is in contrast negatively related to SA and PuSC.

In sum, correlations with other personality constructs indicate self-conscious-

ness as a problematic characteristic for an individual. It is negatively correlated to all applied measures of well-being. Even the relation to openness, consistently found in other studies, was not confirmed. The lack of this relation could also be a consequence of the results of factor analyses which did not reveal two subscales of PrSC reflecting positive and negative aspects of self-consciousness. It seems that items on PrSC do not measure epistemic motivation for self-insight in the Slovene version.

Nevertheless we can conclude that the SCS is a suitable measure of self-consciousness for Slovene population. It shows a three-component structure with appropriate correlations to majority of other constructs. To obtain even better measure of self-consciousness some corrections in translation should be made and norms for Slovene samples should be obtained, but it seems that the use of the instrument for research purposes is acceptable.

References

- Abrams, D. (1988). Self-consciousness scales for adults and children: Reliability, validity, and theoretical significance. *European Journal of Personality*, 2, 11–37.
- Anderson, E. M., Bohon, L. M., & Berrigan, L. P. (1996). Factor structure of the Private Self-Consciousness Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 66, 144–152.
- Banos, R. M., Belloch, A., & Perpina, C. (1990). Self-consciousness scale: A study of Spanish housewives. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 771–774.
- Bernstein, I. H., Teng, G., & Garbin, C. P. (1986). A confirmatory factoring of the Self-Consciousness Scale. *Multivariate Behavior Research*, 21, 459–475.
- Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1993). Measures of Self-Esteem. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver in L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes* (pp. 115-160). Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.
- Britt, T. W. (1992). The Self-Consciousness Scale: On the stability of the three-factor structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 748–755.
- Bumkrant, R. E., & Page, T. J. (1984). A modification of the Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss self-consciousness scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 629–637.
- Campbell, J. D., Trapnell, P. D., Heine, S. J., Katz, I. M., Lavalley, L. F., & Lehman, D. R. (1996). Self-concept clarity: Measurement, personality correlates, and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 141–157.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., Bucik, V., & Boben, D. (1997). *Model "velikih pet" [The Big Five Model]*. Ljubljana: Produktivnost, Center za psihodiagnostična sredstva.
- Carver, C. S. (1975). Physical aggression as a function of objective self-awareness and attitudes toward punishment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 510–519.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1982). Control theory: A useful conceptual framework for personality-social, clinical, and health psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, 111–135.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1990). Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-process view. *Psychological Review*, 97, 19–35.

- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1992). *Perspectives on personality*. Boston: Allyn in Bacon.
- Chan, D. W. (1996). Self-consciousness in chinese college students in Hong Kong. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21, 557–562.
- Chang, L. (1998). Factor interpretations of the self-consciousness scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24, 635–640.
- Comunian, A. L. (1994). Self-consciousness scale dimensions: An Italian adaptation. *Psychological Reports*, 74, 483–489.
- Conway, M., & Giannopoulos, C. (1993). Self-esteem and specificity in self-focused attention. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133, 122–123.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71–75.
- Doherty, K., & Schlenker, B. R. (1991). Self-consciousness and strategic selfpresentation. *Journal of Personality*, 59, 1–18.
- Duval, S., & Wicklund, R. A. (1972). *A theory of objective self-awareness*. New York: Wiley.
- Fenigstein, A. (1979). Self-consciousness, self-attention, and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 75–86.
- Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 43, 522–527.
- Franzoi, S. L. (1983). Self-concept differences as a function of private self-consciousness and social anxiety. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 17, 275–287.
- Froming, W. J., & Carver, C. S. (1981). Divergent influences of private and public self-consciousness in a compliance paradigm. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 15, 159–171.
- Gibbons, F. X. (1990). Self-attention and behavior: A review and theoretical update. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 23, 249–303.
- Gibbons, F. X., Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Hormuth, S. E. (1979). Self-focused attention and the placebo effect: Fooling some of the people some of the time. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 15, 263–274.
- Gibbons, F. X., Smith, T. W., Ingram, R. E., Pearce, K., Brehm, S. S., & Schroeder, D. J. (1985). Self-awareness and self-confrontation: Effects of self-focused attention on members of a clinical population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 662–675.
- Heinemann, W. (1979). The assessment of private and public self-consciousness: A German replication. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 9, 331–337.
- Ingram, R. E. (1990). Self-focused attention in clinical disorders: review and a conceptual model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 156–176.
- Joireman, J. (2004). Empathy and the self-absorption paradox II: Self-rumination and self-reflection as mediators between shame, guilt, and empathy. *Self and Identity*, 3, 225–238.
- Joireman, J. A., Parrott, L. III, & Hammersla, J. (2002). Empathy and the Self-Absorption Paradox: Support for the Distinction Between Self-Rumination and Self-Reflection. *Self and Identity*, 1, 53–65.
- Lamovec, T. (1988). *Priročnik za psihologijo motivacije in emocij [Handbook of psychology of motivation and emotion]*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Lamovec, T. (1994). *Psihodiagnostika osebnosti 2 [Psychodiagnostic of Personality 2]*.

Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.

- Lyubomirsky, S., Caldwell, N. D., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1998). Effects of ruminative and distracting responses to depressed mood on retrieval of autobiographical memories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 166–177.
- Lyubomirsky, S., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1993). Self-perpetuating properties of dysphoric rumination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 339–349.
- Lyubomirsky, S., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1995). Effects of self-focused rumination on negative thinking and interpersonal problem solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 176–190.
- McCrae, R. R. (1993). Moderated analyses of longitudinal personality stability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 577–585.
- McFarland, S. G., & Sparks, C. (1985). Age, education, and the internal consistency of personality scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 1692–1702.
- Miller, L. C., & Cox, C. L. (1982). For appearances' sake: Public self-consciousness and makeup use. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8*, 748–751.
- Mittal, B., & Balasubramanian, S. K. (1987). Testing the dimensionality of the self-consciousness scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 51*, 53–68.
- Mor, N., & Winquist, J. (2002). Self-focused attention and negative affect: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 638–662.
- Mueller, J. H. (1982). Self-awareness and access to material rated as self-descriptive or nondescriptive. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 19*, 323–326.
- Mullen, B., & Suls, J. (1982). "Know thyself": Stressful life changes and the ameliorative effect of private self-consciousness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18*, 43–55.
- Nasby, W. (1985). Private self-consciousness, articulation of the self-schema, and recognition memory of trait adjectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 704–709.
- Nasby, W. (1989a). Private and public self-consciousness and articulation of the self-schema. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 117–123.
- Nasby, W. (1989b). Private self-consciousness, self-awareness, and the reliability of self-reports. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 950–957.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1991). Responses to depression and their effects on the duration of depressive episodes. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 100*, 569–582.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Morrow, J. (1991). A prospective study of depression and posttraumatic stress symptoms after a natural disaster: The 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 115–121.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Morrow, J., & Fredrickson, B. L. (1993). Response styles and the duration of episodes of depressed mood. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*, 20–28.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Parker, L. E., & Larson, J. (1994). Ruminative coping with depressed mood following loss. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 92–104.
- Nystedt, L., & Ljungberg, A. (2002). Facets of private and public self-consciousness: Construct and discriminant validity. *European Journal of Personality, 16*, 143–159.
- Nystedt, L., & Smari, J. (1989). Assessment of the Fenigstein, Scheier and Buss Self-Consciousness Scale: A Swedish translation. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 53*, 342–352.

- Pavot, W. & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5, 164–172.
- Piliavin, J. A., & Charng, H. (1988). What is the factor structure of the Private and Public Self-Consciousness scales? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 587–595.
- Realo, A., & Allik, J. (1998). The Estonian Self-Consciousness Scale and its relation to the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 70, 109–124.
- Reeves, A. L., Watson, P. J., Ramsey, A., & Morris, R. J. (1995). Private self-consciousness factors, need for cognition, and depression. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10, 431–443.
- Rosenberg, M. (1989). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Revised edition. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Ruganci, R. N. (1995). Private and Public Self-Consciousness subscales of the Fenigstein, Scheier and Buss Self-Consciousness Scale: A Turkish translation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 18, 279–282.
- Scandell, D. J. (1998). The personality correlates of public and private self-consciousness from a five-factor perspective. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 13, 578–592.
- Scheier, M. F., Buss, A. H., & Buss, D. M. (1978). Self-consciousness, self-report of aggressiveness, and aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 12, 133–140.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). The Self-Consciousness Scale: A revised version for use with general populations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 687–699.
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Gibbons, F. X. (1979). Self-directed attention, awareness of bodily states, and suggestibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1576–1588.
- Shek, D. T. L. (1994). Assessment of private and public self-consciousness: A Chinese replication. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 50, 341–348.
- Siegrist, M. (1996). The influence of self-consciousness on the internal consistency of different scales. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20, 115–117.
- Smith, J. D., & Schaffer, D. R. (1986). Self-consciousness, self-reported altruism, and helping behaviour. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 14, 215–220.
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Lushene, R. E. (1970). *Manual for the State Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist's Press.
- Trapnell, P. D., & Campbell, J. D. (1999). Private self-consciousness and the five factor model of personality: Distinguishing rumination from reflection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 284–304.
- Treynor, W., Gonzalez, R., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2003). Rumination reconsidered: A psychometric analysis. *Cognitive Therapy and Research (Special Issue on Rumination)*, 27, 247–259.
- Turner, R. G. (1978a). Consistency, self-consciousness, and the predictive validity of typical and maximal personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 12, 117–132.
- Turner, R. G. (1978b). Self-consciousness and speed of processing self-relevant information. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 4, 456–460.
- Turner, R. G., Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Ickes, W. (1978). Correlates of self-consciousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 42, 285–289.

- Watson, P. J., Hickman, S. E., Morris, R. J., Stutz, N. L., & Whiting, L. (1994). Complexity of self-consciousness subscales: Correlations of factors with self-esteem and dietary restraint. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 9*, 761–774.
- Watson, P. J., Milliron, J. T., & Morris, R. J. (1995). Social desirability scales and theories of suicide: Correlations with alienation and self-consciousness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 18*, 701–711.
- Watson, P. J., Morris, R. J., Ramsey, A., Hickman, S. E., & Waddell, M. G. (1996). Further contrasts between self-reflectiveness and internal state of awareness factors of private self-consciousness. *Journal of Psychology, 130*, 183–192.
- Wicklund, R. A., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1987). The fallacy of the private-public self-focus distinction. *Journal of Personality, 55*, 492–523.
- Wood, J. V., Saltzberg, J. A., Neale, J. M., Stone, A. A., & Rachmiel, T. B. (1990). Self-focused attention, coping responses, and distressed mood in everyday life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 1027–1036.
- Zuckerman, M., Kuhlman, D., Joireman, J., Teta, P., & Kraft, M. (1993). A comparison of three structural models for personality: The Big Three, the Big Five, and the Alternative Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 757–768.